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Charisma and Structure in the Assemblies of God: Revisiting O’Dea’s Five Dilemmas

Margaret M. Poloma

Prologue

Charisma, in final analysis, is a gift — a breath that is illusive and fragile. She can launch a new institution and breathe life into existing ones. The Assemblies of God, birthed by her spirit, has been renewed by her grace. Whether she will continue to seek and to find a home within the Assemblies of God remains a critical question that only the future can answer.¹

Nearly twenty-five years have passed since I first launched a sociological study of the Assemblies of God (AG) — a research adventure published as The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads in 1989. My conclusion about the fate of charisma in this rapidly growing Pentecostal denomination was cautious and tentative. Its destiny, despite the gloomy Weberian prognosis on the inevitable routinization of charisma, was then colored by the revitalization of the Assemblies of God brought about by the rise of the charismatic movement during the 1960s and 1970s, bringing Pentecostal experiences to the mainline Christian churches. The charismatic movement soon waxed and waned, as had the earlier revival on Azusa Street in Los Angeles (1906–9) that birthed Pentecostalism during the first decade of the twentieth century. It was not long, however, before another move of the Spirit, the so-called Third Wave, crossed the American continent during the 1980s — a move which marked the rise of more contemporary and youth-oriented charismatic groups, many of which developed out of the Jesus movement of the 1970s.² Rumors of a fresh renewal in the early


². Although most Pentecostals were wary of both the charismatic movement and the
1990s attracted international attention with the outbreak of the so-called Toronto Blessing. It developed in the Third Wave sector but soon spilled over into the Pentecostal and charismatic streams of the larger movement. With its nightly revival meetings beginning in January 1994 attracting pilgrims from around the world, the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship became the epicenter of a fresh revival fire that torched similar gatherings at numerous other North American sites. One such site emerged on Father’s Day 1995, at Brownsville Assembly of God in Pensacola, Florida, where the new revival found an inroad into the increasingly routinized and bureaucratized Pentecostal stream of the Spirit-filled movement.3

The “Pensacola Outpouring” caused some degree of tension within the AG, blurring the boundaries and raising questions about denominational identity. But tension has always found a home within the AG; and, as I have discussed at length elsewhere, a degree of tension between charisma and structure has been an important factor in accounting for the vitality enjoyed by the AG.5 Indeed, William Menzies’ following theological essay effectively presents a case for the AG’s ability to live with theological tension by demonstrating “continued evidence of a reasonable balance between charisma and organization.” Maintaining a free flow of charisma, however, requires skill not unlike that of a unicycle rider: despite great skill, there is always the risk of a fall.

The fear of falling into the abyss of “carnal,” unregulated religious experi-

---


5. As Lewis Coser (Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict [Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1967]) convincingly argued almost forty years ago, tension and conflict can have positive institutional consequences. Tension with an out-group (external conflict), for example, can serve to establish a strong group identity, and Pentecostalism’s status as a “third force” within Christianity owes much to the hostility Pentecostalism experienced as a newly emerging sect during the first half of the twentieth century. Tension within the group (internal conflict) can also have positive repercussions, especially for loosely knit structures such as the Assemblies of God.
ence has often caused established Pentecostalism to quench charisma as it sought to protect its emergent structure. Fresh charismatic outbursts seem to find more fertile ground outside organized denominations in the growing numbers of parachurch networks and independent churches. Sociologist Peter Berger was correct in his passing assessment that “religious experiences are institutionally dangerous.”

Newly formed networks and emerging congregations appear to have less to risk in embracing fresh experiences than do established sects and denominations.

A tolerance for a moderate amount of tension between charisma and institution, however, is seemingly built into the DNA of Pentecostalism where religious distinctiveness centers on paranormal experiences believed to be generated by Spirit baptism. The inherent tension between what Grant Wacker has called primitivism and pragmatism — the paranormal working of the Holy Spirit and the organizational matrix that promotes the Pentecostal mission — is rooted in its earliest history. As Wacker succinctly summarizes his thesis: “My main argument can be stated in a single sentence. The genius of the Pentecostal movement lay in its ability to hold two seemingly incompatible impulses in productive tension. I call the two impulses the primitive and the pragmatic.”

This tension between charisma (the “primitive”) and organization (a facet of the “pragmatic”) continues to be central for understanding the AG today, just as it is for understanding its past.

As I have done in my earlier work on the AG, I will use the framework of dilemmas of institutionalization developed by Thomas O’Dea to explore the tension between charisma and organizing religious work by the AG. For each of O’Dea’s five dilemmas, I will identify an issue in Pentecostalism and explore its “core” and “peripheral” dimensions. A core value, according to Lewis Coser, is a central component of the relationship (in contrast to a pe-


7. The birth of the AG itself provides an excellent example of embracing risk and institutional resistance to seemingly unregulated religious experience by established sects and denominations. Those who reported being Spirit-baptized during the first decade of the twentieth century, complete with paranormal experiences (especially glossohalia, but also healing, prophecy, deliverance, and miracles), usually (voluntarily or involuntarily) withdrew from what they regarded as “dead denominations.” History was to repeat itself throughout the twentieth century with the development of fresh charismatic experiences and the splits and schisms resulting from failed attempts to agree on the essence and meaning of such experiences.


Peripheral issue), an attack upon which threatens the social group. If a core value is attacked, a single line of cleavage that may have seriously negative consequences threatens the organization. Loosely knit organizations, such as the AG, may actually be strengthened by the tension that develops around multiple peripheral issues, conflict which tends to diffuse an attack on a core issue. Coser contends that when stress mounts within a group, making allowance for tension may serve a positive force in "sewing" diverse factions together. Different alliances often made on different peripheral but potentially divisive issues paradoxically can further group integration. The problematic face of conflict arises when a single core issue is made focal and threatens to bifurcate the group.

In addressing key core and peripheral issues currently facing the AG, Coser's and O'Dea's theoretical framework will be grounded in data collected from a random sample of 447 AG pastors who were mailed surveys in early 1999. The major conclusion from the survey analysis: The AG has a solid core around which there are varying levels of ambiguity. The ambiguity that exists on peripheral issues appears to function as a safety-valve mechanism feeding the ongoing dialectical interrelationship between charisma and institution building. In sum, the AG continues to successfully balance charisma with institutionalization, as it has for much of its history. Institutionalization has not sounded the death knell for charisma, nor has revitalization of charisma brought about organizational anarchy.

O'Dea's Five Dilemmas in the Institutionalization of Religion:
Ambiguities and Creative Tension

Thomas O'Dea's well-known "five institutional dilemmas" point to the inherent tension found to some degree in all religious organizations. Each dilemma reflects the "basic antinomy" or "fundamental tension" that exists between charisma (that is, the immediacy of direct religious experience) and institutional forces. The ongoing tension between spontaneity and stability that permeates all five dilemmas can be described as "transforming the religious experience to render it continuously available to the mass of men [sic] and to provide for it a

12. A copy of the questionnaire and summary of responses is available at: http://www.hirr.hartsem.edu/sociology/sociology_online_articles.html#P.
stable institutional context.”14 Once free-flowing, nonnormative, and seemingly chaotic, charisma must (at least to some extent) be transformed into something stable, normal, and ordered. Although an important catalyst in the development of all world religions, charisma is usually quenched in favor of the patterned and predictable institutional features of social life. Each of the dilemmas — mixed motivation, symbolic, delimitation, power, and administrative order — provides a unique vantage point to explore the working of the AG as seen by its pastors as evidenced in their survey responses.

The Dilemma of Mixed Motivation: Assessing Identity

According to O’Dea’s theory, the emergence of a stable structure brings with it the capability of eliciting a wide range of individual motives that follow the ideal-typical state where a charismatic leader is able to generate “single-mindedness.”15 It should be noted that the Pentecostal/charismatic movement (PCM) has never had a single charismatic leader similar to Methodism’s John Wesley, Quakerism’s George Fox, Mormonism’s Joseph Smith, or Christian Science’s Mary Baker Eddy. In a movement that has democratized charisma, the relationship between a charismatic leader and his disciples described by O’Dea has not been the prime motivating factor. Rather, the single-mindedness of the movement has been energized by a common experience of the Holy Spirit out of which a diffused leadership and organizations have emerged. Countless churches, networks, and small sects came out of the particular experiences of the Holy Spirit which were reported in the nineteenth century, became better labeled and identified in the early twentieth century, and spread globally through the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles from 1906 to 1909.16 It was in 1914 that the leaders and pastors of some of these groups came together in Hot Springs, Arkansas, giving birth to the AG, the largest and most influential white Pentecostal denomination in the United States.

Although the dilemma of mixed motivation can be illustrated through the rise of an ordained clergy and the correspondent development of leadership roles (as suggested by O’Dea and described in Assemblies of God at the Crossroads), it can also be assessed through a discussion of religious identity issues.

16. Wacker identifies Pentecostals as part of a genre of believers he calls “radical evangelicals” who emphasized a fourfold gospel of “personal salvation, Holy Ghost baptism, divine healing, and the Lord’s soon return.” The emphasis of the streams differs somewhat, with Pentecostals putting their focus on “Holy Ghost baptism.” Wacker, Heaven Below.
found in its distinctive worldview. A passage from Zechariah 4:6 that serves as a motto for the AG provides a succinct statement about Pentecostal identity: “Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit,” says the Lord Almighty.” This simple profession reflects what AG theologian Frank Macchia describes as a “paradigm shift from an exclusive focus on holiness to an outward thrust that invoked a dynamic filling and an empowerment for global witness.”  

As routinization extracts its due, however, this emphasis on “dynamic filling” and “empowerment” increasingly shifts from personal experience and testimony to profession and expansion of doctrinal decree. Testimonies of lived experience that empowered early believers take a backseat to a selective reconstruction of AG history and doctrine that often fails to capture the diversity that found expression in the larger PCM. As Robeck effectively argues in his discussion of Pentecostal identity, Pentecostalism has demonstrated a host of “indigenous entries,” including “Oneness Pentecostalism,” “World Faith Pentecostalism,” “Feminist Pentecostalism,” and even “Gay Pentecostalism,” all of which have been rejected by the AG. The AG has increasingly defined itself primarily as “evangelical Pentecostalism,” or perhaps more accurately, as the AG has increasingly defined itself primarily as “evangelical Pentecostalism,” or perhaps more accurately, as Menzies argues in the following essay, as “evangelicalism plus tongues.” Robeck goes on to state:

Pentecostals have historically disagreed with one another on what constitutes a real Pentecostal, and as a result, on what constitutes genuine Pentecostalism. The fact may not be easy for some Pentecostals to accept, but it is true nonetheless. Each group seems to want to identify its own specific character as providing the best, if not the only legitimate identity for all real Pentecostals. Insofar as their distinctives become all that define Pentecostalism, the real character, contribution, and impact of the whole Movement may be lost.

What appears to happen, particularly in more established classical Pentecostal denominations like the AG, is that the breadth and depth of the PCM is eclipsed as each segment identifies with a single appendage much like the blind men in their respective attempts to describe the proverbial elephant. The es-


sence of Pentecostalism as a “new paradigm” — with the natural and supernatural engaged in a dialectical dance — is compromised by accommodative forces that threaten to dilute Pentecostal identity. As evangelicals find a prominent place in the American religious mosaic, some would put aside the “new paradigm” to embrace a modernist religious identity that downplays controversial issues that come with “dynamic filling” and “empowerment.”

It should be noted that Spirit-filled Christianity, unlike Christian fundamentalism and evangelicalism, is not primarily a reaction to modernity. It has proactively developed certain characteristics which taken together make its worldview distinct from other forms of Christianity, both of the liberal and conservative stripes. The Pentecostal worldview is experientially centered with followers in a dynamic and personal relationship with a deity who is both immanent and transcendent. According to Johns, “The Spirit-filled believer has a predisposition to see a transcendent God at work in, with, through, above and beyond all events. Therefore, all space is sacred space and all time is sacred time.” God is seen as active in all events past, present, and future which work together in a kind of master plan. It is a worldview that tends to be “transrational,” professing that knowledge is “not limited to realms of reason and sensory experience.”

Consistent with this transrational characteristic, Pentecostal Christians also tend to be anticreedal, believing that “knowing” comes from a right relationship with God rather than through reason or even through the five senses. Theirs is a God who can and often does defy the laws of nature with the miraculous and unexplainable. Without doubt the Bible holds an important place in their worldview, but for many it is a kind of catalyst and litmus test for the authenticity of personal and corporate experience rather than a manual of rigid doctrine and practices. As Johns succinctly states: “In summary, a Pentecostal paradigm for knowledge and truth springs from an experiential knowledge of God which alters the believer’s approach to reading and interpreting reality.”

This paradigm is shared by both classical Pentecostalism and more recent PCM streams. The newer groups together with some classical Pentecostals, however, tend to self-identify as “charismatic” or as “Spirit-filled” Christians and, as products of more recent renewals or revivals, tend to be stronger in primitivism and weaker on pragmatism. Although the distinction Menzies makes in his following essay between Pentecostals and charismatics as being one over the “endowment of power for evangelism and missions” has some

merit, I would contend that “involvement in ministry” is a by-product of Spirit baptism for both groups. The primary distinction I have observed between the two major streams of the PCM in North America is their somewhat different expressions of its common core Pentecostal spirituality. At the risk of some oversimplification, those who self-identify as “charismatic” are more likely to be open to a range of paranormal experiences (including prophecy, miracles, healing, and physical manifestations of an altered state of consciousness) as signs of Spirit baptism, while most Pentecostals tend to place a doctrinal emphasis on the gift of tongues (as does the AG). Furthermore, established classical Pentecostal denominations (like the AG) tend to have well-developed bureaucratic structures while thriving neo-Pentecostal organizations tend to be nondenominational with members focusing on relational ties expressed in loosely knit networks.

What can be said about the PCM, regardless of the stream, is that it is more about a distinct spirituality than about religion. Members share a common transcendent worldview rather than particular doctrines, defined ritual practices, or denominational involvement. This worldview is a curious blend of premodern miracles, modern technology, and postmodern mysticism in which the natural blends with the supernatural. Signs and wonders analogous to those described in premodern biblical accounts are expected as normal occurrences in the lives of believers. Johns asserts that what underlies Pentecostal identity is a Pentecostal epistemology “congruous with the ancient Jewish approach to knowledge” — one that represents an alternative to modern ways of knowing: “Pentecostals have an alternative epistemology because they have an alternative world-view. At the heart of the Pentecostal world-view is transforming experience with God. God is known through relational encounter which finds its penultimate expression in being filled with the Holy Spirit. This experience becomes the normative epistemological framework and thus

22. Poloma, “Inspecting the Fruit of the ‘Toronto Blessing.’”
23. The heightened primitivism of neo-Pentecostal spirituality and eschewing of traditional organizational structures have led one British sociologist to make the following wager: “I would put my money on the old Pentecostal denominations still to be with us, and thriving at the end of the next century. I’m not prepared to put my shirt on the new churches, and don’t relish the long-odds on the Renewal.” Andrew Walker, foreword to Pentecostals in Britain, by William K. Kay (Carlisle, U.K.: Paternoster Press, 2000), pp. vii-ix.
shifts the structures by which the individual interprets the world." The general issue of Pentecostal identity is the core of this analysis — an issue that impacts each of the other dilemmas.

A report of the survey findings on the Pentecostal identity of AG pastors will add details to this brief description of Pentecostal identity and the importance of its worldview in maintaining the dialectical tension between charisma and organization that has been at the heart of Pentecostalism's success. Through data provided by the survey questions, identity issues can be empirically explored to reveal core tenets as well as attendant ambiguities. What does it mean to be Pentecostal (specifically AG) at the turn of this new century? Is there congruence between the reported identity self-perceptions of pastors and the congregations they represent? Is there a goodness of fit between these perceptions of identity and the denominational work performed by national and regional administrative offices? These and other related questions are used to tap the core identity and the ambiguities that exist around it, including the importance of being a member of the AG and a Pentecostal, and social distance between AG and adherents of other religious worldviews.

**Pentecostal Core Identity**

AG scholar Everett Wilson put the question to pen: "What makes a Pentecostal?" Difficulties of providing a simple description are deeply embedded in Pentecostal history. Wilson concludes that the social identity of a Pentecostal is rooted in a worldview based on the "mystical, the 'supernatural' and the allegedly miraculous," which tended to stigmatize and marginalize early Pentecostals. For Wilson, being labeled a Pentecostal was the result of more than a confessional act — it signaled a worldview that separated these believers from other Christians. As Wilson comments:

> Like the proverbial duck, if the person looked like one, walked like one and talked like one — especially if one were supportive of the beliefs and practices that Pentecostals advanced — friends and neighbours could assume that he or she in fact belonged. At least the often-sung refrain, "I'm so glad I can say I am one of them" apparently gained favour not just to establish identity or to convince believers that they were with the right crowd, but because adherents gave assent to the Pentecostal way of looking at reality,

something about which they may have felt deeply even when their convictions were not overtly displayed.  

Although professing to be a Pentecostal certainly does not tell the whole story of AG identity, it is a good place to begin a discussion of single-mindedness. Are pastors still singing “I am one of them,” as the denomination has taken a more accepted place in the religious mosaic? For the vast majority of pastors the answer appears to be “yes.” Self-identity can be gleaned from a question which instructed respondents to “indicate how important it is to identify with each of these groups” — Assemblies of God, Pentecostalism, revival/renewal, charismatic movement/Third Wave, and evangelicalism. Pastors were most likely to report their primary self-identity as Pentecostal (55 percent claimed it was “extremely important,” with another 33 percent saying it was “very important”). Nearly identical figures are reported for a personal identification with “revival/renewal,” implying a conscious decision to support a revitalization of Pentecostal identity through fresh religious experiences. Reporting self-identification with the AG was only slightly less than being Pentecostal and in revival/renewal. Forty-nine percent reported self-identification with the AG as “extremely important,” and another 36 percent said it was “very important.” The vast majority of the pastors report a religious identity that can be described as Pentecostal and being a member of the AG. These same pastors also identify very strongly with the need to be involved in revival/renewal, suggesting that Pentecostalism is largely regarded as a dynamic process rather than a staid structure. These labels of self-identity, however, need to be further explored. Probing into the nature of Pentecostal identity will reveal some of the ambiguities that beset the denomination.

**Ambiguity around the Core Identity**

Despite the strong approval of retaining and reviving Pentecostal identity, an old dilemma lurks beneath the “single-mindedness” reflected in the pastors’ responses. The AG historically has found itself in the paradoxical position of pro-

---


29. The mean scores for Pentecostal identification and for identifying with revival/renewal was 3.4 (on a 4-point scale). The mean score for identification with being Assemblies of God was 3.3.

30. Although the solid majority figures are being highlighted, the strength of the minority position should not be overlooked. For 16 percent of the pastors, identity with the AG is only “somewhat important” or “not important”; for 14 percent, being in revival is relatively unimportant; and for 13 percent, Pentecostal identity is not particularly relevant.
moting a distinct Pentecostal perspective while seeking a rapport with fundamentalism and later with a more moderate evangelicalism, sectors of which have been very critical of the PCM. Within two years of its founding in 1914, the AG’s message and mission, as Edith Blumhofer noted, “would be held within the boundaries drawn by traditional evangelical doctrines.”31 Its attempt to become “fundamentalism with a difference” (fundamentalism plus Spirit baptism) was not always well received, and Pentecostals, including the AG, became the target in 1928 of the World’s Christian Fundamentals Association, which went on record as “unreservedly opposed to Modern Pentecostalism.” It was not until the development of the more moderate National Association of Evangelicals (NAE) in the early 1940s that the AG found acceptance in this newly formed transdenominational conservative network. However, support for the NAE by AG constituents was far from universal. Blumhofer reports the critical response of one influential AG pastor to AG membership in the NAE: “This association is not Pentecostal and many of their speakers who are listed for a convention . . . not only do not favor Pentecost, but speak against it. This [cooperating with the NAE] is what I call putting the grave clothes again on Lazarus, while the Scripture says: ‘Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.’”32

The old controversy appears to be far from resolved, and it is here that ambiguity surfaces. Clergy remain divided about the threat that evangelicalism presents to the Pentecostal worldview that provides the AG with its distinct identity. A clear majority (60 percent) of pastors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Too many AG churches have stressed a general evangelical identity at the expense of their Pentecostal heritage.” Those AG congregations that clearly downplay their ties to the denomination often select a name for their congregation that gives the impression of its being an independent evangelical church. Ritual in such congregations (as will be discussed in a later section) often follows an evangelical format in which Pentecostal practices are discouraged — or at least their public display is not encouraged.

Over two-thirds of the pastors responding to the survey self-identified as evangelical, a nomenclature that is somewhat less important for most respondents than Pentecostal, AG, and revival/renewal identities. The evangelical label is clearly more important, however, than is self-identity with cousins in the

charismatic/Third Wave sector of the PCM.\textsuperscript{33} Despite the Pentecostal-like worldview of charismatic/Third Wave churches, only 28 percent of AG pastors reported that self-identification with these newer streams of the PCM was “extremely important” or “very important.”\textsuperscript{34} While self-identifying as Pentecostal and evangelical is central to the identity of a clear majority of AG pastors, only a minority self-identify with newer streams of the PCM where revitalization and renewal are often accompanied by a range of “signs and wonders” strikingly similar to those reported in the history of Pentecostalism.\textsuperscript{35}

Further ambiguity may be observed in the response to the question about belief in a dispensationalist interpretation of the Scriptures — a fundamentalist “fundamental” of long-standing tension within the AG. The dispensationalist perspective, popularized in the notes of the Scofield Bible and permeating sectors of evangelical Christianity, has been used to disparage Pentecostalism as at best delusional and at worst heretical. As Blumhofer has noted: “Dispensation- alists generally held that miracles had ceased with the Apostles; Pentecostalism thus could not be authentic, for its premise that New Testament gifts would mark the end-times church was false. Rejecting the latter-rain views by which Pentecostals legitimated their place in church history, dispensationalists effectively eliminated the biblical basis for Pentecostal theology.”\textsuperscript{36} Reflecting the fact that many Pentecostals did embrace the Scofield Bible (while rejecting its teachings on spiritual gifts in the contemporary church), 58 percent of the pastors strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, “I believe in a dispensationalist interpretation of Scripture.”

The interface with the fundamentalists goes back to the earliest days of

\textsuperscript{33} Evangelical identity had a mean score of 3 (on a 4-point scale) while charismatic/Third Wave identity scores had a mean of 2.

\textsuperscript{34} In North America the term “Pentecostal” usually refers to persons in denominations born out of or having some connection with the Azusa Street Revival in Los Angeles (1906-9). “Charismatic” applies to those in mainline and newer (often independent) churches which embraced a Pentecostal worldview in the mid–twentieth century or later. In the United States some 23 percent of all evangelical Protestants, 9 percent of mainline Protestants, 13 percent of Roman Catholics, and 36 percent of black Protestants claim to be “Spirit-filled,” another appellation for those persons embracing the PCM (John C. Green, James L. Guth, Corwin E. Smidt, and Lyman A. Kellstedt, Religion and the Culture Wars [Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 1997], p. 228). Americans who claim to be Spirit-filled tend to self-identify as Pentecostal (4.7 percent) or charismatic (6.6 percent), but much less frequently as both charismatic and Pentecostal (0.8 percent). It is thus not surprising that these clearly Pentecostal pastors would express some social distance from charismatics. Despite a worldview and theology that are more similar than dissimilar, most persons involved in the PCM are likely to identify with a particular stream of the movement.

\textsuperscript{35} Wacker, Heaven Below.

\textsuperscript{36} Blumhofer, Restoring the Faith, p. 107.
the AG. As Blumhofer has observed, "The causes espoused by fundamentalists seemed to coincide in meaningful ways with AG denominational interests and to offer as well an opportunity for declaring Pentecostal sympathies with doctrinal 'fundamentals.' It was not long before 'right belief replaced right experience,' causing even further erosion of AG distinctiveness."37 The danger that fundamentalism (and its softer evangelical expression) poses for Pentecostal identity has been noted by, for example, Cox, Hollenweger, and Spittler.38 Although the AG can be placed securely within the walls of larger evangelicalism, there is evidence that such positioning fragments its identity and, as O'Dea's dilemma of mixed motivation suggests, leaves the denomination with possibly dissonant agendas that may not be easy to resolve.

As reflected in our "collective fellowship" survey questions, dissonance between what AG ministers say and what they do to live out the common PCM paradigm can be seen in the groups with which they and their congregations are willing to cooperate in promoting issues of common concern. When pastors were asked to indicate the "extent you would like to see the AG cooperate with different religious groups," they were most likely to choose full cooperation with other Pentecostals. Sixty-five percent indicated a desire for full support with other Pentecostal churches. Despite paradigmatic differences, over half the pastors (57 percent) advocated full cooperation with evangelical churches on issues of common concern. Pastors were much less likely to support full cooperation with associations of charismatics in mainstream Protestantism (26 percent) or with independent charismatic organizations (27 percent).39

Clearly there is widespread support for a Pentecostal identity among AG pastors, but the essence of this distinct identity, especially when considered in light of fundamentalist opposition and evangelical indifference to Pentecostalism's worldview, is much less evident. Part of the explanation may come from Pentecostalism's success in spreading their once-distinct worldview to the larger Christian church. A popular cessationist position teaching that the su-

37. Blumhofer, Restoring the Faith, p. 159.
39. The mean scores for cooperating with various religious groups "on issues of common concern" (on a 3-point scale marking none, limited, and full) are as follows: with evangelicals = 2.6; with Pentecostals = 2.6; with independent/nondenominational churches = 2.3; with charismatic organizations = 2.2; with mainline Protestant churches = 2.1; with the Roman Catholic Church = 1.7; and with non-Christian religious groups = 1.4.
pernaturally gifts were meant only to jump-start early Christianity (and then ceased) may have lost ground in many evangelical circles. This perspective seems to have been found wanting in a postmodern culture that is hungry for spiritual means to counter the inadequacies of materialism and rationalism. Much of the argument about the availability of “signs and wonders” for contemporary Christianity appears to be about semantics and doctrinal statements rather than popular belief. As Jon Ruthven has noted in his review of Are Miraculous Gifts for Today?, the work edited by Wayne Grudem: “One is left with the feeling that the whole debate could be resolved by a simple change in labels (not ‘prophecy,’ or ‘a word of knowledge,’ but ‘leadings’; not ‘gifts of healing,’ but ‘healings’). Here the issue is not so much what God actually does today, so long as one avoids identifying these events as ‘miracles’ accrediting new doctrine.”

The real issue underlying the controversy that comes to the surface in Grudem’s collection is how frequently and how intensely these events should be expected. It may be that a version of the early Pentecostal worldview is widely accepted by both Pentecostals and non-Pentecostal Christians, but it is a domesticated version that has diluted the original paradigm. As we shall see in the next section, the twin issue of frequency and intensity is not only relevant for dialogue between Pentecostals and non-Pentecostals, but also points to an ambiguity within Pentecostalism.

In summary, there appears to be single-mindedness about key aspects of AG identity: the overwhelming majority of pastors claim that being AG and Pentecostal is “important” or “very important” to them, with a significant majority claiming evangelical identity and only a minority self-identifying with the charismatic/Third Wave streams of the PCM. A convergence of Pentecostal and evangelical identities is reflected in the pastors’ acceptance of a more refined Pentecostal worldview at a time when some evangelicals are abandoning a dispensationalist hermeneutic that preached against “signs and wonders” for contemporary Christianity. An analysis of how a converging of seemingly consonant identities translates into theology and religious cooperation reveals some AG fragmentation. Pentecostal support for fundamentalist theology and for evangelical alliances (after the founding of the NAE in 1943) seems to have sowed seeds of ambiguity that continue to this day that prevent established Pentecostal denominations like the AG from being on the cutting edge of the PCM.

The Symbolic Dilemma: Assessing the Prevalence of Pentecostal Experience

The worldview of the early Pentecostals not only accorded ideological legitimacy to the paranormal experiences reported in biblical times but restored them to a normative position in the twentieth-century Western world. Although glossolalia, or speaking in tongues, became the pivotal experiential doctrine in the AG, accounts of divine healing, prophetic words, miracles, and demonic exorcisms were also part and parcel of the Pentecostal package. More controversial were the strange physical manifestations that generated the pejorative label “Holy Rollers” ascribed by outsiders to Pentecostal believers who sometimes fell in a faint to the floor, jumped pews, violently jerked and shook, laughed, barked or rolled in the aisles under the alleged influence of the Spirit. Despite the denials of many contemporary cultural Pentecostals about their occurrence in early Pentecostalism, these same controversial manifestations erupted again during the New Order of the Latter Rain movement, spread to the “second wave” as Pentecost came to mainline denominations, and intensified during the contemporary “third wave” revivals.41

A dilemma facing Pentecostal believers from the earliest days of Azusa Street was how to allow the Spirit free movement while controlling excesses judged to be fanatic. This challenge was met by sorting out the more controversial physical responses (often difficult to justify from biblical texts) from less controversial experiences (more readily defined as “biblical”) that frequently have accompanied the perceived presence of the Holy Spirit. In the AG glossolalia and healing became doctrines while many other alleged expressions of the Spirit’s presence were relegated to the realms of fanaticism and heresy. Despite the solid ideological support for revival expressed in pastoral responses to the Pentecostal identity issues already discussed, much ambiguity continues around the incarnation of this ideology. What is perceived to be “extreme” and “fanatical” has fluctuated in AG history, thus contributing to a mixed message about the current streams of revival. This ambivalence about once commonly experienced revival phenomena can be gleaned in reviewing survey data through the lenses of the symbolic dilemma.

At the heart of the symbolic dilemma is ritual — “the cultic re-presentation of the religious experience [that] is central to the life of the religious group.”42 In

Pentecostalism, however, the goal was never to simply remember the past but rather to provide a forum for ongoing religious experiences. As described at some length in *The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads*, the report card on this dilemma is mixed, as noted in this concluding paragraph of the chapter titled “Maintaining a Pentecostal Worldview through Ritual”:

The symbolic dilemma is deemed one of the most important in maintaining charisma, yet it is, paradoxically, perhaps the most difficult to keep alive. In an attempt to minimize the dangers of both disorder and inauthenticity, some pastors are placing less emphasis on experiences in their services. Opting for set programs, well-timed services, and a high level of professionalism, these pastors are often openly critical of “emotionalism” in services. The dilemma is further jeopardized by the fact that some very successful Assemblies of God congregations have exchanged charisma for institutional techniques to promote church growth.43

**Core Ritual Expressions within the AG**

The debates within the AG about choirs and choir robes, printed bulletins, and ritualized services have over the years been increasingly resolved in favor of order and predictability. As noted in Menzies’ following essay, pragmatic decisions to accommodate multiple services, to make services more inviting for non-Pentecostals, and to deal with time-conscious Americans have produced a ritual in many churches that is indistinguishable from non-Pentecostal evangelical services. Mechanisms used to maintain order are the same ones that stifle the free flow of Pentecostal experiences. Earlier years of distinctive Pentecostal ritual when congregants commonly “tarried,” waiting for the Holy Spirit to move in the gathering, sometimes with unpredictable results, are the makings of AG history.44 Some recall this history with fondness and longing; others are more cautious about feared abuses found in unregulated meetings. The result is for the Pentecostal spirit to be unevenly distributed, a story that can be developed from statistics on the personal religious experiences of pastors as well as from pastoral reports about congregational services.

The most frequently practiced Pentecostal expression reported by pastors is speaking in tongues, or glossolalia. All ministers must sign a document annually when their credentials are renewed certifying that they accept the doctrine of tongues as the “initial physical evidence” of Spirit baptism. Although the

44. See Wacker, *Heaven Below*. 
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doctrine has repeatedly been challenged by those outside the denomination, as well as some within, it appears to have strong support among pastors. Eighty-five percent of the pastors agreed with this statement: “A person who has never spoken in tongues cannot claim to be Spirit baptized.” However, there appears to be a significant increase over the last quarter-century in the number of pastors who do not agree with the AG position on tongues as initial evidence of Spirit baptism. The 16 percent figure indicating disagreement is up from 2 percent in the 1980s survey. Although increasing numbers of AG congregants do not speak in tongues and a significant percentage of pastors disagree with the doctrinal statement, the experience of glossolalia and professing the creed of “initial evidence” continue to be a prerequisite for receiving and retaining AG ordination papers.45

The overwhelming majority of pastors in our survey (82 percent) did report praying in tongues weekly or more, with no pastor reporting not having prayed in tongues this past year. Tongues (at least on occasion) is a nearly universal part of the prayer lives of AG pastors. Pastors are somewhat less likely, however, to use this gift in a church service. Eighteen percent reported that they never gave an utterance in tongues or an interpretation of a glossolalic word during the past year, with another 36 percent indicating they did so only a few times. Forty-seven percent gave expression to glossolalia in a congregational setting more regularly, reportedly giving an “utterance” or an “interpretation” once a month or more. The fact that pastors pray in tongues in private ritual but are less likely to use the gift of tongues in a corporate setting suggests a dissonance in this expression of Pentecostal identity. Despite a more vocal yet clear minority who have reservations about the doctrine of tongues, it appears that the use of glossolalia is nearly universal for pastors in private prayer. Its corporate form of expression as “tongues and interpretation,” however, is practiced regularly by fewer than half the pastors surveyed.

Glossolalia is central to AG doctrinal identity, as reflected in its inclusion as one of the sixteen items found in the AG Statement of Fundamental Truths. It is, however, only one of many paranormal expressions found in early Pentecostalism or in the larger Spirit movement within Christianity. Experiences of other gifts and manifestations common at Azusa Street, during the early history of the AG, and during subsequent renewals and revivals are now seemingly few and far between. This narrowing range of Pentecostal experi-

45. Data from the CCSP (Cooperative Congregational Studies Project) found that “40% of churches estimated that half or less of their members have been baptized in the Holy Spirit with evidence of speaking in other tongues,” Sherri Doty and Efrem Espinoza, “FACT Survey Analysis: A 2000 Survey of Assemblies of God Churches,” General Council of the Assemblies of God, 2000.
ences was true for the pastors’ accounts of their personal experiences as well as for their reports of corporate experiences within their congregational services. Only a minority of pastors regularly experienced prophecy, healing, deliverance, or other phenomena believed by many to be signs of the activity and presence of the Holy Spirit. For example, 34 percent claimed to have given a prophecy once a month or more. Forty-six percent reported being a prayer facilitator for a physical healing, and 41 percent for a mental and emotional healing. Only 13 percent, however, claimed regular involvement in deliverance from demonic oppression as a result of prayer. Put another way, 66 percent never or rarely gave a prophecy, 55 percent never or rarely witnessed a physical healing through their prayer, 60 percent were never or rarely a witness to emotional or mental healing, and 88 percent never witnessed deliverance. Other physical manifestations common to contemporary revival meetings outside the AG were similarly less likely to be part of experiences reported by pastors: 94 percent were never or rarely slain in the Spirit, 83 percent had never or rarely experienced holy laughter, and 76 percent had never or rarely experienced the bodily manifestation of shaking or jerking, all of which were commonly experienced during the recent revivals.

A similar pattern was found for corporate ritual experiences. Tongues and interpretations were reported as a regular experience for only 43 percent of the congregations. While only 2 percent of the pastors said tongues and interpretation (as dictated by Pentecostal protocol) were never a part of their public ritual, they still occurred infrequently for the remaining majority. Only 33 percent reported regular experiences of prophecy, a gift that serves a function similar to that of tongues and interpretations. Both are regarded as inspired words or messages from God delivered to the congregation, with prophecy being a simple message without the glossolalic prelude.

Although prayer for healing was a regular feature of 90 percent of congregational services, fewer than half the congregations (41 percent) provided regular opportunity for sharing healing testimonies. It appears that healing prayer has become a nearly universal ritual in AG churches, but that fewer churches include opportunities for testimonials commonly used to encourage and build faith for miraculous healing. The fact that testimonies about healings received were far less likely to be reported than regular prayer for healing may point to underlying ambiguity about healing ritual as well as glossolalia. The

46 In reviewing these statistics, I was reminded of a comment made by an AG graduate student in one of my courses during which I was discussing my research on divine healing. The young man commented, “I have heard stories like you are reporting all of my life, but I have never seen one case of such healing in my church. Healing is professed but I have seen little evidence of its being practiced or experienced.”
survey responses regarding pastoral involvement in the expression of charisma during worship services and the pastoral reports of congregational use of gifts during worship demonstrate how ongoing charismatic practices vary widely within the AG.

**Ambiguity and the Ritual Dilemma**

The history of the AG, as we have already seen, is one of a revitalization movement that emphasizes an experiential baptism distinct from baptism with water. In the words of David du Plessis, a central Pentecostal actor in the charismatic movement of the 1960s and 1970s, “God has no grandchildren.” Because the identity of Pentecostals is rooted in paranormal religious experiences, their children cannot rely on their parents’ experiences to claim Spirit baptism. Many adherents, however, appear to be lapsing into a cultural Pentecostalism that increasingly assumes an evangelical identity at the expense of Pentecostal experience. This may be demonstrated by the changes in Pentecostal ritual over the decades, particularly the decrease in revival meetings where signs and wonders drew both the faithful and potential converts to be refreshed by Pentecostal experiences. In a recent discussion of the history of Pentecostalism, Everett Wilson emphasized the important role revival plays in the spread of this global movement:

> Whatever success the historian has in identifying the succession of Pentecostal outpourings in the early century, the issue is not “who begat whom,” but who or what brought to life and enthusiasm those many different specimens of Pentecostalism in diverse settings and sequences. A pedigree can show the relationship of each ascending generation to its predecessor, but each new generation still has to be born in reproductive passion. Revivals last not because the movement had an impressive beginning, but rather because periodic renewal keeps the enthusiasm vibrant despite energy-sapping generational, organizational and circumstantial changes.47

Revivals, once common in the AG, have gradually taken a backseat in many sectors of the denomination to “seeker-sensitive” churches and well-promoted programs. They were first banished from Sunday morning time slots and relegated to Sunday evening church gatherings and summer camps. They increasingly have been replaced by other rituals in many AG churches, lingering only as rumors from a seemingly distant historical past, as fewer pastors and their congregants experience the range of charisma found in early Pentecostal-

47. Wilson, “They Crossed,” p. 92.
ism. When new outpourings of charisma come along that revive the larger PCM, the AG has been reluctant to accept them as authentic moves of God. That isolationist and protectionist mentality has cost them opportunity to participate in charismatic outpourings in other sectors of Christianity.

Blumhofer’s observations about the consonant notes found in the New Order (Latter Rain) revival of the 1940s and early Pentecostalism provide some insight for understanding the ambivalence of the AG toward the fresh outpouring of charisma:

Some first-generation Pentecostals had begun within a decade to bemoan their movement’s waning power and had pointed to a future, more copious shower of the latter rain. Consequently, there was even precedent for the eschatological innovation by the New Order advocates. Daniel Kerr, for example, noting a declining focus on healing as early as 1914, had heralded a coming dispensation in which healing would have the prominence accorded to tongues at the turn of the century. As Pentecostal groups had organized and charismatic fervor had waned in some places — or was largely confined to revival campaigns and campmeetings — voices had been raised asserting that the turn-of-the-century Apostolic Faith Movement had seen only the beginning of a revival whose more copious latter rains were yet to come.46

While Blumhofer goes on to describe the AG rationale for rejecting the Latter Rain or New Order movement (particularly its rejection of religious organizations and its indictment of “old Pentecost”), the fact remains that the AG has been at times ambivalent and at times hostile to Pentecostal experiences in other streams of the PCM. The Latter Rain, the subsequent healing revival of the 1950s, and the charismatic movement of the 1960s and 1970s all, for the most part, occurred outside the AG. It had a positive effect on AG growth during this period largely through pastors who risked the criticism of their peers and sometimes censure from leadership for their support of this newer movement.

Most pastors in our survey do seem to be aware that the Pentecostal worldview is in continual need of revitalization. A vast majority (84 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The AG must actively seek to revitalize its early Pentecostal roots.” Very few (5 percent) agreed that to reach the unchurched “the AG must downplay the public use of the gifts of the Spirit” which are believed to accompany baptism with the Holy Spirit. The overwhelming majority of pastors verbally support AG identity as a Pentecostal

denomination in which paranormal gifts are openly displayed, even if these manifestations should cause some discomfort for first-time visitors. Moreover, 85 percent of the respondents reported that their congregations are of "one mind" regarding "expressive worship practices" which have at times caused divisions and disagreements in the past.

Despite the verbal acquiescence, there appears to be an unresolved paradox between the widely acclaimed support for revival with an openness to paranormal gifts and the absence or near absence of Pentecostal vitality in at least half the AG churches. With the possible exception of tongues and interpretations (experienced regularly in 43 percent of the congregations included in this study), other gifts and manifestations commonly witnessed in the larger PCM do not appear to be a regular part of AG ritual. The discrepancy between sentiments and behavior — between what people say and what they do — has been long observed by social psychologists, and can be once again seen in the responses to questions about the Brownsville Outpouring and other renewal tributaries.

The revival/renewal of the 1990s in North America can be traced to a revival begun with the AG in Argentina — a revival that continues into the twenty-first century. Although it first took form in North America in 1994 (at the then Toronto Airport Vineyard, a Third Wave congregation) and quickly spread to the United Kingdom (largely in independent "new" or "restoration churches" and Anglican charismatic churches), in 1995 similar revival phenomena found expression in an AG congregation in Pensacola, Florida. Brownsville Assembly of God (BAOG) quickly became a pilgrimage site for Spirit-thirsty Pentecostals and charismatics alike. Its leaders soon offered a traveling version of the revival as Awake America Crusades and began monthly treks to local communities. In June 1997 the Pentecostal Evangel ("The Official Magazine of the Assemblies of God") devoted a special issue to the question, "Is America on the verge of spiritual awakening?" It presented revival updates on twenty-four AG congregations throughout the United States. Full-length articles appeared on churches in the Golden State (AG churches in Sacramento, Modesto, and Bakersfield, California); First Assemblies of God in Fort Wayne, Indiana; the Tabernacle in Orchard Park, New York; Bethel Temple in Hampton, Virginia; and Bettendorf, Iowa, Assembly of God. Editor Hal Donaldson acknowledged that this issue is "by no means a comprehensive report . . . [but the churches] featured here are merely representative of congregations across America —

large and small, urban and rural — that are recognizing fresh spiritual life.” The tone of the issue was affirming of renewal sprinkled with only a bit of caution. Donaldson offered this editorial comment: “Historians will judge whether the burgeoning revival in America deserves to be dubbed the next great awakening. But signs suggest this is more than a spiritual tremor.”

The response paper adopted by the General Presbytery in August 2000, “Endtime Revival — Spirit-Led and Spirit Controlled,” appeared to be more cautionary about the excesses of renewal than it was affirming. While stating that the “last thing any sincere Pentecostal believer wants to do is to quench or grieve the Holy Spirit,” much of the paper was devoted to cautioning against “revival extremes.” These two publications — the special issue of the Pentecostal Evangel and the “Response Paper to Resolution 16” dealing with “Endtime Revival” — demonstrate the ambiguity that readily can be found in the AG about revival/renewal.

The survey data collected from AG pastors about the 1990s revivals reflect the same dissonance. As reported earlier, 86 percent of pastors identify with Pentecostal renewal or revival (R/R), reporting that being involved in R/R is extremely important or very important to them. Nearly all (98 percent) were aware of the R/R movement found at BAOG and other congregations in North America through reading articles in AG literature (100 percent) or in other Christian magazines (86 percent) and by talking with AG leaders/pastors (72 percent), with church members (70 percent), or with other persons who have visited popular R/R sites (86 percent). The overwhelming majority of the pastors appear to be aware of the current Pentecostal revival and seem to have a single mind about the importance of reviving authentic Pentecostal spirituality. This does not necessarily mean, however, that AG pastors are of one mind about BAOG and the revival of the 1990s. Pastors were evenly divided on whether “America is in the midst of a revival similar to the one that gave birth to Pentecostalism.” This suggests that even AG national leaders’ cautious approval and support of the revival at BAOG may have been ahead of the ambivalence among pastors.

Nearly all the pastors surveyed support revival in principle and nearly all had heard about BAOG and the R/R movement, but far fewer had experienced

51. It was interesting to review the selection of readings found in the eighty-fifth anniversary edition, 1913-98, of the Pentecostal Evangel, the weekly publication of the AG. An article on Pentecostal revival was reprinted from the July 12, 1924, issue that lamented how “many folks are blind” to the Pentecostal revival that was still in process. The anniversary issue, although published three years after the revival began at BAOG, failed to mention the Pensacola Outpouring (as it is often called) as one of the significant events of AG history.
this latest outpouring of charisma for themselves. It is noteworthy that despite
the verbal assent to the importance of revival, approximately two-thirds have
not personally checked out the nightly meetings at the BAOG in Pensacola or
any of the other AG and non-AG renewal sites that dot the nation. The vast ma-
majority have not invited R/R speakers to their churches (67 percent), nor have
they attended an Awake America Crusade sponsored by BAOG in various cities
throughout the United States (80 percent). Given this lack of firsthand contact,
it is not surprising that only 30 percent of the pastors report their churches “to
be actively engaged in the Renewal/Revival.”

In sum, it is clear that most pastors perceive a decline in Pentecostal prac-
tices within the denomination. It is noteworthy that 70 percent either strongly
agree or agree that “the gifts of the Holy Spirit are losing their prominence in
AG churches as a whole.” They report concern about the loss of Pentecostal
power, embrace a renewal/revival identity, and are informed about the various
renewal sites, but surprisingly most have made little effort to check out for
themselves the rumors of revival. Being of one mind around the core value of
revival has apparently not translated into an acceptance of revival in contempo-
rary dress. Present-day pastors, much like their predecessors, have been reluc-
tant to accept charisma as it has taken flesh in periodic revivals of the latter half
of the twentieth century. At least among some pastors, revitalization in
Pentecostalism is being relegated to doctrine rather than personal experience.
Revivals are often acknowledged to be “messy” — even by their supporters. Es-
tablished Pentecostal denominations like the AG may well prefer the safety of
doctrine to the unpredictability of religious experience.

_The Dilemma of Delimitation:_
_Doctrine and Pentecostal Experience_

The dilemma of delimitation addresses the threat to charisma posed by the
relativizing of the original religious message in relation to new conditions. One
horn of the dilemma is the danger of watering down the message to fit the times,
often rendering commonplace what was originally a call to the extraordinary.
The AG (as may be gleaned from earlier discussion) runs a risk of grabbing on to
this horn with its long history of courting noncharismatic evangelicals who are

52. Ambiguity and ambivalence appear to be heightened by the fact that only 6 percent of
the respondents did not believe that the denomination is responsible for promoting revival.
Sixty percent of the pastors surveyed believed it was the task of the national office, and another
34 percent reported that it was the task of the district offices.
indifferent and often hostile to the distinct Pentecostal worldview. Primitive charismatic tendencies are tamed as favor is bestowed on more pragmatic ritual and organizations. The other horn of the dilemma is the creation of rigid doctrines and religious legalisms set up in an attempt to capture and reproduce the charisma of the original movement. The early founders of the AG were initially resistant to forming any kind of doctrinal statement, but they soon found it necessary to produce a statement of faith, consisting largely of a reiteration of the “fundamentals” drawn up earlier by Protestant fundamentalists. The stage was set for the replacing of right experience with right belief—a move that tends to water down the distinct Pentecostal worldview where the Spirit of God moves freely, openly, and creatively in the lives of ordinary believers.

During the 1914 founding meeting of the AG in Hot Springs, Arkansas, there was strong resistance to the development of a creedal statement, but the Oneness “heresy” that developed between 1914 and 1916 forced leaders to quickly adopt one. As elaborated in Menzies’ following essay, most of the tenets were derived from the Fundamentalist Statement of Truths, with two important additions: tongues as “initial evidence” of Spirit baptism and “healing by the atonement.” The belief in divine healing is not distinctively Pentecostal, being promoted by other sectlike non-Pentecostal groups even at the time the AG creed was formulated. The doctrine of “initial evidence,” however, is distinctively Pentecostal and has been embraced to varying degrees by most Pentecostal groups in North America. Accounts of Pentecostal-like revivals that did not promote a doctrine of initial evidence have usually been lost in unexamined historical archives. At its core, however, the AG Statement of Fundamental Truths is basically a fundamentalist-dispensationalist creedal statement, with “initial evidence” added to the other largely eschatological concerns. Its adoption from fundamentalism set the stage for the unfolding of the dilemma of delimitation. O’Dea and Aviad describe the dangers of delimitation as follows: “While the dangers of distortion of the faith require these definitions of dogma and morals, once established, the definitions themselves pose the possibility of another kind of distortion. They become a vast intellectual structure which serves not to guide the faith of untrained specialists but rather to burden it.”


54. See Gary B. McGee, “‘Latter Rain’ Falling in the East: Early-Twentieth-Century Pentecostalism in India and the Debate over Speaking in Tongues,” American Society of Church History 68 (fall 1999): 648-65, for one such account of the rise of Pentecostalism in India.
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In theory, it is the task of the Holy Spirit to ensure that Pentecostalism does not sink into the abyss of contentless mysticism or become caged in a cavern of rigid doctrine. Pentecostalism in its various faces has continuously needed to balance experience with biblical teachings, describing itself as both people of the Spirit and people of the Word. At the heart of Pentecostalism is a conviction that the Bible is the inspired word of God. Pentecostals do differ, however, in their hermeneutics, with scholarship tending toward an evangelical rational/propositional theology with some pastors uncritically adding an undefined narrative to the fundamentalist core. Some Pentecostals, as already noted, have “aligned themselves with Evangelicals in their move toward adopting the methods of higher criticism.”\(^56\) The text is easily reduced to the meaning intended by the author of the Scripture without sufficient exploration of the insight that can be gleaned from integrating this hermeneutic with narrative theology. Traditional Pentecostalism, despite its official fundamentalist creed, notes Cagel, often placed greater “emphases on the immediacy of the text and multiple dimensions of meaning.”\(^57\) It allowed for subjective experiences and subjective interpretations to exist alongside the more objective critical-historical-literary methods. Even the doctrine of tongues as “initial evidence” emerged not from the pens of theologians versed in higher criticism but from the accounts told by those who experienced glossolalia and sought to align this experience with their reading of the Bible.

Today’s Pentecostalism is more likely to appear dressed in the rationalism of contemporary American society, devoid of the colorful and emotional accounts that found expression through the anointed preaching and testimonies of its earlier days. As already noted, the seeds for this condition can be found in the early history of the AG as its leaders sought to find acceptance and legitimation from the dispensationalist fundamentalists. As Gerald Shepherd noted in his discussion of the “uneasy relationship between Pentecostalism and dispensationalism,” embraced evangelical views “have raised new problems for the identity of Pentecostals — hermeneutically, sociologically, and politically.”\(^58\) Other scholars have also cautioned against the danger of an uncritical wedding of Pentecostalism with evangelical/fundamentalist theology. Harvey Cox, for example, noted the paradoxical relationship between fundamentalist Christianity and modernity, cautioning that fundamentalism is but a crude
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form of nineteenth-century rationalism that is not compatible with a Pentecostal worldview.\textsuperscript{59}

Evangelical rational thought with its propositional truth tends to undermine the importance of religious experiences, the stuff out of which Pentecostalism is made and through which it maintains its vitality. At the same time, it has provided a useful form for professing the faith, one that gains common and uncritical acceptance by most AG pastors. The present study of AG pastors, as well as an earlier one by Guth, Green, Smidt, Kellstedt, and Poloma,\textsuperscript{60} suggests that AG pastors are of a near single mind on most common theological issues. Of the eight Protestant denominations included in the study by Guth et al., the AG clearly is the group in most accord on basic doctrine. This theological core and some attendant ambiguities provide the contents for discussing the delimitation dilemma.

\textit{The Bible, Fundamentals, and Orthodoxy}

On matters of biblical orthodoxy, AG pastors score higher in the Guth et al. study than clergy in the Southern Baptist Convention, Evangelical Covenant Church, Christian Reformed Church, Reformed Church in America, United Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), or the Disciples of Christ. On basic biblical beliefs coupled with premillennial eschatology, AG pastors responding to our survey demonstrated almost unanimous agreement. One hundred percent of the pastors agreed or strongly agreed that “there is no other way to salvation but through belief in Jesus Christ,” 99 percent believe “the devil actually exists,” and 98 percent agreed or strongly agreed that “Scriptures are the inerrant, literally accurate word of God not only in matters of faith, but in all matters.” Ninety-four percent agreed or strongly agreed that the “Bible clearly teaches a ‘premillennial’ view of history and the future,” and 98 percent reported believing “in the imminent ‘rapture’ of the church.”

Widespread agreement on basic Christian tenets, which appears to be stronger in the AG than in other denominations, may be due in part to its tendency to downplay the refinement of doctrine. As AG historian William Menzies observed nearly thirty years ago, the AG “has been surprisingly free of theological controversy, possibly owing to the relative unconcern of the fellowship with the niceties of doctrinal distinctions.” Menzies goes on to state: “The

\textsuperscript{59} Cox, \textit{Fire from Heaven}.

\textsuperscript{60} James L. Guth, John C. Green, Corwin E. Smidt, Lyman A. Kellstedt, and Margaret M. Poloma, \textit{The Bully Pulpit: The Politics of Protestant Clergy} (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1997).
traditional emphasis has been experiential and practical, not ideological. Absolute trust in the Bible and general agreement on fundamentals of the faith have served to furnish a fairly tolerant basis of fellowship."61

However, some ambiguities can be seen lurking beneath the surface of the seemingly placid doctrinal waters. As shown before, the survey suggests an ambiguity about a dispensationalist hermeneutic that hints at a major potential cleavage. While 58 percent reported accepting a dispensationalist interpretation of Scripture, 42 percent rejected this approach. The uncritical wedding of dispensationalism and Pentecostalism by a majority of pastors points to the downside of not wrestling with theological "niceties" within the denomination. A de facto theology has emerged, but one that often suffers from a lack of coherence and relevance in its failure to mirror a clear Pentecostal worldview. Of particular concern in exploring the dilemma of delimitation is the degree to which the "definitions of dogma and morals" within the AG contribute toward maintaining or quenching a distinct Pentecostal identity.

Ambiguity and Dissent on Select Doctrinal Issues

Traditional Pentecostalism has birthed a movement that it has been unable to monitor. The Spirit blows how and where it will, and much of the activity within the past fifty years has been outside of classical Pentecostalism within the so-called Latter Rain, charismatic, and Third Wave sectors of the Spirit movement. Robeck describes the dilemma faced in the wake of an expanded PCM as follows:

While it is indisputable that the needs of some people are being met in these newer congregations, sometimes the very categories with which they choose to identify suggests a new form of elitism. Older Pentecostals are now being portrayed as passé, while these groups promise that God is on the move in their midst. They are the latest "wave" of what God is doing. Older "waves" have been passed by. As members of the first "wave" of what

61. William W. Menzies, Anointed to Serve: The Story of the Assemblies of God (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1971), p. 376. Unpublished interviews conducted with AG pastors by a team of Organizing Religious Work (ORW) researchers under the direction of Nancy Ammerman at Hartford Seminary seem to confirm Menzies' observation about the focus being on the sixteen fundamentals, with little concern for "niceties of doctrinal distinctions." It is significant that while some respondents talked about being "big on sound doctrine," it was largely with regard to issues decided at the 1916 Council. Interestingly, none of the twenty-eight pastors interviewed talked about their disagreement with any of the fundamentals of the denomination, not even the somewhat controversial "initial evidence" tenet on glossolalia which insists that speaking in tongues is the evidential sign of Spirit baptism.
God is said to be doing in the Church today, Pentecostals must now deal with the same feelings that members of the historic churches had when they were first faced with the claims that Pentecostals were proclaiming the “Full Gospel.” For some older Pentecostal groups, this has introduced questions of self-doubt or very human desires to discredit the “new” as not sufficiently up to God’s standards.62

Of significance for this discussion is that many of these newer streams have tended to de-emphasize the importance of glossolalia for Spirit baptism, much to the chagrin of classical Pentecostals.63 This diminished emphasis on tongues while emphasizing the presence and power of the Holy Spirit has appealed to others outside the larger PCM. Popular American Baptist sociologist/theologian Tony Campolo raises the issue of how to be Pentecostal without speaking in tongues in a book written for a larger evangelical audience.64 Campolo joined others outside the Pentecostal camp in rediscovering the power of the Holy Spirit. They adopt and adapt the Pentecostal worldview of Spirit baptism, suggesting that there is more to being a Christian than believing the accepted doctrines and practicing the right rituals. As is evident in Menzies’ following essay, glossolalia as a symbol of distinct Pentecostal identity is being eroded by the influence of the larger Spirit movement that refuses to accept the centrality of tongues as “initial evidence,” causing AG leaders to cling even more to the one plank of doctrine that makes them different.

There has been a growing awareness that the Pentecostal perspective is no longer marginalized but has gone mainstream. As AG scholar Glen Menzies commented:

[Most Christians once] regarded glossolalia in particular as a token of fanaticism and emotional excess. But due to the eruption of the charismatic movement in the 1960s and its widespread success in popularizing this Pen-


63. It is interesting to note the estimate that only 35 percent of Pentecostals speak in tongues. In other words, only one in three members of churches who teach that glossolalia is the “initial evidence” of Spirit baptism is actually glossolalic. Walter J. Hollenweger, “Roman Catholics and Pentecostals in Dialogue,” Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies 21 (spring 1999): 147, comments on this statistic: “If we add to this number those Pentecostal denominations who refuse to subscribe to the doctrine of ‘initial sign’ (for instance, the very strong Chilean movement), the percentage is even higher.”

64. Tony Campolo, How to Be Pentecostal without Speaking in Tongues (Waco: Word, 1994).
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tecostal understanding of spiritual gifts outside Pentecostal circles, the notion that all of the gifts of the Spirit are available to the contemporary church no longer constitutes a “distinctive” of Pentecostalism. And while Pentecostals rejoice that in this regard the rest of the church has moved in their direction, this “success” has only intensified the need for Spirit baptism and evidential tongues to provide distinctive identity and internal cohesion to Pentecostalism.  

The logic of the leaders, some of whom are currently proposing tightening up the doctrinal wording to minimize the mental gymnastics some pastors engage in annually as they check the form to renew their ordination credentials, runs something like this: the key to Spirit baptism is tongues, the key to revival is Spirit baptism, the key to church growth is revival. Without tongues there can be no Spirit baptism, no revival, no church growth. To back down on what is increasingly becoming a controversial doctrine in some sectors of the AG, according to this logic, would insure the AG traveling down a slippery slope of losing its Pentecostal identity and jeopardizing the institutional well-being of this thriving denomination. At the same time that this particular symbol is being sharpened, the use of glossolalia and other experiences that birthed Pentecostalism seems to be waning within the AG.

As discussed earlier, glossolalia remains a litmus test for “true” Pentecostalism for many AG leaders and pastors (at least in North America), but increasingly it is a doctrine held up for scrutiny. While the vast majority (85 percent) of pastors affirmed the doctrine in their survey responses, a significant minority (15 percent) expressed disagreement with it.  


66. The figure for those disagreeing with the tongues doctrine represents a significant increase over the 2 percent figure reported from a 1985 data set on pastors for the same question (Poloma, Crossroads, p. 40). Also of interest from the results of the study of congregations and pastors in the mid-1980s is the gap between the pastoral and congregational responses to the issue of tongues as initial evidence. At that time, 39 percent of the congregants did not agree with this fundamental doctrine (as compared with 2 percent of the pastors). Anecdotal evidence further supports the concern about an erosion of consensus regarding the tongues doctrine. Specifically, at least some pastors have quietly been neglecting to check the box asking about a belief in tongues as “initial physical evidence” of Spirit baptism, noting that the constitution and by-laws do not authorize the collection of such information. Those seeking ordination papers for the first time are the ones caught in the most precarious position. Reportedly the Executive Presbytery has added the term “immediate,” reading “tongues as the immediate initial physical evidence,” to close in on those who have been acquiescing to the words but not the spirit of increasing doctrinal rigidity.
are experiencing a range of Pentecostal-like phenomena without emphasizing tongues? Some answered the question by saying that eventually the Spirit-baptized person will speak in tongues, leading to the attempt to insert the word “immediate” before “initial physical evidence.” Even more disconcerting to those who would make tongues a litmus test for Spirit baptism is the fact that in many AG congregations the majority of adherents do not report speaking in tongues. Such observations plus an evangelical hermeneutic have caused a small but growing number of pastors to question the biblical base for the doctrine. Although a majority of pastors appear to support the official position (we have no way of determining how many are engaged in personal mental revisions as they acquiesce to this plank of AG doctrine), there is a significant minority opposition movement present in the AG. Those who tackle the issue, however, do so at the risk of their own status as ordained AG ministers.\footnote{One interesting caveat may be found in a testimony by J. Roswell Flower, the first general superintendent of the AG, on his Spirit baptism. In the original article appearing in the Pentecostal Evangel in 1933, it is clear that Flower, while clearly believing in the fundamental about glossolalia, regarded himself as having received the baptism some months before he actually spoke in tongues and \textit{after} leading evangelistic crusades deemed to be Spirit empowered. When the article was reprinted in the Pentecostal Evangel in 1993, it was abridged in such a way as to make it appear that Flower actually spoke in tongues on the occasion of his Spirit baptism that he reports empowered him for the crusades. For an AG defense against critiques of the existing doctrine on tongues, see James K. Bridges, “The Full Consummation of the Baptism in the Holy Spirit,” Theological Enrichment, fall 2000, pp. 92-95.}

The doctrine surrounding glossolalia is one of two major issues that have generated controversy over the years that I have been a systematic observer of the AG. The other is divorce and remarriage among AG laity, and especially among church pastors. In the congregational survey that provided data for The Assemblies of God at the Crossroads, approximately half the adherents of AG churches reported beliefs that were not in compliance with the stance of the denomination on divorce. The 1973 Statement on Divorce and Remarriage clearly proscribed divorce, but left the question of remarriage for adherents to “be resolved by the believer as he walks in the light of God’s Word.”\footnote{Poloma, Crossroads, pp. 148-49.} While adherents were given permission to discern the issue of divorce for themselves, until very recently divorced ministers were granted no such freedom of conscience about remarriage after divorce. Even if the divorce and remarriage occurred before the person’s conversion, a divorced and remarried person could not be ordained. (Rumblings could be heard, however, about annulments being granted which have enabled some high-ranking ministers to avoid the censure of losing credentials after divorce and remarriage or after marrying a divorced person.)
After defeating a similar measure in 1991 and 1997, the AG General Council passed a resolution in August 2001 that allows divorced persons to become pastors as long as the divorce occurred before their conversion.

This action has partially resolved the divorce and remarriage issue. Significant numbers of pastors appear to be in favor of even more flexibility in dealing with the divorce and remarriage of pastors, just as there has been for laity. Pastors responding to the survey reported considerably less support for the official AG position on ministers divorcing and remarrying than at the time of my first pastoral survey in 1985, when only 10 percent disagreed with the AG policy of defrocking divorced and remarried pastors. The present survey found that 43 percent agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “Persons who have been divorced and remarried should be permitted to serve as AG pastors.” Only 19 percent reported a strong disagreement with the statement that would ban divorced and remarried pastors from the ministry, suggesting that most desire increased flexibility in dealing with the thorny issue of divorce and remarriage. Further, only a minority of pastors (23 percent) would prohibit divorced and remarried persons from assuming leadership in local congregations — a position which further illustrates the denomination’s inability to withstand accommodative forces stemming from a widespread acceptance of divorce and remarriage in the larger culture.

Other moral proscriptions remain as vestiges from a past in which all worldly amusements were shunned by Pentecostals who set themselves apart from the larger world to live “holy” and “separate” lives. Questions were asked on the survey about four such practices: drinking alcohol, gambling, dancing, and movies. Proscriptive attitudes toward such behavior remain fairly strong among pastors (although sermons are rarely preached on these issues in most urban AG churches). A clear majority disapproved of “gambling, including lotteries” (98 percent), even “the occasional use of alcoholic beverages” (82 percent), social dancing (80 percent), and Christians patronizing “movie theaters” (51 percent).

In a more striking way than in other well-established Protestant denominations, there is an intact seamless robe around Christian orthodoxy in the AG extending even to its particular eschatology and most moral and behavioral taboos. The garment wrapping distinct Pentecostal theology, however, does show some signs of wear. Pastors are seemingly divided on some remnant moral issues that once seemed central to Pentecostal identity — behavior and practices that set Pentecostals aside as a “peculiar people.” Attempts to select any doctrinal items, as the leadership has done with glossolalia and divorced ministers, to prevent the further slide down what is commonly referred to as the slippery slope, appear more likely to cause division than to reinforce Pentecostal iden-
tity. What seems needed to deal with the slippery slope is not a tightening of doctrinal reins but rather continued flexibility that allows controversy around peripheral issues not central to the larger Pentecostal worldview. Perhaps the best way to deal with controversial issues is to frame them theologically within the “new” Pentecostal paradigm discussed earlier — one that reflects an openness to personal experience and narrative that aligns with Pentecostal identity as a Spirit-led people.69

Spirit baptism remains a core feature of PCM identity, but increasingly it is not regarded as synonymous with the gift of tongues. Spirit baptism (or “in-filling”) is often treated as an ongoing process in which Pentecostals of all streams experience the power of God not only for personal pleasure and edification but also for empowerment for service. Power and empowerment cannot be legislated or mandated by doctrinal decrees or denominational edicts, but rather depend on hospitable terrain that allows the wind, rain, and fire of the Holy Spirit to fall as it will. A fertile environment can be created, but the desired work of the Spirit is in every sense charisma or gift — which takes us to the fourth dilemma, that of power. The accommodative forces at work in O’Dea’s dilemma of power are important for understanding the interrelationship between attempts to enforce doctrinal decrees on pastors and the empowerment sought by early Pentecostals.

**The Dilemma of Power: From Pilgrims to Citizens**

The theme of accommodation to the larger culture runs through all the institutional dilemmas, but perhaps no dilemma focuses on a more important facet of accommodation than does the dilemma of power. O’Dea and Aviad succinctly describe the dilemma of power as follows: “Religion cannot but relate itself to the other institutions of society and to the cultural values. Yet such accommodation tends toward a coalescing of religion and power. The alliance of religion and secular power creates a situation in which apparent religiosity often conceals a deeper cynicism and a growing unbelief.”70

Although the early Pentecostals were not trained in sociology, they seemed to have a natural instinct for the importance of separation from the larger world if their distinct worldview were to be retained. As Blumhofer noted, “[E]arly Assemblies of God members professed little interest in contem-

porary society; they had either not yet glimpsed a broader social world or had consciously turned from it.”71 They began their sojourn as pilgrims, but slowly and steadily moved toward becoming citizens. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the move from an apolitical (once pacifist) stance with a strong sense of Spirit-led destiny to embracing the political agenda of fundamentalism/evangelicalism. An eschatology proclaiming a soon-coming end times, the imminent rapture of the church, and premillennialism that once kept Pentecostals at bay from politics, now seems to undergird a staunchly conservative political agenda.72 Spiritual power (empowerment) has, at least for some, been converted to political power.

*The Core and the Periphery: Consonance and Dissonance in Political Thought*

As the Religious Right began to flex its political muscles during the 1980s and 1990s, the AG struggled with its role in the political scene. Few AG pastors plunged into partisan politics (although a significant majority are self-reported Republicans), but rather they began to speak out on select issues. On the basis of both congregational and pastoral data as well as other research on conservative religions and politics, Poloma noted a distinction between private morality and public political issues that continues among AG pastors:

Although the dividing lines are somewhat blurred, it appears that the Assemblies of God is quite concerned about private moral issues, such as divorce, pornography, drug and alcohol abuse, and abortion, that touch on “personal purity.” Its leaders, however, are much more reluctant to step into the area of “public issues,” including economic problems, social welfare legislation, and international affairs. Most appear not only to oppose political involvements that focus on the public sphere but also carefully to eschew partisan politics.73

The increased visibility of and attention paid to the Religious Right have prompted many AG pastors to take a place alongside other evangelicals in politics as well as theology, a stance Blumhofer has linked with the AG’s one-sided involvement with the National Association of Evangelicals.74 Not only are pastors now more likely to express concern over select political/moral issues, but

72. Guth et al., *The Bully Pulpit*.
many reportedly expect national and regional denominational representatives to lead the way in conservative political action. For example, 86 percent of the pastors in the present survey believed the national office should “serve as a political voice to combat homosexuality and abortion,” with another 3 percent relegating this task to the district offices, and only 11 percent indicating such activity should be performed by neither office. Fewer pastors, although still a clear majority, support denominational action to promote select political candidates. Fifty-nine percent assigned this task to the national office and 8 percent to the districts, with 33 percent replying that such political activity is not appropriate for either denominational administrative office.

Eschatology has always played a role in AG political stances (or lack of them), and the overwhelming majority of pastors continue to support this plank of traditional AG theology. As we have seen, AG pastors are nearly unanimously committed to the premillennial eschatology held by their forebears. They still profess premillennial beliefs that once led their ancestors to resist political activities, but the impact and meaning of AG eschatology on pastoral politics has become somewhat fuzzy. Thirty-five percent of the pastoral respondents, for example, concurred with a statement that is more in accord with postmillennialism than with a traditional understanding of premillennial doctrine: “The Kingdom of God can be built in every institution and sphere of life before the Second Coming of Jesus Christ.” For many the coming kingdom should be facilitated through the Christian Coalition, as “a proper channel to use to accomplish political goals” (59 percent in agreement). While there has been great resistance to ecumenism in the AG (especially dialogue with Roman Catholics and mainline Protestant organizations), paradoxically the vast majority (91 percent) would favor interfaith cooperation in politics “even if they can’t agree on theology.” Finally, underlying a more activist stance by many pastors is a more traditional majority opinion (70 percent) that “if enough people were brought to Christ, social ills would take care of themselves,” a seeming holdover of a once dominant apolitical posture.

AG pastors are being increasingly drawn into an evangelical political agenda that fails to mirror an earlier Pentecostal understanding of power. As there has been a subtle transition of the AG from being pilgrims to citizens, there has been a corresponding shift from reliance on Pentecostal power to that of political power. The passage from the book of Zechariah quoted earlier still can be found on the front cover of each issue of the Pentecostal Evangel: “Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord.” The classic Pentecostal understanding of that passage and the issue of Pentecostal empowerment war-

75. See Blumhofer, The Assemblies of God.
rant closer inspection for unpacking the relevance of the dilemma of power for the AG.

Power, Politics, and Empowerment: A Minority Report

The AG serves as a good illustration of the strong correlation that exists between theological conservatism and political conservatism in American politics. The history of Pentecostalism suggests, however, that this relationship is due more to social class concerns than to Pentecostal spirituality. When the PCM is in its charismatic moment, political agendas seem to lose significance as actual behavior may become (at least for the moment) somewhat radical. In the words of a popular renewal song that became a theme of the so-called Toronto Blessing, Spirit-filled people will “break dividing walls” — walls that can be found between men and women, blacks and whites, Pentecostals and non-Pentecostals, old and young (fill in other categories).\textsuperscript{76} According to some Pentecostal historians, dividing walls fell at the Azusa Street Revival that birthed Pentecostalism but were quickly reconstructed during the years that followed. Gender, social class, race, ethnicity, and denomination all become less relevant (at least temporarily) when the power of the Spirit is sweeping over a gathering of people, leaving ecstasy in its wake.\textsuperscript{77}

Despite their apolitical stance, many of the early Pentecostals seemed to understand that the Pentecostal experience was meant for service. As elaborated in Menzies’ following essay, tongues, for example, was initially conceived as an infused knowledge of a foreign language for missionary activity. Those who tried to exercise their new language in foreign countries were usually disappointed, but their disappointment did not cause them to abandon glossolalia. Tongues was reconceptualized as a door that opened for the believer a storehouse of spiritual power, with missionaries coming to expect Pentecostal signs and wonders to provide for their necessities and to bring others to the Christian

\textsuperscript{76} See the video Go Inside the Toronto Blessing, an account of the outbreak of revival at the Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship in 1994 and its effects as reported in 1997. Distributed by Fresh Start Marketing, Canton, Ohio.

\textsuperscript{77} Perhaps the story of an egalitarian Pentecostalism is but a myth (as some historians have suggested); religious myth can be a powerful propellant for change. What is significant here is that the myth of early equality has been eroded with the aging of Pentecostalism. The vision of God’s pouring out his Spirit on all people, as foretold in the book of Joel and reiterated by Peter on Pentecost, often fails to find modern expression. See Augustus Cerillo, “Interpretive Approaches to the History of American Pentecostal Origins,” Pneuma: The Journal of the Society for Pentecostal Studies 19 (spring 1997): 29-52, for an excellent review of different historical approaches to reporting Pentecostal origins.
faith. Reports by missionaries then — and now — affirm this link between Pentecostal power and service. As AG scholar and veteran missionary Douglas Petersen describes the situation in a commentary on Macchia’s excellent article calling for a paradigm shift in Pentecostal thinking: “From its inception, emphasis upon supernatural empowerment for ministry, observes Macchia, rather than academic formation was the motivational force behind the ever-expanding pastoral and missionary activity of the movement. Characterized by the active participation of its members as ‘doers’ of the word, assessment of Pentecostalism by themselves or others, according to Macchia, usually focused on their enthusiasm, emotional expressions, or exponential growth.”

Macchia (and seemingly Petersen) would encourage a shift in emphasis to include the spiritual power underlying Pentecostal missionary activity, particularly the Pentecostal experiences of Spirit baptism and divine healing. “These spiritual encounter moments serve as a corrective antidote for these distinctive theological beliefs which are traditionally embodied within the uncritical constructs and limits of doctrinal guides. When supernatural experiences are integrally linked together with the person of Christ, Macchia argues, they offer potential for Pentecostals to move beyond a personal experience of self-gratification toward becoming part of a prophetic movement for both spiritual and social liberation.”

The AG’s uncritical acceptance of a conservative political stance, at least in the United States, is not consistent with the nature of the potentially radical Pentecostal experience. The Azusa Street Revival, the event that catapulted the Pentecostal gospel on to the scene, according to some historical accounts empowered blacks and women long before the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s. However, this breaking down of dividing walls was short-lived, as organized Pentecostalism mirrored the same problems of racism and sexism that could be found in the dominant culture.

Sexism, social class inequities, racism, ecumenism, and other issues that captured the attention of liberal Protestantism more than a generation ago are slowly finding their way into AG awareness, causing more ambiguity around the core. Some have heard the challenge offered by scholars like Ronald Bueno, a Salvadoran Pentecostal anthropologist, to begin “listening to the margins” — to reflect on Pentecostalism as it has been constructed by individuals, churches, and denominational bodies.


different ethnic groups. Others are calling for greater openness to women's issues within Pentecostalism, noting how Pentecostalism's success has limited opportunities for women. Still others have begun working on the challenge of interfaith dialogue as pioneered by the late David du Plessis (an AG minister, who was once defrocked for his ecumenical activity, known as “Mr. Pentecost” for the work he did to present the Pentecostal worldview to mainline churches) and continued by Cecil M. Robeck (an AG minister and professor at Fuller Theological Seminary who continues to serve as a Pentecostal representative to international ecumenical gatherings). The isolationist mentality that has made the AG so wary of “ecumenism” has inadvertently cut off the denomination not only from traditions that could provide much-needed insight for developing a truly Pentecostal theology, but also from fresh revival experiences. As we have discussed, the AG has tended to distance itself from those most likely to share its worldview, namely, neo-Pentecostals in mainstream Protestantism, Roman Catholics, and members of the independent charismatic movement.

There is evidence that the work done by Pentecostal scholars is slowly filtering through some pastors and into the pews, increasing an awareness of the importance of tackling issues beyond the narrow focus of so-called family values. This awareness is not shared by all, thus creating some additional ambiguity around the core of near universally accepted positions. Seventy percent of the pastors, for example, agreed that “issues of social concern really get to the heart of the Gospel.” After years of encouraging black Americans to join the largely black “sister” organization, the Church of God in Christ, 93 percent of the pastors agreed or strongly agreed that the “AG should actively work to attract persons of color.” Support for women’s issues appears to be more divisive. Although the AG has ordained women throughout its history, only 72 percent of pastors support women serving as senior pastors. A smaller percentage


percent) would support women in leadership positions within the national or
district AG government or on local church boards (53 percent).

Although the AG has done an admirable job of establishing a loosely
knit, cooperative worldwide network that is sensitive to regional and cultural
differences, the American church has been relatively homogeneous. The sam-
ple of pastors responding to the survey reflects this homogeneity. Only 5 per-
cent of the respondents were female; 97 percent self-identified as “white.” Only
one respondent was African American, two were Hispanic, two were Asian
American, and two were “other.” The congregations pastored by these respon-
dents, not surprisingly, tended to be Caucasian, native-born American. Signifi-
cantly, 6 percent of the congregations were either mostly (3 percent) or en-
tirely (3 percent) comprised of Hispanic Americans. Less than 1 percent were
primarily African American congregations, and 1 percent, Asian. The survey
fails to capture a change seemingly under way in the ethnic composition of the
American AG.

Figures on ten-year church growth of the AG reveal a slight decline in
white AG churches during the decade from 1990 to 2000 and a noteworthy in-
crease in the number of ethnic churches (which is responsible for the overall in-
crease in the number of churches and adherents claimed by the AG for the past
decade).83 A document from the newly formed Commission of Ethnic Rela-
tions notes:

Change doesn’t happen overnight. It occurs in small stages. It is usually so
subtle that it goes undetected until we are overwhelmed by it. Because of
this we don’t always understand the affect [sic] of change and we don’t al-
tways know how to respond to change. We don’t see it happening and when
we look back we wonder how we could have missed it and what we should
have done.

I say this because I believe the Assemblies of God is now in the midst
of what could be the most dramatic change since the founding of our Fel-
lowship in 1914. I also believe we need to recognize and understand what
this change means to us as a fellowship of Pentecostal believers. The
change I speak of is not a doctrinal change and it is not a change that
poses a threat, but rather an unparalleled opportunity. The change I

83. David J. Moore, director of the AG Center for Ethnic Relations, provided figures
showing an increase of black (from 111 to 213), Hispanic (from 1,457 to 1,885), Native American
(from 168 to 178), and “other” (from 53 to 125) congregations. “In 1990 ethnic minority congre-
gations and those with no single majority represented 20.2% of all A/G churches. In ten years
that has grown to 26.7%. If the current trend remains constant in 2001 they will account for one
third of our churches.”
speak of is a change in the composition of the church. We are becoming more ethnic minority.84

Pentecostals have been compelled by social forces to accept the increasingly pluralistic nature of American culture, with the AG being a beneficiary of the new waves of immigration that do promise to change the composition of the church. To date, however, the African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and “others” are not found in the mainstream of the American AG polity but are often relegated to “special language districts.”85 The change in composition currently under way in the AG will undoubtedly have repercussions for the power dilemma considered in this section as well as the issue of delimitation discussed in the section that preceded.

It would appear, judging from historical accounts of religious isolationism and sometimes racist church policies, that the AG has already lost at least one opportunity to be a catalyst for social change that is consistent with the Pentecostal experience. The jury is still out as to whether it will continue to accept the political agenda of the evangelical subculture without reflecting on its own Pentecostal heritage or whether it will grant a greater voice to those on the margins of society.

*The Dilemma of Administrative Order: Elaboration and Alienation*

The final dilemma to be discussed brings us back to the brief history presented in the prologue of this article — back to the emergence of the AG and its transition from a “cooperative fellowship” to a denomination with its complex bureaucratic structure. It also returns us to the dilemma of mixed motivation, the first of the five dilemmas to be addressed, and in many ways the most significant one for understanding the AG. O’Dea and Aviad describe the relationship between concerns about the administrative order and mixed motivation as follows: “Since it is this structure of offices which becomes the mechanism for eliciting the mixed motivation . . . and mobilizing it behind organizational goals, the in-

85. The overwhelming majority of respondents, reflecting their Anglo affiliation, either disagreed (61 percent) or strongly disagreed (28 percent) with the item stating that these special language districts have been detrimental to the AG. A significant minority of pastors, most of whom are themselves “on the margin,” do seem to recognize the problems presented by the present structural arrangement.
dividends involved come to have a vested interest in the structure as it is, and to resist change and reform, which they tend to see as threatening to themselves. Thus not only can the structure become overelaborated and alienated from contemporary problems, but it can contribute to the alienation of office holders from the rank-and-file members of the group. As found in our study of the other four dilemmas, the dilemma of administrative order provides a portrait of the AG as reflecting some ambiguity around a solid core.

Charisma does not exist in pure form but requires some degree of organization to promote and protect her spirit. Despite an earlier resistance to organization, the AG is now a well-structured bureaucracy. At the top of the flowchart is the General Council of the Assemblies of God, clergy and congregational representatives from all member congregations, which gathers every two years. The overall administration of the AG is under the direction of the Executive Presbytery, four elected officers (general superintendent, assistant general superintendent, secretary, and treasurer) who together with various boards, directors, counselors, and committees govern the denomination and minister to its needs. Growth within the AG has led to a proliferation of programs to mobilize groups and resources. These programs embody an evangelistic emphasis, including missions, a drug program, university campus outreach, military and prison chaplaincies; there are also programs that focus on education, including a division of Christian education, Bible and liberal arts colleges, and a publishing house; and service programs adopted by most congregations to provide opportunities for fellowship and learning from cradle to grave. Buffered between the national office and the local congregations are the district offices with bureaus of their own, most of them based on geography but some based on ethnicity or special need (e.g., churches of the deaf). This is the complex organization which attempts to maintain the vision and carry out the mission of the AG — an organization which appears to have the respect and support of a vast majority of AG pastors.

Coherence around the Administrative Core

Whether based on the pastoral survey or an ancillary survey of 250 leaders of regional judicatories, support appears to be solid for the work being carried out by the national and regional governing structures. In the ancillary survey, AG leaders tended to give high marks to the way the church has met ministry
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objectives, with only a small minority indicating that denominational effectiveness has decreased over the past five years. We list these objectives (and the percentage disapproving of task performance): providing resources for spiritual revitalization (2 percent), expanding overseas mission efforts and ministries (1 percent), attracting and keeping members in the denomination (14 percent), attracting ethnic minority members in particular (6 percent), maintaining high quality of clergy in local churches (7 percent), keeping unity of purpose within the denomination (10 percent), creating a financially stable national church (0 percent), developing an identity as a global church presence (2 percent), attracting ethnic minority clergy (8 percent), strengthening the health of local churches (9 percent), getting judicatories to share resources with one another (7 percent), and maintaining a denominational identity in local churches (20 percent). When this report card is reviewed internally or compared to those of other groups included in the ORW study, the AG administration appears to pass with high marks.

Similar expectations for and satisfaction with the governance of the denomination can be found in the pastors survey. A majority of pastors indicated the following tasks should be primarily the responsibility of the national office:88 marshal available resources for world evangelism (91 percent), provide press information on the AG for the secular world (89 percent), serve as a political voice to combat homosexuality and abortion (86 percent), support seminary and Bible colleges (80 percent), safeguard doctrinal conformity (78 percent), support denominational liberal arts colleges (72 percent), develop congregational programs like Royal Rangers, Missionettes (71 percent), coordinate missionary activities (66 percent), promote renewal/revival (60 percent), serve as a political voice to elect God-fearing candidates to public office (59 percent), and develop suitable educational resources for local congregations (58 percent).

The vast majority of the respondents were knowledgeable about the denominational work being done in the realm of missions and evangelism, and expressed strong approval of this work. Approval ratings between "good" and "excellent" were awarded to the Division of Foreign Missions, followed closely by three other evangelism programs: Teen Challenge, for drug and alcohol addiction; Speed the Light, for young people; and Light for the Lost, a more general evangelical support program. The vast majority of the pastors also re-
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ported being knowledgeable about and gave positive ratings to publications and Christian education programs developed by the national office. The weekly magazine *Pentecostal Evangel* and the work of Gospel Publishing House were both rated between good and excellent, with the Division of Christian Education receiving a slightly lower approval rating, midway between fair and good.

Two years after his election to the top church post in 1995, General Superintendent Thomas E. Trask noted that he wanted denomination programs to serve churches rather than have churches serve a denominational bureaucracy. Trask told *Charisma* magazine, the major publication for the PCM, "We want to address the needs of the local church and the pastor. We want to be known as servants of the local church." For the most part, it appears that pastors and leaders give high marks for such effort. At the same time, as with each of the dilemmas, there are areas of ambiguity and potential alienation that merit some note.

*Administrative Ambiguity and Potential Alienation*

Given the history of the AG and its resolution not to become a denomination, perhaps it is not surprising that the report card provided by the pastoral survey on the administrative dilemma includes a few lower grades. There is a seeming and possibly increasing alienation among pastors from the national office, particularly if measured by decreased attendance at the biannual General Council meetings. Only 40 percent strongly agreed (4 percent) or agreed (36 percent) with the statement, "I always do whatever I possibly can to attend General Council meetings." Another statement may provide a key for understanding the seeming apathy toward this once important gathering. Forty-six percent either agreed (10 percent) or strongly agreed (36 percent) that the General Council "does not provide an adequate forum for discussing differing opinions on key issues." In informal discussions, some AG pastors are quick to raise the Pensacola revival and "initial evidence" as examples of failures to hear differing opinions on these currently hot topics. These pastors also say they prefer to use their time and money going to conferences (very often outside the denomination) which are more relevant to their ministries than those of the AG. A concern about the AG becoming a denomination in a post-denominational society can also be heard in the pastoral survey. Over half (54 percent) the pastors agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that the AG needs to "focus more on being a religious network and less on being a denom-
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ination.” My informal discussions with pastors suggest that many would like the denomination to do more to provide opportunities for fellowship and spiritual growth.

The AG has historically been ambivalent about higher education, and the survey responses may be reflecting current ambivalence — or possibly indifference — to the sponsorship of higher education by the denomination. Although a majority of pastors agreed that it was the responsibility of the national office to provide support for its colleges and seminary, over 40 percent of the respondents did not feel they knew enough about the denomination’s colleges in Springfield, Missouri (where the AG national headquarters is located), to provide a rating, and 38 percent were unable to rate the seminary. The mean ratings for Evangel College, Central Bible College, and the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary were “fair” (with mean scores of 1.2, 1.8, and 2 respectively, on a 4-point scale). Pastors were most familiar with Berean University, the correspondence course designed to train AG ministers, giving it the highest ratings for the work done in the educational realm (mean = 2.3).

Silence, as suggested above in the discussion of AG institutions of higher education, may provide a porthole for discerning dissatisfaction. While fewer than 5 percent of respondents were unable to provide a scorecard for ministries like Gospel Publishing House, the Division of Foreign Missions, and the Pento-costal Evangel, this form of “no response” was fairly high for the Executive Presbytery and the General Presbytery. Twenty-two percent of the pastors were reluctant (reportedly unable because of a lack of knowledge) to rate the job being done by the Executive Presbytery or the General Presbytery. The mean scores for those who did rate them were somewhere between “good” and “fair,” with means of 2.4 and 2.5 respectively.

Despite many comments I have heard over the years about the increased centralization of the AG, such hearsay appears to be the report of a minority (31 percent). Most pastors strongly disagreed (8 percent) or disagreed (61 percent) with the statement that “too much power is being centralized in the National Office.” Respondents were nearly divided in whether their churches made “extensive use of the services provided by the National Office,” with 56 percent either agreeing (51 percent) or strongly agreeing (5 percent).

Pastors seem to be somewhat more supportive of their respective district offices than of the national office. Given their dependence on and expectations of the district to provide networking opportunities (including nominations for church positions), they appear more likely to attend their district council meetings than the national General Assembly. Seventy-one percent strongly agreed or agreed that district councils “are a good investment of my time.” Use of district office services appears to be strong, with 84 percent of the ministers
strongly disagreeing (26 percent) or disagreeing (58 percent) with the statement, "I cannot find any service provided by the District Office that is of particular use to my congregation."

The services the majority of pastors expect from their district offices include the following: opportunities for pastoral fellowship (88 percent), workshops for ongoing pastoral training (73 percent), establishing appropriate networks for pastors (70 percent), providing resources for smaller churches (68 percent), providing pastoral/congregational "covering" (64 percent), developing programs to encourage pastoral spiritual growth (52 percent), and providing credentials for ministers (51 percent). The last item is of special interest given the fact that the national office provides the credentials, taking over even more authority after the disagreement between the Louisiana District and the National Headquarters over the Jimmy Swaggart censure in the 1980s. Only 48 percent of the pastors indicated support for the national credentialing of ministers, with 1 percent indicating that neither judicatory should be involved in this work.

Charisma and Administration

From its inception as a formal organization in 1914, adherents of the AG have had a love-hate relationship with institutionalization. Although the leaders of this new religious movement recognized the need for organizing to carry on its mission, they also recognized the perils structure would pose to their fragile newfound gift of charisma. The healthy tension that could be observed over the years in the AG continues today. Many are wary of the threat that administrative offices pose to charisma, but many also trust the Holy Spirit to lead both congregations and denominational administrative offices.

When pastors were asked, "To what extent does the manifest presence (e.g. prophetic leadings, tongues and interpretations, etc.) of the Spirit affect the decision making process of your local congregation?" only 19 percent reported "greatly" with another 54 percent replying "somewhat." Twenty-seven percent, a significant minority for a denomination whose identity is rooted in a worldview that has historically recognized the power of the Holy Spirit, responded "not at all." A clear majority of pastors report that the Holy Spirit guides the leaders and workers in various bureaus, agreeing (58 percent) or strongly agreeing (11 percent) that the "Holy Spirit directly affects the decision making process in most AG administrative agencies." Once again, however, a significant minority (31 percent) appear to regard the day-to-day operations of the denomination much like they might regard the workings of any modern secular organization.
Summary and Conclusion

The Assemblies of God structure is sufficiently flexible and tolerant of ambiguity for the continued presence of charisma. The siren of accommodative forces, however, can deafen believers to the whisper of charismatic voices, dreams, and visions. Waiting quietly and patiently for the leading of God is not readily compatible with the contemporary American culture, where instant lottery winners are heroes and fast-food chains a main export. Worldly models of growth and success have subtly made inroads in this denomination that once sought to be separate from the world.90

The AG contains a solid core of beliefs and practices, with a healthy level of tension around peripheral issues. Its growing ethnic diversity positions it for an even more visible place in the American religious mosaic of the twenty-first century. The report cards provided by both the pastoral and judicatory surveys demonstrate a solid core of pastoral support for the administrative functioning of the denomination. Charisma and institutionalization, at least in the minds of a majority of pastors, are still interwoven some eighty-five years after the AG’s founding.

The ambiguity found around the central core for each of O’Dea’s five institutional dilemmas, however, provides some guidelines for charting the future. Perhaps the greatest challenge faced by the AG is what might be termed its “identity crisis.” There is a need for a paradigm shift — a move away from the old modernist, doctrinal paradigm (embraced in word but not necessarily in deed by earlier leaders) in favor of a new paradigm that could embody and empower the distinctive identity that is AG history and experience. Pentecostalism is more than “evangelicalism plus tongues,” and to limit it in this way robs the AG of its rich identity. Globally the PCM has become a “third stream” within Christianity as distinct from other streams as Catholicism is from Protestantism. (The uniqueness of the Pentecostal movement is particularly apparent when it is removed from the American culture where it developed and from where it spread and placed within the larger global culture where it is said to account for some one in four Christians.)

If the AG is going to be a major player in the American religious mosaic in the twenty-first century, it will require a paradigm that can reflect its unique qualities, qualities that fit better a postmodern paradigm than a modern one. Among other things, Pentecostalism has made the common experience of the divine available to a spiritually starved materialistic culture, taught the mean-
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ing of paradox to a Western world steeped in propositional logic, revived a sense of miracle and mystery among people trapped in the cage of rationality, and provided opportunities for catharsis in a civilization fearful of emotion. Increasingly AG identity, however, is expressed in terms of rational doctrine that masks the playful creative Spirit its believers have encountered during the last one hundred years of Pentecostalism's existence. The mixed motivation generated by the ambiguities in Pentecostal identity lies at the heart of the routinization of charisma.

While new paradigms reflecting a Pentecostal worldview are being embraced by more recent "waves" of the PCM, a significant number of AG pastors and their churches seem to be caught in a web of de facto dispensationalist-evangelical theology and its modern paradigm. These cultural Pentecostals are proclaiming a distinct identity but looking more and more like evangelicals in their beliefs and religious practices. Despite an overwhelming proclamation of the need to revitalize early Pentecostal roots, the revival at Brownsville Assembly of God and other AG and non-AG revival sites failed to interest two-thirds of the pastors enough to personally check out any of these events. With an identity shaped more by evangelical writings than by experiences of their black Pentecostal brothers or their charismatic cousins, it is perhaps not surprising that charismatic expressions and experiences are becoming less intense and less frequent at the average Assembly of God.

This failure to develop a consistent Pentecostal theology within an appropriate paradigm has made it difficult to affirm revivals within its own churches and renewal movements outside its boundaries. While some congregations have embraced fresh wind and fire, for the most part the reaction toward the new "waves" of charisma has been to critique and to tighten control on dissonant theologians and ministers who lacked a large congregational power base. The tendency to quench charisma can be most clearly seen in our discussion of the dilemma of delimitation. On one horn of the dilemma we find the watering down of Pentecostal identity due to inevitable accommodative forces; on the other, attempts to control ministers through doctrinal edicts in hopes of making them more "Pentecostal."

Also to be learned from assessing charismatic routinization through the lenses of O'Dea's dilemmas is how accommodative forces have eroded any distinct political voice that could have developed from a well-articulated Pentecostal theology and sense of Pentecostal history. The experiences of the early Pentecostals that challenged the sexist and racist culture of early-twentieth-century America could have paved the way for later disciples to make significant contributions to changes in women's roles and civil rights. Its early pacifist stance could have provided a plank for the peace movement. Its suspicion of rigid
denominationalism in the face of a democratized baptism of the Spirit could have provided a platform for ecumenical activities. None of this happened, in part due to the isolation of Pentecostals during the first half of the twentieth century. Once they moved across the tracks to a more comfortable lifestyle, contemporary followers lost sight of Pentecostalism’s unique identity as a marginalized people upon whom the Spirit released his power and presence in the earliest years of the twentieth century. As they made the journey from pilgrims to citizens, AG pastors seemed to take on the political voice of the fundamentalist-evangelical church expressed through the Republican Party.

The bureaucratic structure of the AG and its programs to serve churches and pastors have, for the most part, been rated well by pastors, especially in the area of missions and evangelism, including publications and church programs. As we have seen, pastors gave high marks to most of these services provided by the denomination. There is some indication, however, that some may feel that leaders have lost touch with the local churches (as reflected in increasingly fewer pastors making attendance at General Council meetings a priority). The reluctance of pastors to rate educational facilities and the performance of the Executive Presbytery is another indication of some estrangement between the national office and AG pastors.

In many respects the AG educational institutions are on the periphery of the organizational structure, a remnant of the ambivalence Pentecostals have traditionally had toward higher education. This is unfortunate. A long-range proactive approach toward appropriate self-definition could include harnessing some of the leading faculty in AG universities and the Assemblies of God Theological Seminary to help executives develop a distinct Pentecostal identity that goes beyond the doctrine of glossolalia as “initial evidence.” The administrative offices could then be agents of disseminating the information and receiving feedback that would ensure that the articulation of Pentecostal identity would always be a dynamic process rather than perceived as a finished product.

The ambiguities reported in this study that exist around near universal attitudes and opinions can be regarded as indicators of vitality and catalysts for change within the AG. Tension and ambiguity are signs of life and are often positively functional for organizations. In allowing for the expression of differences and nurturing existing pluralism, the mechanisms of change are set in motion that can revitalize institutions. Since no institution can remain static and survive, some of the minority positions discussed in this paper may serve as catalysts of change that will assure that the AG remains true to its mission and identity.

The Assemblies of God is a religion where experience of the mystical is more than a memory, where the pragmatic and the supernatural can dance to-
gether in a worldview that transcends the premodern/modern dichotomy. Its structure and polity is permeable enough to ensure a medium for the charismatic play of the Spirit. Whether it can continue to surf the tension required to balance charisma with effective organization is the question that still begs an answer.
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