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Abstract

Since the late 1940s, Praise and Worship has emerged as a new mode of liturgical expression out of North American Pentecostalism. Despite a variety of conflicts that have marked its adoption, it has found a home in a wide swath of global Protestant churches and it is estimated that nearly a quarter of the world’s Christians practice some form of Praise and Worship today. Praise and Worship today is known primarily by the expectation that participants will encounter God’s presence through music.

This dissertation presents a historical case study of the International Worship Symposium (IWS) as a lens into Praise and Worship history. The IWS was an annual Praise and Worship teaching event that began in 1977 and peaked in the late 1980s. The theology and practice of IWS worship was built on the central claim that God “inhabits” or “is enthroned upon” the praises of God’s people (from Psalm 22:3)—an insight first popularized by Latter Rain theologian and pastoral leader Reg Layzell. I begin with the background of the Latter Rain Revival of 1948 and the impact of Reg Layzell’s theology on the churches and individuals that birthed the IWS. Through conference teaching materials, personal interviews, and other primary sources, I explore how IWS teachers expanded on this theology by the 1980s and used the Tabernacle of David as typological prism for understanding worshipers’ special access to God through Praise and Worship, especially music. My argument concludes with a case study of the critical, early influence that the IWS had on the theology and music of a major—though little-researched—player in the worship music industry: Integrity’s Hosanna! Music. Through its
influence both on the thousands of individual conference participants and on the leadership of this one major company, the IWS had a central role in the dissemination of Praise and Worship’s practices and theology. In summary, I suggest that it is precisely the biblically-derived theological and liturgical understandings of the IWS that were central to the development of Praise and Worship (and its music) in the 1980s.

Despite its importance, liturgical studies scholarship has largely ignored the role of Latter Rain Pentecostals and the IWS. Instead, scholars have constructed a music-industrial history of Praise and Worship that focuses primarily on musical style and attributes Praise and Worship’s origins to the Jesus People Movement of the late 1960s and 1970s. I argue that is actually Pentecostals affiliated with the Latter Rain Revival of 1948, including those who originated and led the IWS, who were most critical to the construction and mainstream dissemination of Praise and Worship during the critical period of development, which was the 1980s. In addition to focusing on the wrong people and the wrong time period, scholars have often overlooked the underlying liturgical theology of Praise and Worship, which is, I suggest, the most critical element in its historical development. Thus, the dissertation offers liturgical history as a productive frame for engaging musicological and ethnomusicological research on present-day sites while expanding the scholarship of liturgical history on the Latter Rain stream of Pentecostal worship that has contributed to contemporary transformations in global Protestant worship today.
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Chapter 1. Introduction: Why We Need a New History of Praise and Worship

1.1 The Global Significance of Praise and Worship

Since the late 1940s, a new mode of liturgical expression has emerged out of North American Pentecostalism. Despite a variety of conflicts that have marked its adoption, it has found a home in a wide swath of global Protestant churches. While the genuine experience of God’s presence and power through musical worship has spread this phenomenon globally, the workings of an international network of persons responsible for its production, marketing, and consumption has also aided its dissemination. According to sociologists tracking these changes in the US, for example, the growth of new styles of worship have been helped along both by changes in forms of ecclesial organization as well as new styles of music. In American religion as a whole, the change “partakes of a decades-long trend . . . away from an emphasis on belief and doctrine and toward an emphasis on experience, emotion, and the search for a least-common-denominator kind of worship in a time of ever less salient denominationally specific

1 cf. Mark Chaves and Allison Eagle, “Religious Congregations in 21st Century America,” National Congregations Study (2015) https://sites.duke.edu/ncsweb/files/2019/02/NCSIII_report_final.pdf. The National Congregation’s Study conducted by Mark Chaves at Duke University interprets the data on trends in worship practices and notes that, “worship services have become more informal in recent years, with more churches using contemporary music and musical styles, more spontaneous speaking from people in the pews, more unscripted bodily movement, and other developments that make worship more expressive and apparently focused on producing a certain kind of religious experience for participants” (9). Furthermore, the NCS summarizes saying, “One would think that the rise of this particular worship style has to peak eventually as it reaches a saturation point, but it has not yet reached that point. Especially given the centrality of worship to congregational life, this is a trend worth watching in the years to come” (11).
liturgical and theological content.”\(^2\) Outside the United States, this new liturgical phenomenon marks the type of worship most commonly associated with the growth of global pentecostal-charismaticism in West Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia (among other places).\(^3\)

In Monique Ingalls and Amos Yong’s recently edited volume, they use the term “pentecostal-charismatic” in an attempt to provide an umbrella term for the “the constellation of twentieth-and twenty-first-century Christian renewal movements” that participate in a transnational social “network connected by shared beliefs and practices—of which music is, of course, key.” In present-day practice, Ingalls and Yong argue, “music and worship practices often overlap significantly with those of evangelicalism, mainline Christianity, or charismatic Catholicism.”\(^4\) To describe this overlap as a liturgical phenomenon, Lim Swee Hong and Lester Ruth have suggested the term “Contemporary Praise and Worship” to recognize the multiple historical streams represented in this way of worship and the multiple terms in use among present-day practitioners. Among these multiple streams that are contributing to the current

\(^3\) Much work remains to be done to document the history of CPW in these settings, particularly the dissemination of CPW by western evangelical and Pentecostal missionary organizations, large conferences and evangelistic events, and the marketing and sale of western CPW music. One important volume that begins this work is Monique Ingalls and Amos Yong, eds., *The Spirit of Praise*: Music and Worship in Global Pentecostal-Charismatic Christianity (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2015). See also Jenkins on the geographic center of global Christianity moving generally to the South.
situation, one of the primary liturgical traditions is one known most commonly by the music associated with it. The liturgical phenomenon to which I am alluding is Praise and Worship.⁵

Ingalls and Yong estimate that nearly five hundred million people world-wide—nearly one quarter of the world’s total Christians⁶—practice some form of Praise and Worship today. Yet the authors of the sociological study mentioned above (one of the largest, ongoing sociological studies of American religion) are only able to write obliquely about recent changes, citing informality, spontaneity, bodily movements, and other “expressive” elements “apparently focused on producing a certain kind of religious experience for participants.”⁷ On one hand, such a vague description is fitting because of the breadth of their analysis. On the other hand, there is a dearth of secondary literature available to account for the sources and origins of the practices they describe; the lack of available historical research on recent changes in worship is grossly disproportional to the percentage of Christians who are implicated in it.

This historical gap is particularly evident in reference to the adoption of Praise and Worship. Indeed, scholars in the field of liturgical studies have not yet produced a substantial body of scholarship that documents the development of Praise and Worship in global Protestant worship, especially its origins.⁸ The relative lack of available research on Praise and Worship is

---

⁵ I use the capitalized term “Praise and Worship” to refer to the liturgical phenomenon as a whole in its diversity of expressions over time and in various places. When quoting other authors, I follow their usage.
⁶ Ingalls and Yong, The Spirit of Praise, 1.
⁸ Lester Ruth’s 2014 article “Divine, Human, or Devilish?” described the recent state of the field and suggested that the field of liturgical studies has contributed almost nothing to the historiography on contemporary praise and worship as a whole. Beyond his own work, few others have published on this topic since 2014, and the state of the question remains largely the same as described there. See Lester
glaring when compared to the amount of scholarship available on other periods in worship history or on other topics in the same historical period (the second half of the twentieth-century).

1.2 The Music Industrial History of Praise and Worship

1.2.1 What do We Know about Praise and Worship History?

There is, however, some recent scholarship that has attempted to account for the history of Praise and Worship as it has reshaped global Protestant worship in the last seventy years. Because music choices for congregational worship are such a palpable marker of worship changes, music has become an important and useful site of inquiry. Scholars in the field of ethnomusicology have been especially active in mapping the present state of the music of Praise and Worship. In particular, case studies have highlighted influential sites for the construction and maintenance of an inter-connected global network of musical practices that are shaping music for Christian worship in the twenty-first century, though scholars working on projects in

___________________________


9 In general, Praise and Worship is not a singular “practice” but an assortment of worship practices and theological understandings. When describing the entire phenomenon of Praise and Worship in reference to other worship traditions, I use the singular “practice.” When describing Praise and Worship, I use the plural “practices” to acknowledge that it is multi-faceted and not limited merely to music-making (even though the music-making itself enjoys multiple elements of expression).

neighboring fields have constructed similar narrative accounts. In doing this work, a relatively stable portrayal of the history of Praise and Worship has begun to emerge.

Recent scholarship on the history of Praise and Worship I describe as a “musical-industrial” history. As the term “music-industrial” suggests, this discourse focuses on the development and use of new styles of Christian music and a concomitant industry around that music. The history begins in the 1960s, especially with the rise of the Jesus People Movement and its use of folk and rock music. By the early 1990s it turns to the development of an industry to produce, market, distribute, and license music to churches for use in corporate worship. Finally, it picks up on the transnational connections forged in the Christian music industry in the mid- to late-1990s and continues to the development of globalized worship music brands such as *Passion*, *Hillsong*, and *Bethel*.

This history comes, however, with an associated set of challenges: namely that the particular contributions of Latter Rain Pentecostals to Praise and Worship history have not been well-documented and therefore have not been considered in scholarly discussions. To counterbalance and correct this history, I suggest that the Latter Rain Pentecostal Revival of 1948...

---

12 See Ingalls, *Singing the Congregation* and Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion.”
13 I reserve the use of the generic term “Pentecostal” for the most macro level description of Pentecostals who may or may not have adopted Praise and Worship or have been associated with a sub-tradition within Pentecostalism. I use “Latter Rain Pentecostal” to describe Pentecostals affiliated expressly with the network of churches that emerged out of the Latter Rain Revival of 1948 and their teachings.
1948 and the churches affected by it are actually responsible for the theological developments that are key to understanding the liturgical phenomenon of Praise and Worship, such as the widespread expectation today that worshipers can experience the presence of God through music. Indeed, it was musical leaders from Latter Rain churches who developed an annual teaching conference called the International Worship Symposium (IWS) that drew thousands of attendees by the mid-1980s and became a central node in the further development and dissemination of Praise and Worship theology and practice beyond Latter Rain-affiliated churches.

As a result of the oversight of the key contributions of Latter Rain Pentecostals in and through the International Worship Symposium, the music-industrial history has significant gaps in the account of Praise and Worship’s theological, liturgical, and musical content. The nature of this gap is not a result of some inherent deficiency in the ethnomusicological literature but is a direct result of the lack of attention that liturgical scholars have paid to Praise and Worship in the second half of the twentieth century.¹⁴

To understand more fully the contribution that this dissertation aims to provide with a fuller historiography of Praise and Worship I will give an account of three features that constitute this “musical-industrial” history of Praise and Worship. First, I rehearse the shared scholarly reliance on the Jesus People Movement as an origin story for Praise and Worship that has downplayed the contributions of Latter Rain Pentecostals in the 1970s and 1980s. Second, I discuss the role of the diverse nomenclature used to describe the “genre” or “repertoire” of

¹⁴ See also Ruth, “Divine, Human, or Devilish?”: 296–303.
various worship musics and how attention to these musics masks attention to the larger theological and liturgical phenomenon of the Latter Rain origins of Praise and Worship. Finally, I address how the emphasis on the “industry” of Praise and Worship music has obscured the concrete ecclesial needs within Latter Rain Pentecostal churches that the “industry” was created to resolve.

1.2.2 The Jesus People Movement Narrative

Studies that employ a music-industrial Praise and Worship history have established a narrative that traces the origins of the musical worship of present-day Christians to the Jesus People Movement of the late 1960s and 1970s. However, the strength with which they center the Jesus People Movement downplays the potential that other explanatory resources have regarding the history in question, especially that of other contemporaneous Pentecostal worship practices.

The history begins by pointing to the way participants in the Jesus People Movement sought to articulate the experience of their new-found faith through the music idioms popular in the late 1960s and early 1970s, namely the styles of folk and rock musics. With Southern California’s Calvary Chapel in Costa Mesa, California as the epicenter for the Jesus People Movement, the narrative foregrounds the founding of Maranatha! Music under Chuck Fromm and the popularity of the “Praise Album” series. The first album in that series, “The Praise Album” (1974), this history treats as a forerunner to later recordings that feature songs to be used in congregational worship. The historical narrative has a tendency to filter any and all later developments through it, including musical style features, developments in the recording
industry, and church organizational logic, among other topics. I refer to this simply as “the Jesus People Narrative.”

In developing the Jesus People Narrative, scholars have drawn largely on the available secondary material from a few key sources that happen to be central to (and problematic for) the narrative that is being constructed. Commonly cited research across the secondary literature include Charles E. (‘Chuck’) Fromm’s doctoral dissertation on the history of Maranatha! Music, Robb Redman’s *The Great Worship Awakening*, and Donald Miller’s *Reinventing American Protestantism*. Notably, both Fromm and Redman were executives at Maranatha! Music, the epicenter of the Jesus People Movement’s music in the 1970s. As such, their proximity has, to my mind, skewed the relevant historical record towards the developments in that context. Fromm is also notable because multiple interviews with him as the head of Maranatha! Music are used as primary source material on the history of the Christian music industry, blurring the lines between industry insider and scholarly source. Supporting these

---

15 This dissertation is notable in particular because it includes a significant amount of first-hand information from Fromm’s own work establishing and leading Maranatha! Music. Though it represents itself as a scholarly account and includes strong theoretical interpretations of the history, much of the historical information itself should be treated as primary material. See Charles E. Fromm, “Textual Communities and New Song in the Multimedia Age: The Routinization of Charisma in the Jesus Movement” (PhD diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 2006).

16 Like Fromm, Redman’s close connection to the Southern California Christian music scene and Redman’s positive characterization of the history—and proximity to it—position this work as somewhat less-than-secondary literature. Robb Redman, *The Great Worship Awakening* (Ventura, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2002).


18 This fact does not discount the rich historical accounts they offer but is meant to indicate how these sources may have an inherent bias towards the developments with which they are most familiar.
sources, Miller’s work in the sociology of religion features interviews with Chuck Fromm and highlights Calvary Chapel, suggesting that music was a megaphone for the message of this new religiosity in a way that was culturally relevant: “People knew they did not want the religion that went with stained glass and pipe organs, but a long-haired hippie strumming a guitar and singing about Jesus’ love sent a different message.”19 These three works are foundational to the Jesus People Narrative used in scholarly literature even while Redman and Fromm blur the lines between primary and secondary source and intertwine elements of scholarly insight and practical advice.

Beyond these accounts, Michael Hamilton’s Christianity Today article, “The Triumph of the Praise Song: How the Guitar Beat out the Organ in the Worship Wars” (1999)20 is a high-water mark in mainstream media for the Jesus People Narrative’s identification as the root of present-day praise songs. The article suggests that the conflicts in the 1990s over musical style in worship owes its roots to the music of the 1960s and the way that music has formed the Baby-Boomer generation’s preferences. His article’s title works as a short-hand summary of recent

19 Miller, Reinventing, 83. Though Miller refers to the role that church networks have played—particularly within the limited scope of churches in Southern California which he examines in his work—he says little about the worship practices and the theologies of worship as they pertain to the ecclesiology. Moreover, his study was published at what might be considered the high-water mark for these particular church networks and their organizational structures, not to mention at a high point in popularity for the music publishing arms of these networks. Note too that his discussion highlights the Vineyard and Hope Chapel networks, both of which have similar Jesus People connections.

Protestant worship history, framed as a battle of aesthetic preferences between those who prefer the organ and those who (because of the Jesus People revolution) prefer the guitar. The prior group has, according to Hamilton, lost the “war.”

Access to primary documentation on the Jesus People also aids the case for the central role of the Jesus People Narrative in the history of Praise and Worship. David di Sabatino’s *The Jesus People Movement* and Larry Eskridge’s book *God’s Forever Family* together provide a well-defined set of resources from which scholars studying present-day worship can easily draw.

With a clear set of primary and secondary resources describing the origins of the Jesus People Movement, the above-mentioned authors appear well-resourced to examine this narrative’s connection to their particular projects. This is especially true for those whose work attempts to interpret the relationship between the current state of white, United States Evangelicalism and Praise and Worship history. Somewhat surprisingly, however, scholarship on Praise and Worship in African-American megachurches also relies on the Jesus People Narrative, such as in the work of Birgitta Johnson. Internationally, the case is the same.

---

21 I have argued elsewhere that Hamilton’s article overlooks the important role of the keyboard in the dissemination of CPW. See Adam Perez “Beyond the Guitar: The Keyboard as a Lens into the History of Contemporary Praise and Worship.” *The Hymn* 69, no.1 (Spring 2019).


Historians documenting the worship history of the UK such as Pete Ward in *Selling Worship* and Les Moir in *Missing Jewel* appeal to the Jesus People Movement as the origins of Praise and Worship in those contexts. Anne Dickerson’s dissertation on the role of Praise and Worship among Cuban evangelicals similarly employs the Jesus People Narrative.

To point out these common resources is not simply to suggest that the Jesus People did not play a role in the development and dissemination of Praise and Worship. Indeed, the Jesus People Movement has played an important role. My outlining how the Jesus People Narrative pervades scholarship on Praise and Worship broadly is, rather, intended to demonstrate the breadth of scholarly reliance on a single historical moment that shapes current understandings of Praise and Worship history across a variety of scholarly fields. At the root of that narrative is a problematic methodological reliance on sources that overestimate their own role in that history.

Adding to the confusion here is the framing of the Jesus People Movement as significant for worship history today in a way that highlights their evangelical identity at the same time that it downplays their overtly Pentecostal worship practices, such as the common practice of


speaking in tongues. Indeed, although Pentecostals do fall categorically under the broad umbrella of evangelicalism, the Jesus People Narrative isolates their evangelical sociological identity. Though it is beyond the scope of my argument, it is important to acknowledge that the Jesus People are Pentecostals within evangelicalism when viewed from a liturgical perspective.26 Because the Pentecostal aspects of the Jesus People’s worship are not immediately necessary to describe the present ecumenical sharing of worship musics today, it is easily overlooked.27

1.2.3 Worship Music’s Many Names

The scholarly agreement on the music-industrial history of Praise and Worship extends from a shared narrative of its source in the Jesus People Movement to the music that is understood to be the content of that history. This aspect derives primarily from discussions about the changing dispositions toward the use of popular (“secular”) musical styles appropriated by Christian musicians since the middle of the twentieth century inaugurated by the Jesus People Movement. This aspect takes for granted that the history is located primarily in the musical works and their popular consumption, distribution, and sales. Though new styles may be a “product” of changing dispositions toward music, theological and liturgical changes within Pentecostalism are also an important factor that has not been adequately explored. In the case of

27 My review here also begins to note how liturgical historians have lagged behind other fields (such as ethnomusicology and historical musicology) in their attempts to document the array of worship expressions among Pentecostals (including the Jesus People).
the history of Praise and Worship, it is precisely the theological and liturgical developments that develop the phrase “Praise and Worship,” which becomes attached to its music products.

Though scholars across a variety of disciplinary boundaries have told the history of Praise and Worship through its musical artifacts, the most significant and sustained participation in this discourse has come from ethnomusicological case studies on recent sites in American worship contexts. This is, of course, fitting to the nature of ethnomusicological inquiry, but similar approaches can be found beyond musicological scholarship. Michael Hamilton and Robb Redman (cited above) likewise situate this history and its conflicts in musical terms.

One well-trodden path has been to look at the apparent evolution of the musical artifacts themselves, group them under a moniker that signals their distinct stylistic features, and narrate the history of that style’s development from the early innovators to its later-stage adopters. In historical musicology this process of codification is itself an important hermeneutic. To name and classify a song as part of a generic group (i.e., of the same genre) is to suggest that it shares a certain set of formal, recognizable features in the text and/or music with a larger body of songs. Genres play an important role when trying to describe the history of Praise and Worship as a music-industrial phenomenon. In Singing the Congregation, Ingalls indexes the state of the question on genre classifications and nomenclature, noting that there has long been a distinction at the most basic level between “music for entertainment and devotional listening,” often referred to as CCM (Contemporary Christian Music) and “music for use in congregational singing” (terms include ‘praise and worship music,’ ‘contemporary worship music,’ ‘modern worship
music,’ or simply ‘worship music’). However, even these two broad categories have not been agreed upon in popular usage.

Probably the most commonly used term in the music-industrial history is “Contemporary Worship Music” (CWM). Monique Ingalls defines CWM as “the broad repertory of evangelical congregational song composed from the late 1960s to the late 2000s in mainstream Western popular music styles.” As Mark Porter rightly notes, this definition is a modification of Robb Redman’s earlier definition. Porter, too, situates his work using the term CWM to describe the musical repertory of the charismatic evangelicals in the Anglican tradition that feature in his study. In Wen Reagan’s dissertation, he describes his use of the term ‘contemporary worship music’ as a catch-all, suggesting that it appeals neither to the specific theological practices of “Praise and Worship” from charismatic contexts, nor to the historical specificity of the terms “praise music” or “modern worship” music, each of which have been employed at specific times (the 1960s and the 1990s, respectively). Reagan even acknowledges that there is an overlap with a specific genre that goes by the same name, yet uses the term nevertheless to describe “the contemporary forms that worship music has taken, broadly speaking, with the adoption of rock music in American sanctuaries over the last fifty years.”

---

28 Ingalls, Singing the Congregation, 43.
29 Porter, Contemporary Worship Music, 5, citing Ingalls, “Awesome in this Place,” 16.
30 Redman, The Great Worship Awakening, 47.
Writing about the use of worship music in recent concert and conference contexts, Busman employs “Praise and Worship” as a catch-all term for this “pop-styled liturgical music” saying, “‘Praise and worship’ is used to refer to a body of Christian congregational music which draws musical and textual influences from mainstream Western popular styles, such as folk, rock, and country.” Regarding the origins of “praise and worship,” Busman suggests that the worldwide success in the major label releases of the 2010s (note the recording industry terminology for marking its ‘success’) can be traced back to its origins in the Jesus People Movement of the 1960s.

Beginning in the late 1960s, the ‘Jesus Movement’ movement married the social ethics of the hippie subculture with a fundamentalist understanding of Christian theology and began producing new simplified congregational worship music with the musical and lyrical directness of folk revivalists. Throughout the 1970s, this music was developed and popularized by campus ministries and youth-oriented parachurch organizations, eventually finding a strong foothold within the institutional church. By the middle of the 1990s, praise and worship music was firmly and broadly ensconced in American evangelical practice.

Here we see also how the present-day status of this music as “broadly ensconced in American evangelical practice” is—somewhat anachronistically—projected back onto the Jesus People without attention to the Jesus People’s Pentecostal worship practices.

32 Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion,” 1.
33 Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion,” 5.
34 Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion,” 16.
35 Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion,” 5.
Though decidedly distinct from the conversation about Praise and Worship in white contexts, recent scholarship on Praise and Worship in Black church contexts is similarly organized around the historical origins of the Jesus People Movement and the genre nomenclature for the phenomenon. One important differentiation in this setting is the repertory boundaries between “praise and worship” and “contemporary gospel music.” Though there are admittedly fewer scholars working in this area, two examples are important to discuss. The most extensive discussion of Praise and Worship in Black churches is in Birgitta Johnson’s ethnomusicological work on African-American megachurches in Los Angeles. In her dissertation, Johnson uses the term “praise and worship” to describe both a musical style and a period of musical activity in the worship service. Regarding musical style, Johnson suggests that there are two sub-categories within Praise and Worship that are determined by a song’s “effectiveness in church worship.” “The first,” Johnson explains, “is a congregational style or highly participatory Praise and Worship [and] the second category includes solo, small group style, or minimally participatory praise and worship.”36 Both styles emphasize a feature that is key for her definition of Praise and Worship: a “vertical lyric.” Johnson also uses “praise and worship” to describe a period during the service that, during the 1980s, eventually overtook the “devotional period” common in many Black churches.37 In a similar multiple-use definition, Cory Hunter uses the term “praise and worship” in Black church contexts to describe a

“subgenre of gospel music,” a style of songwriting, a genre within the CCM market, and a movement that encompasses a diversity of other musical genres.38

One primary challenge in defining these terms through genre and repertory classifications is that musical styles have changed over time. One must choose which period and element in the music-industrial history is most important, influential, or inclusive—even as those categories shift. In addition, the distinction between sites of inquiry (churches, conferences, concerts, recordings, etc.) impacts scholars’ use—and rightly so. Unfortunately, this situation means that scholars’ choices necessarily place certain aspects of the history at the top of the interpretive hierarchy as each one risks obscuring aspects of the history not as closely associated with the chosen term. As a result, even titles like Lim and Ruth’s Lovin’ on Jesus that avoid the use of a musical term reinforces a historic connection to the informality associated with the Jesus People Movement with the word choice in its title. Though the phrase is drawn from a particular stream within recent worship history (the Vineyard Movement), the title subtly reinforces the centrality of liturgical informality even as the work as a whole attempts to displace that narrative by attending to other expressions, such as the cultural formality expressed in both white and Black Pentecostal Praise and Worship contexts.

In some cases, these terms were developed by the industry precisely for the marketing and sale of musical products (as with ‘modern worship music,’ for example), regardless of the

38 Hunter, “The Politics of Real Spirituality,” 126–130. He puts these in service of arguing that praise and worship increased a sense of multiculturalism in Black Churches.
complex relationship between the names of the genres and the musical or theological practices from which (some of) the repertories earn their names. This situation is the case for Praise and Worship where the term was developed through theological reflection and was later adopted by recording companies. The distinctions between these terms and their developments are important for understanding their historical significance. Unfortunately, multiple terms have been employed in a variety of ways that lacks clear consensus. While some of these terms are employed with a more limited scope (see Ingalls on CCM above), there remain other terms that have been suggested as umbrella terms for the broad repertory of songs for congregational use today, including those mentioned above as well as new idiosyncratic scholarly terms such as “contemporary congregational songs” and “Christian congregational music.” Scholars’ inability to establish a clear consensus in their uses of each of these terms has caused confusion as to the shared (or not) object of research—even when relying on the Jesus People Movement as the historic antecedent of their studies.

Admittedly, this definitional disarray is not simply a product of scholarly convention but also of the way the terms are used by various communities in its history. Praise and Worship is perhaps unique in that the term enjoys a discrete theological origin and thus stands apart from the other nomenclature or repertory. Turning to its theological and liturgical roots, however, does not

40 Cf. the bi-annual (every other) Christian Congregational Music Conference, Ripon College, Cuddesdon, UK.
immediately solve the issue of the way the musical styles employed within this way of worship may have changed over time beyond the boundaries of a singular musical genre. It does, however, give us a clear basis for a hermeneutical lens that is fitting to its musical products that can clarify the trajectory of its historical development into the various contexts in which it is deployed as a term by later participants and scholars.

1.2.4 CCLI and the Praise and Worship Industry

As I have already begun to outline, the music-industrial history intertwines an emphasis on music going back to the Jesus People Narrative and the development of a commercial industry to develop, record, market, distribute, and license songs for worship or sell to consumer listeners. Ingalls’s account summarizes that the above-mentioned distinctions in musical genres stem from “the late 1960s [when] evangelicals started using pop-rock music both for concert performances and for collective singing in worship.”41 ‘Message music’ and ‘praise music’ diverged in “less than a decade. . . and form[ed] recording industries that were to remain largely separate for another two decades.”42 These distinct music recording industries began to reassemble in the late 1990s as “CCM recording labels and publishers scrambled en masse to break into the worship music business.”43 Ingalls’s work highlights concisely the ways in which

41 Ingalls, *Singing the Congregation*, 43. Note again how this description veils the fact that the Jesus People were Pentecostal in practice.
42 Ingalls, *Singing the Congregation*, 43. See also, Ingalls, “Awesome in this Place,” 77f. Note also that Ingalls includes an extended section on differentiating between the CCM and CWM genres, especially in the 1980s, as practiced in congregational worship. The discussion is put in service of arguing for the role of Vineyard and Integrity Music’s impact on the broader CCM industry.
43 Ingalls, *Singing the Congregation*, 43.
genre, nomenclature, and industry development are not only interwoven but rooted in the Jesus People narrative.

While helpful for understanding the recording industry history, there remains an element of the broader history of the industry’s development that has not been explored at length, namely the situation within Latter Rain Pentecostal ecclesial communities that gave rise to industrial forms of music production and codification like, in particular, the origins of entities such as Integrity’s Hosanna! Music and Christian Copyright Licensing International (hereafter CCLI). These two companies emerged out of discretely Latter Rain Pentecostal ecclesial contexts and helped to mainstream Praise and Worship on an international scale. Though Integrity’s Hosanna! Music has largely been overlooked in accounts of Praise and Worship history, CCLI often sits at the center of that narrative. In particular, CCLI is credited with the growth of a church-serving copyright industry at the end of the 1980s that precipitated changes in songs choices among congregations, and in so doing its origins in Latter Rain Pentecostal ecclesial community are overlooked or downplayed.

As other scholars have noted, CCLI did arise expressly to help solve the question of copyright licensing for the emerging implications of a congregational worship-focused wave of

\[
---------------
\]

\[44\] It is important to note that here that the popular recording industry not only responds to consumer desires but also plays an active role in the construction of genre boundaries through the marketing promotion of particular artists and sounds to various constituencies. In addition to the construction of discrete genres, songs or artists that defy clear genre-based marketing boundaries are described by the term “cross-over.” This classification is meant to indicate either that a song or artist has moved from one genre into another or that they have appeal in multiple markets. For CPW music this is either across the Christian/secular divide (Amy Grant is a notable example) or the CCM/worship divide (such as the Michael W. Smith’s release of a worship album in the early 2000s).
new songwriters. Scholars have suggested however, that CCLI did more than just solve a niche issue in church music distribution. Reagan says the contemporary worship music industry was “fueled by CCLI,” especially in the 1990s.\textsuperscript{45} Busman describes the growth of CCLI by noting that Praise and Worship music was “receiving enough widespread adoption to merit the creation of its own performing rights organization.”\textsuperscript{46} This new organization was, according to Busman, necessary for the legal protection of church musicians in a new era of copyright law to allow them “to continue functioning as they had” in copying, arranging, and projecting song lyrics.\textsuperscript{47} Reagan and Bowler explain that with the founding of CCLI, “A new revenue stream for worship songwriters and their publishers emerged almost overnight. . . . This licensing structure effectively transformed Sunday morning services into cover band venues.”\textsuperscript{48} Similarly, Ingalls notes that the creation and publishing of CCLI’s top song lists became, in effect, the “pop charts” of Christian worship and began to serve as major career boosters for worship songwriters and their affiliated publishing houses and record labels. Indeed, as Ingalls concludes, “what began as a solution to copyright issues became a source of much wider influence on the industry.”\textsuperscript{49}

Unfortunately, the implication of this scholarly portrayal is that CCLI gave rise to an industry of Praise and Worship songwriting. This is an incomplete portrayal. Without rehearsing

\textsuperscript{46} Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion,” 5.
\textsuperscript{47} Busman, “(Re)Sounding Passion,” 48–49.
\textsuperscript{49} Ingalls, “Awesome in this Place,” 115.
the history of CCLI here, such accounts do not adequately explore the way it was founded out of a Latter Rain Pentecostal church, un-affiliated with the Jesus People, that was a key node in a broader network of Praise and Worship that goes back multiple decades. This element of the music-industrial history veils the concrete ecclesial situation which gave rise to solutions that eventually grew to have significant influence over the production and dissemination of Praise and Worship songs and indeed its wider dissemination through Protestant worship. To summarize, CCLI is not treated as an entity that was founded by Pentecostals to solve a need that was created within Pentecostal churches practicing Praise and Worship because of a particular liturgical theology. Thus, the centrality of CCLI in the music-industrial discourse extends the way that the contributions of Pentecostal Praise and Worship to broader worship changes remain veiled.

1.2.5 Music Industrial Conclusion

The music-industrial history’s focus on present-day American evangelicals and their antecedents has downplayed—and in some cases overlooked entirely—the Latter Rain Pentecostal ecclesial, theological, and liturgical core of Praise and Worship and its contributions to the recent history of changes in Christian worship. Two additional issues compound the challenges associated with the omissions in the music-industrial history—and the related methodological limits of ethnomusicological scholarship—as it relies on other historiographic works that have not addressed Pentecostal contributions as such. First, that scholarship on Pentecostal worship has centered the role of speaking in tongues to the detriment of other emerging features in the last few decades, such as Praise and Worship. Second, that liturgical
scholars have not yet provided a useful body of scholarship on Praise and Worship as a phenomenon in recent liturgical history. My argument in this dissertation is that the music-industrial history of Praise and Worship is incomplete and misleading without a broader account of the ecclesial, theological, and liturgical contributions of a particular subset of Pentecostals to the history of Praise and Worship.

Admittedly, the study of a worship tradition that is not text-based is definitely a hurdle for the field of liturgical scholarship that emerged in the late nineteenth century with a philological method of tracing changes in ancient liturgical manuscripts. Anthropological and ethnographic methods have been incorporated into the field of liturgy with the advent of the related discipline of ritual studies in the 1980s, but this did not create a body of literature on Pentecostal worship in particular. Instead of providing thorough accounts of Praise and Worship since the 1980s, liturgical scholars have perhaps been distracted by the apparent threat of worship practices associated with growing independent megachurches, such as Willow Creek Community Church and Saddleback Church, as well as from within mainline denominational churches, such as the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America-affiliated congregation Community Church of Joy and Ginghamsburg United Methodist Church. Regarding the


liturgical history of Pentecostals, mainline liturgical scholars have also relied too strongly on the scant description of evangelical and Pentecostal liturgical history provided by James White.\(^{52}\)

There has, however, been one very recent source in the field of liturgical studies that has begun to address the Pentecostal contributions to recent changes in Protestant worship more broadly: the groundbreaking work of Lim Swee Hong and Lester Ruth. Ruth and Lim have done an initial mapping of the key theological contributions of Latter Rain Pentecostals to the broader history of Contemporary Praise and Worship but they have not addressed the role of conferences as a site of dissemination for Praise and Worship or attempted to situate the development of particular theological themes Praise and Worship music within a broader industry context as I do here.\(^{53}\)

It is clear that scholars across fields and discourses are under-resourced by liturgical historians on the topic of Praise and Worship history. Neither musicologists nor liturgical scholars can fully answer the questions they are asking without a fuller account of the contributions that Latter Rain Pentecostal worship has made to recent liturgical history. At a compelling alternative take on the history and methods of evangelical worship in direct response to White’s category, see Melanie Ross, *Evangelical vs. Liturgical: Defying a Dichotomy* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014). For an evaluation of the historiography upon which James White relies in constructing his Frontier Worship category, see Melanie Ross, "New Frontiers in Evangelical Worship," (forthcoming).


\(^{53}\) Cf. Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship and Lovin’ on Jesus*.
basic level, the history represented there is simply incomplete. More so, the interpretation of that history as it applies to important events and developments cannot be understood accurately without incorporating the Latter Rain Pentecostal worship history that this dissertation supplies. It is an imperative for liturgical historians to correct these deficiencies and to contribute our piece to this mosaic of change in Christian worship communities in the second half of the twentieth century and on into the twenty-first century. As I hope to show, the International Worship Symposium not only provides a window into that history but is a critical hub in the development and dissemination of Praise and Worship in the 1980s.

1.3 Rationale and Method

This study is a liturgical history of the International Worship Symposium and the making of Praise and Worship. It aims to fill the research gaps described above by providing an alternative narrative to the Jesus People music-industrial history. The development of Praise and Worship as a liturgical phenomenon can be studied by looking at the particular Latter Rain Pentecostal ecclesial network that developed it. Though there are limited archives and records of the worship among this network of churches, an annual worship conference emerged that provides a window into Praise and Worship history. During the 1980s, the International Worship Symposium became the central site for developing and codifying the biblical theology and practice of Praise and Worship, as well as a central node in its dissemination. By studying the Symposium through conference notebooks, teaching syllabi, media, interviews, and other primary materials, this dissertation describes Praise and Worship as a discrete theological and liturgical tradition.
On one hand, my history of Praise and Worship through the lens of the International Worship Symposium concedes that the development of the music industry does, in fact, have some impact on congregational worship life insofar as the industry functions as a mechanism of formation through the dissemination of value-laden musical artifacts. On the other hand, it resists the assumption that the industry exists apart from the influences and developments happening in congregational worship and the theologies that undergird it. The dissertation frames certain central aspects of the development of the Christian music industry as following from transformations in congregational worship and not the reverse. Rather than look through the lens of the inception, development, and centralization of a Christian music industry, this project looks through another lens: that of a worship conference. The particular issues that are being navigated by local churches and conferences created the conditions out of which the worship music industry emerged. Though music plays a primary role in the worship practices of these conferences, music is treated as just one part of the worship theology and practice, alongside a variety of other important practices. As I will show, beginning with a specific context of worship—its theology and practice—sets the stage for understanding the large-scale development and transformation in what has become known as the worship music industry.

Likewise, this dissertation contrasts the liturgical history highlighted by liturgical scholars insofar as it does not look at evangelical megachurches but at interrelated networks of Pentecostal church contexts that are bound up not by leadership structure or formal organization but by their shared practices and theology of worship. This theology—not their data-driven, market-savvy growth strategies—is what holds the network of churches together. As we will see,
the power of the worship practices themselves and the corporate worship experience were understood to attract and convert new believers. Many interviewees attest to this power in their own stories and experiences in Praise and Worship settings. Though liturgical scholars and others would suggest that Praise and Worship is simplistic in practice, we will see that the worshipers at the International Worship Symposium enjoyed a mature, biblical theology of worship. Through a complex and robust theological reflection, the IWS developed a worship theology that was initially idiosyncratic but, through important channels of dissemination, became a part of mainstream Protestant worship theology and practice. In summary, the history of the International Worship Symposium provides a lens through which we can see the development of Praise and Worship in a way that both complements and corrects a music-industrial historical account.

1.4 Chapter Summaries

This dissertation argues that Praise and Worship is a discrete theological-liturgical phenomenon that emerged from within Latter Rain Pentecostal contexts in the late-1970s and 1980s. It has a history and theology that has not been well-documented in recent literature, often treated as a fluid (and contested) style of recent Christian music inflected with stylistic elements of other popular musics.

In chapter two of this dissertation, I document the history and theology of what would later become known as the Latter Rain Revival in North Battleford, Saskatchewan, Canada through the founding of the International Worship Symposium. I begin by documenting how the core leadership group formed and the initial Revival began. I then turn to the experience of the
Revival and its emphasis on worship through the personal narratives of leaders who received it both first- and second-hand and were important in the founding of the International Worship Symposium. In the second half of the chapter, I describe the connections between early IWS-leaders and the first few years of gatherings that would later become known as the IWS. In that section I provide accounts of both the personal histories of important leaders like Mike Herron and Barry and Steve Griffing and the histories of their ecclesial networks as it pertains to the dissemination of Latter Rain Worship from 1946 to 1980.

In chapter three, I narrate the coming of age, mature development, and markers of decline in the history of the IWS from 1981 to 1989. I provide a year-by-year description of the IWS as an organization, its locations, its central teachers and their teachings, and its numerical growth. I describe how year after year the IWS made new connections through its itinerancy that helped spread its message across the US and abroad. I conclude by suggesting the potential reasons for why the Symposium’s prominence began to fade toward the end of the decade, such as because of emerging competitors.

Chapter four is an accounting of the theology of Praise and Worship as taught by the IWS. I begin by documenting the importance of the concept of “Restoration” and the role of praise in their biblical theology of worship. Next, I detail the central concept of the Tabernacle of David as a key typology for worship and a prism through which further teachings on Praise and Worship developed. Then, I take a closer look at the significance of the restoration of music in the tabernacle typology and how it relates to music ministry and congregational worship
practices. Finally, I look at the broader understanding of the arts in worship as part of God’s plan for worship restoration.

Chapter five follows the central theological themes of chapter four and discusses a case study of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music (IHM). Each of the IHM leaders learned Praise and Worship from the International Worship Symposium and subsequently helped to codify the sound and style of mainstream Praise and Worship music through their popular recordings. In the chapter, I describe how each of the five early leaders attended Symposium and were brought together by evangelist Terry Law and his teachings on Praise and Worship as they were derived from his experience with IWS. The case study concludes with an analysis of the first tape in the Hosanna! series and how it codified musically a theology of “enthronement” in Praise and Worship.

In the conclusion to the dissertation, I point to elements in the history of Praise and Worship that can be reimagined in light of this dissertation’s historical account. These elements include a reframing of the sites where Praise and Worship has been spread and the liturgical-historical approach to understanding the development of the so-called “worship industry” today. I finish by suggesting how future research on Pentecostal Praise and Worship history can build upon the insights offered in the pages of this dissertation.
Chapter 2. Rooted and Nourished in the Latter Rain: The Early History of the International Worship Symposium

2.1 Chapter Intro:

(Re)writing the history of Praise and Worship begins by revisiting the context where its key notions were initially developed: the Latter Rain Revival of 1948. The later emergence of the IWS and its worship cannot be understood without revisiting this key context because it contains the DNA, so to speak, of IWS worship. Revisiting this Revival is also critical because it reveals the network of Latter Rain Revival-affiliated churches upon which the Symposium was initially built in the late 1970s. In many ways, the theological and liturgical innovations of the Latter Rain Revival described in this chapter are only as important as the network that disseminated them. This network of churches first developed in the Pacific Northwest but later spread down the West Coast and throughout the United States as important centers for Latter Rain worship emerged. As I will show in this chapter, some of those churches became regional hubs that helped provide a groundswell of support for later IWS events.

In chapter one, I argued that the Latter Rain Revival context has been largely overlooked in the Protestant liturgical history of the second half of the twentieth century. In liturgical studies and adjacent fields, little has been written from a historical perspective on Praise and Worship.¹

Nor is it evident in the works of those writing about the history of Praise and Worship music(s). Admittedly, neither has much been written from a historical perspective by those directly involved in that history beyond hard-to-find personal memoirs; Pentecostal church leaders are not well-known for historical self-reflection and, at the time, were more deeply focused on participating in the revival than narrating it for future historians. Therefore, I rely on written and recorded memoirs by Revival participants and personal interviews as the tools for telling this history.

While this chapter describes early Latter Rain worship practices and summarizes some key liturgical-theological developments, it is not a detailed history of the liturgical developments within Latter Rain churches between 1948 and 1977. Instead, in this chapter, I detail the history of the leaders, churches, events, and encounters that led from the Latter Rain Revival of 1948 to the establishment of the IWS. In short, I describe the ecclesial history and context that frames our understanding of the IWS. In doing so, I provide both an alternative source and a corrective to the Jesus People Narrative of Praise and Worship history described in chapter one.

As I described in chapter one, it is almost a rule that writing on Praise and Worship revolves around music. Indeed, the music has become a primary feature of this way of worship and is an important feature of the history I tell here. But more than a focus on music is needed for a fuller history of Praise and Worship. Exploring Praise and Worship’s ecclesial and theological history is particularly insightful because it reveals a web of commitments that are more than just musical innovations and are particular to a discrete group of Pentecostals. The Latter Rain history explored in this chapter centers the deep desires for spiritual revival and
restoration that were connected liturgically with the practice of prayer, intertwined with a theology of prophecy, and concomitant with a form of ecclesial governance, among other features. As we will see, many accounts attest to the power of the musical worship in the churches touched by the Latter Rain Revival. This history describes a particular kind of Latter Rain musicking\(^2\) in worship. More than discrete songs or pieces of music, the spread of Latter Rain worship is fueled by a form of musicking that contains and frames a broader repertoire of liturgical activities. These activities include the reception and delivery of prophecy, healing ministries, the commissioning of new church leaders, and spontaneous personal and corporate prayer (sung and spoken), among other elements. At the risk of oversimplifying, Latter Rain Pentecostals eventually used musical praise as a vehicle for God’s presence, thus any activities that depend upon on God’s presence happen within a musicking frame.

As I show in this chapter, IWS as an organization and its teachings on worship were not simply the creation of maverick music leaders or the fever-dream of hippies involved in the Christian counterculture of the late 1960s. Similarly, Praise and Worship and the IWS were not the result of a successful marketing campaign devised by influential record companies. Admittedly, musical leaders, converted hippies, and record companies all did play a role in the textured story of Praise and Worship’s rise to prominence. They were not, however, at the center of this history. Instead, it is in the Latter Rain Pentecostal ecclesial history that we find the most

---

\(^2\) The term “musicking” comes from musicologist Christopher Small, who argues that music is not a “thing” but “an activity, something that people do.” See Christopher Small, *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening* (Middleton, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1998), 2.
critical origins of Praise and Worship as a theological and liturgical tradition. This chapter features the ecclesial context of mid-twentieth-century Pentecostals, the Latter Rain Revival event, and the spread of the Latter Rain network up to the founding in the late 1970s of the annual events that would later become known as the International Worship Symposium.

The chapter begins by reviewing the events of the initial Revival, the experience of worship at the revival as described by its participants, and the contributions of Reg Layzell to the network’s theology of praise. At the revival, the emphasis on the “restoration” of the church and a variety of its practices is a key hermeneutic that endured in the Latter Rain context and frames later Praise and Worship theology. After describing the Revival itself, the chapter highlights how the message of revival, the practice of worship, and the theology of praise was inherited by four key churches and their leaders. In that section, I chronicle the personal and ecclesial connections of Reg Layzell, Myrtle Beall, Violet Kiteley, and Dick Iverson as they spanned the thirty years between the Revival and the first Symposium gathering in 1977. During those years, these leaders not only nurtured the Latter Rain worship practices that they inherited but built their own networks that would continue to disseminate them.

In the second half of the chapter, I describe the early years of annual gatherings among Latter Rain-affiliated music ministers that would later become known as the International Worship Symposium. In each of those accounts, I highlight how those conferences developed and grew through connections that relied upon the loose but clear, ecclesial and personal, 

3 I revisit the theology of restoration at greater length in chapter four.
affiliations between Latter Rain Revival churches, especially the churches described in the first half of the chapter. My goal in this chapter is to provide the critical ecclesial backdrop that connects the Symposium’s theology and practice of worship to the Latter Rain Revival within Pentecostalism. This backdrop is an interpretive key to understanding the source of Symposium’s theological tradition and practice of worship before I turn to the ways they innovate and expand on that inheritance in subsequent chapters.
2.2: The Latter Rain Revival and Emerging Church Centers

2.2.1 Section Intro

The fire of what would become known as the Latter Rain Revival within Pentecostalism was ignited on the frozen prairies of the central Canadian province of Saskatchewan in February of 1948. Though the zeal for revival resulted from an experience of the post-World War II healing ministry of evangelist William Branham, it took on its own life among the faculty and students of the recently established Sharon Orphanage and Bible School in North Battleford, Saskatchewan, Canada. The Revival’s worship practices highlight the centrality of prayer and a variety of practices that emerged out of an understanding that God was “restoring” the Church and its ministries. Alongside prayer, music was an important feature in the form of what was described as the “heavenly choir,” a period of improvised, harmonious, congregational singing of praise. Through the theological contributions of Reg Layzell, a Pentecostal minister who would soon become affiliated with the Revival, praise became a primary feature of worship that helped to sustain the fires of revival into the subsequent decades.

White Pentecostalism in the 1930s and ’40s had already been experiencing a period of stagnation. The fire of Azusa Street had died down. Respectable, middle-class denominational groups had been formed, and compared to the original events at Azusa Street, Pentecostal worship had become routinized. But not all Pentecostals were content with the state of Pentecostalism, and many were seeking another wave of revival. Among them were those at the Sharon Orphanage and Bible School in North Battleford. It was an
altogether humble and unlikely origin for the movement that would perpetuate and precipitate a new theology of worship. Within a few short years, the message and influence of the Latter Rain Revival would be carried across the continent and around the globe.

The Latter Rain Revival of 1948 did not emerge in a vacuum. Latter Rain historian Richard Riss situates the history of the Latter Rain Revival within another Pentecostal movement known as the “Western Prairie revival” in Canada between 1935 and 1938 that “continued as a strong movement until the end of World War II.”

Riss, Latter Rain, 12.

This movement forms an important backdrop for the religious climate of the period because it precipitated the establishment of Sharon Bible College by George Hawtin. Sharon Bible College was one of “over a dozen new Bible schools in that area, almost all of which experienced rapid growth in a relatively short period of time.”

Hawtin had recently pioneered another school, Bethel Bible Institute in Saskatoon, before handing it over to the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada denomination in 1942, an association that would soon be severed when most Pentecostal denominational groups condemned the Latter Rain movement. Beyond the local situation of the “Western Prairie Revival,” the Latter

1 Richard Riss, Latter Rain: The Latter Rain Movement of 1948 and the Mid-Twentieth Century Evangelical Awakening (Mississauga, Ontario: Honeycombe Visual Productions, 1987), 12 (see fn. 5).
2 Riss, Latter Rain, 12.
Rain Revival also shared in the post-war energy that propelled a broader wave of evangelical religious fervor, from the healing revival already mentioned (led by William Branham, Oral Roberts, T.L. Osborn, Gordon Lindsay, and others) to college campus revivals across the continent, from Billy Graham’s revivals among non-Pentecostal evangelicals to parachurch ministries such as Campus Crusade for Christ and World MAP. Though these revivals were distinct, each with its own story and primary characters, they often enjoyed a kind of intermingling on the ground level that attests to their status as independent ministries, unconcerned with the boundaries of traditional denominationalism. Thus, the Latter Rain Revival was not an isolated incident but part of a wider stream of religious fervor across the North American continent.

2.2.2 A Brief History of the Latter Rain Revival

The story of the Latter Rain Revival events in North Battleford begin in the fall of 1947 when Herrick Holt, a local church pastor associated with the International Church of the Foursquare Gospel, described as Sharon Children’s Homes and Schools in North Battleford on a thousand acres of land he had purchased for that purpose. Though the orphanage was established independently by Holt, the Bible college was founded upon the arrival of three former faculty members of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada’s

---

5 The site at Sharon was also important because it was the former site of a military airstrip and airplane hangars out of which Holt was establishing a flight school. so that evangelists and preachers could learn to fly their own planes to travel to their preaching appointments more easily (as it was much quicker than driving at the time).
(PAOC) Bethel Bible Institute: Rev. George Hawtin, Rev. Ernest Hawtin, and Rev. Percy Hunt. The North Battleford site also housed a high school and a technical institute alongside the orphanage and Bible school. These three leaders had left Bethel in nearby Saskatoon over both doctrinal and administrative disagreements with the PAOC’s denominational governance, taking a number of students with them. The doctrinal dispute apparently included conflict over their encouragement of long periods of fasting and prayer, among other issues. These disputes were codified in the summertime PAOC denominational gathering in 1947 when the three effectively ended their affiliation with the PAOC. They were joined at North Battleford by Milford Kirkpatrick, George Hawtin’s brother-in-law, bringing the core leadership group to five.

As described in the January 1, 1948 issue of the Sharon Star, a periodical publication issued by the North Battleford brethren that eventually carried news of the revival, a contingent of the leadership had been deeply impacted by the healing evangelist William Branham at an event in Vancouver. The published editorial recounted crowds that defied the level of marketing for the event. The writer of the editorial (presumably one of the five leaders) remarked: “I came home from those meetings realizing as never

---

6 One such issue was the role of demonology.
before that the real gifts of the Holy Spirit are far mightier than anything we have imagined in our wildest dreams.”

Renewed in their fervor by Branham’s meeting, a revival of their own broke out at the Sharon school in the early days of February 1948. The restoration of both biblical spiritual gifts and worship practices was central to the revival. Holdcroft describes the event:

In extended chapel services for four days from February 11th through the 14th, the procedure emerged of calling out members of the audience and imparting a spiritual gift to them by the laying on of hands accompanied by suitable prophecy. The authorization and direction of these activities was a series of vocal prophetic utterances by both students and their teachers. It would appear that the student body enthusiastically and wholeheartedly entered into these new beliefs and practices. Chapel services featuring the impartation of spiritual gifts by the laying on of hands with prophecy took precedence over all other campus activities. Other worship patterns emerged that were somewhat unique in their time, with stress upon the visible manifestation of the charismata, and such novelties as the so-called “heavenly choir.”

George Hawtin also described the events in the Sharon Star, noting that a student had prophesied that the community at Sharon was “on the verge of a great revival” and all they had to do was “open the door” and “enter in.” The prophecy was clarified and expanded in another prophetic word, this time by George’s younger brother and fellow

---

8 Quoted in Riss, Latter Rain, 57.
10 Hawtin, in The Sharon Star, quoted in Faupel, “The New Order,” 241. Note here the sense of immediacy and active agency, not a tarrying for God to act but the sense that the impetus rested on the seekers to ‘enter in’ and not on God.
minister/teacher at Sharon, Ernest Hawtin and described in terms of restoration: “The gifts of the spirit will be restored to my church. . . . They shall be received by prophecy and the laying on of hands of the presbytery,”\textsuperscript{11} echoing words from 1 Timothy 4:14. That same day, as George narrated it, “All Heaven broke loose upon our souls, and Heaven came down to greet us.”\textsuperscript{12}

Prior to the revival, the faculty had encouraged the student body—most of whom had followed the faculty from Bethel—to participate in a period of fasting and prayer. Ern Hawtin attributed the emphasis on fasting and prayer to reading Franklin Hall’s 1946 book, \textit{Atomic Power with God (thru Fasting and Prayer)},\textsuperscript{13} writing that, “the truth of fasting was one great contributing factor to the revival. One year before this we had read Franklin Hall’s book. . . The revival would never have been possible without the restoration of this great truth.”\textsuperscript{14} In addition to the restoration of prayer and fasting, the Latter Rain leaders sought restoration of what they perceived to be lost to the church: the

\textsuperscript{11} Hawtin in \textit{The Sharon Star}, quoted in Faupel, “The New Order,” 241. See also Riss, \textit{Latter Rain}, 58, which cites James Watt as saying that the Hawtin Brothers were influenced by Episcopalian J.E. Stiles on the topic of the Holy Spirit. To Stiles, the Holy Spirit was a gift that could be received through honest repentance and a fellow believer laying on hands, not tarrying.\textsuperscript{12} Hawtin in \textit{The Sharon Star}, quoted in Faupel, “The New Order,” 241.
\textsuperscript{13} Hall alleged that the Latter Rain outpouring, along with many of the other popular healing evangelists at the time, was spawned in part by following the methods and benefits of fasting as described in the book. Franklin Hall, \textit{Atomic Power with God (Thru Fasting and Prayer)} (San Diego, CA: Franklin Hall, 1946).
\textsuperscript{14} Milford E. Kirkpatrick, \textit{The 1948 Revival & Now} (Dallas, TX: Al Printing Co, 1954), quoted in Riss, \textit{Latter Rain}, 60. Note that the language of restoration of prayer and fasting is effectively the first restoration in their theology of restorations that were being bestowed on the church through this revival.
nature of the church, its mission, its authority, and its worship. Though a longer discussion of the emphasis on restoration is reserved for chapter four, it is important to note the centrality of restoration already at the revival as the leaders sought to place themselves within a history of successive revivals within the church that reclaimed biblical orthodoxy that they perceived to have been lost since the early church. As Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong summarize:

Specifically, what the movement would see as being restored in 1948 were not only the gifts of the Spirit by the laying on of hands but multiple aspects of church life seen in the New Testament: prophecy over individuals by a presbytery, recognition of a full range of offices including current-day prophets and apostles, and autonomous local church government with elders.¹⁵

Once “the move of God” broke out at the Sharon Bible College, teaching activities and other campus activities were suspended. Soon after the initial outbreak among the Sharon community, a camp meeting was planned to start on March 30, 1948. News had spread in the intervening six weeks, and this “Feast of Pentecost” camp meeting drew attendees from both Canada and the United States.¹⁶ Violet Kiteley (1925–2015), a young itinerant minister in the region who attended early meetings at North


¹⁶ Faupel, “The New Order,” 241. Note that the name invokes what they thought was happening: a fulfillment of one of the Biblical Feasts in the modern day as the Spirit was descending afresh.
Battleford at the time—and would become a key figure in teaching on Latter Rain-derived worship—recollects,

In 1948 people were drawn to an old, dilapidated Word War II hangar in an obscure location in subzero weather. There was no heater, only an old cook stove. The services began daily at 5 a.m. and lasted 10 to 12 hours. No meals were served. This was before the days of television and computers, and there was no media coverage. Yet people came from all over Canada, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, Scandinavia, the British Isles and India.

Some people claimed they saw prophetic messages in the sky or had dreams and visions that led them to participate in this new movement. Some said they had supernaturally received the address and location of this outpouring and were compelled by the Holy Ghost to go and see for themselves. After this initial camp meeting in March, a second, larger camp meeting was set for July and the crowds grew, with visitors flocking to North Battleford from across the region, the continent, and around the world.

Before moving on, it is important to say more about one of the key liturgical practices that was restored at the Revival: the “heavenly choir.” In particular, Jim Watt, one of the early Latter Rain “Brethren,” first received a word from God regarding the heavenly choir in 1945 after reading the books of earlier Pentecostal Maria Woodworth-Etter. In them, Woodworth-Etter included accounts of the heavenly choir as a common

congregational practice that resulted in many conversion experiences. While reading these accounts, Watt heard God telling him that he would see that practice restored in the “not too distant future.”19 He shared that word with Ern Hawtin while a student at Bethel Bible College under Hawtin in 1945. At a meeting in March 1948, Hawtin asked Watt to speak on the topic. Using what he had learned from Woodworth-Etter—alongside an exposition of various passages of scripture on singing in the Spirit—Watt obliged him and taught. When he concluded, Ern Hawtin then encouraged Watt to lead the gathering in the practice. Unsure of how to begin, Hawtin prodded him to begin with the short chorus “Hallelujah, Hallelujah” then let the Spirit take over. The congregation quickly caught on. They continued singing spontaneously and harmoniously in the same key as the initial chorus. It was this sound of aleatoric, improvisational singing that quickly spread in places touched by the Revival.20

2.2.3 The Spread of Revival to other Centers

Though the fire of revival was initially centered at North Battleford in 1948, attendees quickly carried the message of a Latter Rain restoration across the region and around the world. While some missionaries were almost immediately commissioned and sent out from North Battleford, other visitors picked up the revival and brought it back

home to their own churches. By as early as 1950, important centers for the Latter Rain Revival popped up not only on the Canadian prairies but also in major United States and Canadian metropolitan areas such as Detroit, Los Angeles, and Vancouver. In turn, these centers began to attract their own crowds of visitors who had caught wind of the revival, brought it back to their home churches, and sent out their own missionaries. This pattern of multiplication continued over and over. Riss describes one sequence of transmissions that demonstrates well the domino effect of transmission. Writing about a series of meetings in January 1951 in Kingston, Jamaica, Riss explains,

The events in Jamaica had resulted from a convention in Toronto, which had come about because Cecil Cousen had been influenced by a convention at Elim Bible Institute [Lima, NY]. Elim had been influenced by Ivan Q. Spencer’s trip to Bethesda Missionary Temple in Detroit; Bethesda’s awakening had come about as a result of M.D. Beall’s trip to Glad Tidings Temple in Vancouver; the Hawtin Brothers had sparked awakening in Vancouver after travelling from North Battleford, Saskatchewan.21

In this manner, churches involved in the revival multiplied early and quickly. Itinerant preachers charged with the message of revival rapidly crisscrossed the continent and traveled overseas. The energy around this revival also drew the attention of the denominations whose churches were joining the revival. Those traditional Pentecostal denominational groups by and large condemned both novel theological contributions of the revival, especially the patterns of church governance and the immediacy of the

21 Riss, Latter Rain, 109. Riss’s description suggests that Layzell’s role is somewhat passive in receiving the revival. See below for more on Layzell’s active contribution.
practice of praise. Thus, many churches and Pentecostal denominations barred Latter Rain preachers from their churches. Nevertheless, many churches did entertain Latter Rain preachers and worship practices—with or without knowledge of the explicit connection to North Battleford. These two aspects resulted in the de-centering of North Battleford and its own camp meetings as the primary site of revival as early as the 1950s.

Some Pentecostal groups eagerly greeted the coming of revival and were aware that it had been prophesied. Historian William Faupel suggests that between the two world wars, Pentecostalism had gained acceptance with other mainstream denominational groups, and that this resulted in the muting of distinctive charismatic manifestations, even a hallmark practice such as glossolalia. In North Battleford among this second and third generation of Pentecostal believers there was an eagerness for the experience a fresh outpouring of spiritual gifts. Earlier in the 1940s, elder statesman of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada A.G. Ward noted that a revival within Pentecostalism would require a “new order of leadership.”22 This desire for new leadership was one shared not only by the PAOC; David DuPlessis noted in 1947 at the First World Pentecostal Conference in Zurich, Switzerland, when the “floods” of revival come, they “will not keep to our well prepared channels but [they] will overflow and most probably cause chaos in our regular programs.”23 Indeed, the Latter Rain Revival just one year later

would disrupt the regular programs of denominations such as the PAOC and the Assemblies of God in the United States. Clergy credentials were revoked due to association with the Latter Rain, pastors resigned to become independent preachers, churches reneged on their denominational affiliations, and church communities were weakened by splits over Latter Rain theology and worship. As Holdcroft summarizes, “This spirit of independent autonomy, so characteristic of Pentecostals, was an important factor in assuring a wide-ranging hearing” for Latter Rain preachers in the pulpits of independent and denominational Pentecostal churches.24

In this section I have briefly summarized the history and context of the Latter Rain Revival but have so far said little about the worship there. In the next sections, I detail the personal connections that key Latter Rain leaders had to the revival, which led to the network upon which the IWS was built. In describing the affiliations and experiences of four Latter Rain leaders in turn, I develop a clearer picture of the liturgical life of the Revival and among Latter Rain-affiliated churches, a life narrated primarily through these leaders’ own descriptions.

2.2.3.1 Reg Layzell and Glad Tidings Temple, Vancouver, British Columbia

One of those early adopters whose message enjoyed a hearing in innumerable pulpits was Reg Layzell. Layzell was a PAOC minister, an important early adopter of the Latter Rain Revival teachings, and would become an important contributor to the legacy

of Latter Rain worship inherited by the International Worship Symposium.\textsuperscript{25} A retired businessman turned minister, Layzell recounted that he had initially met Hawtin at a camp meeting back in 1946. Layzell, a native of Ontario, had agreed to an invitation by the superintendent of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada in British Columbia to host a series of meetings in local churches around the region.\textsuperscript{26}

According to Layzell’s account of the period, the initial meetings were an outright failure. After two days and nights of meetings that bore little to no fruit, Layzell began fasting and arrived early at the church to pray and to beg God for a special blessing on the remainder of the week’s ministry at the church.\textsuperscript{27} Around midday, a verse came to mind and he began seeking God for special revelation regarding the verse: “But thou art holy, O thou that inhabitest the praises of Israel” (Psalm 22:3). Focusing on the first half of the verse as a confession of God’s holiness, Layzell began to confess every sin he could remember—but to no avail. Then, his attention was drawn to the second half of the verse and the emphasis on God’s presence in praise. He began praising God in the small study room where he had been praying, raising his hands and speaking praises to God aloud.

\textsuperscript{25} The following discussion is based primarily on Ruth and Lim, \textit{History of Contemporary Praise and Worship}. See also Hugh Layzell and Audrey Layzell, \textit{Sons of His Purpose: The Interweaving of the Ministry of Reg Layzell, and His Son, Hugh, During a Season of Revival} (San Bernardino, California: privately published, 2012); Maureen Gaglardi, \textit{The Key of David} (Vancouver, British Columbia: Glad Tidings Temple Publications, 1966); Reg Layzell, \textit{Unto Perfection: The Truth About the Present Restoration Revival} (Mountlake Terrace, Washington: The King’s Temple, 1979).
\textsuperscript{26} For a fuller account of the sources on Reg Layzell, see chapter one in Ruth and Lim, \textit{History of Contemporary Praise and Worship}.
\textsuperscript{27} Note that, as with the Sharon revival, the narrative begins with a period of fasting and prayer.
Then he ventured into the sanctuary of the church and filled the whole building (including the washrooms!) with his spoken praises until the evening meeting.

The resulting experience in worship confirmed Layzell’s interpretation of the scripture: God’s presence manifests in response to praise. Almost immediately during the first song of the song service (“There’s power in the Blood”), a woman threw up her hands and was “baptized in the Holy Spirit,” a classic Pentecostal-Charismatic confirmation of God’s presence. Soon others followed and the worship became more intense. Layzell remarked that this was the first occasion he could remember on which someone was baptized in the Spirit during the pre-sermon song service rather than at the post-sermon altar call.

The revelation of Psalm 22:3 and of praise as the key to unlocking God’s presence became central to the remainder of his meetings during that trip. His emphasis on this topic earned him the title “the apostle of praise.”28 He carried the emphasis on the “secret to [God’s] presence”29 to his first pastorate—a post to which he was invited by the same superintendent who had invited him to minister earlier in the year. Layzell and his family moved to nearby Mission, British Columbia in the summer of 1946.

---

29 Layzell and Layzell, *Sons of His Purpose*, 46.
Early on in his time in Mission, Layzell reconnected with Hawtin, whom he had first met in Terrance, British Columbia, at a series of meetings there. The occasion this time was a four-day, city-wide campaign of meetings led by the burgeoning ministry of itinerant healing evangelist William Branham in November of 1947, just one month after the opening of the Bible school at Sharon Orphanage. Encouraged by the meeting and eager for revival, the two promised to seek a move of God and to notify the other if such a move occurred in their respective locales. Consequently, when revival broke out at the school in North Battleford, Hawtin called Layzell and invited him to the second camp meeting at Sharon, scheduled for July—around the same time Layzell accepted the call to a new pastorate at Glad Tidings Temple in Vancouver.

Upon attending the camp meeting, Layzell’s first impressions were positive, especially of the palpable sense of God’s presence there. Prayer and praise were strong features of the entire atmosphere, including during the extended times of individual prayer, thanksgiving, and praise that preceded each of the three services marking the day. Praise was a particularly strong element in the spontaneous spoken and sung elements of the services. As Hugh Layzell—Reg’s son—later described it, there was a “high level of corporate praise and worship, including singing in the Spirit.”

30 Layzell and Layzell, Sons of His Purpose, 52; Reg Layzell, Unto Perfection, 4.
31 Hugh Layzell, Sons of His Purpose, 111. Hugh Layzell is likely not using the term “praise and worship” in a technical sense to describe a specific theology of praise that leads to worship but in a collective sense to suggest that both praise and worship were being offered to God.
confirmed what Reg Layzell had come to know through his personal revelation regarding the priority of praise for experiencing God’s presence.

Through his time at the camp meeting and his fellowship with those in the revival, Layzell became one of a short list of ministers who had received their apostolic ministry through the laying on of hands and the confirmation by prophecy directly from the Sharon group. The list not only sanctioned these ministers but also sought to shore up a hierarchical oversight of the revival with the Hawtin party at the top—an element of their view of the restoration of church offices. This view of apostolic oversight and direct lineages of authorization and commissioning through the laying on of hands and personal prophecy by a group of apostles (“a presbytery”) was an important feature of Latter Rain worship gatherings and would remain a central feature of the Latter Rain contribution to Pentecostal worship. Yet the goal of central oversight by the Hawtin party does not seem to have been respected by the many churches influenced by the revival early on, nor did it endure as even early affiliates of the Latter Rain Revival saw

---

32 The Sharon Star, May 1, 1949, quoted in Riss, Latter Rain, 109–110.

33 Riss, following an unpublished master’s thesis by Cornelius J. Jaenen, suggests that the Latter Rain leaders’ emphasis on the laying on of hands may have been influenced directly by the impact of Branham’s healing revivals that employed the laying on of hands for healing, rather than by the traditional Pentecostal healing service method: prayer by the pastor and congregation. This practice by Branham—and subsequently by the Latter Rain Revival—was apparently part of the controversy between established Pentecostals and this new wave.

34 See also Faupel, “The New Order,” 246–59. This church leadership structure has endured in the movement today known as the “New Apostolic Reformation.”
the North Battleford brethren as losing the core emphasis of the revival already in the 1950s.

Layzell’s embeddedness in these initial days of the Latter Rain Revival helped to extend his emphasis on praise within the movement of the Revival. Initially, Layzell’s status as authorized by the Hawtins helped his own church became an early hub for the Latter Rain activity. Beyond the fact that Glad Tidings in Vancouver was much more easily accessible than the rural North Battleford site, Layzell’s authority was also reinforced by the Hawtin party’s visit to Glad Tidings starting on November 14, 1948. The ministers stayed for three weeks and included George and Ernest Hawtin as well as Violet Kiteley, and Phyllis and James Spiers, the latter “who in the early years seemed to have been the musical face of the Latter Rain revival.” As Ruth and Lim summarize,

All the liturgical aspects of the revival were on display in the Vancouver meeting in addition to the ‘heavenly choir,’ a musical practice that had begun in another meeting involving the Hawtins elsewhere in Canada during the previous month of October. This practice, which could continue for long, indefinite periods of time, involved unscripted, ecstatic congregational singing in either one’s known language or in tongues.

---

36 Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter one.
37 Cf. Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter one, fn. 38: “Specifically the meeting was the annual Canadian National Convention of the Independent Assemblies of God held in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada in late October 1948. Riss, Latter Rain, 83, says that it was the public reading of accounts written by Marie B. Woodworth-Etter of such heavenly singing among earlier Pentecostals that triggered the practice in Edmonton. After the Edmonton meeting, the ‘heavenly choir’ became a regular and important feature of early Latter Rain Praise & Worship.” For a musical analysis of similar singing-in-tongues practices, see Hinck, “Heavenly Harmony,” 167–191.
The second way in which Layzell’s teaching on praise was perpetuated by the revival was that it was well-suited to the broader Latter Rain message of restoration. In the area of Praise and Worship, the liturgical center of Latter Rain gravity shifted early on towards Layzell and the worship at Glad Tidings Temple. Glad Tidings would remain a thriving church and center for Latter Rain praise throughout the late 1970s and even beyond.

Though there are few detailed records of the worship at Glad Tidings, Ruth and Lim provide a helpful case study of a Glad Tidings-affiliated church in Chilliwack, British Columbia in the early 1960s. The liturgical activities in that congregation included an hour of spoken prayer in a dedicated prayer room ahead of the main service, a service in the main auditorium that began with approximately an hour of congregational singing, then a sermon, and an altar call. The hour of congregational singing that began the service opened with spontaneously-selected short choruses and testimonial songs that were repeated at length (without songbooks in the hands of participants) during which congregants would offer physical expressions of praise including raising hands, kneeling, standing, and even simple dancing. Over the course of the song portion, the congregation would move into what was described as “high praise” or “high worship” as a sense of divine presence resulted from their praise. Toward the end of this period, the leaders or

---

38 See Ruth and Lim on the connection between the framing of the revelation of praise within the successive restorations of the church. Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter one. See also chapter three of this dissertation for a theological exposition.
congregants would offer prophetic words or the prophetic “song of the Lord.” One important distinction from other Pentecostal and evangelical worship at the time is that the time of congregational singing was not simply a “warm-up” to the preaching but an integral and full-fledged element of the worship service.

2.2.3.2 Myrtle D. Beall and Bethesda Missionary Temple, Detroit, Michigan

The message of restoration and revival did not stop at Layzell’s church. One of the influential pastors that caught the message from Glad Tidings very early on was Myrtle D. Beall (1894–1979). Beall was an Assemblies of God minister at a large and growing church in Detroit, Michigan. At the time of the Latter Rain Revival in North Battleford, Beall’s church was already experiencing a revival of its own in deliverance and healing ministries. In fact, the growth from its revival had precipitated the construction of a new building that was massive for its time. The impetus for the building project was, as Beall describes it, “the command God had given to build an Armory where soldiers would receive equipment.” That “Armory” was an almost three thousand-seat sanctuary on the edge of Detroit. Construction of this new building was nearing completion when Ma Beall (as she was affectionately called) first heard about the Latter Rain Revival. Beall received the news of revival from Vera Ludlum Bachle, a

39 See the lengthier description of this congregation’s worship and its leaders, Dave and Fran Heubert, in Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter one.
fellow minister (evangelist) in the Assemblies of God. Bachle had called and invited Beall to drive out to Vancouver with her and her husband for the meetings happening at Layzell’s church. Beall agreed, and the three set out on the 2,500-mile journey.

When Beall and the Bachles arrived, it was November of 1948 and Glad Tidings Temple was hosting George Hawtin and his team from North Battleford. Beall described the experience of being there in her memoir:

I have never before in my life sensed the presence and power of God as I did in that church. The worship was heavenly, the teaching so down-to-earth and so full of truth that we certainly felt we had come into a new realm — into another one of His lovely chambers of revelation and truth. . . . It was an experience I shall never forget for I had met God in a new way.41

More specifically, God met Beall by confirming what had been spoken to her about her ministry in Detroit through a prophecy given to her by the ministers. Beall described the event saying,

While I thought on these things [the direction of her ministry] and expressed my need [to God] in the meeting, they called me to come forward. The Presbytery laid hands on me. Among the many things that were prophesied, one part of the prophesy was almost more than I could receive. These men, who had never been to Detroit, who never at any time had seen the building that God called an Armory, a building almost in a state of completion, began to prophesy concerning it. ‘They shall come to thee from the ends of the earth and go forth from thee as lions equipped as from a mighty Armory.’42

41 Beall, *A Hand on My Shoulder*, 120.
42 Beall, *A Hand on My Shoulder*, 120.
Because of the laying on of hands and prophecy by this “presbytery,” Beall’s sense of mission and ministry was enlivened, and their worship eventually was transformed.

The first worship service upon Ma Beall’s return to Bethesda on Sunday December 5, 1948 was marked by this new emphasis. Her daughter, Patricia Beall Gruits, recounts that during the service the congregation broke out in spontaneous “spiritual worship and praise which was unheard of at this time [and] continued for about an hour.”

Myrtle’s son, James Beall (1924–2013) recollected that even before Myrtle Beall’s testimony about her experience in Vancouver, the congregation had caught wind of Latter Rain modes of worship:

Instead of quietly awaiting for someone to lead us to the throne of grace, the congregation spontaneously, under the sovereign leading of the Holy Spirit, raised their hands and began to ‘sing praises to God,’ together and in harmony. It was the sound of a heavenly choir as wave after wave of praise swept over the congregation. Since that time we have nurtured and endeavored to develop the ministry of Praise and Worship in this local church. We have learned the praises of his people provide a habitation for God.

Though James Beall refrains from mentioning the “heavenly choir” and the reference to Psalm 22:3 in explicit terms, the fingerprint of Layzell and the Latter Rain modes of Praise and Worship are clearly invoked. This revival intensity reportedly

43 Beall, A Hand on My Shoulder, 120.
44 James Lee Beall and America to Your Knees Radio Ministry, The Ministry of Worship & Praise (Detroit, MI: Bethesda Missionary Temple, 1980), 17–18. Note the clear reference to Psalm 22:3 in praise as a “habitation for God,” though it is possible that this language is a later gloss on his experience at the time.
continued in daily services at Bethesda for three and a half years. As Patricia Beall Gruits summarizes, the revival at Bethesda was “marked by the new sound of worship [i.e. ‘heavenly choir’] and the laying on of hands with prophecy.” According to Myrtle Beall, “The results of the Revival in Vancouver brought to the lives of many a complete change in their beliefs and their mode of worship.” Just as with the leaders at North Battleford, Bethesda too, by 1950, shed its denominational affiliation as part of the Assemblies of God because of its commitment to the Latter Rain teachings that were not welcomed there. As Riss’s example of transmission suggests, over the course of the next three and a half years many people came through Bethesda’s doors and took seeds of the Latter Rain revival with them both down the street, around the Great Lakes region, and around the world.

2.2.3.3 Violet Kiteley and Shiloh Temple, Oakland, California

Violet Kiteley (1925–2015) was another Pentecostal minister who, like Layzell, caught the revival right from the source. She was one of the few women to become an early leader in the network of Latter Rain preachers, making early appearances with the

45 Riss, Latter Rain, 189.
46 Beall, A Hand on My Shoulder, 122.
47 Beall, A Hand on My Shoulder, 119.
49 See discussion below of Zion Evangelistic Temple regarding Symposium 1982.
North Battleford leaders even at Reg Layzell’s church (as mentioned above). Though it is unclear what unique contributions Kiteley made to the early years of the Revival, Kiteley’s church, Shiloh Temple (Oakland, California), would be a proving ground for the International Worship Symposium and its message of the restoration of the worship of the Tabernacle of David.\textsuperscript{50}

Born in Vancouver, British Columbia, Kiteley was the only daughter of an Irish immigrant mother and a Canadian wheat farmer who lost his farm and wealth in the Great Depression.\textsuperscript{51} Kiteley came to faith in a Foursquare Gospel Church in Vancouver where she was baptized in water and in the Spirit at age twelve. At the time, the visiting preacher gave Kiteley a word of prophecy concerning her call to be a minister, to preach the gospel, and to pastor churches. As her daughter-in-law Marilyn Kiteley noted at her funeral, “this was not a normal kind of word to be given to a young person, let alone a young woman in those days.” Though the prophecy may have seemed somewhat out of the ordinary, it was given by none other than one of the most prominent evangelists of the

\textsuperscript{50} Mark Chironna has suggested that there is evidence that Kiteley was already teaching on this topic in the 1950s, decades before Kevin Connor brought this theme into the mainstream of writing on Latter Rain worship. Mark Chironna, interview with Adam Perez, February 17, 2020.
\textsuperscript{51} Though no biography of Violet Kiteley’s life has been written, the biographical information in this section comes primarily from her funeral service at Shiloh Church in which her daughter-in-law read a chronology of her life. See \textit{Dr Violet Kiteley Home-Going Service}, accessed June 15, 2020, \url{https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L5AALc_BnIBI}. Other biographical information is taken from Kiteley’s own reflections as published in Violet Kiteley, “Remembering the Latter Rain,” \textit{Charisma Magazine} (2000), accessed April 8, 2020, \url{https://www.charismamag.com/site-archives/24-uncategorised/9494-remembering-the-latter-rain}. 
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time (male or female): Aimee Semple McPherson. McPherson was the founder of the Foursquare Gospel denomination and happened to be visiting the church at that time.

The fulfillment of the prophecy spoken over her by McPherson began a few years later, when Kiteley was ordained at age seventeen to her first pastorate in a predominantly Chinese Foursquare church. At eighteen, Kiteley was married. At nineteen, she was widowed and seven months pregnant with her son, David. The tragedy of her husband’s death and her child’s birth sent her into a “shock and trauma” and she was in a psychosomatic paralysis for thirteen months. In November of 1946, she received a miraculous healing through the prayer of an evangelist from Jordan whom she met through happenstance and whose name she would promptly forget. The evangelist also told her that she would be given “a new message to preach around the world.” Kiteley subsequently traveled as an itinerant evangelist around the region and shared the story of her miraculous healing in the midst of tragedy.

But after a year and half, Kiteley became dissatisfied with the extent of this new message. Like Layzell and the Hawtins before her, she turned to “a desperate prayer session with God.” That same day, Kiteley received yet another prophetic word, this time delivered by “an elderly sister,” that was similar to the word given by the evangelist who healed her. This time, however, the prophetic word “specifically stated that I was to

52 Kiteley, “Remembering the Latter Rain,” np.
53 Kiteley, “Remembering the Latter Rain,” np.
54 Kiteley, “Remembering the Latter Rain,” np.
go to North Battleford, Saskatchewan, with my son and become immersed in a new
movement that was being birth by the Holy Spirit.” Though she was cautioned against it
by her pastors at the time—even threatened with losing her credentials—she chose to go
anyway, trusting that it was God who was sending her.

At North Battleford in the winter of 1948, the presbytery laid hands on her,
confirmed her call to ministry through a prophetic word, and bestowed the gift of healing
on her. That gift of healing was immediately tested and confirmed—both for her and for
her young son David. For the next seven years, Kiteley would travel as an itinerant
evangelist with her young son, usually ministering at a church for two weeks at a time
before moving on. Her itinerancy brought her all across Western Canada and the Western
United States, including pulpits like Layzell’s in Vancouver. At one time, Kiteley was
also a parishioner in Layzell’s church and served in a ministry to youth in Vancouver
alongside Charlotte Baker, before each one started their own churches. By 1955,
Kiteley established a church called Revival Tabernacle in Surrey, British Columbia,
which she pastored for a number of years before being pushed out. She then moved down

55 Kiteley, “Remembering the Latter Rain,” np.
56 It is unclear whether Kiteley attended the camp meetings in March or July of 1948.
57 Both Violet and her son David, who was just a young boy at the time, were asked to heal others
in the congregation. The healings were confirmed by the presbytery. Other elements of Kiteley’s
testimony to her experience at the revival are found in the following chapter.
58 See “The Province” (newspaper) July 17, 1954, 13. Kiteley is advertised as in residence at Glad
Tidings Temple from Tuesday-Friday for meetings beginning at 8 p.m., separate from the events
at Crescent Beach Bible Conference.
the West Coast to Oakland, California and planted Shiloh Temple in 1965. She founded a Bible College there soon afterward. Kiteley describes her motivation for moving to Oakland as both led by God and also as prompted by a desire to have an experience of ministering to people of different races and cultures. Oakland in the 1960s would provide ample opportunity for such ministry. Kiteley’s ministry would become well-respected by ministers involved in the Latter Rain movement as she ministered across North America and globally.\(^6\) As we will see, Kiteley’s Shiloh Temple in Oakland is one of the initial spawning grounds for the Symposium and its leadership.

2.2.3.4 Dick Iverson and Bible Temple, Portland, Oregon

One of the ministers deeply influenced by Kiteley’s ministry and message was Dick Iverson (1930–2018) at Bible Temple in Portland, Oregon. Iverson and Bible Temple became a key node in the network of Latter Rain churches flowing in Praise and Worship by the 1970s and 1980s. Bible Temple was an increasingly influential Latter Rain church by the 1970s as its ministries earned a regional and global audience through publication and recordings of the teachings and worship at the church. As Iverson’s church became a major hub for Praise and Worship by the late 1970s, it was also the

\(^{60}\) Bill Hamon, popular speaker and author in the charismatic and apostolic-prophetic movement, said of Kiteley upon her death, "Sister Violet Kiteley was one of the greatest women pioneers that I have ever met. I was deeply touched by her both on a personal level and one that I could look up to as a forerunner. She will be greatly missed and was a treasure for the body of Christ," quoted in Cindy Jacobs, “A Great Trailblazer Has Gone Home: A Tribute to Sister Violet Kiteley,” Charisma News, December 1, 2015, https://www.charismанews.com/opinion/53519-a-great-trailblazer-has-gone-home-a-tribute-to-sister-violet-kiteley.
location of the first gathering of leaders that would form the backbone of the Symposium. Bible Temple’s influential status was not the result of Iverson’s innovations alone but was deeply indebted to other Latter Rain leaders, namely Reg Layzell and Violet Kiteley. In a video message offered at Violet Kiteley’s funeral, Iverson gave credit to Kiteley not only for one of his first books, but also for the foundations on which he built his church—including worship.\(^6\) The history of Bible Temple demonstrates both their multiple, deep ties to the Latter Rain movement—specifically to Reg Layzell’s emphasis on praise and personally to Kiteley’s ministry—and the development of multiple ministry platforms that amplified the message of Dick Iverson and other Bible Temple leaders at the time. Understanding Bible Temple’s history is key to understanding how its music minister Mike Herron was able to galvanize a group of fellow music ministers in the region to gather for the first Symposium.

When Dick and Edie Iverson agreed to take over his father’s ministry in 1961, they had been involved in itinerant ministry for over a decade. The son of a Pentecostal minister, Dick Iverson’s first forays into ministry were as an itinerant preacher and

\(^6\) Iverson says, “I don’t know of a woman that I’ve known so many years that has blessed me so. I remember when I first met her probably 40 years ago. She had the truth of the Latter Rain in purity and I received it from her [and] her notes. I even actually wrote my first Present Day Truths book based on her material and I gave her credit for it… I am so honored to say she was my friend for 40 years and Bible Temple was based on her teachings many years ago.” Present Day Truths is a book on the restoration of biblical truths to the church today. In that way, it is his own codification of Latter Rain principles for the church’s ministry and belief. Dr Violet Kiteley Home-Going Service, accessed June 15, 2020, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L5ALe_BnlBI.
revivalist. Inspired by the power of his experiences at William Branham services in Portland in 1947, he had traveled as an itinerant evangelist in the United States, the Caribbean, and for an extended season in Ireland. He had ministered on and off with his father, pastor at Montavilla Tabernacle. After a decade of that, his father became ill for a season, and in 1961 Iverson agreed to take over the small church. By the time “Bro. Dick” took over, the church’s name had been changed to Deliverance Temple to reflect the emerging emphasis on deliverance that was at the center of their teaching. The name change came after a healing and evangelistic trip back in 1951, after which Dick and Edie made a stop at Beall’s church in Detroit, Michigan.

But this was not the first exposure to the Latter Rain for the Iversons. Edie—Dick Iverson’s high school sweetheart from Portland—had become involved in the Latter Rain revival even before they married in 1950, having first encountered the Latter Rain message in 1949 through a series of revival services in Portland hosted by Wings of Healing Temple (pastored by Thomas Wyatt) during a visit by several ministers from North Battleford. As a result of her experience, Edie was inspired to attend Sharon Bible Institute in North Battleford during the second year of the revival. Iverson recounts

62 Thomas Wyatt (1891–1964) became another early popular minister in the Latter Rain movement as an itinerant preacher, through his Bethesda Bible College in Portland, OR, and through his radio broadcasts. While his emphasis seems to have remained primarily on the healing ministry (similar to Branham), his direct engagement in Latter Rain is evidenced by his role as a contributing editor to the Latter Rain Evangel published by Myrtle Beall and Bethesda Missionary Temple.
in *The Journey* that Edie held deeply to those teachings and experiences over the years, though Dick Iverson apparently took rather longer to appreciate and integrate the message for himself.

By the time Iverson assumed leadership of Deliverance Temple in 1961, worship had become what Iverson described later as reactionary against the hype of older Pentecostalism—no praise, no clapping of hands, no emotional hype, just the singing of a few hymns and ministry of the Word.\(^{63}\) But the local pastoral ministry made Iverson restless. For someone who, after fifteen years, had grown accustomed to large revival-style events held in Ireland to the Caribbean and many places in between, that restlessness was understandable. Consequently, just one year into his ministry (1962), Iverson decided to take his family on a five-week vacation to visit churches where he had heard that there was a move of the Spirit. In particular, the Iversons visited two prominent Latter Rain pastors, David Schoch in Long Beach, California, and Reg Layzell in Vancouver, British Columbia. It is unclear how Dick Iverson initially became aware of them but perhaps Edie Iverson had known them through her relationships from her time at Sharon Bible College, or perhaps it was through informal contacts made with churches like Bethesda or through personal connections of his own.\(^{64}\) In any case, those visits


\(^{64}\) Edie Iverson was also a songwriter, and her choruses can be seen in Bible Temple hymnal publications such as *Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs* (Portland, OR: Bible Temple Press, 1980).
caused Iverson to have a conversion to the Latter Rain movement; Iverson wanted what they had going on in their churches. There were three aspects in particular that he longed for in his church: unity (his father’s church had just suffered a split), a strong commitment to prayer, and the times of fervent congregational praise that included people raising their hands and dancing.65 Upon the Iversons’ return home, Dick received a vision of an expanding church ministry that included elements like “missionary work, Bible School, literature, branch churches, youth camp, old folks home, radio & television ministry”66—the full gamut of ministries that would spread and sustain the revival. This entrepreneurial approach evokes that of Holt and the Hawkins at the Sharon site in North Battleford two decades earlier.

Implementing Iverson’s vision of Praise and Worship for his church in the dynamic way that he experienced in Schoch’s and Layzell’s churches proved difficult. Though he and Edie stood on the platform and sang praises, they did it all by themselves since the congregation would not join in. Since his 1962 experience, Iverson had also been teaching on Praise and Worship but it had yet to lead to a revival. Though Iverson had invited Layzell and Schoch, it took several years before they were able to come and lead the kind of revival service he envisioned. Finally, in April 1965, the two pastors led

66 Iverson, The Journey, 110.
a “double-header” revival Tuesday through Friday, both pastors preaching each night. On the final night, Iverson recounts that Layzell preached on the “sacrifice of praise” in Hebrews 13:15 and “how we were to offer up our praise to the Lord, how we were to sing a new song, lifting our hands and worshiping as priests unto God, and how we needed to do so by faith based on God’s Word.” In the congregation, the “lights came on in the hearts of the people as they heard the message” of praise and responding to God in faith.

Yet as both the church and the area population began to grow, God revealed to Iverson that his church would not grow on an “emphasis,” that is, on deliverance ministry alone. As a result of that revelation, the church changed its name to Bible Temple.

Though the church still only had about 150 members, things were beginning to change in the ministry as Iverson’s “blackboard vision”—a visual map of the church’s future ministries, given in 1962—was beginning to take shape. Year by year, the ministries of the church grew dynamically and organically.

First among these changes was a petition by forty-two teenagers that the first three rows of the sanctuary be reserved for the young people—the same young people

---

69 They shifted the name first by adding “Bible,” i.e., “Bible Deliverance Temple.” That compound name persisted for a season. They dropped “Deliverance” and became “Bible Temple” in 1965. Later in the 1980s, they rebranded as “City Bible,” and in the 2010s as “Mannahouse.”
who used to occupy the last three rows.\footnote{Iverson, \textit{The Journey}, 128. A photo of the movie theater-turned-sanctuary location on the corner of 76th and Gilson confirms that the young people did in fact occupy the front rows \textit{en masse}.} There was also a surge in young people interested in going into the ministry and seeking training from Iverson himself. Thus, in 1965, Iverson met with two church members, Dr. David Blomgren and Bob Stricker, and organized what became Portland Bible College. With Iverson as its president, Blomgren as the vice president, and Stricker as the dean of students, sixteen full-time students enrolled in the school’s first year. The second year saw a “two hundred and fifty-two percent increase in enrollment with outside students from six states and two foreign countries.”\footnote{Iverson, \textit{The Journey}, 131.}

The courses that were taught at Portland Bible College eventually became the materials that were published by Bible Temple Publications (also established in 1965). Over time this ministry of the church distributed “tens of thousands of books around the world”\footnote{Iverson, \textit{The Journey}, 130.} and amplified Latter Rain teachings beyond first-hand experience of sermons or Bible studies, including books on Praise and Worship. Book offerings included titles from Iverson and others involved in the church and Bible college leadership on topics such as Latter Rain doctrine, the work of the Holy Spirit, the role of the local church in God’s restoration, and the “song of the Lord.” Because these in-house books were seldom available in mainstream Christian bookstores (which were typically associated with the
more conservative evangelical group, the Christian Booksellers Association and did not carry Pentecostal titles), Bible Temple also opened its own bookstore across the street from its building on 76th Avenue and Glisan Street. It was a relatively small operation at first and Iverson himself was its first pressman.

As part of the educational programming both within and beyond the church walls, Bible Temple’s tape ministry was founded in 1970. Initially the tape ministry was for internal purposes: Dick Iverson recounts how Edie was recovering from surgery at home and wanted to hear the services. A member named Errol Livesay began taping the services with six separate tape recorders at once. Later, the church purchased duplicating equipment, and by 1972 was “sending out twenty thousand tapes a year all over the world.”

Even if Iverson overestimates how many were being sent out, the volume of tapes may well have been over 350 tapes per week. It was not just Iverson’s (and other guest preachers’) sermons that drew in listeners; it was the times of Praise and Worship on the tapes that caught the listeners’ ears. Iverson says that the tapes were unique because the sermon was on one side was accompanied by excerpts from the worship service on the other. As we will see in the next section, these had a direct impact on some early participants in the IWS network.

---

73 Iverson, The Journey, 132.
74 Iverson, The Journey, 132. See also Tim Smith, interview with Adam Perez, January 17, 2020.
75 See chapter five on the role of tapes.
It is important to note that by the early 1970s, the Jesus People had made their way up the West Coast and became involved at Bible Temple and Portland Bible College. Many future leaders of the church joined from this wave of young people: Frank Damazio, Ken Malmin, Wendell Smith, Bill Scheidler, Mike Herron, and others. The influx of these young people did not, however, mean that the church simply adopted the styles of these young Jesus People in relaxing the worship culture or dress of the church, nor were Jesus People songs newly introduced into the song repertoire of the church. Instead, Iverson and the church brought these young people under their wings and nurtured them into a more mature version of their faith—and more formally dressed, too, in order to meet the standards of decorum of these Pentecostals.

The story of Tim Smith is representative of the kinds of connections that were forged through informal networks among Pentecostal churches, family ties, and the reach of tape recordings. Tim and his three brothers were raised in a Nazarene family in the Pacific Northwest. He attended Northwest Nazarene College in Nampa, Idaho (90 miles east of Portland) from 1970 to 1974 where he studied secondary music education. Because of the church’s growth to over 800 people by 1972 (Iverson, *The Journey*, 138), in addition to the growing number of programs, it became apparent that the church governance needed to be restructured. Brother Dick arranged for a pastoral team of ten trained elders to act as district pastors and to minister to the specific needs of the congregation based on the different areas of the city—a leadership structure that endured into the 1980s. Each of these elders had to be someone called to one of the “five-fold ministries” of the church: apostle, pastor, evangelist, prophet, or teacher [See more in chapter three; also, for a later summary see C. Peter Wagner, *The New Apostolic Churches* (Ventura, CA: Regal, 1998)]. These elders also held home meetings (akin to small group ministry) in addition to the regular services (Clark Brody, interview with Adam Perez, Nov. 23, 2018).
Meanwhile, his older brother began attending Bible Temple and sent him tapes of their congregational worship. Tim describes his reaction at hearing the worship on the tapes from this “radical church”: “I heard a sound that I had never heard before, you know, this free-flowing—what we’d call “prophetic worship”—and songs of the Lord and some really radical sounds. . . It was so powerful.”77 Distinct from the earliest practices of primarily spoken praise emphasized by Reg Layzell, Iverson and Bible Temple had moved into a more music-based “sacrifice of praise” by the late 1970s, as had other Latter Rain churches (including Layzell’s Glad Tidings).

The late 1970s saw a new vision for church planting at Bible Temple that sent out a number of teams to plant churches across the nation. In the early 1980s, Iverson remembers that they sent out some of their most central leaders including their “music leader [Mike Herron], dean of the Bible college [David Blomgren], the head of our counseling ministry, the principal of our high school, several teachers from the Bible college, and several district pastors [i.e. “elders”].”78 These leaders, along with graduates of Portland Bible College, became the backbone for a Revival Fellowship—an informal network of churches—centered at Bible Temple (the network was later renamed the

77 Tim Smith, interview with Adam Perez, Jan. 17, 2020. Another one of his brothers, Wendell, joined Bible Temple in 1972 and eventually became an Elder (i.e., pastor) there.

78 Iverson, The Journey, 142. Note that “elders” in the “five-fold ministry” context is equivalent to what most other protestant Christian churches would call a pastor. The overarching church governance paradigm of most Latter Rain contexts was based on the idea that God was restoring to the Church the five ministries described in Eph. 4:11. See more in chapter three.
Minister’s Fellowship International). That network of ministers in fellowship with one another was a vehicle that transmitted globally the emerging teachings, songs, and worship practices that were happening at Bible Temple, especially the songs being birthed by their music leader in the late 1970s, Mike Herron.

**2.2.4 Section Conclusion**

In this section I have laid the foundation for the ecclesial network that stands behind the International Worship Symposium. This network predates the Jesus People movement by at least two decades and is dispersed across diverse geographic centers. Furthermore, the four leaders and their churches described in this section are not just any churches and leaders within the Latter Rain network but some of the most critical nodes in the network. While Layzell and Kiteley received the Revival teachings at North Battleford, Beall experienced it at Layzell’s Glad Tidings and Iverson experienced it with visits to various churches and by welcoming Latter Rain leaders into his own church. Subsequently, each church provided both ecclesial and theological leadership for the other churches in their respective areas.

From the time of the Revival through the mid-1970s, there is very little record of how worship practices changed within Latter Rain networks. During this time, Layzell continued to expand his exegesis on praise and God’s presence through writing and preaching. Ruth and Lim suggest that Layzell’s teachings expanded to include five key themes: praise and God’s presence, praise as an act of obedience and not based on one’s feelings, praise as a weapon for spiritual warfare, praise as love for and delight in God,
praise restored by God to the church. These theological elements alongside the distinctive congregational musicking practices of the “heavenly choir” and the “song of the Lord” grew and spread as core elements of Latter Rain worship. Writing about the overall impact of the Revival, Layzell noted that “A new experience in God was introduced by the Spirit [at the Revival] as He restored that wholesale, whole-hearted worship to the Lord.” However, as the IWS emerged as a new site in the late 1970s, it both amplified the worship inherited by the Latter Rain Revival churches and began to develop it in new directions.

2.3: Early Symposium Meetings, 1977–1980

In the following sections I detail the initial development (1977–1980) of the Symposium through the networks of churches described above. This history details the particular connections between people and churches that allowed the conference to grow and develop through connections with various host churches across the United States. These narratives are important because they detail for the first time the personal and direct ways in which the theology and practice of Praise and Worship was transmitted between churches within the Latter Rain network. These connections and events were amplifying the message of Praise and Worship more than a decade before the music industry of Praise and Worship would become the standard-bearer of this worship

79 See Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter one.
80 Layzell, The Pastor’s Pen, 207.
tradition. More so, it is not the adoption of popular musical styles (as was the case with the Jesus People) that allows these music ministers to excel but their classical musical training alongside a Bible College education that, together, makes them well-suited to lead in Latter Rain worship contexts and develop the musical and theological patterns of Praise and Worship.

Though an account of the broader and later mainstreaming of Latter Rain modes of worship is reserved for chapter five, the following section describes the new connections between the music ministers at these churches and their experiences in the mid- to late-1970s. The individuals involved in the Symposium and its Latter Rain-affiliated churches saw their work in congregational music as part of the move of God in restoring Biblical worship and prophetic power to the church today. The early leaders involved in the Symposium established a platform for disseminating Praise and Worship as they sought to serve God by devoting themselves to this message and to the work of the conference. Though the conference was initially a platform for camaraderie among Latter Rain music leaders, within a few short years, it became a popular site for teaching and experiencing Latter Rain modes of worship. The story of these first few years of the Symposium thus reveal the ecclesial and personal channels through which Praise and Worship spread.

As I describe the history of these first few Symposium events through my interviews with those involved, I center the story of persons who were involved firsthand in leading these conferences. Doing so highlights their sense of spiritual calling and the
way their personal and professional lives are affected by the Symposium and reciprocally forms the development of the Symposium. Though a number of these young leaders came to faith or were renewed in their faith through the Jesus People Movement, they speak about their transition out of that movement and into the Latter Rain (a.k.a. the “Restoration Revival”) movement when describing their church music leadership in Praise and Worship. In these early, central cases in the development of the IWS, it is classical music training and skills that become the launching pad for these leaders’ Latter Rain music ministry. In this section, it becomes apparent that the early history of the Symposium is more than just a history of an organization but is also a history of the connections between people, their divinely-inspired musicking, and their shared theological commitment to the restoration of biblical modes of worship.

2.3.1 1977 Bible Temple and Mike Herron

What would become known as the International Worship Symposium got its start as an informal, regional gathering in the Pacific Northwest in 1977 with participants primarily from Washington and Oregon, as well as a number from California and a few from the Midwest. By the late 1970s, Bible Temple’s regional influence among Latter Rain churches had grown and it had become known particularly for its emphasis on congregational musical worship. This was true more broadly of churches with similar roots along the West Coast in the Latter Rain movement who were beginning to

81 Tim Smith, interview.
emphasize patterns of worship derived from the biblical example of the Tabernacle of David and the Psalms. These leaders included Graham Truscott in Los Angeles, Violet Kiteley in Oakland, Reg Layzell in Vancouver, and Dick Iverson in Portland, among others. Given Iverson and Bible Temple’s entrepreneurial spirit for the expansion and reach of their ministry—in addition to their connections through the broader Revival Fellowship out of Southern California— it is fitting that they would conceive of a gathering to reach out to fellow music ministers who practiced a similar mode of Latter Rain worship.

By 1977, Bible Temple had already been gathering annual conferences of ministers under Iverson’s leadership and between other churches within their fellowship, but there was a hunger for an event to support the music ministers. However, there were not any conferences or gatherings at the time focused on supporting the distinctive music and worship practices of Latter Rain churches. In particular, how many Latter Rain church musicians had begun setting Psalms to new music and practiced prophetic singing of the “song of the Lord” within congregational worship. The practice of the song of the Lord (as I described at length in chapter four) was an extension of the prophetic ministry

---

82 Iverson appears to have maintained his connection to the Revival Fellowship led by David Schoch, Reg Layzell, Violet Kiteley and some others, at least until his own Minister’s Fellowship International (MFI) was established more formally in the 1980s. The establishment of MFI is a strong signal that Iverson had ascended to one of the top tiers of apostolic leadership at the time. The reason for establishing his own group was to provide greater support for churches in the Northwest Region and because he felt, according to Mike Herron, that that Fellowship was too strongly promoting dance and the use of banners, with which they took issue. For more on this issue, see chapters three and four. Mike Herron, phone interview with Adam Perez, 2.19.20.
of the musicians as they, under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, received divinely-inspired songs within times of congregational musical worship.

In his capacity as Bible Temple’s music leader, Mike Herron’s (b. 1949) prophetic songs of the Lord had been sent out on the weekly worship tapes from their congregation by 1974. Through them, Herron became well known for his skill and anointing in the song of the Lord and was receiving regular correspondence from music ministers who desired to institute similar practices of worship in their own churches. Out of those initial contacts, the idea to host a conference was formed.

Herron had come to faith during the Jesus Movement in Portland in 1969 while studying music at the University of Oregon. He followed a call to ministry by attending Portland Bible College in 1971 and came on staff around 1974 alongside Shari Iverson (b. 1951). Shari (Pastor Dick Iverson’s daughter-in-law) had been serving first as the choir director and later as music pastor from when she was just a teenager in the mid-1960s, and she remained on staff until the late 1980s.\(^3\) Herron counted Shari as a primary inspiration and mentor in the practice of spontaneous worship and the importance of being able to lead music by ear. Herron joined the ministry as “worship pastor.” At the time, neither he nor pastor Dick Iverson knew exactly the meaning of the

\(^3\) Shari Iverson, interview with Adam Perez, Feb. 26, 2020. Shari Iverson also had a role in the development and management of Christian Copyright Licensing International as a Vice President in the company.
title they had created. Given Herron’s ministry education at Portland Bible College and the musical skill he employed in leading the congregation into an experience of God’s manifest presence, the term collapsed those two responsibilities in a theologically sensible way for them. Herron’s responsibilities included the direction of the choir and leadership of Sunday morning times of worship. Using his music degree from the University of Oregon, Herron worked to institute a music curriculum in the church’s grade school, using both the Suzuki method and teaching instrumental and vocal improvisation as the groundwork for the worship practice of the church and in one’s personal spiritual life—features inherited from Shari Iverson’s mentorship.

Spontaneous musical worship and the “song of the Lord” were the key features of that first conference gathering in 1977. Herron reports that he invited the group of forty to fifty music ministers simply by calling them up on the phone. Little is recorded or remembered about the details of the event though multiple participants recollect that the event was largely informal and aimed at facilitating fellowship among those music ministers who were gathered. Indeed, the event strengthened loose ties that had already been forming through church visits, tapes of worship services, and camp meeting type events. Beyond Mike Herron hosting the conference, other participants included Barry

---

84 Herron, interview.
85 Herron, interview.
Griffing from Shiloh Temple in Oakland,\textsuperscript{86} Doug Moody from Glad Tidings Temple in Vancouver (brother of Dave Moody, author of “All Hail King Jesus”), Dan Gardner from Zion Evangelistic Temple in Detroit, Dean Demos from Hope Temple in Findlay Ohio, and Tim Smith (who would join the staff of Bible Temple in 1981).

\textbf{Figure 2.1}: Orchestra section of Bible Temple on Sunday morning in the 1970s worship in their Granada Theater location on 76th and Glisan, Portland, Oregon\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{86} On an unpublished tape from the conference, one participant is singled out for having come from San Jose, CA. Tape courtesy of Tim Smith.
\textsuperscript{87} Screenshot taken from Dick Iverson’s Memorial Service. City Bible Church, “Pastor Iverson Memorial Service.”
The group gathered for two days at Bible Temple for worship and prayer. There were no formal classes; Iverson simply shared with the group his vision for musical worship. In good Latter Rain fashion, Doug Moody received a song of the Lord right then and there in response to Iverson’s message and shared it with the group. Other important features of the conference included fellowship and mutual encouragement among the Latter Rain “chief musicians” (a biblical term for the lead church musician derived from 1 Chronicles) who had been moving into an awareness of practices associated with the worship of the Tabernacle of David in the Old Testament. Together, these elements formed the rough skeleton of what developed into the International Worship Symposium in the first period of its existence, 1977–1980.

Though no printed materials remain from that initial conference (whether and what was produced at all is unclear), an edited cassette tape recording has survived from one of the morning worship sessions. The recording features extended times of singing in which new songs were being taught (as evidenced by the song leadership), spoken words of prophecy were given, prophetic songs were sung (at least one of them sung by

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CYK6LHtEXrw&ab_channel=CityBibleChurch (accessed February 13, 2018). Bible Temple moved to a larger auditorium around 1980.

88 Herron, interview.
89 For an extended treatment of this theology, see chapter four.
90 This time is identifiable only because it is announced that the cooks are ready with breakfast and they need to wrap up the time of worship. The worship goes on for some time after the announcement.
Mike Herron), prophetic visions were described by both men and women, words of encouragement were offered (deliberately described as not being prophetic words from the Lord), and some practical discussion occurred among the group.\textsuperscript{91}

The conference also highlighted previously under-realized commonalities among the group. In a 1981 retrospective published by Barry Griffing in his \textit{Music Notes} newsletter, he noted that at the 1977 conference they also realized the need for a “clearinghouse” to share the new songs and choruses that were being “born in Zion,”\textsuperscript{92} i.e., songs of the Lord that they thought would edify the church at large. The group also discovered how similar the challenges were in their roles as “chief musicians” of congregational worship and the importance of \textit{how-to} clinics for meeting those needs.\textsuperscript{93}

The planning for a conference the following year came about somewhat spontaneously. In a recent interview Barry Griffing described it by saying that he simply felt called to host a follow-up event the next year. While he was still in Portland (staying in the home of Mike Herron), he phoned Rev. David Kiteley (co-pastor with his mother Violet Kiteley) in Oakland and received permission to host the event.\textsuperscript{94} On the extant recording from the 1977 conference, Herron can be heard announcing the plans for the

\textsuperscript{91}Courtesy of Tim Smith, e-mail to Adam Perez, May 26, 2020.
\textsuperscript{92}Barry subsequently established ZionSong, a service of cassette tape recordings and music sheets, to help serve that need. ZionSong also offered a copyright service; the organization would register songs on behalf of songwriters for a small fee.
\textsuperscript{93}\textit{Music Notes}, vol 3.2 (April 1981), 1.
\textsuperscript{94}Barry Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, Feb. 26, 2020.
following year’s conference saying, “I don’t know if everybody was here when Barry invited all of us to come to Oakland, California, for next year if we’d like to get together—I think it would be tremendous, I really do.”\(^{95}\) Notice the spontaneity embedded in Herron’s announcement (and in Griffing’s announcement that he referenced): it was not assumed that there would be a follow-up event or series of events, much less that the conference was somehow proprietary to Bible Temple. Instead, the emphasis is put on the value of getting together for another voluntary opportunity for fellowship. In a printed account from 1981, Griffing recollected the commitment somewhat more formally, describing later that in 1977 the group “covenanted to meet annually every August in a different region of the United States for a national worship conference.”\(^{96}\) After that first conference, Barry Griffing stayed the weekend in Portland and preached and taught at Bible Temple; he even led worship with his bass guitar.\(^{97}\)

Elsewhere on that recording from the conference, two songs that became iconic within Praise and Worship in the early 1980s are featured at the conference: Laurie

---

\(^{95}\) Herron goes on to discuss materials from the conference, saying: “As far as your addresses and sending these tapes, I don’t know if there’d be a charge for the tapes. We’ll just send you out a tape, we’ll just mail it to you. As far as the choruses, Tim do you have any suggestions? We had talked about a standard-sized eleven-by… do you have any thoughts about that? [Inaudible].”

\(^{96}\) *Music Notes*, 3.2. April 1981, 1.

\(^{97}\) Herron, interview with Adam Perez, Feb. 19, 2020.
Klein’s “I Love You Lord,” and Dave Moody’s “All Hail King Jesus.” The recording demonstrates the informality of song transmission; participants indicate they had previously learned one or the other of the songs incorrectly. Thus, the conference worked as an opportunity for standardization and correction for songs already in circulation in some areas, even as they introduced the songs to many others for the first time (see Appendix A).

2.3.2 1978 Shiloh Temple and the Griffing Brothers

Barry and Steve Griffing were the musical hosts of the 1978 conference at Shiloh Temple in Oakland, California, under Revs. David Kiteley’s and Dr. Violet Kiteley’s

---

98 Laurie Klein, “I Love You Lord” (House of Mercy, 1978, 1980). Klein resided in central Oregon at the time, though she was apparently not affiliated with a church. One author suggests that the song was initially popularized by Jack Hayford’s Church on the Way and was later included on a Maranatha! Praise Album in 1980. See Nathan Myrick, “History of Hymns: ‘I Love You Lord’” https://www.umcdiscipleship.org/articles/history-of-hymns-i-love-you-lord (accessed March 7, 2021). Near the end of the tape, a discussion emerges about what songs should go on the tape of the conference (presumably to be sent out only to the participants and not more broadly). Before sharing Klein’s “I Love You Lord,” the song leader asks the group how many of them already know the song. Though a response is not audible on the recording, the lack of congregational participation at the opening (unlike other songs on the tape) indicates that it was not yet widely known among attendees; indeed, the song would not even be copyrighted until the following year. In addition to those learning it for the first time, others can be heard correcting the versions they had learned. One participant responds audibly saying, “I think we learned it wrong,” to which the song leader says, “It’s a beauty.” Indeed, the version sung differs from the copyrighted version. In the official version held by CCLI, the line “Let it be [a sweet, sweet sound]” begins on the downbeat and each syllable is evenly divided into an eighth-note rhythmic pattern. On the 1977 conference recording, the line of text begins with an eighth-note pickup to the downbeat on the word “Let,” while “me be a . . .” is treated as a quarter-note triplet.


100 For a musical analysis and extended treatment of these two songs on the tape, see Appendix A.
leadership. Cindy Jacobs, in her obituary of Rev. Violet Kiteley for CharismaNews,\textsuperscript{101} notes that “Shiloh became a forerunner in a new sound of worship that influenced the starting of the International Worship Symposiums where thousands of people came hungry to hear the new sounds that God was releasing in that generation. The hippies she led to the Lord…became the leaders for a new generation of worshipers.”\textsuperscript{102} Indeed, two of those new young converts to the church would become leaders of the International Worship Symposium: Barry and Steve Griffing.

The Griffing brothers grew up “in a very Baptist home,” and because their father was in the Navy, they moved a number of times between California, Washington D.C., and Florida.\textsuperscript{103} The Griffings were new neither to the Christian faith nor to the world of church music ministry: both of their parents had master’s degrees in music from University of California-Riverside, and they had served in a variety of local Baptist churches wherever they lived. Both Barry and Steve’s faith was reinvigorated in the late 1960s when they were introduced to charismatic Christianity via the Jesus People

\textsuperscript{101}CharismaNews is a division of Charisma Media (formerly Strang Communications), associated with the print magazine Charisma, a long-running popular magazine aimed at charismatic and evangelical Christians. As a media mogul, Strang was listed in 2005 on Time’s “The 25 Most Influential Evangelicals in America.” Strang’s parent company also publishes the Creation House book imprint which published many books by later Praise and Worship leaders.


\textsuperscript{103}Note that Juliette Eymann, spouse to Job Eymann, was their sister; both were regular teachers at the symposium for many years. Juliette became involved in leading the dance ministry sometime after the 1978 conference.
Movement as students at the University of California-Berkeley.\textsuperscript{104} The individuals that led Barry into that experience also led him to Shiloh Bible College and Barry attended beginning in 1969. Because of his background in music, he became involved in the music program there, and soon became the director of the Friday night Coffee House ministry,\textsuperscript{105} later joined by his brother Steve. In 1976, Barry came on staff as the music minister at Shiloh Temple. The following year, he attended the gathering at Bible Temple. As he felt led to host a gathering of the group again at Shiloh in 1978, he coined the name initial name of the IWS: the National Music Symposium.\textsuperscript{106}

Steve Griffing was likewise converted in the context of the West Coast Christian counterculture and evangelism of the Jesus People movement. Both he and Barry played multiple instruments and, in line with the culture of the time, had their own rock band

\textsuperscript{104} Barry describes that experience using both the terms “charismatic” and “Jesus People Movement,” though for some these terms denote different streams of charismatic faith and experience.

\textsuperscript{105} Coffee House ministry was a mainstay of churches in Southern California that were ministering to the young people involved in the Jesus People movement. The ministry at Shiloh closed in 1975.

\textsuperscript{106} Barry remained on staff at Shiloh until he planted a church in Delaware in the fall of 1983. Three years later, he stepped away from that role (as a result of a prophetic word delivered to him by popular itinerant minister Judson Cornwall) and took a position as music minister with Jamie Buckingham’s Tabernacle Church, a large congregation in central Florida. A few short years later, Barry left that position and became an itinerant minister for a number of years. Buckingham was a well-known preacher, author, and evangelist and was well-connected within the charismatic movement. Buckingham was a charismatic Baptist preacher and columnist for a variety of pentecostal magazines (such as Charisma and Christian Life). He was also a board member and good friend to Steven Strang, the owner of Creation House publishing, an imprint that published books on Praise and Worship both in English and in Spanish. See “A People’s Preacher: Jamie Buckingham, Dies” Orlando Sentinel, February 19, 1992. Accessed July 30, 2020. \url{https://www.orlandosentinel.com/news/os-xpm-1992-02-19-9202190125-story.html}
named *Joyful Sound*. But popular Christian music was not his only interest: Steve was trained at University of California at Berkeley as a music student and his primary instrument was the violin. Though the Jesus movement brought him into the fold at Shiloh, it was Violet Kiteley’s teaching on the Latter Rain’s Restoration of worship that transformed Steve’s life and led him into ministry. In addition to his musical training, Steve also attended Shiloh Bible College and studied at the Church Divinity School of the Pacific in Berkeley, an affiliated seminary of the Episcopal Church in the United States. The combination of Steve’s skill on the violin and his theological training quickly positioned him alongside his brother as a leader of the worship conference. Though his experience in a Christian rock band with his brother would prove a resource to him, it was his orchestral training that was his main contribution to Shiloh and Symposium worship. Steve also joined the music ministry staff at Shiloh during this time and in the mid-1980s moved from there to Fuchsia Pickett’s Fountain Gate Ministries in Plano, Texas.¹⁰⁷

Barry Griffing estimates that in the mid-1970s, Shiloh Temple had an attendance of around four to five hundred people.¹⁰⁸ In the early 1970s, the Friday night Coffee House ministry of the church had already begun using Praise and Worship as an evangelistic tool. To support the ministry, Barry had organized groups of musicians from

---

¹⁰⁷ See footnote 55 for additional biographical information on Fuchsia Pickett.
the church to lead on a rotating schedule, each group covering one evening set per month. The Coffee House ministry was thus an important and successful evangelistic tool for the church.\textsuperscript{109} But it was also successful in training up new music leaders for the church, even though the music of congregational worship was stylistically distinct. Eventually, Barry (with Steve’s help) combined these groups that had “cut their teeth” on worship leadership in the Coffee House to form the initial choir and orchestra group at the church.\textsuperscript{110}

As Barry had promised, the fledgling group of Latter Rain music leaders met in Oakland, California in 1978 at Shiloh Temple.\textsuperscript{111} The conference attracted around 120 participants and featured a more formalized set of breakout sessions that drew on the strengths of Shiloh’s ministry departments. Though no extant material from this conference has been found, a 1981 article in Barry Griffing’s \textit{Music Notes} newsletter provides a helpful retrospective of the event.\textsuperscript{112}

Like at the 1977 gathering, Barry reports that the “song of the Lord” remained a central feature of the “teach-and-do” workshops at the Shiloh gathering in 1978. Barry suggests that “dozens were liberated in this Bible experience for the first time.”\textsuperscript{113}

---

\textsuperscript{109} The ministry met in a storefront area of the Shiloh Temple building that faced the main road. But doors leading from the coffee house to the sanctuary allowed leaders to bring fledgling converts directly into the sanctuary to pray with them.

\textsuperscript{110} Barry Griffing, interview, May 25, 2017.

\textsuperscript{111} The church changed its name the following year to Shiloh Christian Fellowship. Barry Griffing, interview with Adam Perez. February 26, 2020.

\textsuperscript{112} The following relies almost exclusively on \textit{Music Notes}, 3.2 (April 1981), 1.

conference also made time for sharing new choruses and “songs of the Lord” that had been received or recently composed by attendees. Additional clinics were offered on a wider range of worship-related topics: choral conducting, local church video programming, producing an album, and more. One new feature introduced at that event would become a mainstay of the conference programming: the use of expressive movement in worship.

Not only did the conference feature practical sessions, it also introduced to the conference format a more public-facing event in the evenings presented by host church, a practice that would continue through 1983. Barry described the event as “multimedia presentation… which demonstrated the combined use of lighting, costuming, dance, and pagentry [sic] and music under the anointing.”¹¹⁴ This was a different kind of event than the scripted church musicals¹¹⁵ that had been circulating in evangelical and Pentecostal circles for some decades, in that it was highly participatory. On one hand, it demonstrated the impressive performance capacities of traditional church music programs in local churches of the time. On the other hand, it provided another opportunity to teach the biblical witness on the restoration of Praise and Worship through enacting biblical stories and closing the gap between the leaders-as-performers and the congregation-as-

spectators. In this setting, the congregation was encouraged to worship along with the performers on stage. It had the additional benefit of introducing to a wider audience some of what was happening behind the scenes during the daytime session at the conference. This type of mixed presentation/worship session during the evening conference slots became a mainstay in the following years and drew upon the multiple artistic skills of the host church’s music and worship departments.

At Shiloh in 1978 the Symposium began to take shape as a conference and not just a fellowship event (though that element remained critical too). The conference was hosted by young, classically-trained musicians and Shiloh Bible College-degreed leaders with a history of church music service in their family. Indeed, being a classically-trained musician with skills for improvisation was almost universally a prerequisite for music ministry leadership, especially at churches involved in the Symposium. Though the Griffing brothers were influenced by the Jesus People movement in Oakland to whom Shiloh church ministered, the mode of congregational worship was very much in line with the established traditions of Latter Rain Pentecostalism under their pastors Violet Kiteley who co-pastored with her son David. It is unclear how many participants at the conference were new to Latter Rain modes of worship in general and how many came from established Latter Rain churches. Nevertheless, there were elements of worship ministry organization and leadership that participants with less experience or fewer resources would have learned from those with more experience and resources. Though the theology of Latter Rain worship and ministry was already being taught at the
affiliated Bible college, the Symposium effectively extended its reach in an experiential and short-form event.

### 2.3.3 1979: Hope Temple and Dean Demos

After the 1978 Symposium in Oakland, Pastor Moses Vegh of Findlay, Ohio’s Hope Temple offered to host a gathering of this emerging group in 1979. By that time, Hope Temple had already been moving confidently into the ministry of Praise and Worship for several years, especially in the formation of a church orchestra. An estimated 85 music ministers were in attendance. There was only two-thirds of the attendance from the previous year but that reduction was not entirely unexpected given the change in location and relative lack of density in Revival churches in the Findlay area compared to that on the West Coast. Nevertheless, Pastor Vegh and Hope Temple’s multiple levels of interaction with Latter Rain churches had a significant impact on the worship of the church leading up to the Symposium.

Vegh had a strong connection to the Latter Rain through his visits to camp meetings at Shiloh as well as strong fellowship with nearby Bethesda Missionary Temple in Detroit, Michigan (only a hundred miles to the north) that had been forming his liturgical vision for his church. In the years leading up to hosting the Symposium, Vegh had received a vision from God for a full symphony orchestra in worship (and in the grade school) that he and his music minister, Dean Demos, had begun to realize. As with Herron at Bible Temple and the Griffing brothers at Shiloh Temple, the musical training of Dean Demos and his associate Janet Shell helped to make Hope Temple an important
node in the network of Latter Rain Praise and Worship. Hosting the Symposium in 1979 affirmed and propelled Hope Temple (and others in their area) along that path.

Vegh’s vision for the symphony orchestra was connected intimately to his theology of worship, which was developing in connection with broader themes that were emerging in the 1970s among Latter Rain churches. For two years in the late 1970s, the Sunday evening service had been dedicated to teaching on the worship of the Tabernacle of David and the song of the Lord.116 Among the teachers Vegh invited during this period were Graham Truscott (who was also a skilled clarinetist), the Griffing Brothers, Mike Herron, LaMar Boschman, and David Kiteley. As with many churches in the Latter Rain network, the pulpit at Hope Temple also hosted many prominent pastors and preachers, including Dick Iverson, Violet Kiteley, Ernest Gentile, Judson Cornwall and others. Not only did visiting preachers come to Hope Temple but Hope members went to visit other churches. Sometime in the mid- to late 1970s, for example, forty members of the music ministry flew out to Oakland for the “family camp” at Shiloh Temple where they learned prophetic playing alongside the music ministry there. Janet Shell, orchestra teacher at the school and a leader of the congregational worship orchestra, was herself taken under Steve Griffing’s wing as he mentored her in playing the violin under the “prophetic anointing.”117

116 Janet Shell, interview with Adam Perez, April 6, 2020.
117 Shell, interview.
The primary work of organizing the 1979 Symposium fell to Dean Demos. Demos (b. 1948) was raised in what he describes as a strict Pentecostal home. He was part of several Pentecostal churches growing up but did not receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the evidence of speaking in tongues until he was sixteen years old when a missionary evangelist with prosperity gospel ties who had picked up the Latter Rain emphasis on praise came through their storefront Pentecostal church, prayed, and laid hands on Demos. That preacher’s name was Charles Trombley. In time, his 1976 book on the “seven Hebrew words for Praise” became a staple resource for Praise and Worship leaders.118

After serving for a time in the military in Vietnam, where the Christian group *Navigators* had turned him on to scripture memorization, Demos returned home to marry his girlfriend who was from Findlay and attended Hope Temple. Almost immediately upon his arrival in Findlay, Demos felt that God was telling him to serve a “spiritual apprenticeship” to Pastor Vegh and so Demos submitted himself to Vegh. Though Demos’s day job was selling advertising at a local newspaper, his heart was focused on the life of the church. In the early 1970s, Hope Temple was (according to Demos)

118 Trombley later wrote one of the first published books on the “seven Hebrew words for praise” teaching. The teaching was influential on Demos, and it showed up in many forms related to Tabernacle of David worship—sometimes by that title and sometimes simply infused into the teaching materials. At Symposium, Dr. Sam Sasser was best known for the teaching as well as his multi-media means of presenting it. See Charles Trombley, *How to Praise the Lord* (Harrison, AK: Fountain Press, 1976).
drawing 400 to 450 in the Sunday morning services and 600 in the evenings when the “moon-lighters from the denominational churches would come out because they knew a revival was on.”119 The experience of worship was powerful and, “in the spirit of those days… you could sing the National Anthem and it would blow the roof off.” What they were actually singing, however, were scripture songs and choruses like those from New Zealand couple Dave and Dale Garratt whose Scripture in Song volumes had become a popular early resource for Praise and Worship. To use Demos’s analogy, the Garratt’s carried the “traveling trophy of Praise and Worship” at the time.

Dean became involved in the music ministry at Hope Temple by playing the trombone alongside others in worship services. In the mid-1970s, worship was led by a choir that learned by rote, a pianist that played by ear on a six-foot Kimball piano, and a fine organist who was still learning to play by ear on a Conn electric organ. To these leaders Demos added his trombone, accompanying the “good ol’ hymns that spoke of heaven and a Spirit-filled life.”120 For Dean, “the Spirit was there [in the services] and the inspiration and the feelings and fervor. . . But [he admitted] the quality was not there, and I knew the Lord deserved better.” So, with Pastor Vegh’s blessing (and his G.I. Bill in his wallet), Demos enrolled in a music education degree program at nearby Bowling Green University. Still a member of the team, Demos took the administrative and

119 Dean Demos, interview with Adam Perez, March 19, 2020.
120 Dean Demos, e-mail, July 16, 2020.
organizational matters he had learned in music school and implemented them in the services. Upon graduation, Demos was appointed the Minister of Music at the church and came on staff at the Church’s grade school. Demos used both the worship leading experience he had gained over time at Hope Temple and his university training in music education to develop a connection between the school’s music curriculum (especially the orchestra) and the church’s worship services. Though the vision for that integration came from Pastor Vegh, Demos executed it alongside another important contributor who later became a leader in the orchestra at the Symposium, Janet Shell.

Janet Shell came to Hope Temple for the first time in 1977 or 1978 when Demos—who had been a fellow music student at Bowling Green State—invited her music group “Friends in Him” to perform at the church. But she knew Pastor Vegh from when she was just a student in high school; Pastor Vegh would stand outside the school and preach to students and staff. Her father, the school’s orchestra teacher, was one of those to whom he preached. Eventually, because of Vegh’s vision for a symphony orchestra in the school and church, Vegh made a personal covenant with God for the salvation of the Shell family and their ministry at Hope Temple. God apparently honored Vegh’s covenant and the Shells became involved in the school and musical worship ministry at Hope Temple.

Shell founded and taught orchestra classes at the grade school attached to the church and, like Herron at Bible Temple, trained students to play both by note and by rote. They used this school training to funnel students into the church orchestra to help
lead worship on Sunday mornings. In photos of worship at Hope Temple from the period, the large orchestra (with many young persons) can be seen crammed into the center of the platform—without any music stands (See Figure 2.2).

Figure 2.2: Hope Temple Choir and Orchestra, 1982

---

121 Photo courtesy of Janet Shell.
Demos suggested that the orchestra was so good at the time that he could put studio charts in front of them and they would play them note for note, or he could ask them to play spontaneously and they could even improvise the harmony. Regardless of the veracity of his estimation it is critical to recognize that both ways of playing were deeply valued and used in congregational worship. The grade school functioned much as a music magnet school or conservatory with music classes. To this was added the benefit of chapel each day, where the orchestra would accompany the singing and students would be lined up to sing the song of the Lord.\(^{122}\) By the time of the 1979 Symposium, the orchestra at the church boasted sixty members.\(^{123}\) Janet quickly became a core teacher on youth orchestra programs at the Symposium, where she taught annually for many years starting in 1979.

All of this background on Vegh, Demos, and Shell shows how Hope Temple was well-situated and connected to host the 1979 Symposium. The work of organizing the 1979 Symposium, however, fell on Demos’s shoulders. The two prior Symposium gatherings up to this point had been relatively small, with a degree of informality to the organization. At Findlay, the emphasis on developing the orchestra for worship required a greater level of organization. In the two years prior, times of singing were led mostly from the piano among the relatively small group of accompanying musicians. But Vegh

\(^{122}\) Shell, interview.
\(^{123}\) Shell, interview.
and Demos were well-equipped to lead such an event as they already had experience hosting a music and worship conference.\textsuperscript{124} In fact, the nomenclature of “Symposium” by which the IWS would become known is credited to Vegh and to a conference they held the previous year. \textit{Music Notes} reports that Hope Temple had held a “Symposium” the year prior and had invited Mike Herron and Barry Griffing out for it. From the name of that earlier music conference, the “Symposium” name was added to this emerging itinerant gathering that would become known as the IWS. Given the emphasis on the centrality of the musical worship practices, this 1979 conference was aptly titled the “Song of the Lord Symposium.”

In the limited extant records of the conference, the song of the Lord did feature centrally in the program. According to the conference notes of Warren Hastings (who would later host Symposium 1981 with Olen Griffing) Barry Griffing taught a seminar titled, “How to Release the Song of the Lord in your Worship Service: A Checklist.” In the teaching notes, Barry Griffing emphasized the spiritual and physical preparation required of a Praise and Worship leader who desired to lead the congregation in that ministry. Griffing even suggests a pattern for the appointment of designated musicians and singers “by course” or rotating schedule (following the biblical example from 1 Chron. 25) that mirrored the organizational pattern he had instituted at Shiloh and had

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Music Notes} 3.2 (April 1981). Notably, Dean did not refer to this prior conference in my interview with him.
based on his Coffee House ministry: four teams, one for each Sunday of the month. Other teaching notes include technical distinctions regarding the practice of the song of the Lord (taught by Barry Griffing) and a session titled “Bible Patterns of Praise & Worship” in which Larry Dempsey laid out an overview of worship themes across scripture.\textsuperscript{125} Though these teaching sessions were important to the nature of the gathering, it became clear to Demos during the course of the conference that the formal teaching times had been over scheduled. In response, the afternoon classes were subsequently canceled to allow more time for fellowship and worship among the gathered attendees.\textsuperscript{126}

Embedded in Hastings’ notes on the song of the Lord session is also an interesting comment about Barry Griffing’s preference for musicians to be “scribes” who write down songs that were previously given to them prophetically or spontaneously. Part of the specific responsibility of the music minister as scribe was to work out the harmonizations and orchestrations in advance of their implementation in worship. Hastings noted that Barry Griffing’s practice was to bring out a new song about every three months, adding it to other songs that had been collected. This seasonal sharing of songs became the early pattern for the ZionSong subscription song publication service that he established in 1979 to help support and standardize the circulation of new songs within this fellowship of chief musicians.\textsuperscript{127} In Barry Griffing’s \textit{Music Notes} report, he says that many of the first

\textsuperscript{125} Personal notes, Warren Hastings.
\textsuperscript{126} Demos, interview.
\textsuperscript{127} See also the announcement in \textit{Music Notes} 2.6 (December 1980): 1.
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twenty-four subscribers in 1979 were from churches in the Midwest who had heard about the ZionSong service at the Findlay Symposium.

As a result of the conference and the increasing sense of shared mission, direction, and organization, Barry Griffing formed a steering committee and invited Dean Demos to be a member. The committee at the time included other emerging leaders with whom they had been in fellowship at the prior two conferences such as Steve Griffing, Mike Herron, LaMar Boschman, David Fischer, and Larry Dempsey. Rev. Larry Dempsey quickly rose to a prominent role in the Symposium group after attending for the first time in 1979 and offered to host the event the following year. Known both for his ability to offer music workshops for choir and for communicating effectively with pastoral leaders, Dempsey was a dynamic contributor to the Symposium. Under his pastor George Rohrig, Living Faith Church in Santa Ana (near Los Angeles) did indeed host the following year’s gathering, with the additional aid of Barry Griffing.

2.3.4 1980: Living Faith Church and Larry Dempsey

Symposium 1980 was held at Living Faith Church under Pastor George Rohrig and music minister Larry Dempsey. The year also saw the name of the event change to the “National Music Leadership Conference, Symposium ’80.”

Though back in more familiar territory on the West Coast, Santa Ana is still four hundred miles south of where the 1978 Symposium was held in Oakland. Nevertheless, Barry Griffing’s newsletter

Music Notes reports 161 delegates from eighteen states as well as Canada who registered for fifteen elective workshops, six plenary sessions, and three new song sharing sessions.\textsuperscript{129} Simultaneously, the subscription for Barry Griffing’s Music Notes reported having two hundred subscribers representing over one hundred churches.\textsuperscript{130} Not noted is how many discrete churches were represented at the conference. However, given that Music Notes subscribers came primarily from the conference audiences and churches who invited Barry Griffing as an itinerant minister, it is likely that those 161 delegates came from a relatively large number of churches — potentially as many as eighty or more. The growing size of the conference may also be due in part to the more active marketing approach of Larry Dempsey. Music Notes 3.2 details how Dempsey had for a prior conference simply sent mailers and registration forms to over eight hundred churches in the area that he found listed in the local Yellow Pages. Dempsey attributed the turnout to a growing awareness and hunger for “unity and worship” among Pentecostal and Charismatic churches, two key themes that participants experienced in the Latter Rain Revival.\textsuperscript{131}

Though there were only 161 attendees at the conference, the Symposium also offered evening events that were open to the public. Reports indicate that attendees for these times of special music ministry and worship filled the entire church building “to

\textsuperscript{129} Music Notes, 2.5 (October 1980): 1. \\
\textsuperscript{130} Music Notes, 2.6, (December 1980): 1. \\
capacity.” The evening events were of a larger scale and scope than the daytime worship services and featured original musical productions of choir, orchestra, dance, and drama put on by churches in the region. As reported in *Music Notes*, on the opening night of the conference, Claremont Christian Center’s (Claremont, California) dancers and orchestra presented Janet Alward’s production of the story of Israel being brought into captivity in Babylon and then going up to Zion. On Wednesday evening, Graham Truscott’s team of singers and players from Restoration Temple (San Diego, California) presented a production on the life of Jesus. On Thursday night, the seventy-member choir and dance company of Willard and Ione Glaeser’s church Living Waters Temple (Pasadena, California) presented a production on the Feast of Tabernacles (written by regular IWS teacher Debbie Olson). The final evening event was held off-site at the Chapman College Auditorium where the “Temple Musicians” of Shiloh presented a full theatre stage production of “I Will Build My Church,” a musical written and directed by Barry and Steve Griffing. Larry Dempsey reported that several times during the performance spontaneous congregational worship erupted along with shouting, clapping, and praising God “as the anointing of the Holy Spirit moved into the House.” More than just amateur choreography, Shiloh’s team featured “several dancers who were saved out of the San Francisco Ballet.” This kind of performance would only have been possible with the

132 Note the name change at the time from Shiloh Temple to Shiloh Christian Fellowship around 1979.
appropriate space and flooring. In short, the higher production value required a theater-type space.

Up to this point, the prior three years of annual gatherings were built primarily on connections within the Latter Rain networks that had been previously established. Symposium 1980, as described in *Music Notes*, appears to have been the first strong step in moving beyond those networks—a path that the Symposium followed through various stages in the 1980s. Dempsey’s advertising strategy played no small part in that, though other factors are important to note as well. For example, the location of the conference just outside a major metropolitan area like Los Angeles contributed to its accessibility by members of a wide range of traditions. Participants came from the “Assemblies of God, Four Square [sic], Charismatic, Baptist, Independent Pentecostal, Restoration/Revival [Latter Rain], Christian Evangelical Assemblies, Pentecostal Church of God, and Open Bible Standard.”¹³³ That location also provided easy access to the music recording industry based in Southern California at the time. Representatives from *Manna Music*, for example, attended the conference alongside two other minor music publishers. *Manna*, however, was no small name in publishing: it had just received the 1979 ASCAP award for Gospel Publisher of the Year and enjoyed a list of well-known evangelical composers and performers with credits, among them Andraé Crouch, Cindy Walker, Jimmy Owens, Ralph Carmichael, Rich Cook, Doris Akers, Jerry Sinclair, and Tom Fettke, among many

¹³³ *Music Notes* 2.5 (Oct 1980)
others. Though Manna’s connection with the conference is unclear, their presence signals perhaps that there was an awareness of the Symposium constituency as both potential writers and customers of settings of congregational songs, choir octavos, and musicals. Manna had, for example, published two Christian musicals by Dan Barker, one of the teachers at Symposium 1980. When looking at these contributors to Symposium—together with Barry Griffing’s relatively small ZionSong subscription service—it is clear that this network of music ministers was only marginally involved in the broader Christian music industry around 1980.

2.4 Chapter Conclusion

In Music Notes 2.5, Dempsey reflected theologically on the work of God being revealed through the Symposium during this period:

God seems to be knitting together the hearts of chief musicians everywhere. I believe this is one of the signs of Unity that is coming to the Body of Christ. Mike Herron, Dean Demos, Hazel Sasser, LaMar Boschman, Barry and Steve Griffing, Larry Turner, Warren Hastings, and Kirk Dearman… these musical prophets of the Lord are moving forth in the truths and blessings of Unity.

134 Manna Music, np. Manna Music also attained ownership of the copyright for Stuart K. Hines’ “How Great Thou Art,” one of the most popular (white) Gospel songs of all time. [http://mannamusicinc.com/history-manna.html](http://mannamusicinc.com/history-manna.html)
135 Dan Barker would later enjoy some fame for renouncing his evangelical faith in 1984 and speaking about it publicly on The Oprah Winfrey Show before launching a career in advocacy and publishing regarding atheism and church-state separation.
136 Larry Dempsey, Music Notes 2.5 (October 1980). Note that the word Unity is capitalized in the original, perhaps to denote the importance of the word as a theological category for ecclesial life.
Dempsey’s reflection not only centers the role of music, prophecy, and the “chief musician” role that is so characteristic of the Latter Rain as an ecclesial network; it directed these toward unity. This emphasis highlights how deeply fellowship was valued within Latter Rain churches, both as a characteristic of interpersonal relationships but also as a style of ecclesial organizations like the Revival Fellowship, Minister’s Fellowship International, or the Symposium itself—a new kind of network that served music ministers in particular. These ministers shared not only a common vision for highly skilled orchestras and choirs but also deep theological reflection about the biblical witness on Praise and Worship and how it was being restored to the church. It was Latter Rain networks of ecclesial fellowship and shared musical worship practices that initially supported the Symposium’s establishment and growth. Ecclesial fellowship was a key marker of these early years. When asked about the Symposium in this early period of involvement, Janet Shell remarked that the Symposium community was like family and that it enjoyed such strong connections that could not be found anywhere else. It offered the musicians the sense of being part of something bigger in a movement—one distinct from the developments associated with the Jesus People and American evangelicalism—that may have been feeling the strains of stagnation in the thirty years on from the initial revival. More than that, it encouraged the musicians to believe the

137 Shell, interview. Some of those connections still endure for folks like Shell, even though the network as a whole has faded, and the particular “move of God” has dissipated.
message of the restoration of Praise and Worship, which centered the music ministers as leaders of the next big move of God.

As regards the relationship between the Symposium as a fledgling organization and the broader network of Latter Rain churches, it is notable that the leadership of each conference came under the pastoral leadership of the particular congregation that was hosting it and was seen not as an independent organization but an expression of the ministries of these churches at the time. The early Symposium had virtually no direct connection theologically to the Jesus People or that movement save for providing a context for the conversion to Pentecostalism for some Symposium leaders and participants. Though Barry Griffing, Steve Griffing, David Fischer, and Larry Dempsey emerged as informal leaders of the group, this preliminary period of Symposium’s life is marked not so much by their individual leadership but by a distributed sense of ownership of the message of Praise and Worship. Initially, the gatherings had been highly focused on the practice of the song of the Lord and would continue to center that practice in the coming years. Nevertheless, the broader ministry administration and leadership paradigms associated with Praise and Worship were already beginning to emerge at Symposium.

Steve Griffing described the late-1970s saying, “[IWS] started with music. In 1978, ’79, [it was] very much [about the] musical and symphonic, concerted sound. God
was bringing us out of little bands [of people], starting to involve more people.”

Musically speaking, the practice of the song of the Lord was producing many new songs out of local churches during this period. This was markedly different context for songwriting from other new music coming out of contemporaneous sources like the praise songs of the Jesus People. These songs of the Lord were also disseminated in a way entirely unaffiliated with a music industry. Songs emerging from the major nodes in the Latter Rain network such as Layzell’s Glad Tidings Temple, Iverson’s Bible Temple, or Kiteley’s Shiloh Temple were being distributed on simple cassette recordings of their congregational worship services. In this way, songs like Dave Moody’s “All Hail King Jesus” would become well-known (even though “incorrectly”—see Appendix A) through informal networks of transmission in the months after it was first delivered in a Sunday service. In the late 1970s there was no centralized, well-coordinated industry for disseminating these emerging Praise and Worship songs. In many cases, the person who received and delivered these songs of the Lord did not even consider themselves “songwriters” *per se*, but vessels for prophecy that might bless the church. Barry Griffing’s *ZionSong* was one of the few early services that attempted to support churches looking for new songs, though it remained relatively small. Indeed, the Symposium itself became a novel site for new song sharing that condensed what was a previously an

________________________

138 Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 13, 2018.
informal process facilitated by the itinerancy of preachers and music ministers. More so, Symposium became a clearinghouse not only for songs but for the emerging theological paradigms of Praise and Worship within the Latter Rain network such as the emphasis on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David.

My discussion in this chapter highlighted the role of Latter Rain ecclesial connections and theological history that points to more than just music. In the next period of the IWS’s history, increasingly wide connections and new networks for fellowship helped propel the IWS and its articulation of the Latter Rain message of the restoration of Praise and Worship onto a massive stage.

3.1 Introduction

Over the course of the Symposium’s development into the 1980s, it continued to rely on a core constituency of Latter Rain teachers and leaders to guide the Symposium. The contours of the Symposium’s movement followed the personal connections that were forged in shared ecclesial contexts and predicated on powerful experiences in congregational worship. The core of its message, too, remained the same: God is restoring the practices of Praise and Worship to the church. The practice of the song of the Lord remained a central experience in both the Symposium worship services and in the Symposium teaching sessions. Though the teaching on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David (and the Psalms more broadly) as a pattern for Praise and Worship had been circulating for at least a decade in some Latter Rain contexts, it began to take center stage (both figuratively and literally) in and through the IWS during the early 1980s. In the mid-1980s the Symposium expanded into a new depth of articulation of that restoration message as it incorporated new forms of artistic expression derived from the Biblical witness on Praise and Worship, especially the visual and bodily elements of worship: dance, banners, and pageantry.

At the same time, another important transition took place: the event moved beyond the Latter Rain ecclesial context that birthed it. Year after year, the Symposium
moved into new ecclesial networks and geographic spaces that extended the scope of its impact. Although the majority of teachers still had a Latter Rain background, teachers from these other (primarily Pentecostal) ecclesial traditions and who shared the vision for the restoration of Praise and Worship became more involved in the Symposium. Beyond the increasingly diverse list of Symposium teachers and participants, the range of geographically diverse conference locations in the 1980s is a clear signal of the Symposium’s growing footprint in Praise and Worship history.

In this chapter, I describe the development of the Symposium as an event more than an organization, with a textured history in the 1980s. As an organizational entity, the IWS ultimately failed. The evidence for this consists in part in the rapid decline of its attendance into the 1990s. It is also evidenced in the simple fact that knowledge of the IWS has been almost entirely lost to the pages of Praise and Worship history, save for the oral accounts of those participants who had first-hand experience with it. Assessing the IWS as an organization in the 1980s raises the question of what goods it produced. The only recognizable media produced by the IWS were the cassette tape recordings from a selection of conference sessions. Those cassettes were only offered directly through the conference and were not widely available. Though Barry Griffing’s ZionSong subscription service was formed to serve the same constituency as Symposium by supplying them a steady stream of new songs of the Lord, it was an independent entity with a limited scope. Probably the closest thing to a “product” that the Symposium created was not music at all but a structured curriculum called “The
Restoration of the Worship of the Psalms in the Twentieth Century Church.” The curriculum was authored in 1985 by the four primary conference leaders (Barry Griffing, Steve Griffing, Larry Dempsey, and David Fischer) for use at Living Waters Bible College, an institution connected to the Living Waters Church (host of Symposium 1983) with which Symposium leader David Fischer was associated. The curriculum was based on the core tenets of the Symposium teachings at the time, such as the Tabernacle of David, the Psalms, song of the Lord, dance, pageantry, and banners. Even this, however, was simply a joint venture authored by the Symposium’s leaders and built on the Symposium’s popularity. It was not itself a product, so to speak, of the Symposium. In sum, the organization’s primary product was its regional and annual events that enjoyed a significant popularity for a limited period of time among churches moving in Praise and Worship during the 1980s.

But perhaps the story of the IWS’s success or failure is best evidenced not in the perseverance of its organizational identity or the commercial success of its products but in other measures. For example, the Symposium’s worship helped create a desire in local churches and individuals for similar musical experiences on which later industrial entities and organizations were able to capitalize and, indeed, were built. By this measure, the Symposium was remarkably successful—an argument I reserve for chapter five. For an historiographic account of the impact of the IWS, it would be misleading to associate the success of its material goods or its economic viability with its historical significance. In this chapter, my focus on the year-by-year development of each annual Symposium event
is chronicled in the available primary source material from the conferences (primarily the syllabi) and through personal interviews with its leaders and participants.

As with the previous chapter, so here I continue to show how the annual IWS events centered around a loose network of leaders and churches devoted to the theology and practice of Praise and Worship in the local church. These leaders were by and large Pentecostals with little or no association to the Jesus People Movement that had been waning for some time by the early 1980s, nor with a close association to the emerging Christian popular music industry. As I argued in the previous chapter, this network did not emerge around songs, albums, or the apparatus of industry but through the growth of the network itself, which precipitated those very things later in the 1980s. The story of the Symposium’s development in this chapter continues to lay the historical groundwork for the theological descriptions and case studies that follow in the subsequent chapters.

The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section details the conferences in 1981 to 1983. I explore how the Symposium began to develop a distinctive identity and audience beyond the informal fellowship shared among its participants. The section concludes with the story of a major break in that fellowship that deeply—though only temporarily—shook the Symposium’s leaders. In the second section (1984–1989), I explore how IWS moved into new ecclesial contexts and established important connections that would become critical for the mainstreaming of its message on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David in Praise and Worship. This chapter continues to reference elements of the theology of worship and the arts as they pertain to the
Symposium’s content each year, though it reserves fuller treatments of those elements for chapter four.

3.2 The Middle Years: Symposium 1981–1983

From 1981 to 1983, the Symposium began to develop a distinctive identity. In the previous four years, each year’s conference was almost exclusively directed and planned by the local church staff, especially its minister of music. Even so, Barry Griffing, Steve Griffing, and Mike Herron (among other local hosts) began to emerge as prominent figures within the network in the late 1970s. Moving into the 1980s, the location of the annual conferences began to test the reception of the message of Praise and Worship beyond the Latter Rain churches that functioned as regional hubs for Praise and Worship (Bible Temple, Shiloh Temple, etc.). Even though the Symposium returned to a decidedly Latter Rain church in 1983, the Symposium benefitted from those forays and the new connections that were made in those locations as attendance at Symposium ballooned in the mid-1980s.

In this next stage of the Symposium’s history (1981 to 1983), conference guidebooks and teaching syllabi for the symposiums appeared and have been an important source—alongside personal interviews—for this research.¹ Not only was a centralized leadership emerging but so was a formalization of the conference as more

¹ Warren Hastings thinks he was the first to put together a binder of all the materials for the conference, rather than have each of the teachers take care of their own materials. Warren Hastings, interview with Adam Perez, December 30, 2019.
than just a gathering of friends. Each of the conferences now included a formal guidebook and collection of teaching syllabi (sometimes one document and at other times two). These documents were necessary for participants to manage the increasing scale of the conference that could no longer be managed through informal verbal instructions during plenary sessions. While the 1980 conference in Santa Ana enjoyed over 160 participants (almost twice that of Findlay in 1979), over the next three years conference attendance more than quadrupled, with nearly nine hundred at the Pasadena meeting in 1983.

The ongoing development and decentralization of the conference beyond Latter Rain churches also precipitated an increase in the centralization of conference leadership. Though the conferences never did stray far from the fold, they did expand their fellowship beyond their earlier Latter Rain network. As the conference became more independent as an organization, it also required greater dependence on a few key leaders to maintain its continuity. Admittedly, those leaders still had pastoral oversight from well-known leaders within the Latter Rain network and were thus not entirely independent of their ecclesial structures. Nevertheless, the development of a centralized and semi-autonomous leadership garnered a new level of scrutiny from some Latter Rain pastors and “apostolic elders.”² Protective of the Latter Rain teachings, these elders

² Note that I mean the phrase “apostolic elder” in the technical sense used within Latter Rain (and later the New Apostolic Reformation), i.e. the Five-Fold ministry drawn from Ephesians 4.
regarded the theological education and practical exposition of Praise and Worship at the conferences as something potentially threatening—especially given the conferences’ growth in participants and breadth of influence. The result of that tension after the 1983 conference led to new contexts for the Symposium.

### 3.2.1 Symposium 1981: Shady Grove Church, Grand Prairie, Texas

By October of 1980, it had been announced in *Music Notes* that the fifth “National Music Leadership Conference, Symposium 1981” would be hosted by music minister Warren Hastings at Shady Grove Church in Grand Prairie, Texas.\(^3\) In a pattern that would continue throughout the 1980s, an advance party of conference teachers held a conference on site ahead of the annual conference. In this case, Mike Herron and LaMar Boschman led a music and worship workshop at Shady Grove in late 1980 that both previewed some of the conference material and built a base of support for the annual conference in midsummer 1981.\(^4\)

Though it welcomed Latter Rain teachers into its pulpit on the topic of Praise and Worship (among other things), Shady Grove did not self-identify as a Latter Rain church. Its members did, however, enjoy strong direct fellowship with and influence from Latter Rain churches that were leading in Praise and Worship at the time. In the late 1970s, the pastor, Olen Griffing, and Warren Hastings took trips to Charlotte Baker’s church in

---

\(^3\) See *Music Notes* 2.6 (December 1980): 1–2. Note that Pastor Olen Griffing’s name is not mentioned in that announcement.

\(^4\) *Music Notes* 2.6 (December 1980): 1–2.
Seattle\(^5\) as well as to Bible Temple in Portland.\(^6\) Hastings had also been present at both the 1979 and 1980 Symposia. But becoming a Symposium host did not mean one had to be an expert. In fact, an important aspect of the gatherings was that the diversity of individuals involved truly represented a “symposium” of ideas and teachings. Many people came to a Symposium as much to teach as to learn. Over successive years, Symposium attendees continued to experience a palpable sense that God was continuing to speak and reveal aspects of the restoration of the Tabernacle of David at these annual gatherings.\(^7\) Hastings’s and Olen Griffing’s stories evidence how becoming a host for Symposium did not mean one was an expert in this worship tradition. Instead, their stories show how the Symposium drew them and Shady Grove more deeply into this new mode of worship.

Warren Hastings (b. 1943) grew up the son of pastors and missionaries. After completing a season of military service in the late 1960s, being drafted into the military in 1967 and later discharged, he pursued his love for music and studied for his master’s degree in vocal performance. After graduating, he taught at a Church of God Bible

\(^5\) Charlotte Baker was pastor in Bellingham Washington at Glad Tidings Temple, started in 1954 as a church plant out of Layzell’s Glad Tidings in Vancouver. According to Hugh Layzell, Baker and Violet Kiteley had been overseeing a young people’s ministry in a downtown area of Vancouver. Once Reg Layzell noticed her leadership, he made her the leader of a small house church in Bellingham. She founded and pastored King’s Temple in Seattle, WA from 1963 onward. She moved to Plano, Texas around 1982 to found Fountain Gate Ministries, where Steve Griffing later joined her in ministry.


\(^7\) Steve Griffing, interview with Lester Ruth, Swee Hong, and Adam Perez, Oct 13, 2017.
college called Bay Ridge Christian College (a Bible college that trained pastors and
music ministers) in rural Texas. While teaching there in 1972, he received the baptism of
the Holy Spirit. After three years, he returned to school, this time to Southwestern Baptist
Theological Seminary (SWBTS) in Fort Worth, where he studied for a Doctor of Musical
Arts degree. During his time at SWBTS, he began leading worship for a Full Gospel
Businessmen’s group in Fort Worth, Texas where he met Olen Griffing. Olen Griffing
had previously attended the seminary as well and was similarly impacted by the
Charismatic Movement among some Baptists there. The connection warmed Hastings to
the idea of visiting Olen’s church, Shady Grove, in Grand Prairie, Texas. Tired from his
own studies, Hastings dropped out of the seminary (he had already completed his
doctoral coursework) and began teaching at Shady Grove Christian Academy. With his
training in music and in scripture from both Bible college and his doctoral work, he
incrementally involved himself in the music program for this two-hundred-person church.
The instrumentalists at the time included a pianist, a flutist, and about six guitarists all up
on the stage. Hastings joined the instrumental group and played the cornet that he had not
touched since grade school. In 1979, after a year and a half as a participant, he was asked
to move over from the school staff to the church staff in full-time music ministry.
Although Hastings preferred the term “worship pastor” to describe his ministry, the term
was confusing for congregants and he would often use “minister of music” or “music
director” instead. In this role, Hastings was in charge of making the musical selections for
worship. Popular choruses were the primary repertoire at the time, songs like “Hallelujah, Hallelujah,” “He is Lord,” and Laurie Klein’s “I Love You Lord.”

Shady Grove was Olen Griffing’s\(^\text{8}\) second pastorate after his career change from law enforcement in his twenties. When he started serving at Shady Grove in 1974, it was a Baptist church—true to his background as a pastor’s kid and his work at SWBTS. By the summer of 1975, Olen Griffing became entranced by the story of the Ark of the Covenant and its association with the presence of God. He eventually felt led to preach on the Tabernacle of Moses, and through the inspiration of and early popular book on praise, Merlin Carothers’s *Power in Praise* (1972), Shady Grove began to sing choruses and express more charismatic sensibilities. As a result, the Dallas Baptist Association severed its ties with the church. Through the recommendation of a church member, Olen Griffing found his way to Charlotte Baker’s King’s Temple church in Seattle\(^\text{9}\) for a camp meeting, and this is where he first encountered Latter Rain Praise and Worship. Griffing also began attending the annual meetings in 1976 of one of the large networks of Latter Rain-influenced churches in Southern California known as the Revival Fellowship. At

\(^\text{8}\) Note that Olen Griffing is not closely related to Barry and Steve Griffing.

\(^\text{9}\) Baker was part of the Latter Rain. She was an influential pastor among the International Worship Symposium leaders both for her prophetic ministry and for her emphasis on dance in worship. Originally, she was part of Layzell’s Glad Tidings Temple and had ministered alongside Violet Kiteley in Vancouver before being sent out by Layzell to establish a church in Bellingham, Washington.
those annual meetings, he was also exposed to the teachings of many major Latter Rain leaders.\(^{10}\)

But the experience at King’s Temple was especially impactful. It clarified in him a practical vision for a mode of worship that resonated with what he had been teaching about the Tabernacle. As a result of the visit, he wanted to move his church’s worship more in the direction of spontaneous worship. To help achieve this goal, Olen Griffing and Warren Hastings made a trip in early 1979 to Bible Temple, where they connected with Mike Herron and heard about the upcoming Symposium in Findlay later that year.\(^{11}\) Shady Grove had previously hosted itinerant worship leaders and teachers such as LaMar Boschman for an evening of worship and teaching in 1978. Boschman was perhaps one of the earliest itinerant worship leaders who originally came out of Layzell’s Glad Tidings Church in Vancouver and was very involved in the early Symposiums. Through these multiple levels of connections (King’s Temple, Revival Fellowship, Bible Temple, LaMar Boschman, Symposium 1979) the two continued to nurture the development of Praise and Worship at Shady Grove.

While attending the Findlay conference, Hastings remembers being most affected by the spontaneity and the musicians “playing under what they attributed to ‘the

\(^{10}\) For a lengthier account of Olen Griffing and Shady Grove’s relationship with the Charismatic movement as well as the Latter Rain network, see Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter three.

\(^{11}\) Olen became friends with Iverson and sought his advice from time to time but never formally became part of Iverson’s Minister’s Fellowship.
anointing of the Holy Spirit’” and by the related practice of the song of the Lord. Shady Grove’s worship had already included “singing in the Spirit,” which Hastings described as “singing softly in tongues just real gently, kind of to yourself, worshiping the Lord.” This led to a sense of revival around that time that steadily grew the church and led to it hosting other annual conferences for prophecy and for missions, positioning Shady Grove as a center for worship in the region. By the time of the 1981 Symposium, Shady Grove had been “doing all [they] knew how to do,” but the Symposium “kick-started” them.

The 1981 conference also saw the schedule grow to a new high of twenty elective sessions spanning the full gamut of Latter Rain worship ministry at the time, including both theological and practical sessions on dance and drama, the church orchestra (development and arranging), songwriting skills for choral music (both beginner and advanced), worship leading, using multi-media, vocal techniques, and theology of the restoration of David’s Tabernacle as a pattern for Praise and Worship. As we will see in the subsequent chapters, the restoration of the worship of David’s Tabernacle would become a critical lens for Praise and Worship at the Symposium.

The Symposium teachers were drawn from both the prior years’ participant pool, such as the Griffings, Dean Demos, LaMar Boschman, and Sam and Hazel Sasser of

---

12 Olen Griffing, interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, October 10, 2017.
13 Hastings, interview.
15 Because Dean Demos was supposed to be on the steering committee for the symposium, he was surprised to receive an invitation to attend the Shady Grove conference from Larry Dempsey—
The Rock Church in Virginia Beach, as well as other first-timers. Among those were Shady Grove members such as trumpet player Fletch Wiley, who taught orchestral arranging, and Jack Nation, who was on staff at Shady Grove and taught church administration. Notable newcomers included Robbie Carder, who was on staff with LaMar Boschman in Little Rock, Arkansas and Dan Gardner from Zion Evangelistic Temple (host of Symposium 1982).

As in previous years, the Symposium was coordinated primarily by the local hosts Warren Hastings and Olen Griffing. Hastings suspects that the majority of the estimated 350 participants came from the West Coast and Southern California, though Music Notes reported that twenty-three states were represented, along with Canada and Mexico (totaling 101 churches)—including 140 from Texas and another 100 from Kansas, Arkansas, and Missouri. Leading up to the conference, homestays were being organized for the participants, but at some point during the planning, the number of participants became too large for the church to accommodate in this way and hotels were used for the first time.

who apparently had not been at the steering committee at the time but was quickly rising into a leadership role. Unfortunately, this oversight alienated Demos, and he did not return to Symposium after the 1981 conference.

16 Notably, Fletch Wiley was associated with Andraé Crouch.

17 Though a steering committee had been developed prior to the 1981 Symposium, the planning and execution of this symposium seems to have sidestepped the committee and was functionally disbanded. See Demos, interview; Hastings, interview.
Graham Truscott and Charlotte Baker were two of the non-local participants and the keynote speakers for the event (aside from host pastor Olen Griffing). Truscott was a New Zealand native who had been a missionary in India for a time before pastoring a church in Southern California beginning in the 1970s. Truscott was becoming widely known at the time for his books *The Power of His Presence: The Restoration of the Tabernacle of David* and *Every Christian’s Ministry*, some of the earliest books that were foundational for Praise and Worship theology and practice. The impact that Charlotte Baker had on Olen Griffing’s experience of Praise and Worship made her a prime candidate for a keynote speaker slot. Baker’s church was known by this time for its “excellence in expressive worship,” and Baker herself was known for her prophecies, which she often delivered in narrative form as parables. One such prophetic parable became a highlight of the closing banquet at the conference. The other two evening events of the conference included a message by host pastor Olen Griffing and a musical drama titled “Lamb” that was led by the music department at Shady Grove. Another notable musical selection from the conference was Kirk Dearman’s song “We Bring the Sacrifice of Praise.” Dearman was a member of Shady Grove who assisted with Praise

19 Baker is also the author of what was then a popular book on praise and worship called *On Eagles’ Wings*. E. Charlotte Baker, *On Eagles’ Wings: A Book of Praise and Worship* (Seattle, WA: King’s Temple, 1979). See also my discussion in chapter four of the work of Todd Farley, who would act out her prophetic parables at the IWS.
and Worship leading at the church. The song became popular as a direct result of its popularity at Symposium 1981 and through the Symposium network’s influence—and not initially as a popular recording. The song soon become a mainstay of Praise and Worship, and held that spot more than a decade. Between the lyrics that describe the fundamental activity of Praise and Worship (bringing the sacrifice of praise) and its upbeat style, the song was often used to open worship services and later appeared as the opening track for a number of Praise and Worship recordings from a diversity of sources. Because of the huge demand for this song as a result of the Symposium, ZionSong distributed the sheet music with its next issue.

The conference at Shady Grove concluded in a somewhat surprising way: a closing banquet at Texas Stadium where five hundred gathered for dinner and Praise and Worship. The stadium was the home of the Dallas Cowboys’ professional football team, which was practicing on the field below the banquet area. The Cowboys’ owner, Clint Murchison, and his wife Anne were members of Shady Grove and very supportive of the worship ministry there. Anne Murchison’s experience in worship at the church even prompted her to compile a short book on worship titled Praise and Worship on Earth as

---

20 Music Notes 4, no. 1 (Fall 1981): 1. See a discussion of the song in Monique Ingalls, “‘Awesome in this Place,’” 88–89.
It is in Heaven, published the same year as the Symposium by the popular evangelical publisher, Word. The book is a short but wide-ranging exposition on the theology of Praise and Worship and was an early book publication on the topic for an evangelical publisher.

Though the song of the Lord was a central experience to the conference, another important element was powerful in framing Symposium musicians’ perspective on their roles and responsibilities. As I mentioned earlier, at the closing banquet, Charlotte Baker delivered one of her prophetic parables that was later titled “The Eye of the Needle.” The parable came during the time of worship and was accompanied on the piano by Shady Grove musician Kirk Dearman. The prophetic parable spoke of a music minister receiving various ministerial gifts from God and being caught up into a heavenly vision. Vacillating between the voice of God and the voice of Baker within the vision, the prophecy concluded by delivering a powerful injunction to the Symposium attendees to commit their gifts to God and not to use them simply to minister to men:

I have brought you together this day, to make unto you a choice. You can minister unto men and I will cause you to sway the hearts of men with your talent. Or, you

23 Anne Murchison, Praise and Worship: In Earth as It Is in Heaven (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1981). The book is somewhat of a hodgepodge of teaching material on praise and worship. Compared to other published materials at the time from Latter Rain teachers, it does not enjoy the same level of scriptural exegesis and instruction.

24 The text of the parable can be found in E. Charlotte Baker, The Eye of the Needle and Other Prophetic Parables (Hagerstown, PA: Parable Publications, 1997), 125–32. Judson Cornwall endorses her book by talking about her prophetic visions being able to reach the heart and paint a picture. The original recording is also available online, with Kirk Dearman’s improvised piano backing, at https://godfire.net/Audio/EyeOfTheNeedle.mp3.
can go through a very small gate, that is "the eye of the needle, the gate of worship," and while making new worshipers, you will minister unto the King of kings and Lord of lords!"

On one hand, the prophetic word implored Symposium attendees to shift their concept of ministry away from a prior Pentecostal or evangelical mode of music as a ministry to the hearts of others (typified by David playing for Saul) and towards the Praise and Worship mode where music is used to minister directly to God. Symposium teacher Janet Shell remembers that the parable was a turning point for many of the musicians as they reflected on their musical gifts and the goals of their ministry. Shell later described the experiencing, saying,

When the Lord began to tell us to put our instruments down and lay down our learning, I remember thinking, “This is serious. God is asking us to give everything up. We may never play again, we may never sing again… He is asking for everything.” You always go to the cross and give him everything but this felt different. This felt really tangibly real.

As Charlotte Baker continued to prophesy, musicians began to lay down their instruments—even prostrating themselves on the floor. Shell notes: “We were all crying so hard that we were gagging—it was not just like a little weeping, we were sobbing. It was incredible.” In that moment, Shell says she gave up everything in her life and music to God. Over the following years (and following from the promise of the prophetic word) God gave back to her almost everything she had laid down in that moment, but now in a transformed way. For example, she offered her instrumental talents to God and as a result “there was no more ‘horizontal playing’” for the pleasure of other people, only the
“totally vertical” playing for God’s pleasure. Shell described her experience using language familiar to those impacted by Latter Rain Praise and Worship: she compared herself to King David. “The more abundantly he praised God,” explained Shell, “the more abundantly God touched the people. The more abundantly you give to God the more he releases the power of his presence.”

25 For the Symposium attendees and for many others who later heard or read the “Eye of the Needle” prophetic parable, the moment deeply affected their sense of calling as musical worship leaders to be wholly devoted to congregational worship and not to the fame or money of becoming a music recording star or otherwise use their talents for their own gains. These commitments were implicitly sounded against the growing fame of contemporaneous music groups such as those musicians affiliated with Maranatha!’s Praise albums and others in the growing Contemporary Christian Music industry. The impact of this parable would continue to echo in the ears of Symposium’s leaders in the years to come.

3.2.2 Symposium 1982: Zion Evangelistic Temple, Detroit, Michigan

In its Fall 1981 issue, Music Notes announced that Pastor Leonard Gardner had accepted the Symposium steering committee’s invitation to host Symposium 1982 at Zion Evangelistic Temple.26 The steering committee also voted to extend the conference by one day and to designate two pastors from different parts of the country to support the

25 Shell, interview.
host pastor.\textsuperscript{27} The steering committee was an informal group of music ministers comprised of past Symposium hosts that dissolved quietly around 1982 as the growing amount of logistical responsibilities fell to Barry Griffing as “National Chairman” and Larry Dempsey as “National Secretary.”\textsuperscript{28} As with other conferences during this period, much of the planning fell to the music minister Daniel Gardner (Pastor Leonard Gardner’s son).

Unlike Shady Grove, Zion Evangelistic Temple was more in the mainstream of Latter Rain churches. Though they had been carrying the message of the Latter Rain for a long time, they had not carried it very far. Pastor Leonard Gardner was sent out in 1955 from Bethesda in Detroit to plant Zion Evangelistic Temple in the nearby suburb of Clawson, Michigan, just nine miles to the west of the new building that Bethesda built in Sterling Heights in 1951.\textsuperscript{29} As with other churches planted out of Bethesda, Zion Evangelistic Temple would earn its own respected status as a worshiping church in the 1970s and 1980s and would continue the emphasis on worship.\textsuperscript{30}

In the early years at Zion, Pastor Leonard Gardner’s wife played the piano and accompanied the worship, but the worship began to develop in a different direction when their son Daniel Gardner became involved in the ministry in 1980 as the full-time

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{27} Music Notes 3, no. 4 (Fall 1981): 1.
\bibitem{28} Symposium 1983, Syllabus, 1.
\bibitem{29} This section is constructed primarily from an interview with Dan Gardner unless otherwise noted. Dan Gardner, interview with Adam Perez, February 12, 2020.
\bibitem{30} Music Notes 3 no. 4 (Fall 1981): 1.
\end{thebibliography}
worship leader—a position in which he served for over thirty years. Daniel Gardner was born into Zion Evangelistic Temple in 1956, a year after his father began his work as a minister there. As a teenager, he grew in his love for music. He learned the guitar in school starting in the third grade and learned to play the piano later on from his mother. Daniel Gardner expressed his growing love for music by singing spontaneously from the Psalms, a practice that the Lord had put on his heart as a teenager. As his skills progressed both in music and in spontaneous song, he started leading worship for Wednesday night services at Zion. During this time, Daniel and his father began studying scripture on Praise and Worship and began to teach others about entering into worship by lifting one’s hands, an emphasis derived from one of the “seven Hebrew words for praise.” Musically, Dan credits the broader Charismatic movement of the 1970s in mainline denominational churches and across boundaries with initially introducing them to the “scripture songs” that were coming out in the 1970s, particularly David and Dale Garratt’s Scripture in Song book collections. For the Gardners, as with other churches beginning to move into Praise and Worship, it was more than the songs themselves but a new theology and practice of Praise and Worship. This new mode of worship shaped the way the songs were used in times of congregational singing and distinguished their worship from the Charismatic Movement and even from what was happening at Bethesda, their mother church.

Around that time, Zion Evangelistic Temple was branching out into greater spontaneity and ministry time in worship, unlike nearby Bethesda Missionary Temple,
whose worship was more “scripted and had open times of just singing extemporaneously”—practices that the Bealls inherited from very early on in the Latter Rain Revival. Gardner described the order of the opening time of worship in the mid-1970s at Bethesda as including two or three songs, followed by a time for prayer and receiving words of knowledge or receiving a healing, interspersed with song. But worship at Zion shifted from what they inherited from Bethesda as the Gardners began to gain an interest in the Tabernacle of David in the Old Testament and the ministry of worship as described there. It is unclear when, where, or how exactly the Gardners initially encountered or discovered the Tabernacle of David teaching. It is possible that echoes of it resounded through the Full Gospel Businessmen’s Association with which Leonard Gardner was intimately involved. Nevertheless, without any formalized teaching on the topic (yet), Dan turned to the Bealls for advice. The Bealls, in turn, directed him to the Symposium set to be held in Findlay, Ohio in 1979. Though the Bealls and Bethesda never adopted the Tabernacle of David theology at the heart of Symposium worship, they were sufficiently amenable to the teaching—and aware of the event—to recommend the Symposium as a site for ministerial growth to Dan Gardner, who was a young worship leader in his mid-twenties at the time. At the 1979 Symposium, the spontaneous songs by Mike Herron and others resonated deeply with Dan. His engagement must also have impressed other Symposium faculty as he returned to Symposium gatherings in 1980 and 1981 as a teacher.
By the time of Symposium 1982, Zion was a large church, gathering two thousand people in its three Sunday morning services. Like its parent church, Bethesda, so too had Zion moved into multiple modes of media including a TV program as well as congregational worship music albums with songs written by Dan.\(^{31}\) The church had also produced a musical on the Ark of the Covenant that had been filmed and was locally available. As with other emerging media in Latter Rain contexts, these productions were not available through national networks of Christian publishing but only by contacting the church directly.

Symposium 1982 featured another wave of growth in the size of the gathering to over 560 participants from over two hundred churches.\(^{32}\) Barry Griffing celebrated in *Music Notes* that the conference also saw an increase in the number of pastors and non-musical staff attending the Symposium: one out of every five delegates. Of the thirty-seven breakout sessions offered that year, at least three directly addressed the pastor-musician relationship in ministry (one of which was offered by Violet Kiteley).\(^{33}\) Kiteley also offered one of the evening messages, as did Moses Vegh. A special plenary session for the first time went beyond music and preaching to include a dramatic presentation by Jill Austin; her message about God as the “Master Potter” was accompanied by her spinning a clay pot on stage.

\(^{31}\) See *Songs of Zion*, vols. 1–3 published by Zion Evangelistic Temple during the 1980s.
\(^{32}\) *Music Notes* 4, no.3 (Fall 1982): 1.
In general, the conference featured speakers who had already become regulars at the Symposium: Dean Demos, Warren Hastings, LaMar Boschman, Janet Shell, and others. However, an apparent cancellation from regular presenter Sam Sasser opened up the opportunity for Jim Gilbert of the musical group Living Sound (out of Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, Oklahoma) to present on music in missions behind the Iron Curtain.34 This connection was important because it helped pave the way for a later Symposium at Oral Roberts University. Other delegates from Tulsa were also present: Dan Amstutz, who helped direct chapel music and worship at Oral Roberts University, and Billy Joe Daugherty of Victory Christian Center (a church that met on ORU’s campus). It also instigated a chain reaction that had an impact on the formation of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music, the most important recording company for Praise and Worship music, founded in 1985 (a case study of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music is featured in chapter five).

In what was easily the height of professionalism in the use of drama at the Symposium, Zion offered a lengthy evening musical called “David,” written by Dan Gardner and Truman Kelly. The musical re-enacted many scenes from the life of King David, highlighting especially the return of the Ark to the Temple in Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 13). In advance of the Symposium, the production had run for four

34 See hand-written notes on Hastings’ 1982 syllabus, courtesy of Warren Hastings. Sasser’s sessions are crossed out, and on one of those sessions Jim Gilbert’s information is scribbled in the margins.
consecutive nights at the church. Everything about it was lavish. *Music Notes* described it as “Wagnerian in scope” with at least 150 in the choir and orchestra and dozens in the cast (who were all church members). The cost of the production of this dramatic musical performance was estimated at $16,000 at the time, $5,000 of which was dedicated to the two-story set.\(^{35}\) The set was designed by Truman Kelly, a recent convert to the church from New York City who had performed professionally for a few years in off-Broadway productions. The set was built by a church member who was a carpenter and who donated both his time and the lumber for the construction. The costumes came in at around $3,000. Dan Gardner wrote all the music with choir and orchestral accompaniment,\(^{36}\) and all of the actors came from within the church. The entire performance lasted four hours (with an intermission).\(^{37}\)

The performance of “David” at Symposium 1982 demonstrates in part the central fascination of Symposium theology with the role of David and the restoration of the worship of the Tabernacle. The musical did not simply exegete the story for congregants but embodied the story and wove together the practices of Praise and Worship in a telling of the biblical narrative central to Praise and Worship theology. The musical also

\(^{35}\) Estimated to be valued at approximately $43,000 in 2020, adjusted for inflation.

\(^{36}\) One of the most memorable songs from the musical, “Come Sing a New Song of David” was later featured on an Integrity *Hosanna!* Music tape (HM-0010), “Praise and Honor,” with Dan Gardner leading. That album also featured Marty Nystrom’s famous song “As the Deer.” Though the album advertises itself as being recorded live at Zion, Gardner says he recorded it in Brooks’ studio in St. Louis.

\(^{37}\) The performance was also revived two years later and recorded. That video is now available online at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AnMwzNQOo-c](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AnMwzNQOo-c).
demonstrates the openness among Symposium-affiliated churches to the broader integration of the arts with Praise and Worship (see chapter four). In addition to the way it attempted to realize the theological vision of Praise and Worship, it also went beyond simply the sharing of the songs themselves. The songs were embedded within the larger visual and narrative context of the biblical story that provided an interpretative and imaginative frame for the participants. The musical included moments for congregational participation in the Praise and Worship of the characters on stage. Though the production of Christian musicals was common within a range of churches (including Latter Rain ones like Shiloh Christian Fellowship), “David” went much further in the way it created an opportunity for its viewers to become participants. In almost every way this performance was not only technically excellent for a church production but logistically challenging to replicate in other churches, given the scale and that it relied on Zion’s particular mix of professional skills. Nevertheless, it made enough of an impact on the imagination of Symposium worshipers that elements from it were reproduced at one of the evening worship sessions at Symposium 1983.

3.2.3 Symposium 1983: Pasadena City College and Living Waters Christian Fellowship

Symposium 1983 took place at Living Waters Christian Fellowship, a church under the leadership of Pastors Willard and Ione Glaeser and music minister, David
Fischer\(^{38}\) (who would later become the head pastor). Ione Glaeser and her husband Willard started fellowship at Living Waters of churches affiliated with the Latter Rain Revival in 1960 that met annually, and the church was a “seed bed of revival” in the late 1970s through the 1980s.\(^{39}\) In particular, it was a center of activity for large Restoration Revival pastors’ conferences in that period at which leading ministers in the Latter Rain movement gathered.

By the time of Symposium 1983, David Fischer had become a mainstay of the Symposium’s teachers. Originally from Corpus Christi, Texas, Fischer grew up in Pasadena, California. He graduated from Stanford University, and then pursued theological education for a year at Fuller Seminary and another year at Princeton Theological Seminary before becoming involved in the Charismatic movement. As a result of his conversion, he returned home and in 1965 began attending Living Waters, pastored by the Glaesers.\(^{40}\) Because of his background in theology, Fischer was asked to join the staff of the Living Word Bible College as its Dean in 1971, the Bible college

\(^{38}\) See Joannah R. Glaeser, “Enhancing Worship Understanding through Historical Reflection at Living Waters Christian Fellowship, Pasadena, California” (Doctor of Worship Studies Thesis, Robert E. Webber Institute for Worship Studies, 2007). The project was designed to preserve the history and theology of Living Waters Christian Fellowship and for use in catechesis.

\(^{39}\) The fellowship had members including Reg Layzell, David Schoch, Myrtle Beall, Ernest Gentile, and Charlotte Baker. See Joannah R. Glaeser, “Enhancing Worship,” 111, 143.

\(^{40}\) The Church was originally called Living Waters Tabernacle and was located in Monterrey Park before moving to Pasadena at a later date.
affiliated with Living Waters church. He also joined the pastoral team in 1978, then became senior pastor in 1988.41

Willard and Ione Glaeser’s welcome letter to Symposium 1983 features a logo design for the first time, a sign of the growth in the scale and budget of what was called, for the final time, the “National Music Symposium.”42 The logo stylized the word “Symposium” by using downward strokes from the stems of the letters to form the stems of musical notes. Those stems beneath the words end in note heads on three lines and spaces, invoking a musical staff. Not just any notes, the pitch relationship between them—accompanied by the stylization—invokes the famous four-note opening choral motif from the Hallelujah Chorus of Handel’s “Messiah” (see Figure 3.1).

41 David Fischer and Barry Griffing, interview with Lester Ruth.
42 Note that “leadership” is dropped from the title, though no mention of the rationale for the choice is indicated. Possibly it was incidental, but more likely it was intentional.
In another first, the guidebook included brief, self-reflective information about the conference for attendees, including a description of the Symposium’s purpose; a brief history and timeline of conferences, its locations, dates, and leaders; and a description of its organizational model. The inclusion of this information provides a strong indication that the Symposium was attracting enough newcomers that this information needed to be disseminated formally; word of mouth was no longer sufficient. As it turned out, the Symposium’s steering committee had been functionally dissolved (though no mention of

---

that is announced in any materials) and the Symposium 1983 guidebook refers to Barry Griffing as the National Chairman and Larry Dempsey as National Secretary of the Symposium. Though sponsored by Living Waters Christian Fellowship, the conference was held at the Pasadena City College (approximately one mile away) to accommodate the estimated nine hundred registered delegates. Those delegates were greeted at their first gathering by Mrs. Loretta Thompson-Glickman, the Mayor of Pasadena, before a musical presentation by Living Waters Temple and a message by Paul Garlington of Rochester, New York. The daytime schedule featured a mix of forty-four different breakout sessions as well as multiple plenary sessions throughout the day. The conference activities concluded each night with an evening “worship rally” and keynote speaker. Other evening sessions included ministry by Charlotte Baker, Jack Hayford, and host pastor Ione Glaeser.

The Pasadena Symposium was an important launching pad for the message of Praise and Worship for many beyond the original Latter Rain context. That diversification and extension happened both through the presenters and attendees. The conference program reveals that the core classes on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David, the Latter Rain revival, and the theology of Praise and Worship were still taught by core Symposium faculty more deeply embedded in the Latter Rain network. Indeed, the centrality of the message of the Tabernacle of David for the restoration of Praise and

\[44\] *Music Notes* 5.3 (1983), 1.
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Worship was increasingly prominent in the conference schedule. Yet some locals and newcomers contributed on topics like how to revitalize your church choir and the use of sound systems.

Among the important local participants at the Symposium was Jack Hayford. Hayford, pastor of the Church on the Way in nearby Van Nuys, led the Wednesday evening “Worship Rally” in Pasadena City College’s Sexson Auditorium. Though Hayford was a minister in the Foursquare Gospel denomination, he nimbly crossed into many different ecclesial contexts as a conference speaker and preacher, especially Pentecostal and evangelical denominations and groups.45 His presence and popularity in the region may have contributed to the large evening gatherings that year, estimated to be in excess of 1,600.46 Hayford brought with him the choir from Church on the Way and, as part of an evening plenary session, they performed Hayford’s recent song “Majesty” as part of a larger musical production by the same name. Though the song had already been circulating by this time, this event helped to extend its reach and popularity.47

Other notable attendees from the conference included a larger delegation from Tulsa, Oklahoma and the Word of Faith-associated leaders who were geographically centered there. Some of them had heard about the conference from Jim Gilbert and Dan

45 For more on Hayford and his impact, see chapter five.
47 See also my discussion in chapter five on the origins of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music and Tom Brooks’s attendance at Symposium 1983 where he heard this song for the first time.
Amstutz in 1982. Also in attendance was the choir director and chair of the music department at the time from Oral Roberts University, Macon Delevan. Delevan would be credited with arranging for the use of ORU’s music department space for Symposium 1984. Tom Brooks and Don Moen were also in attendance and would later pioneer the early recording projects of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music.\(^\text{48}\) Popular evangelist Terry Law was also with them and attended Dean Demos’ class on the “Vow of Praise: The Worshipper’s Devotional Life.” Demos’s teaching later made it directly into one of Law’s books on Praise and Worship.\(^\text{49}\) Dan Amstutz also brought with him Pastor Bob Yandian from Grace Fellowship, and Jim Hart, who worked with the orchestra and wrote musical arrangements\(^\text{50}\) for the church. Billy Joe Daugherty at Tulsa’s Victory Christian Fellowship was also there with David Grothe, his music director. They were in attendance not simply to enjoy the times of powerful Praise and Worship, but to encounter it and learn its theology for the first time. Within the Word of Faith community, these were significant churches and leaders to whom others in the network looked—even more so when they hosted Symposium the following year (1984).

\(^{48}\) Note that the first Hosanna! Music tape is orchestrated and recorded by Brooks the same year as he attends the symposium and features “Majesty” as the opening track

\(^{49}\) Dean Demos, e-mail correspondence, July 16, 20. According to Demos, it was included without attribution. Although he noted it, Demos included this point to say how he was pleased that the teaching was out there and impacting others’ lives.

\(^{50}\) Jim Hart has an undergraduate degree from Oral Roberts in sacred music and a master’s degree in music from Tulsa University. Jim quickly became involved in Symposium, began to provide arrangements for Symposium worship, and eventually became its music director. He is now the director of the Robert E. Webber Institute for Worship Studies, a major center for graduate education in worship studies. Jim Hart, interview with Adam Perez, February 11, 2020.
The printed materials for Symposium 1983 reveal the increasing complexity and professionalization of Symposium logistics. With multiple pages of maps, registration instructions, scheduling information, and other logistical details, it is clear that organizing Symposium had become much more involved than in years past where facilitating homestays and inviting speakers were the primary logistical responsibilities. For Symposium 1983, organizers rented Pasadena City College’s facilities, arranged shuttles to and from the airport, coordinated multiple mass housing opportunities were coordinated, and more. It was clear this event could no longer be conceived of in the same way as past years’ events.

With their connections growing and beginning to extend beyond the Latter Rain community, Symposium 1983 was a transitional event in the life of the Symposium. Though the local church hosts were still highly involved in 1983, Symposium planning began to require a dedicated staff for planning in addition to pastoral or ecclesial oversight. As we will see, the nature of pastoral oversight and Symposium planning would take on new forms in the following years as Symposium continued to move beyond the local church—eventually growing to the point that only convention centers had sufficient capacity.

3.2.4 Section Conclusion and Internal Conflict

The Pasadena Symposium was a transitional event in another way. The end of the 1983 Symposium saw a conflict that fractured the Symposium community. The conflict emerged out of exegetical disagreements over the emerging practices associated with the
Tabernacle of David. As Symposium insider Dean Demos described the situation, it was a kind of “Acts 15” council with a group of leaders at the top of the apostolic pecking order within the Latter Rain confronting IWS leadership on what was being taught and practiced. Dick Iverson and Moses Vegh were among those who came to address what they saw as diverging from the scriptural warrant on Tabernacle worship.

The theology of Praise and Worship was not some esoteric issue to be resolved but entangled in the leadership models of the Latter Rain that were also theological in nature. In fact, the issue of a theological conflict was organically connected in Latter Rain doctrine to leadership because the alignment of one’s pastoral leadership under a recognized apostolic leader was critical to the validity of one’s ecclesial gatherings. So, because these particular Latter Rain leaders felt that IWS had diverged theologically, they attempted to re-align the leadership through apostolic oversight.

The theological conflict for “the Brethren” had one overarching theme that was expressed in two concrete issues. In general, the first concern was that this message of Praise and Worship was being divorced from the core Latter Rain doctrine, in particular the importance of the laying on of hands as a pre-requisite to receiving the gift of

---

51 Note that the position of “Apostle” was a formal ecclesial title and the one with the most ecclesial authority within the “Five-Fold” ministry pattern derived from Ephesians 4:11. Thus, Apostles were seen to be some of the “highest ranking,” if you will, apostles within the network who had other apostles underneath them. To describe it another way, these were seen as the leaders to whom other leaders were accountable in this ecclesial context. Though there is some overlap with the Shepherding Movement, this is distinct from that. The apostolic structure is an enduring pattern today known widely as the New Apostolic Reformation.
prophecy. Steve Griffing has confirmed that this aspect had been all but removed from IWS teaching.  

The second concern had to do with the meaning of the restoration of the Tabernacle of David in Amos 9, and in particular with the use of pageantry, banners, choreography, and other visual elements in worship. On one side were Pastors Dick Iverson and Moses Vegh. The Iverson/Vegh camp argued that the correct interpretation of the teaching on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David was in the latter part of the verse in question: “so that the residue of men would seek the Lord.” For them, the presence of God in worship that was being restored was for the sake of “the gentiles” and the purposes of evangelism. Iverson’s perspective on the matter was that choreographed dance (individual or group) were peripheral to the central message of Praise and Worship in the Psalms. As Warren Hastings summarized the issue: the Symposium was seen to be “getting off on a tangent” with the growing emphasis on the bodily and visual elements in worship. Iverson and others saw dance as appropriate only as a spontaneous and informal congregational practice.

On the other side were Larry Dempsey, the Griffing Brothers, and some of the women pastoral leaders who had championed the IWS. The conflict, as Dean Demos described it, was around the fact that Symposium leaders took the Amos 9 verse to mean a restoration of all the practices of Tabernacle worship as evidenced in scripture,

---

52 Steve Griffing, interview with Ruth, Lim, and Perez, 2017.
53 See Mike Herron, interview with Adam Perez, February 19, 2020.
54 Hastings, interview.
especially dance and pageantry. Indeed, in the coming years that emphasis would be expanded even further to include the use of mime troupes and ballet. But because the conflict was both theological and ecclesial, a third issue may have played a contributing factor: some of “the Brethren” were not supportive of women pastors in general who had among the Symposium’s most vocal and central pastoral supporters.55

55 Though women pastors were accepted throughout pentecostalism at all levels of ministry, they were still subject to sexism that challenged and questioned their authority. For an exposition, see a sermon to a gathering of Pentecostal women by Fuchsia Pickett (a pastoral leader among the IWS network) outlining her theological position and personal experience in ministry “GÔD Puts Women In The Ministry” by Dr. Fuchsia Pickett, (c. 1980s), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wMxUKsLX9ws, accessed July 1, 2020. Janet Shell recounts a prophecy given to her by Pickett, in which the latter said, “there are gonna be a lot of times when they get down on you as a woman, I [God] am going to get you in the door with music and then you release the gifts and blow them away.” Janet Shell, interview. Fuchsia’s 1994 book The Next Move of God (Lake Mary, FL: Creation House, 1994), was endorsed by high-profile individuals within charismatic pentecostalism: Stephen Strang (media mogul who acquired Charisma and Christian Life magazines, and later Integrity Music), Oral Roberts, Myles Munroe, Iverna Tompkins (sister of Judson Cornwall), and others.
Women pastors had been at the core of Symposium church’s leadership and message: Rev. Violet Kiteley, Charlotte Baker, Fuchsia Pickett, Tornpkins and even the 1983 conference host, Ione Glaeser. Charlotte Baker in particular was a champion of expressive movement, dance, and the visual arts. To clarify, it was not simply that these men did not respect the leadership of these women outright. Longtime orchestra teacher at the Symposium Janet Shell, for example, testified that she had never personally experienced strife based on gender in these contexts. Rather, it was totally normal for her that these “pioneering, strong, powerful women” were in positions of leadership. “Anytime these women ministered,” said Shell, “they had such authority [and it was] authenticated by their demonstration of gifts and the leadership.”\[58\] Nevertheless it

\[56\] According to her book, The Next Move of God, Fuchsia Pickett (1919–2004) was born in Virginia and raised in North Carolina. She studied at John Wesley College and Virginia Bible College, has an earned doctorate in theology and a doctorate in divinity. She taught in Bible colleges for over forty years and pastored for twenty-seven years. In 1959 she became seriously ill, was miraculously healed, and subsequently baptized in the Holy Spirit. She traveled as a conference evangelist and teacher until 1966, when she joined the faculty at a Bible college in Texas. In 1971, she founded Fountain Gate Ministries, an interdenominational church, pre-school, academy, and college, as well as a tape-lending library, video extension program, radio program, and weekly television ministry. In 1988, she returned to traveling and conference speaking, based out of Blountville, TN. See Pickett, The Next Move of God, 182–183. She died in 2004. Pickett was joined in her ministry at Fountain Gate by Charlotte Baker and Steve Griffing at some point in the 1980s. Pickett was also an important influence on other leaders like Myles Munroe and Judson Cornwall. Cf. Matthew Green, “A Teacher and a Mother [Obituary],” Ministrytodaymag.com (published Feb. 29, 2004).

\[57\] Iverna Tompkins was an itinerant minister and author. She was also the sister of popular Praise and Worship speaker and Symposium guest Judson Cornwall.

\[58\] Shell, interview.
was suspected by some that the aspect of gender in leadership contributed to the conflict.\textsuperscript{59}

In addition to the complicating factor of gendered leadership, a bit of jealousy may also have factored into the confrontation: the Symposium was beginning to draw crowds of pastors and music ministers that were much larger than the pastors’ conferences that these men were hosting.\textsuperscript{60} The Symposium’s scale threatened the leadership position and authority of these dissenting pastors among Latter Rain churches. Thus, their independent authority within the Latter Rain ecclesial context to oversee such an influential gathering was suspicious at best. Back at Shiloh in Oakland, even Rev. David Kiteley urged Steve to “play ball” with them for fear that their influence could unravel the gains the Symposium had made for the message of the restoration of Praise and Worship and its leaders.

To resolve this troubling cocktail of concerns, Iverson and Vegh suggested that the Symposium submit more directly to “the Brethren.” But with staunch and fierce

\textsuperscript{59} Of course, there are also a number of important women, such as Aimee Semple McPherson and Kathryn Kuhlman, who were pioneers in the history American Pentecostalism. So too among the pioneers of the Latter Rain: Reg Layzell’s own associate minister (and later his successor) was a woman named Maureen Gaglardi. Layzell’s public reflections on this very topic were published in the Chilliwack, British Columbia press in 1976, which profiled the church. Reflecting on the “biblical order” of authority, Layzell says he has “not been a strong believer in woman pastors.” The journalist summarizes that his beliefs follows from his commitment to the “biblical order” of authority that “should be Christ, then men, then women.” Though Layzell’s comments are not surprising given his context at the time, Layzell rebutted himself saying, “But God has his exceptions for everything and B. Maureen Gaglardi is one of those exceptions.” Reg Layzell, [no title], \textit{The Chilliwack Progress} (Chilliwack, British Columbia, Canada), January 7, 1976: 25. \textsuperscript{60} Steve Griffing, interview, 2017.
defenders from their women pastoral leaders (in addition to support from pastors George Rohrig, Willard Glaeser, and others), the Symposium leaders stayed their course. Larry Dempsey in particular voiced for the group his confidence in the Symposium’s work and their rejection of this proposal. The result was that fellowship between these churches was fractured and Iverson purportedly circulated over two thousand letters discouraging others from attending the Symposium in light of the above-mentioned doctrinal concerns.61

It is notable, I think, that the concern over the use of the dance in worship was seen as an issue important enough to warrant a break in fellowship. What it reveals is that though music was a central practice to Praise and Worship, it was situated among an assortment of associated practices of Tabernacle-derived worship. These other practices of worship were not seen as second-rate, either for the IWS leaders who affirmed them or for the other leaders who did not.

Despite the break with such an important church in the Latter Rain network, the Symposium continued to grow in its scope and influence as it was propelled into new networks. In particular, the presence and influence of the contingent from Word of Faith churches in Tulsa buoyed the potential losses from the break in fellowship with Iverson and others. This meant that Herron and some affiliates of Bible Temple and leaders loyal to Iverson no longer attended or supported the conference. Perhaps related to the break in

fellowship, Bible Temple began hosting their own regional conference specifically for music ministers apart from their pastoral conference around the same time. Thus, the *Northwest Music Ministers Conference* was led by Mike Herron, Tim Smith, and a newer staff member, Howard Rachinski. They continued to teach much of the same material on the theology and practice of Praise and Worship (including the song of the Lord) but with a notable lack of emphasis on the broader range of the arts associated with the Tabernacle of David theology. Though the break in fellowship had a devastating impact on some of the fellowship that had developed between these leaders, the break may have been fortuitous for the Symposium events as it helped propel the Symposium’s message of Praise and Worship onto a larger and more diverse stage among Pentecostals over the subsequent years.

3.3 Section Two: The Mature Years: 1984–1989

The early 1980s—especially 1983—became a launching pad for the IWS’s independence from local church hosts. Pasadena was a cliff and they had arrived at the edge. Stepping off the edge meant, on one hand, that the conference would no longer stand only on the platform of Latter Rain ecclesial communities on whose support the IWS had been building over the previous seven years. On the other hand, the conference could now plunge wholeheartedly into new arenas of Pentecostal community and extend its reach and influence far beyond its Latter Rain roots.

The steady growth that the Symposium saw in the early 1980s continued as it moved into new contexts, nearly tripling in size by its peak in 1986. As I will show in this
section, the Symposium’s growth was a result of its intentional moves into new ecclesial networks each year. This is signaled not only by attendance numbers but by geographic moves (1) to the large Word of Faith network through Oral Roberts University in 1984, (2) to the East coast and the broader charismatic renewal movement at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh in 1985, (3) to Washington, DC in 1986, and (4) to destination settings in 1987–1988. By the end of the 1980s, however, the wind in the sails of Symposium’s large-scale events faltered and the IWS returned to local churches in 1989.

In this second half of the chapter, I begin by discussing the continuity and change associated with the Symposium’s transition into the mid-1980s and the significance of its naming practices as the IWS developed up to 1984. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to describing the Symposia from 1984 to 1989 and the diverse geographic and ecclesial networks into which it continually moves.

After Symposium 1983, the Symposium saw a mix of continuity and change as it moved into new contexts. The moves in both the 1984 and 1985 conference were held at gateway sites to much larger movements in both functional and symbolic ways. As with 1983, the conference continued to attract so many participants that local churches did not have the facilities to accommodate the number of concurrent breakout sessions required by the schedule. The university settings allowed for both plenty of classroom space as well as large auditorium spaces that could accommodate the scale of orchestra and performance arts. Oral Roberts University (ORU) in 1984 was a gateway to visibility in the Word of Faith movement. Duquesne University in 1985 was the site of significant
charismatic renewal movement meetings and the original site of a meeting in 1966 that is credited with being the flashpoint of the Catholic charismatic renewal. Duquesne hosted the first national IWS conference on the East Coast and that fact brought with it a level of unprecedented accessibility—and powerful Praise and Worship experiences—to churches in that region.

Admittedly, the IWS was not as well represented on the East Coast of the United States as it was on the West Coast or even in the Midwest. Though 1986 would see a large conference in Washington DC, there was not as strong a network of churches there. A few churches were scattered across the coast that enjoyed connections, such as Rock Church (pastors Anne and John Gimenez) and First Assembly of God (pastor Wally Odum) in Virginia Beach, Evangel Temple (pastor John Meares) in Washington DC, and Elim Bible Institute further north in Rochester, New York (where Bob Sorge was employed). Elim Bible Institute in particular was an important site. As a Bible college whose worship was influenced by the Bealls and Bethesda Missionary Temple, it had been hosting worship conferences for some time. Nevertheless, the IWS’s network on the East coast was strengthened by Barry Griffing’s move to Delaware in 1983. Following his sense of God’s calling, Barry left his ministerial role at Shiloh in Oakland, California

---

and became pastor of a small church there. Barry also began advertising a Newark, Delaware P.O. Box number as the “IWS East Coast Office.” The IWS West Coast Office was addressed to David Fischer’s Living Waters Church in Pasadena, California.

That the Symposium could exist equally comfortably in Latter Rain, Word of Faith, Catholic Charismatic, and other diverse ecclesial settings shows the success of the message of the restoration of Praise and Worship and the power of the experience of Praise and Worship. To the credit of its pioneers, the message of the restoration of Praise and Worship was embedded in a message of unity across the church—similar to the deep hopes of the broader Charismatic movement within denominational churches at the time. Praise and Worship was believed to be an avenue by which the unity of the church could be achieved. The 1984 Symposium syllabus offered an articulation of that hope:

[The IWS is] an annual transdenominational gathering of pastors, chief musicians, and worshipers from throughout the world for the express purpose of exalting Jesus Christ as Lord, thereby strengthening the unity of The Church in the earth in these great days of Revival, Restoration, and Visitation.

If the growth of churches moving into Praise and Worship was any indication, their hopes were being fulfilled. It is significant that though the role of music and the arts were

---

63 During Barry Griffing’s transition in the fall of 1983, he ministered at a conference at Elim Bible Institute and met Bob Johnson—Elim’s founder Ivan Q. Spencer had picked up the revival from Beall and Bethesda in Detroit. The host of the conference was Bob Sorge, and another keynote was Dean Demos of Findlay, Ohio. Bob became a key contributor in the work of Symposium and with ZionSong. In fact, Johnson even invited Sorge to minister at his Assemblies of God church in Rockaway. Johnson would become a key leader and organizer, despite his recent introduction to Latter Rain worship.

64 Syllabus, 1984: 1.
central to the worship of the Symposium, they continually centered these larger goals to which Praise and Worship was aimed, i.e., “Revival, Restoration, and Visitation” in a fundamentally ecumenical way. All the music, dance, and pageantry of Praise and Worship were simply means to that more important eschatological end (albeit very important biblical and ecclesial means).

Beyond Symposium’s logistical, geographic, and ecclesial changes, a transition of the name of the conference that happened in 1984 and lasted for the rest of the Symposium’s life reveals an important set of changes occurring in the Symposium context in the mid-1980s. I first address the significance of the name change from “National” to “International” before turning to the shift from “music” to “worship.”

Up through 1983, the name of the Symposium event lacked standardization. It began with no formal name at its first meeting in 1977 and 1978. Then, Moses Vegh named the event at Hope Temple the Song of the Lord Symposium in 1979. By 1981 it was called the National Music Leadership Conference and, by 1983, the National Music Symposium. Finally, it was named the International Worship Symposium, a name that endured through the remainder of the 1980s and into the 1990s.65 The emergence of a

65 In a curious change, the dating of the conference shifted. While the 1981 conference is advertised as the fifth annual, the 1984 conference is advertised as the seventh annual. The numbering was absent from 1982 and 1983. Consequently 1985 was listed as the eighth annual, and so on. The shift in dating puts the conference roots to Shiloh in 1978 rather than Bible Temple in 1977. Simultaneously, Bible Temple begins its own regional conferences in 1982. The timing is coincidental given the conflict over leadership and fellowship in 1983, though of course that does not necessarily indicate that the date change was intended to revise the origin of Symposium.
name for the event at all signals its growing independence from being a gathering that
was internal to Latter Rain churches. Many church-based gatherings had been happening
for decades without garnering their own identity independent of the host church or
pastoral leader with whom the meetings were associated. The closest things to an
organization among Latter Rain churches at the time was perhaps the Revival Fellowship
or Bible Temple’s Northwest Minister’s Conference which, unlike the Symposium, was
as much a signal of mutual affiliation and shared theological vision as it was an event.

The initial naming of the scale of the conference as “national” was as descriptive
as it was aspirational. Describing the events as “national” intended to distinguish it from
the local or regional gatherings and elevate the status of this singular annual event. Take
for example an event described in the October 1980 issue of *Music Notes*. The issue
describes a prophetic vision delivered by Mike Herron at Symposium 1980. After the
prophetic word through Herron that revival fire would spread across the US and Canada
and that local congregations would be set ablaze with “zealous worship,”

[Herron] then outlined an imaginary map of the United States on the platform of
Living Faith Church and asked the delagates [sic] to gather in the vicinity of their
state, where upon he and some of the other ministry prayed and laid hands on the
“torch-bearers.”

In the following years, *Music Notes* continued to publish news and testimonies of
worship changes in local churches, including local and regional conferences. The

Symposium was also equipping attendees to do the work of leading regional worship events by teaching classes on how to start one, including how to handle budgeting and marketing. Indeed, a number of the churches involved in the Symposium had begun leading their own worship conferences in addition to the annual (national) Symposium, among them Living Waters, Shady Grove, Hope Temple, and Bible Temple. Rather than view these smaller scale events as competition, the National Symposium saw them as important opportunities for furthering their mission of the restoration of Praise and Worship nationwide. As I will discuss in the section on Symposium 1986, there were also nationalistic and Zionist undertones in these hopes.

The name change to “International” in 1984 likewise was descriptive as much as it was aspirational. Admittedly, the Symposium had technically been international since its inception in 1977 with the presence of Doug Moody from Glad Tidings in Vancouver and others. Among the faculty, Jim Gilbert was the only faculty member whose teaching was international in scope, especially on the question of music and worship in missions. Sam Sasser too had been a missionary in Micronesia, though he typically taught Bible knowledge courses there and does not appear to have taught topics related to doing ministry or Praise and Worship in international settings. With the sparse publication of Music Notes in 1984 and 1985 (before ceasing altogether), there is no further

67 See, for example, Larry Dempsey “How to Plan a Music/Worship Conference in Your Local Church,” Symposium Syllabus, 1982: 49ff.
contemporaneous reflection regarding the descriptive value of the change beyond the growing sense of scope. To put it simply, the next biggest designation beyond “national” was “international.”

The aspirational element of the name change reflected not so much a change in mission—from thinking provincially about the United States to thinking globally—but a change in their sense of the international platform from which they were poised to influence Praise and Worship more broadly. The international mindset of missions, for example, in Latter Rain teachings was present at the headwaters. That was reproduced in the strong concern for global missions among the many Bible colleges that were attached to Symposium-affiliated churches (and trained many missionaries). Beginning in the mid-1980s, Symposium teachers led local and regional Symposiums globally, with a special concentration on Latin America and Southeast Asia. This growing sense of platform for the IWS linked up with another globally-minded institution like ORU and the Word of Faith movement in 1984 only supported that transition.

The shift in the event’s title from “music” to “worship” is also a notable development. For many years, the Symposium had been teaching a curriculum on worship that was broader than music (though music played a central role). In fact, one of the widely lauded teachings on Praise and Worship had been delivered by Sam Sasser on the “seven Hebrew words for praise” in scripture, which described a more all-
encompassing vision than merely music. As I have noted above, music was a critically important element of Praise and Worship for the Symposium’s attendees, especially through the early centrality of the singing of spontaneous “songs of the Lord.” In addition to that practice, many of the other worship practices at the Symposium (dance, hand-signing, drama, etc.) were musically mediated or, at the very least, accompanied by music. However, Steve Griffing (and others) had been teaching that whenever one came across the biblical language of singing or music-making, one could assume that three elements were implied: singing, instrumental accompaniment, and dancing. Given that the Symposium was moving into an even heavier emphasis on the performance arts, the name change prepared the ground for a more expansive set of tabernacle-derived Praise and Worship practices.

With the changes in the name also came a formal change in the leadership structure in 1984 to include five co-directors: Barry Griffing and Larry Dempsey (who are credited officially as chairman and secretary in 1983), now alongside David Fischer, Steve Griffing, and Dan Gardner. The following year, that number was reduced to four as Gardner no longer participated in the leadership team.

---

68 Shell, interview.
70 Dan Gardner would only be formally listed for one year as a co-director.
3.3.1 Symposium 1984: Oral Roberts University, Tulsa, Oklahoma

The 1984 Symposium in Tulsa, Oklahoma was attended by “over 1,100 worshiping pastors, music directors, church singers and musicians, dancers, and song leaders.”\(^{71}\) The majority of the conference was held in the music department facilities at Oral Roberts University that made available plenty of appropriate space for both musical

\(^{71}\) Music Notes 1985, vol. 1: 1
and dance performances. The evening services were held in Christ Chapel, which at capacity seated 3,500; the estimated two thousand there in the evening made the space “feel full.”

Rather than arrange home or hotel/motel stays as in years past, the Symposium’s attendees stayed on campus in the air-conditioned dorm rooms and enjoyed a meal package through the university cafeteria. In a sense, the university setting offered all-inclusive accommodations for the first time, and this arrangement also minimized travel time and streamlined the conference program. The “all-inclusive” model persisted through the 1988 conference. Two local churches also provided support: Grace Fellowship in nearby Broken Arrow, Oklahoma, with pastor Bob Yandian and music minister Jim Hart, and Victory Christian Center, with pastor Billy Joe Dougherty and music minister Dave Grothe. Though the Symposium directors coordinated with these churches, the welcome letter in the Syllabus was signed not by the senior pastors (as in past years) but by the Symposium directors. Yet the support of local pastors was still apparent; they were given prominent speaking slots in the conference program during “pastors only” sessions as well as the evening “celebration of praise.”

Dave Grothe reported that the church had an attendance of 4,000 at the time. See a brief profile of worship at the church in “Worship Around the Nation,” *The Psalmist*, 1 no.2 (June/July 1985): 14.
The connection to ORU in 1984 is credited to Macon Delavan and Daniel Amstutz, whose affiliation with the Symposium went back to at least 1982 when Amstutz attended the conference at Zion Evangelistic Temple in Clawson, Michigan. Delavan was a music professor at the time and Amstutz was a local church musician who also helped to lead worship in the chapel. At the conference, Amstutz led a medley of original scripture songs that Barry Griffing later described as a highlight of the conference.

As in previous years, the morning featured worship, plenary sessions, and breakout sessions for Bible teaching. The afternoon elective clinics and workshops were offered by over fifty different faculty. Plenary speakers included Judson Cornwall, local Word of Faith pastor Bob Yandian (Grace Fellowship), and Tulsa-based traveling evangelist Terry Law, whose musical group *Living Sound* was led by Don Moen. Other highlights included the mime ministry of Todd Farley (who later became regular Symposium faculty) and Dove Award-winning recording artist and trumpet player Phil

---

74 For more on Amstutz and ORU, see chapter five, section on Judith McAllister.

75 Without more evidence, it would be difficult to make a case for what, specifically, the effects of this conference were on Oral Roberts University as a whole. Multiple factors are involved in assessing the question. First, Daniel Amstutz was connected to Symposium for at least two years prior and also worked in the chapel leading music, strongly suggesting the influence on chapel worship there began prior to 1984. By the 1984 Symposium, Dan was teaching classes on basic worship leading skills and the flow of worship (Syllabus (“Catalogue”) 1984, 21.) Second, Macon Delevan’s role in the music faculty likely indicates that some measure of Symposium-style musical practices were being taught in the curriculum. Indeed, by 1987, Oral Roberts University became the first university to offer master’s degree-level training in church music that included curriculum on how to lead Latter Rain-style Praise and Worship (see Paul W. Wohlgemuth, “Praise Singing,” *The Hymn: A Journal of Congregational Song*, 38 no.1 (Fort Worth, TX: Jan 1987): 23, fn.7.

76 Barry Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 26, 2020.
Driscoll. Another notable teacher from beyond the Word of Faith and Latter Rain networks was Steve Young77 of John Osteen’s Lakewood Church, an influential megachurch in Texas.78 Though the skill clinics focused on a variety of instruments and associated technical elements, Symposium 1984 was the first time that a class on using the guitar to lead Praise and Worship was offered. In Pentecostal contexts at the time, the piano or organ remained the backbone instrument for leading musical worship. The appearance of the guitar as the lead instrument for Praise and Worship perhaps indicates that it was an emerging need in these Pentecostal contexts by the mid-1980s. The class was taught by LaMar Boschman who, as an itinerant, had been leading from the guitar since the 1970s. Bob Sorge of Elim Bible Institute in Lima, New York was also a presenter for the first time. Sorge emerged in the later 1980s as an important and regular contributor to the Symposium and wrote a very popular book on Praise and Worship entitled Exploring Worship.79

77 Young taught “Requirements and Qualifications for a Minister of Music.”
78 Lakewood church was already an influential megachurch by this period, but it would go on to even greater notoriety and influence in Praise and Worship by the early 2000s when Joel Osteen moved into the pastoral role and hired Israel Houghton as his worship leader. See Kate Bowler and Wen Reagan, “Bigger, Better, Louder: The Prosperity Gospel’s Impact on Contemporary Christian Worship,” Religion and American Culture: A Journal of Interpretation 24, no. 2 (July 1, 2014): 186–230.
79 See Bob Sorge (foreword by Judson Cornwall), Exploring Worship: A Practical Guide to Praise & Worship (Lee’s Summit, MO: Oasis House, 1987). For a short discussion of Sorge’s materials, see Monique Ingalls “Awesome in this Place,” 89–93. Sorge also produced a variety of supplemental teaching tapes on music theory and piano improvisation and technique.
The syllabus for Symposium 1984 shows a remarkable increase in the design of program materials and the pedagogical vision of the Symposium. Previous years had few elements of graphic design (beyond the logo of Symposium 1983 mentioned above) while the 1984 materials featured stylized logos and professionally designed layouts. The image chosen to accompany the logo was a simple silhouette of a female figure dancing while holding a ring with streamers, a visual accompaniment to the musical-stylizing of the word “Symposium.”

In addition to the greater level of professionalization in the visual design, the program itself enjoyed a greater degree of design that was fitting to the University context. The breakout sessions offerings were organized into two segments: the theology of worship classes and the practice of worship classes,\textsuperscript{80} including classes at multiple levels of expertise in both theology and practical topics, as indicated by the conference program. Theology was divided into history, principle, and administration of worship. Practical skill areas included music, dance, and drama, each divided into sections on theory, performance, and education.\textsuperscript{81}

The professionalization of the program was due not only to the support of the local church hosts but also to Larry Dempsey, who spent an extended stay in the area leading up to the conference. While there, Dempsey led breakfast meetings with local

\textsuperscript{80} Symposium 1984 Catalogue, 4.
\textsuperscript{81} No classes on dance education were offered, only theory and performance.
pastors as well as a smaller regional symposium to help build momentum for the national conference. In Barry Griffing’s conference report in early 1985, he highlights for the first time “A nationwide presbytery of seasoned ministers” that included longtime supporters as well as new names, such as cluster of ministers from the Northeast as well as Hugh Layzell (Reg Layzell’s son) from Ontario, Canada. Given the fractured relationship with some leaders after the Symposium 1983 (described above), the inclusion of this new oversight committee and their collective authority signals a show of strength in Symposium’s pastoral oversight, from both old friends and diverse new affiliates.

3.3.2 Symposium 1985: Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Symposium 1985 was held at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The welcome letter described the event akin to the “Feasts of Israel,” an event in Jerusalem at which delegations from all over Israel would gather for a week of celebration and rejoicing in the presence of the Lord—a theme that would continue to be marked in future conferences. Music Notes suggested that conference participants make a family vacation of it, advertising other locations that were “within a day’s drive” of Pittsburgh, including Civil War battlefield sites and East coast beach resorts. “W[h]y not

82 For the first time, the name was trademarked. The reason is not explained, though with the number of other worship conferences emerging (some directly spawned by Symposium and others in connection with Symposium teachers) it is possible that the trademark was intended to shore up the Symposium’s location in the network of events by increasing the level of professionalization.
take 2 or 3 weeks’ vacation to explore the historic Northeast after you’ve enjoyed such ‘present-truth’ ministries. . . ?”, asked the newsletter.

Similar to the lead-up to the 1984 conference at ORU, Larry Dempsey spent some time in advance of the conference leading pastors’ breakfasts and other worship events to prepare the ground for the Symposium. To the surprise of the other directors, Dempsey even managed to secure an office at the University (apparently free of charge) out of which he coordinated the onsite accommodations, registration, and materials. Dempsey’s efforts again resulted in conference attendance near one thousand, and for the first time the conference solicited the help of a registrar, Nancy Watson, to help with administration.

In addition to its easy access to potential vacation spots, the site held spiritual significance beyond the Symposium. Duquesne had been the spawning grounds of the Catholic Charismatic renewal movement twenty years earlier, an event that became known as “the Duquesne weekend.” Duquesne was also the host city of a large, ecumenical Holy Spirit Conference in the spring of each year. Possibly due to the new East Coast context that had not been as saturated with Symposium-style Praise and Worship as the West Coast, the 1985 Symposium attracted even more interest than

---

84 Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez.
85 Symposium 1985 Guidebook, inside cover
86 Music Notes 6, no. 1 (1985), 1.
organizers had expected. As a result of the surprising level of interest, the conference did
not have enough room to accommodate all the classes for the attendees.\textsuperscript{87}

The course offerings themselves at the Duquesne conference marked another
stage of development and formalization. Skill areas and leveling were highlighted for the
first time for this increasingly diverse group of attendees. The conference schedule was
also more formally organized with the lab sessions for various skill areas being reserved
for the late afternoon, some of which were offered in sequences so that a participant
could follow on a specific track throughout the conference week. “Skill Clinics & Labs”
topics included everything from music arranging, to synthesizer technique, from
“Beginning an I.W.S-affiliated Worship Institute in Your Church” to “Production
Costuming and Makeup.”\textsuperscript{88} The skill sessions overlapped with both the “pastors only”
sessions (topics mostly relating to theology and church administration), as well as
rehearsals for the evening event. The pastors’ sessions were reserved exclusively for
“Pastors, Associate Pastors, full-time Evangelists and Teachers, Shepherding Elders, and
spouses,” in effect, those functioning within the five-fold ministry paradigm.\textsuperscript{89} While in
past years only the conference orchestra rehearsed for the evening worship services, 1985

\textsuperscript{87} Janet Shell, interview with Adam Perez, April 6, 2020.
\textsuperscript{88} In the same year, Living Word Bible College, affiliated with Living Waters church in
Pasadena, began offering an Institute of Worship that was sponsored by the Symposium directors
and included at least one curriculum compiled by the directors, titled “The Restoration of the
Worship of the Psalms in the Twentieth Century Church.”
\textsuperscript{89} Symposium 1985, Guidebook, np. Note that only four of the five roles are listed: pastors,
elders, teachers, and evangelists. The fifth role, “apostle” is not listed in the description for these
sessions. The reason for its omission is unclear.
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also saw rehearsals for choreographed processions in the evenings. For example, one of the evening events featured a choreographed procession to an orchestrated rendition of the song “To Him Who Sits on the Throne.”

No longer described as simply a “worship rally” as in past years, the “Pageant of Praise” on Thursday night featured a “cities of Judah” procession. The procession included delegates from various churches participating in a large-scale choreography including customized banners for each church group that were processed through the worship space—an event that was repeated in future years.

---

Local pastor Bishop Joseph Garlington of Pittsburgh preached at this conference, though Covenant Church (where he pastored) had not been advertised as a local church sponsor.  

91 Mark Chironna—who was on staff under Garlington from 1985–198892— also connected with IWS for the first time. Though new to the gathering, Chironna was given

---

91 Note that Bishop Garlington also served in Mobile, Alabama from 1977 to 1984 and was on the board of New Wine magazine that created Integrity’s Hosanna! Music. See more on New Wine magazine in chapter five. His brother, Paul Garlington, had previously spoken at Symposium.

92 The conference program lists Chironna as from New York City; he preached for Garlington the weekend prior to the conference and subsequently joined the staff at the church.
leadership of both plenary worship and teaching sessions. He quickly became a go-to leader both nationally and internationally for the Symposium. Other notable plenary sessions were led by newcomer Chuck Girard (of the famous Jesus People musical group *Love Song*) who led an evening “Pageant of Praise.”

At the Duquesne event, the Symposium organizers noted the rising costs of hosting such a large-scale Symposium.93 This was important because the conference fees primarily paid for lodging arrangements and some of the facility fees. The Symposium never ran a “profit,” so to speak, but always relied on local church hospitality (in the earlier years) and attendee generosity (in the later years). As the Symposium’s programming continued to expand and become more professional, keeping costs contained became increasingly difficult. As the Symposium moved to conference spaces that could accommodate their large numbers, the budget ballooned to secure the necessary infrastructure for staging and sound, costs that previously had been absorbed by churches and universities, whose facilities already had that equipment in place.

The growth in scale had repercussions, both intended and not. One of those was the reduced participation of the congregation in prophetic ministry. The Guidebook described a new policy in 1985 saying:

> Symposium 85 is an international multi-church gathering. In these types of

---

93 Jim Gilbert, interview with Lester Ruth, December 19, 2019. During one of the plenary gatherings, Larry Dempsey went up to the microphone before an offering was to be collected, and said outright, “We need money, you have money. Therefore, give us your money.” The conference erupted in laughter and reportedly received the largest offering of the event.
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meetings we have found it wise policy (and in keeping with I Corinthians 14:40) to ask that all prophecy, exhortation, Song of the Lord, etc., be initiated by those on the platform. We heartily endorse “body ministry” in the local church under oversight of the local shepherd [sic]— but in large multi-church gatherings it is better that members of the congregation refrain from any spontaneous contributions.94

The policy is understandable given the scale of the gatherings, but it did mute some of the distinctives of the smaller-scale gatherings. Given that those distinctives were embedded in their original ecclesial context of and theology Latter Rain worship, it is an important development. Beyond that statement, the Symposium guidebook further articulated its conscious distancing from its Latter Rain origins. In a section entitled “Philosophy,” the directors said outright that they “are not sponsored by or connected to any one particular ‘camp’ or group”—even while they go on to describe distinctives derived from the Latter Rain theology, such as pastoral oversight and the restoration of Psalmic patterns.

Confirming the dating of the conference as the eighth annual meeting, the “history” section of the Guidebook claims the 1978 meeting at Shiloh as the first meeting of what was now the “International Worship Symposium”—a contrast to the history

94 The description goes on to say somewhat strongly, “If you have a problem with this policy, or if you are offended by it, then please prayerfully search your heart-motives. True valid ministry will never be fearful of submitting to authority and leadership covering. A genuine ministry will always function joyfully under government. ‘Lone Rangers’ and ‘mavericks’ will never experience the full maturity of the character of Christ within them.” Symposium Guidebook 1985: 17–18.
given in the 1983 Syllabus. In addition to that, the “Pastor’s college” that provided oversight and led the pastors-only sessions was described as those “whose ministries are seasoned, proven, and highly respected throughout the global pentecostal/charismatic community.” Taken together, these features evidence the organization’s increasing self-distancing from the Latter Rain roots and its self-conscious posturing beyond the Latter Rain context.

3.3.3 Symposium 1986: Washington, DC

Without a very strong connection to a local church host for Symposium 1985, Duquesne could be described as the first of a series of “destination” settings for the Symposium. Symposium 1986 followed from and confirmed that trend by moving to Washington, DC. Bishop John Meares of Evangel Temple was the only local church whose leadership was represented at the conference (but without the use of their facilities). The length of the event was also reduced from five days in the previous two years to four in 1986.

The 1980s saw a number of religious events located in Washington, DC in recognition of the city’s significance as a seat of political power. The “Washington for
Jesus” event in 1980, for example, garnered national attention. Symposium 1986 sought to build on a similar cultural moment and offered Symposium leaders and attendees the chance to interpret the typological significance of the location as one imbued with spiritual power as the nation’s capital city. The event also built on the trajectory of growth of the annual events and as a result, Symposium 1986 was the high-water mark for the Symposium attendance: nearly 2,500 persons registered for the conference and 3,800 gathered for the evening events.

The welcome letter in the Symposium 1986 guidebook again came from the IWS directors rather than from local churches. The letter began by naming the two-fold purpose of the gathering: “enjoying the Presence of the Lord and fellowshipping with like-minded brethren from across the United States and the World.” It cast the location of the conference (Washington, DC) as a type of Jerusalem, both as the seat of government and as the spiritual seat of the nation, where “the natural headship of the nation resides, and the corridors of power operate.” As the capital of the nation, the welcome letter

95 See “Christians Rally” by Marjorie Hyer and Athelia Knight, Washington Post, April 29, 1980. https://www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/1980/04/29/christians-rally/ce2f53d4-89fd-4778-80f4-1355b0342957/. A follow-up event was held in 1988. Notably, the convener of the event—John Gimenez of the Rock Church in Virginia Beach—was also affiliated with the Symposium as a presenter.
96 The event was covered by many major media outlets. See also reporting by Phil M. Shenk “Washington for Jesus,” Sojourners (June 1980). Available at https://sojo.net/magazine/june-1980/washington-jesus. See also the reporting featured on the Pentecostal 700 Club at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hnUmpCwBJs8.
97 See also other praise and worship-based spiritual warfare events aimed at national political outcomes. One such event by occasional symposium teacher Ray Hughes (1984) was the America Arise! event in Nashville. Cf. Janet Shell, interview.
interpreted the gathering typologically as the people of Israel (conference participants) leaving their towns and villages and traveling to Jerusalem (Washington, DC) during the Feasts of Israel (the annual IWS event). The program logo visualized this with a black and white image of the Statue of Liberty holding a cross (instead of a torch). The tagline for the logo read: “Jesus is Lord of America.”

The welcome letter marked this significance in no uncertain terms: “The secret of the spiritual success of Zion was that Praise and Worship continually ascended to the Lord from the capital city of Israel. This can become the secret of revival in our own nation as well!” In continuity with deeply Pentecostal sentiments, one of the goals of the Symposium was always spiritual revival, here enabled through the hopeful act of Praise and Worship at “the seat of spiritual authority over our nation” as believers “pierce the heavenlies with praise and worship.” The idea that spiritual warfare can be waged from specific physical locations was not a novel idea in Pentecostal contexts at the time and the large worship gathering was seen as a new weapon toward that end. Not only was it believed that these large gatherings have unseen effects in the spiritual realm, but they were also confirmed by reports that, for example, crime in the city was lighter than usual on the night of a large worship gathering.\footnote{This was an especially prominent theme reported in Symposium events that were held internationally; see Jim Gilbert, interview with Lester Ruth. Gilbert recounted that local Colombian authorities reported lower violent crimes in the city during the night of large worship gatherings. See also Pamala Smith, interview with Adam Perez.} The theme of the conference—“Jesus is Lord
of America”—was descriptive and prescriptive. In the phrase was both a confidence in a spiritual truth and a hope for Jesus’ Lordship of America as a concrete political position.

The conference program’s design again showed a high level of professionalism with an attractive design and layout. The general structure of the conference did not change significantly from the previous two years but was again expanded. Over 125 breakout sessions and multiple plenary addresses were offered. The pastors-only gatherings also offered daily sessions featuring multiple speakers and dozens of sessions relating to pastoral ministry, shepherding, the role of the pastor in the restoration of worship, and other topics.

One of the highpoints of the conference was the Wednesday night procession/parade at Constitution Hall with “thousands of banners, flags, and streamers!” At Symposium 1986, the arts continued to take an increasingly significant role in the curriculum with theological sessions like Graham Truscott’s “The Secular Arts: Redeemed to Divine Service,” Jon Eymann’s “A Vision for the Arts: Their Nature & Function in the Kingdom” and Sharon Rogers’ “The Value of the Fine Arts: A Christian Perspective.” Practical sessions on the arts also increased in their specificity. Attendees could learn from Patti Amsden’s two workshops on “Hebraic Folk Dance,” Laura Hunter’s “Interpretive Spontaneous Dance Workshop,” Todd Farley’s “Mime Workshop:

The Art of Illusionary Movement,” and Rich Peterson’s “Theatre Workshop: Acting & Directing.” Other sessions in the non-musical arts included banners, “movement segments” in prophetic worship, and pageantry and processions. Overall, the number and level of non-musical arts expanded significantly. So too did the number of sessions available for “Song of the Lord” workshops, now highlighted separately from other practical labs and workshops and featuring fifteen different leaders. As in previous years, a number of teachers joined the faculty for the first time, primarily to lead elective sessions and the labs portion of the program and not the theology of worship portion. One participant of note who took on an increasingly large leadership role throughout the conference was Bob Sorge of Elim Bible Institute in Lima, New York.

For the first time, the evening events did not include a plenary speaker but only “moderators” for the extended periods of worship. This would become the standard for Symposium going forward. The Symposium leaders felt that after long days of talking about worship, they did not need another speaker. They also felt that demonstrating and practicing the skills taught during the day during the extended periods of powerful worship in the evening did more to further the message than a speaker could, given how spiritually powerful the worship sessions often became.

The conference program concluded with notes about the conference philosophy, its history, directors, and “pastoral college” (those providing oversight). In line with the Symposium’s continued self-distancing from the original Latter Rain revival, the program described how the Symposium was “America’s first global conference of its type” and
highlighted how the IWS served virtually every quarter of the worldwide charismatic/pentecostal community." Though the unity of the church had long been an important goal of many types of charismatics, the guidebook outlined its position in relation to other Pentecostal and charismatic streams. In a page-long, bullet-pointed list, the guidebook suggested that “the message of praise and worship transcends denominational identification or group categorization” (see figure 3.4 below).
Complementing this diversity was a swath of pastors from various corners representing the “covering” of the conference, including long-time supporters like Ione Glaeser, George Rohrig, Fuchsia Pickett, Graham Truscott, and others. These lists further show
how associating Praise and Worship too closely with the Jesus People—or even evangelicalism more broadly—is deeply out of sync with the sense that the IWS had of an ecumenical community practicing Praise and Worship already in place by the mid-1980s.

3.3.4 Symposiums 1987 and 1988: Anaheim, California and Orlando, Florida

Symposiums 1987 and 1988 continued to expand the reach and impact of the message of Praise and Worship both across the US and abroad. The organization and execution of Symposiums 1987 and 1988 resembled that of 1986. Both years saw a similar degree of professionalism in the materials and scale of the conference, hosting approximately 1,700 registrants each year. Both gatherings were hosted at conference centers that also served as vacation destination settings: the Hilton Hotel in Anaheim, California and the Marriott World Center in Orlando, Florida.

The Conferences and activities of IWS continue to mark the expansion of their networks by nature of their geographic presence. Back in the familiar territory of Southern California, Symposium 1987 in Anaheim had the endorsement of two local churches, each of which had previously hosted the Symposium: Living Waters Christian Fellowship in Pasadena (Symposium 1983) and Living Faith Church in Santa Ana (Symposium 1980). Though the Symposium had been in the area previously, that did not
mean that there were not first-time participants. The Symposium’s coast-to-coast moves continued to extend the Symposium’s community, attracting delegates from across the country. Across the street from Disneyland California at the Hilton Hotel in 1987 and about two miles away from Disney World in Orlando at the (then-brand new, four-star) Marriott World Center in 1988, these resort-style accommodations likely attracted entire families to the event with the promise of either concurrent activities for those not attending the Symposium itself or for an extended stay in the area. The Symposium had also begun including families at the event by offering sessions for children in 1986 during the daytime conference sessions, and for teens too at the 1988 conference.

But this concern for families was not the only way that the Symposium’s attention had been expanding beyond the local music ministers. It continued to recognize the crucial role of pastors in the restoration of Praise and Worship in the local church. In addition to the Symposium adding programming specifically for pastors in 1985, the programs from 1986 to 1988 expressly welcomed pastors and even offered free registration to all senior pastors and their wives for the 1987 conference. Mark Chironna estimates that by 1988 within Charismatic contexts, the IWS had the largest
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101 Though Patrick Henderson (songwriter, performer, and former music minister at West Angeles Church of God in Christ) had been in the area for some time, he was directed by his COGIC pastor to attend for the first time and participated in leading at least one song during worship. Alongside Judith McAllister, Henderson was an important collaborator in bringing praise and worship into the West Angeles COGIC, and later into the Black Church more broadly, as West Angeles COGIC became the flagship church of that denomination.

concentration of pastors of any conference—more even than Jack Hayford’s pastors’ conference, which Chironna guesses was the second largest of the time among Pentecostals. For reference, Steve Griffing estimates that at least six hundred pastors attended Symposium 1986 and the number only went up in the following two years.

Beyond North America, the pool of Symposium registrants was also expanding. Delegates coming from abroad generated a feedback loop that extended the Symposium’s reach. Attendance in the United States encouraged visitors to establish events overseas, and events overseas attracted participants to the annual event in the United States. This did not happen by chance; it followed from the longstanding and deeply embedded sense of the global scope of restoration, a sense that the Symposium had deliberately fostered over the years. What was relatively new, however, was a new emphasis on the role of worship in evangelism both at home and abroad. Jim Gilbert’s sessions on music in missions work and worship as a “key to evangelism” embodied that message.

Over the previous few years, Jim Gilbert and Mark Chironna had spent an increasing amount of time traveling the globe on behalf of the Symposium. Gilbert’s experience and contacts through Living Sound evangelistic music group gave him the networks and know-how to take the Symposium to churches abroad. Gilbert connected
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103 Mark Chironna, interview with Adam Perez, February 17, 2020.
104 Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020. For more on the role of the pastors, see chapter 3.
105 Gilbert suspects that in 1984, he was the only “international” element at the conference by which they could justify their name. Of course, their sense of global mission provided the
with Chironna at the 1985 conference and the two began leading the first conferences abroad at the invitation of pastors who had come to the Symposium in the United States and desired to have something similar for their local communities. Early on, the two did a tour across cities in southeast Asia: Manila, Singapore, Kuala Lumpur, Taipei, and other locations. David Fischer, Steve Griffing, Jim Gilbert, and others led events in in major cities of Latin America like Cali and Bogotá, Columbia and Caracas, Venezuela. Teachers included other Symposium faculty like Pamela Chesbro and Julie Eymann. These regular visits and new annual events mirrored internationally what had been happening locally for some time. As in the US, the presence of a Symposium event spawned regular ongoing events in that locale. This was true both locally and internationally. Underlying impetus for signaling their reach with a new name. Jim Gilbert, interview with Lester Ruth, December 19, 2019.

Mark Chironna, interview with Adam Perez, February 17, 2020.


For example, Shady Grove began its own worship conference at Shady Grove, Moses Vegh hosted annual symposiums at Hope Temple in Findlay, David Fischer hosted annual regional conferences in Southern California at Living Waters, and Grace Fellowship began hosting the Local Church Music Seminar in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Bible Temple notably began hosting its own regional music and worship symposium as early as 1983 that continued for many years as well. Beginning in the mid-80s, Julie Eymann, a leader in dance at Symposium, taught in Manila annually for the better part of a decade alongside a group of between three and six IWS faculty members. Julie Eymann, interview with Adam Perez.
Class offerings in 1987 and 1988 mirrored much of what was available in 1986 and saw little development in theological and practical areas. Courses on the theology and practice of worship were largely familiar titles and a selection of the classes was offered at up to three levels of skill by 1988. The Symposium’s use of the arts in the large evening worship gatherings continued to expand, including the presence of a professional Christian dance company called Ballet Magnificat and the regular appearance of a portion of staging specifically for the dancers and mimes.

One new presenter in 1987 is worth noting: Herb Mirly. Mirly taught three classes in 1987 and 1988, including one titled, “The Place of the Eucharist in Worship.” Apparently for the first time, IWS included a presenter from the Lutheran liturgical renewal movement on the faculty and a session on the Eucharist. In concert with other Symposium teachings, Mirly’s notes highlight the centrality of Jesus’ presence in worship but reframed the Eucharist as “the most intimate experience” with Christ and therefore the high point of worship. Though IWS never offered Eucharist services, Mirly’s presence is evidence of the Symposium’s increasing openness to the broader charismatic renewal movement in mainline protestant churches, even if it never became a primary expression at the Symposium.

3.3.5 Symposium 1989: Tri-regional conferences

The costs associated with the large facilities and renting the necessary staging and audio/visual equipment in 1987 and 1988 put a significant burden on the Symposium budget. By 1989, the IWS was at an organizational and, consequently, a financial tipping
point. Though the message was expanding and growing through events nationally and internationally, the IWS event itself was not. For the first time in its ten-year history, the 1987 gathering had fewer attendees than the prior year, and 1988 attendance was stagnant. This was a particular challenge for the IWS because they were largely self-financed by the conference leaders. The Symposium costs were offset by registration fees and offerings collected at the evening gatherings. As a result, the ever-increasing investment into the event became a financial burden and both the 1987 and 1988 gatherings left the leaders strapped with tens of thousands of dollars in debt. Because the Symposium did not have any other funding streams and was not part of a larger organization that could defray its costs, organizers had little choice but to employ drastic cost-saving measures. Thus, in 1989, the Symposium returned to the local church(es).

Instead of moving back to a single local church, Symposium 1989 was held in three different regions on a slightly staggered schedule. Faith Community Church in Largo, Florida hosted Symposium South from July 19 to 21, Evangel Temple in Washington, DC hosted Symposium East from August 2 to 4, and Shiloh Christian Fellowship in Oakland hosted Symposium West from August 9 to 11. Though the total scale of the conference was somewhat reduced, each location enjoyed around nine hundred registrants, totaling approximately 2,700 overall. Despite the reduction in size, the event still attracted strong regional interest—more than any one single annual conference had or would. Likewise, the conference syllabus featured a full slate of teachers. In fact, the table of contents in the 1989 syllabus is an exact copy of the
previous year’s syllabus. However, it is improbable that all the Symposium teachers were available at all three locations for three separate weeks in late-July and early-August and it is likely that some sessions were not offered at all three sites.

The choice to move back to local church hosts was a financial success. Gains from the smaller settings with significantly less financial overhead allowed the IWS to pay off remaining debts from the large events in 1987 and 1988. It also brought in revenue that would pay for a somewhat disappointing registration in 1990 at the Grand Kanpinsky/Intercontinental Hotel in Dallas. Now with less wind in its sails, the 1990 conference only registered 650 participants, though the evening gatherings were still large with an estimated 2000 attendees. Eventually, the Symposium made its way back to a Pasadena’s Living Waters Church under David Fischer, who continued to host a smaller—though still vital—conference annually into the 2010s.\(^\text{110}\)

\section*{3.4 Conclusion}

The review of annual Symposium events in the 1980s that I have offered in this chapter has attempted to highlight a variety of themes in the life of the Symposium. As I come to the conclusion of these chapter, I want to reiterate three key elements that are woven throughout this chapter. First, it is critical to highlight the central role that theological reflection played in the history of the Symposium and its mission. The

\footnote{Fischer had also been hosting regional symposiums at the church in addition to the annual IWS event and his international itinerancy in the late 1980s.}
Symposiums leaders were local pastors and theologians, many of whom were also musicians. Though they wielded some measure of power and enjoyed some measure of notoriety, they were not performing stars. Nor did they produce any products beyond the Symposium event itself and the occasional book on Praise and Worship theology and practice. In many cases—especially among the core leadership—IWS faculty were prepared for Symposium not only by their experience in local Praise and Worship ministry but because they were trained in Bible colleges as pastors, theologians, and music ministers. Many continued serving in those roles as they also served Symposium.

Second, it is critical to highlight the role of music in Symposium’s vision of Praise and Worship. On one hand, Praise and Worship was a highly music-mediated congregational practice. On the other, the important conflicts of 1983 and later developments of Symposium’s curriculum demonstrate that other congregational practices were critical to a full-orbed expression of biblical Praise and Worship in one’s local church. Praise and Worship at Symposium was much more than just a period of congregational singing or song of the Lord.

Third, it is apparent through this chapter that there was little to no indication that a discrete industry for Praise and Worship materials had emerged until well into the 1980s. Barry Griffing’s ZionSong remained one of the few and relatively informal systems of cataloging and disseminating new songs by the early 1980s, and it flagged as Barry Griffing’s attention to it shifted by the mid-1980s and other companies dedicated to a similar task began to emerge like Integrity’s Hosanna! Music.
3.4.1 Symposium’s Growth

Over the latter half of the 1980s, the International Worship Symposium saw its rise, its peak, and its fall. This chapter has documented how the Symposium’s growth was marked by the professionalization of its leadership, materials, teaching, and events. Though the planning and leadership in 1980-1981 had a loosely organized steering committee, it developed into a set of four “International Directors” by the mid-1980s. Each of them took responsibility for various aspects of the conference planning and were those charged with primary oversight of the evening worship gatherings during the conference. The conference guidebooks and syllabi reflected the more dedicated attention to the event, with Larry Dempsey and David Fischer overseeing those scheduling aspects while Steve Griffing oversaw the actual content of the teaching materials as “Dean of the Faculty.” After the Pasadena conference in 1983 (hosted by Fischer), the production of handsome conference materials became standard. Looking back across the years, it is evident that there was remarkable consistency in the types of classes and topics taught— even though the titles changed. Over consecutive years of teaching in regional, national, and truly international Symposia, a standard faculty of twenty to twenty-five teachers emerged who had honed their craft year by year not only as worship leaders, pastors, and preachers, but also as teachers. Granted, many of them already had significant experience teaching and preaching on these topics in their local churches, in some cases for decades. So too, the experiences gained in leading successively larger events lent an excellence to the execution of the conference. That excellence also led to great visibility within
Pentecostal and charismatic contexts which largely relied on word of mouth and networked connections. In short, IWS did very little to market or advertise its message outside of conference events themselves. Not through a flashy cultural movement but over a long period of local, regional, and (eventually) national teaching and preaching events, IWS itinerant leaders crisscrossed the country and spread the message of Praise and Worship in innumerable small Pentecostal churches. As a result, they slowly built out their extensive network.

In general, the Latter Rain folks were not good at direct promotion. The Word of Faith movement, however, had plenty of excellent promoters who in many ways had been well-situated and suited to promote Praise and Worship after Symposium 1984 and provided a significant signal-boost to Praise and Worship. Through their well-established media outlets, the Word of Faith movement in particular helped spread the message of Praise and Worship, adding to it their own particular emphasis on healing. The Symposium’s message on Praise and Worship was simple enough to make space for its accommodation into the distinct theological and liturgical practices of Word of Faith
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112 See Reagan and Bowler, “Bigger, Better, Louder:” 211. Reagan and Bowler use this terminology to discuss a later generation of prosperity gospel preachers and contemporary worship leaders—the description is fitting in this context too.
113 Bob Johnson, interview. Johnson tells a joke about an evangelist who goes to visit Hell and, upon his return, Oral Roberts raises enough money to air condition the place. The mere existence of the joke is a nod to the Word of Faith Movement’s well-known capacity to rally engagement around a message.
114 See chapter five in the case study of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music for more on this theological accent.
Pentecostals—and it was not the only adaptation that took place. To state it simply, the international directors and their collaborators put on a really good conference with really powerful worship services. The “excellence” in execution lent a credibility to the “anointing” of the message of God’s restoration of Praise and Worship. It was those powerful experiences in worship, alongside clear biblical teaching, that allowed the Symposium to mainstream Praise and Worship.

The latter half of the 1980s was also marked by the Symposium’s expansion into new teaching areas. The expansion was accompanied by a level of self-consciousness signaled in conference books by downplaying the (controversial for some) Latter Rain backdrop while simultaneously playing up the global, ecumenical/transdenominational, and eschatological character of the message. The slow development of the naming of the event is a prime example of this development: from “Song of the Lord” to “Music” to “Worship” and from “National” to “International.” In every case, IWS’s expansion into new contexts was facilitated not by an invisible hand disseminating innovation through economic success, nor by the mechanisms of the development of an industry apparatus, but by meaningful—often powerful—personal contact with the experience of congregational Praise and Worship and the persons who led it. These new contexts combined would become an incredibly important foundation for Praise and Worship as it became a mainstream phenomenon throughout a breadth of Pentecostal, charismatic, and evangelical churches.
3.4.2 Symposium’s Decline

The Symposium’s demise was rather abrupt. Though IWS had not relied solely on ties with the original Latter Rain church networks as it moved beyond them, those networks still played an important role in the organizational leadership. The strength of the fellowship that was enjoyed in the smaller gatherings earlier on was lost as the scale grew. Direct conflicts and personal losses also affected the leadership: trouble in 1983 with “The Brethren” severed ties with some portions of the Latter Rain network, the split with longtime Symposium teacher Sam Sasser in the early 1990, and IWS Director Larry Dempsey’s sudden passing in 1995 all put strain on this fellowship of teachers. Dempsey’s death was also detrimental for the leadership because he had used his itinerant status to become the strongest publicizer and connector for the conference, especially among other pastors.

Less direct developments also affected the Symposium’s status and position. Because the teachings were typologically based—a familiar hermeneutical practice among Pentecostals—many who came through the Symposium’s doors learned the basics and simply never came back. Others adopted the teaching but quickly began looking for “the next wave of God,” as Steve and Barry Griffing described it. Though the Symposium taught that this restoration was a long-term “river of God,” some were just “riding the wave” of God, doing the dance and pageantry, but ready to move on to the
next wave, such as the increasingly influential Church Growth movement of the late 1980s and 1990s.\textsuperscript{115}

The late 1980s also saw a proliferation of published teaching resources. In addition to the various books being published—many of which were associated with the Symposium in some way\textsuperscript{116}—new national conferences were being established, such as LaMar Boschman’s \textit{International Worship Institute} and \textit{Local Church Worship Seminar}; Ray Hughes’ \textit{The Worship Congress} and his “America Arise” event (Nashville, 1985), as well as smaller conferences like Don and Donna Bennett’s \textit{Gathering of Worshippers}.\textsuperscript{117} Local conferences were also spawned at Symposium-affiliated churches: Shiloh Christian Fellowship, Shady Grove, Hope Temple, Bible Temple,\textsuperscript{118} Grace Fellowship, and others.\textsuperscript{119} Indeed, it was prophesied at Symposium 1980 that regional conferences would play an important role as delegates returned to their local churches and as conferences sprung up across the nation and ignited the fires of revival.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{115} Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 13, 2018.
\textsuperscript{116} From preachers and pastors like Judson Cornwall and Graham Truscott who spoke at Symposium, to folks like Anne Murchison a member of Shady Grove church, and session leaders like Bob Sorge’s popular book \textit{Exploring Worship}.
\textsuperscript{117} Janet Shell, interview with Adam Perez, April 6, 2020.
\textsuperscript{118} Following Pastor Dick Iverson’s convictions, Bible Temple’s Northwest Music Minister’s Conference focuses almost exclusively on music department issues and does not include any material on dance, pageantry, and the other arts. See \textit{Northwest Music Minister’s Guidebooks} 1983, 1985, 1986 (Portland, OR: Bible Temple Publications).
\textsuperscript{119} For an early review of these conferences see the “Regional Conference Review” in \textit{Music Notes} 3, no. 4 (Fall 1981) as well as \textit{Music Notes} 4, no. 1 (Winter 1982): 3.
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Music Notes} 2, no. 5 (October 1980): 4.
The story of Bob Johnson is a case in point. Johnson returned to his Assemblies of God church from attending a regional IWS conference in 1983 at Elim Bible Institute and subsequently began a Saturday morning workshop on Praise and Worship for music ministers in his area. The events gathered around one hundred participants to hear both from Johnson and from other leaders based on the East Coast like Bob Sorge and Mark Chironna. Eventually, Johnson’s pastor shut the event down because, Johnson guessed, it was threatening to what the pastor wanted to do regarding worship. Johnson ended up leaving the church soon after that to join Barry Griffing’s ministry as music minister and administrator over the ZionSong music service.  

The Symposium even taught sessions, early on, about how to establish a local worship conference in one’s own church (including everything from budgeting, to scheduling, to marketing). Various audio/visual materials spread the sounds of IWS-style Praise and Worship, including those being sent out by the Symposium through the ZionSong song sharing subscription service. Some were church-based recordings, like those out of Bible Temple and Zion Evangelistic Fellowship, while other independent recordings from Christ for the Nations Institute (an unaccredited Pentecostal Bible College in Dallas, Texas) were popular among the broader Latter Rain movement. Symposium teachers like LaMar Boschman and Bob Sorge also produced audio/visual
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121 Bob Johnson, interview.  
122 See the three-volume “Sounds of Zion” recordings and songbooks, by Dan Gardner.  
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teaching materials.\textsuperscript{123} Other print publications were also describing and popularizing this way of worship, including \textit{New Wine} magazine,\textsuperscript{124} Steven Strang’s \textit{Charisma} magazine, and Kent Henry’s the \textit{Psalmist} magazine. With the emergence of these and other teaching avenues and venues\textsuperscript{125} on Praise and Worship, the need for a large national or international conference felt to Symposium leaders as if it had simply “dried up.”\textsuperscript{126}

Almost as soon as the Symposium was formed, it began to transform. Its history was marked by expansion and contraction at micro and macro levels, by name changes and fluidity among personnel. Through all the changes, the Symposium retained the kernel of its founding: the restoration of prophetic worship practices around the core teaching of the Tabernacle of David. Early on, attendees experienced this primarily in the experience and expression of the song of the Lord. As the conference developed, that remained in place. But a shift toward platform leadership and professionalized worship leadership was added to it. The days of gathering around the piano sharing songs, as heard in the recording of the 1977 gathering at Bible Temple, were all but gone. Song sharing sessions become a point on the conference agenda, but no longer its \textit{raison d’être}, as new venues emerged for sharing and codifying songs.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{123} See Bob Sorge, \textit{Piano Improvisation Techniques for Worship}, vols. 1–2 (nd.)
\textsuperscript{124} See \textit{New Wine} magazine, Charles Simpson Ministries, Mobile, Alabama. \textit{New Wine} was a magazine dedicated to the teachings of the charismatic movement and centered the voices of pastors associated with Covenant Church of Mobile Alabama who were at one time the center of the Shepherding/Discipleship Movement and Controversy.
\textsuperscript{125} See Ruth and Lim, \textit{History of Contemporary Praise and Worship}, chapter two.
\textsuperscript{126} Janet Shell, interview with Adam Perez, April 6, 2020.
\end{flushright}
Indeed, by the end of the 1980s, worship had become a “key” to just about everything. Throughout its life cycle, the Symposium suggested in various ways that the centrality of restored Praise and Worship extended to a variety of features in the Christian life. In the 1988 Guidebook, to take just one example, we can see this in sessions dedicated to worship as the “heart of evangelism,” worship as the key to holiness, as the key to power, as the hermeneutic for the life of Jesus, as a key link to prophecy, as essential to the imago dei, as holding the keys to kingdom life, as releasing God’s heavenly glory on earth, and as an important weapon in spiritual warfare. Year by year, the theology opened up and broadened, and these Praise and Worshippers found new ways to use Praise and Worship as an interpretive key to Christian scripture and life.

As the Symposium grew into deeper and fuller layers of the restoration of the Praise and Worship of the Tabernacle of David and the worship of the Psalms through the arts, its events prospered—until they did not. As Steve Griffing reflected, “When you get big [the message] spreads out, it gets thinner. It's not as deep… Bigness did not serve our message entirely.” 127 Though the growth in size may have weakened the clarity of its focus, it did extend its reach. Indeed, IWS did a lot of work across boundaries and communities because its message, as they described it, was “transdenominational.”

Looking back, it appears that the performing arts became a kind of recessive gene while the musical worship became a dominant gene in the DNA of Praise and Worship among

127 Steve Griffing, interview with Lester Ruth, Swee Hong, and Adam Perez, October 13, 2017.
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Pentecostals (and eventually, in mainstream evangelical worship). Of course, the broader emphasis on the arts, as we will see in chapter four, was built on the musical practices at the Symposium’s core.

The theology and practice of musical worship in particular endured and spread while the emphasis on the arts flagged, especially in white congregations. As we will see in chapter five, the message of Praise and Worship that was pioneered by IWS did not wane with event attendance. Instead, new centers of gravity emerged for Praise and Worship in direct connection with the Symposium, and those new centers of gravity played incredibly important roles in mainstreaming the message. But before I discuss the impact of IWS on the continued development of Praise and Worship in the 1980s, 1990s, and beyond, I first take a closer look at the theological content of what was being taught at the Symposium.

\[128\] See Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*; see also Ingalls, *Singing the Congregation.*
Chapter 4. Restoration and the Tabernacle of David: A Theological Prism for the Worship of the IWS

In chapters two and three I argued that the International Worship Symposium emerged out of a distinct ecclesial context and that it embodied that context in its theology of worship. In this chapter, I show how the self-conscious development of a distinct theology and practice of Praise and Worship was not associated with either the earlier Jesus People movement’s emphasis on popular musics and industrial development nor with simplistic descriptions of the experiential emphases of Pentecostal worship and speaking in tongues.

The IWS was marked by both a deep indebtedness to the movement that came out of the Latter Rain Revival and an openness to the reception of the message of the restoration of Praise and Worship in other Pentecostal, charismatic (including in “mainline” denominations), and evangelical settings. Though features of the IWS’s theology and practice of worship ostracized them from the leadership of some Pentecostal denominational groups (the Assemblies of God, for example) and prominent leaders within their own networks (such as Dick Iverson), it also opened up avenues among others like the Word of Faith movement. On one hand, the Praise and Worship of the IWS’s later years differed from other Pentecostals and evangelicals in its openness to the use of the arts and “body ministry” in worship. On the other hand, it operated as an annual event unaffiliated with a formal denominational group and was able to deliver its message in ways that were familiar enough to those same groups and thus engendered an honest hearing of its restoration message. The powerful worship nights that embodied the
daytime skills sessions communicated through experience as much—if not more—of the theological ethos of Praise and Worship as did the teaching syllabi.

As I have already begun to show, many of the IWS’s leaders and prominent teachers were theologically trained in Pentecostal Bible colleges. As such they had imbibed of the Pentecostal patterns of biblical interpretation, especially typological interpretations of the Old Testament stories. Their interest in the theology of Praise and Worship as derived from scripture deeply informed their worship practices. As Steve Griffing often described IWS worship, it was the natural outworking or orthopraxy of Latter Rain Revival orthodoxy.\(^1\) Admittedly, it would be an overstatement to suggest that the worship practices flowed exclusively out of theological commitments. Nevertheless, the theological apparatus operating at IWS allowed the leaders to continue to explore the biblical witness on Praise and Worship and consequently press into new areas of worship practice. Confirmed by the experiential power of these new practices within congregational worship, they were codified as classes and taught at IWS events. In this way, there is a dynamic connection in the worship of IWS between biblical theologizing and practical application—often flowing in that direction.

Indeed, new practices could not emerge or be developed without a compelling biblical theology and precedent to accompany it. Sometimes the biblical witness on a topic was rather limited but its potential limitations were overcome because of broader theological commitments. The use of mime is one such example. Though one primary

\(^1\) Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020.
proof text existed for the use of these “prophetic gestures” in worship, mime was a form of body ministry or performance art and thus fell under the IWS’s broader emphasis on reclaiming all the arts for worship.

The theological vision of the IWS was not static and it expanded throughout the 1980s. The seed of worship theology and practice had already sprouted in the Latter Rain Revival movement, and the IWS continued to build on that emphasis. The IWS did not introduce entirely new practices to this ecclesial network but rather drew on existing practices and expanded them—sometimes to their breaking point. The conflict over dance in 1983, for example, was a stress test for the IWS’s expansion of existing forms of worship within the network, a practice that was derived directly from their theologizing on the biblical witness to the Tabernacle of David.

4.1 A Theological Model for IWS Worship

It is challenging to attempt a singular theology of Praise and Worship for the IWS. While the IWS grew out of the Latter Rain Revival movement, by the mid-1980s the IWS included a broad swath of other participants, leaders, and teachers. Each had its own emphases and local, idiosyncratic instantiations of Praise and Worship’s central themes. Indeed, IWS teachings were not developed in an organic, linear, or altogether systematic fashion. Thus, a model is necessary that is neither strict in its composition nor uncomfortably imposed from outside the relevant Pentecostal traditions.

Any model of the IWS’s theology must respect the trajectory of the increasingly diverse constituency over the course of the 1980s. As I argued at the end of chapter three, the IWS was able to attract a range of Pentecostals, charismatics, and evangelicals even
though it had distinct—even insular—Latter Rain roots. The appeal of Praise and Worship practices as popularized through the IWS was perhaps possible precisely because of the way the event distanced itself from the Latter Rain label (though it never abandoned it entirely). It did so because it did not emphasize classic Pentecostal practices such as speaking or singing in tongues. Though scholarship on Pentecostal worship often privileges this practice as the *sine qua non* of Pentecostalism’s liturgical practices, IWS worship points to other, more central markers. Though the use of tongues was definitely present in worship, it was not the central feature. Indeed, IWS is one of the clearest windows we have into the revolution during the 1980s of Pentecostal liturgical values around the now-ubiquitous practice of Praise and Worship across Pentecostal, charismatic, and evangelical ecclesial contexts in the twenty-first century.

Within Praise and Worship, however, a diversity of musical and embodied worship practices existed. In this chapter, I explore a variety of those central practices and their biblical-theological rationale within IWS resources. The content of the chapter is drawn primarily from the IWS teaching syllabi, which include outlines of (most of) the sessions taught at the IWS starting in 1981. Depending on the teacher, any particular teaching may be articulated in the guidebook to a greater or lesser degree. Sometimes the syllabi offer a simple bullet-point list of topics, sometimes fill-in-the-blank notes, and at other times they offer long, detailed, explanatory prose. Admittedly, given the nature of the IWS as an event, it is not out of the realm of possibilities to suggest than any one session could have been canceled or substituted in any one year. Or, as anecdotal evidence suggests, that a session teacher might have set aside their curriculum in order to
enjoy a time of worship instead, as the Spirit might have led. Thus, my discussion of the worship theology of the IWS employs additional resources alongside the syllabi (interviews, other publications, some multimedia) and spans the whole decade of the 1980s. Unfortunately, no video—and very limited audio—is available from the conferences themselves.

Though the practice of the song of the Lord was an initial *raison d’être* of the International Worship Symposium, it was not an isolated practice. The song of the Lord was one of the earliest practices distinguishing the group that became the IWS, and it remained one of the Symposium’s defining features over the years. The church music leaders who attended the first gatherings came together to share in the experience of the flow of the song of the Lord with other expert practitioners, and to share songs of the Lord that had been given to them by God in their respective contexts. While the early network of central IWS leaders can trace its roots directly to the Latter Rain Revival and this central practice, the web of its teachings is not so linear. Rather, it is embedded in a complex theological web of resources, historical frameworks, scriptural interpretations, leadership structures, spiritual experiences, and congregational musicking. Together, they constitute a theology of worship that is not “systematic” in the sense of addressing a standard range of topics with a carefully designed internal architecture. Likewise, it

---

2 Though the “song of the Lord” was so central to IWS practice early on—so much so that the 1979 conference host Rev. Moses Vegh called the event a “Song of the Lord Symposium”—what became known as the IWS incorporated other elements very early on. Among those practitioners of the Song the Lord, many describe Mike Herron as being one of the most skilled and anointed “psalmists,” able to craft songs spontaneously in a way that was impressive and attractive to his peers. His ministry galvanized the early group that later became the backbone of IWS.
cannot accurately be described as “organic” in the sense that a single theological insight unfolded into a complex system. Instead, it enjoyed multiple, discrete contributions within a network of shared practitioner-theologians. This was evident already in the way the Latter Rain Revival amplified Reg Layzell’s revelation on the priority of praise and God’s presence from 1946 onward (described in chapter two).

By the mid-1980s, IWS teachings operated like a prism. The prism itself was the teaching on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David to the church today. The source of light was the broader emphasis on Restorationism that had long been central for Latter Rain churches and continued to be a central commitment at the IWS. However, the specific restoration of the Tabernacle of David filtered Restorationism into the broader set of practices associated with Tabernacle worship. By the end of the 1980s, virtually every topic of teaching at IWS was refracted through Tabernacle typology. Chief among them, as I argue in this chapter, was the restoration of the role of prophetic music-making and worship in the broader restoration of the fine arts.

In the next section, I introduce the centrality of Restorationism and the extent to which it informs the scriptural and theological reflection of the Symposium’s teachers. In the second section, I detail the emphasis on David’s Tabernacle and its relation to prior emphases on praise within Latter Rain worship theology. In the third section, I examine the critical role of music in worship, the practice of the song of the Lord, and the role of

---

3 Another name by which churches in the Latter Rain described themselves was “Restoration Revival Churches,” highlighting the restoration theology that is central to their theological and historical message.
prophecy in congregational worship. In the final section, I explore how the IWS’s characteristic emphasis on the arts in worship followed from their commitment to the restoration of the Tabernacle of David and the enthronement of King Jesus.

Throughout the chapter I rely heavily on Symposium teaching syllabi as well as personal interviews with Symposium teachers. Unlike previous chapters, this chapter incorporates a greater level of published materials from Latter Rain and IWS teachers beyond their teaching syllabi. Though the incorporation of these materials extends the scope beyond what was taught at Symposium, they are critical for describing the broader networks of publications from which Symposium teachers were drawing inspiration.

In a number of cases, these published materials also provide a more detailed window into the contemporaneous teachings on Praise and Worship from leaders within the network who are not as well represented in the syllabi but nevertheless are identified by Symposium participants as critical figures. For example, these connections can be seen in the 1989 book, *An Anthology of Articles on Restoring Praise and Worship to the Church*. This edited volume by David Blomgren, Dean Smith, and Douglas Christoffel demonstrates how IWS leaders like the Griffing brothers and David Fischer were published alongside non-Symposium teachers out of Bible Temple like David Blomgren. Because Praise and Worship is largely an oral tradition that was disseminated through shared experiences, the amalgamation of these materials attempts to present a fuller

---

picture of the teachings on Praise and Worship at the IWS events than the syllabi alone would provide.

4.2 Restorationism

At the heart of the theology of the Latter Rain revival is the emphasis on restoration. At one level, it was characteristic of Pentecostalism’s historical sensibilities to view itself as a restoration of that fundamental Christian practice of speaking in tongues, modeled in Acts 2. On a second level, the emphasis on restoration is drawn from one of the initial sensibilities of North Battleford. Of particular note to our discussion here is Layzell’s emphasis on God’s work of restoring the “sacrifice of praise” to the church, which was disseminated through the Latter Rain Revival. Eventually, the restoration of the Tabernacle of David as a paradigm for worship became a prism for interpreting scripture’s witness on worship that was pleasing to God for IWS’s articulation of Praise and Worship.

4.2.1 Restorationism

The idea of Restorationism built on the broader belief that something has been lost between the New Testament Church and the present day. This narrative is common throughout Protestantism and sees the Protestant Reformation as the first in a series of reversals of centuries-long decay—or alternatively, the shedding of centuries-long

accretions—in the theology and practice of the Christian church, especially in worship. Restorationism also enjoys association with the political formation of the nation of Israel. The emphasis on the restoration of Israel as an important moment in salvation history and end-times chronology has enjoyed widespread celebration among evangelicals, Pentecostals, and charismatics.⁶

Though the emphasis on restoration was a key theological paradigm for the IWS, the guidebooks described the mission of the IWS as serving the “WHOLE Spirit-filled body of Christ” because the “message of Praise and Worship transcends denominational identification or group categorization” (see figure 3.4).⁷ Nevertheless, some of those identities were more prominent in the overarching ethos of the event than others. In the list that follows the above quotation, the 1986 Guidebook lists those multiple identities. Restoration is featured prominently (second only to ‘Pentecostal’) “because we believe and teach that God is restoring his glorious church to full power and dominion as the true Israel of God in the earth today.”⁸ Among the Latter Rain in particular, it did not go unnoticed that the spark of revival in 1948 at North Battleford happened in the same year as the political formation of the nation of Israel. Leaders at IWS saw ancient Israel’s

⁶ Cf. Gerhard Falk, *The Restoration of Israel: Christian Zionism in Religion, Literature, and Politics* (New York: Peter Lang, 2006). Note that Reg Layzell reportedly believed that the prophecy regarding the restoration of the Tabernacle of David in Acts 13 was specifically tied to the restoration of the nation of Israel and did not adopt the interpretation that the Tabernacle of David was related to Praise and Worship.
blessings tied to its successive restorations of Davidic Praise and Worship—an emphasis that appears to be distinct among Pentecostals and evangelicals at the time.

The history of successive restorations leading up to the present day can be found in multiple places across the canon of Symposium teachings over the years. In IWS materials, it is clear that the restoration of Praise and Worship was a result of the Latter Rain Revival of 1948, which was understood to restore other elements such as the “laying on of hands with prophecy” and five-fold ministry governance (derived from Ephesians 4).9

The centrality of Restorationism is embedded in multiple places across the canon of Symposium teachings over the years. The teaching also became the content of full sessions taught year after year, like Larry Dempsey’s “An Historical Overview of Restoration Revivals: 1517–1948.”10 In the session, Dempsey begins the outline by citing a key Restoration text, Hebrews 6:1–2 (“Let us go on unto perfection…”),11 before outlining the “Panorama of Restoration.” This panorama begins with the restoration of justification by faith through Luther in 1517, and marches through six restorations up to the present: water baptism by immersion through the Anabaptists in 1525, holiness through the Wesley brothers in 1750, divine healing through A.B. Simpson in 1880, and

---

9 For a fuller discussion of the Restorationist themes within the Latter Rain Revival, see Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter two.
11 This is also the verse from which Reg Layzell extracts the title of his book *Unto Perfection*. 198
baptism in the Holy Spirit at Azusa Street in 1906, and finally the three-fold “Laying-on-of-hands with Prophecy/Praise and Worship/Governmental Ministries” through the Latter Rain revival of 1948. Other versions of this appeared, both in simple list form, and in a typological version mapped onto the furniture of the Tabernacle of Moses (see Figure 4.1).

For IWS organizers the truth of Restoration was recognized biblically and theologically. But, in addition, it had to be realized through practice, otherwise it was not seen to be effectually restored. Indeed, there was a functional distinction between the truth of the restoration of Praise and Worship and the restoration of other doctrines. For example, the truth of the doctrine of ‘justification by faith alone’ in Luther or the truth of holiness and sanctification by the Wesleys were restored by those theologians (and subsequently became mainstream doctrines). They did not require a practical application. The truth of the restoration of Praise and Worship was unlike these other examples in that it was, in a phrase, a ‘practical theology.’ In other words, it is something that had to be enacted or performed.

4.2.2 Centrality of Praise and “Biblical Theology”

In chapter 2, I discussed how Reg Layzell’s teachings on praise made an early alliance with the Latter Rain revival and how, through the spread of revival, Layzell’s

emphasis on God’s restoration of praise was disseminated. Layzell emphasized primarily spoken praise. LaMar Boschman, IWS teacher and worship leader who attended Glad Tidings Church and Bible college, affirmed that Layzell’s emphasis was ‘just to get the praise out there’ by speaking or shouting it aloud; Layzell was not opposed to musical praise. Boschman attributes the secondary development of the strong connection between music and praise to Dick Iverson. There is no clear, singular moment when Layzell’s spoken praise became musicalized, but by the late 1970s it was assumed in the Latter Rain context that music was a primary vehicle for praise. The alliance between praise and music was made likely through a variety of scriptural examples of the connection (i.e., the Psalms), the common function of singing praise in worship services, and the emerging theology of tabernacle restoration in which music played an important role. David’s Tabernacle in particular became a key window into the connection between music and praise.

In Layzell’s teachings, Psalm 22:3—that God inhabits praise—was paired with Hebrews 13:15, from which Layzell insisted that praise must be offered to God regardless of one’s feelings. Layzell’s teaching can be found in the central affirmations of IWS leaders as Barry Griffing, for example, summarized in his *Music Notes* newsletter, “Jesus dwells in the praises we offer Him as a deliberate free-will offering. This is the sacrifice

---

15 LaMar Boschman, interview with Adam Perez, July 24, 2019.
16 For more on this topic, see Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter one. See also chapter two of this dissertation for a fuller historical account of Layzell and his emphasis on praise.
of praise spoken of in Hebrews 13:15.”

Praise was seen as entirely volitional. It was a “sacrifice” in response to scripture’s (read: God’s) command to praise and it replaced the blood sacrifice of the Tabernacle of Moses.

With praise as a centerpiece of the restoration, theologians, preachers, and teachers turned their attention to scripture’s witness on praise. Over the years, a somewhat standard set of teachings emerged on God’s command to praise, scriptural examples of how to praise, and what happens when you praise. These teachings were derived particularly from the Psalms and major prophets with some reference to a few key New Testament texts. While praise is obviously a common theme across Christian traditions, the emphasis on praise in the Latter Rain context is distinct because of the specificity, origins, and congregational practices derived from the typological teaching on the Tabernacle of David.

18 Lester Ruth has noted that a prior generation of Pentecostals also identified Psalm 22:3 with a similar understanding of it as a promise. Aimee Semple McPherson, founder of the foursquare Gospel, noted back in 1919 that she had seen large gatherings offer up a “great volume of thunderous praises” that allowed her to see God “seated upon a jeweled throne of adoration which His people have builded for Him by their praises.” McPherson connected that vision with Psalm 22:3b, saying, “The Lord inhabiteth the praises of His people. Where real praise is, there God is” (See Aimee Semple McPherson, This is That: Personal Experiences, Sermons and Writings of Aimee Semple McPherson (Los Angeles: Bridal Call Publishing House, 1919), 621. Ruth also notes that McPherson does not seem to have imbued it with as much weight as Layzell, and it did not become a centerpiece of her teaching and ministry. As a counterpoint, foursquare pastor Jack Hayford notes in his book Church on the Way that he heard the saying “the Lord inhabits the praises of His people” growing up in the McPherson’s Foursquare denomination, but did not know its scriptural basis until much later. See Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter one.
19 Notably, the teachings from the Tabernacle of Moses also played an important spatial role, though secondary to the theology of the Restoration of Praise and Worship in particular.
4.3 The Tabernacle of David: A Scriptural Prism for Restorationist Worship

By the late 1960s, the restoration of the Tabernacle of David emerged as a theological and typological prism in Latter Rain contexts for what would become known as Praise and Worship. It remains unclear who first began teaching on this topic. Some suggest it may have been Violet Kiteley soon after the Latter Rain Revival in the late 1940s or early 1950s. Graham Truscott, however, was the first to publish a widely read volume on the topic—*The Power of His Presence: The Restoration of the Tabernacle of David* (1969)—though he does not claim to have originated the teaching. Other influential authors in the Latter Rain network also wrote on the topic, among them Kevin Connor and his book *The Tabernacle of David*, the first of three books on the “Divine Habitations” that he wrote while teaching at Portland Bible College (affiliated with Dick Iverson’s Bible Temple). These and other books became a solid foundation for IWS teaching materials on the topic. The centrality of this teaching was evident in the pride

20 Mark Chironna, interview by Lester Ruth and Adam Perez, September 30, 2019.
23 Bible Temple was a hub of research and publication activity. See also Dick Iverson and Bill Scheidler, *Present Day Truths* (Portland, OR: Bible Temple Press, 1975) and David K. Blomgren, *Restoring God’s Glory: The Present Day Rise of David’s Tabernacle* (Regina, SK: Maranatha Christian Centre, 1985). Blomgren was a teacher at Portland Bible College prior to his move to Regina.
24 For more on the development of the Tabernacle of David paradigm, see Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter two.
of place it was given in Symposium materials and its thoroughgoing repetition as a
theological source-text.

One example of this pride of place—as well as providing an explanation for when
the teaching arose—can be seen in the teaching of Larry Dempsey, one of the IWS
organizers. By 1983, Larry Dempsey was teaching a course at Symposium that situated
the 1948 Latter Rain Revival within a lineage of historic restorations. He did so by
mapping successive revivals onto the furniture of the Tabernacle of Moses (see Fig 4.1).
Figure 4.1: Diagram of the Tabernacle of Moses with major revival events typologically mapped onto each element of the Tabernacle. Larry Dempsey, “The Role of Music in the Panorama of Restoration: As pictured in the Tabernacle of Moses and the Tabernacle of David,” Symposium 1982, Syllabus: 73.

While there are some differences between his teaching outlines, and while the title changed as he repeated the course, the basic content remained largely the same. The course functioned as an introduction for IWS newcomers to the history of the revival and
to the theology of worship. For the 1948 Revival, Dempsey suggested that the laying on of hands with prophecy (citing Hebrews 6:1–2), unity in the Body of Christ, and Praise and Worship were all restored to the church. Notably, he placed another Revival at the pinnacle of his Tabernacle diagram, one that he called the “Tabernacle of David Revival.” It is unclear to what event (if any) he was referring here, even among his fellow IWS leaders. In addition to the apparent idiosyncrasy of the broader teaching on a 1967 Revival, he did not attach any specific doctrine or practice to the revival as he did with the other Revivals. Its name carries the implication that the doctrine of the restoration of the Tabernacle of David was restored at that time. We can say at the very least that it appears that the teaching on the restoration of the Tabernacle of David does not seem to emerge in print before the late 1960s.

Barry Griffing’s exposition of the Tabernacle of David as “Bible Pattern for Contemporary Music Ministry” at Symposium 1982 argued for the distinctive importance of David’s Tabernacle for today. His rationale made critical connections from the Old Testament, to the New Testament, to today in that they regarded David as the prototype and pattern for the New Testament worshiper. Said another way, the Davidic patterns and their effects were still operative in New Testament times and evident across the New

---

25 See also Acts 8:18, 1 Timothy 4:14 and 2 Timothy 1:6.
26 When asked in an interview about this teaching, Steve Griffing said that he was unaware what was being referred to in this teaching and, as the overseer of the syllabi, should have questioned Dempsey about its inclusion. Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez.
27 Mark Chironna has suggested that Violet Kiteley had been teaching on this topic since her initial conversion. Chironna, interview with Adam Perez, February 17, 2020.
Testament, especially in the Book of Acts and in Revelations. Thus, they can still operate today when the same patterns are restored.

Barry Griffing detailed those patterns at greater length and suggested that “Davidic Patterns of Temple Worship” brought spiritual, moral, and military blessing to Israel when they were restored. Through a typological interpretation, the implication was that these could be true for Christians in the USA today. Using stories from the Old Testament, Barry cites Jehoiada and the crowning of King Joash in 2 Chronicles 23, King Hezekiah’s restoration of worship “according to the commandment of David” (and Nathan) in 2 Chronicles 29, and the restoration of the temple and of the Levitical divisions by King Josiah in 2 Chronicles 35. These stories provide the basis for understanding what the effects of restoration of the pattern of Davidic worship would be. As Graham Truscott summarized in his 1984 class on the “History of Davidic Worship Revivals,” “Whenever there was a restoration of God’s Word and ways under a Godly King, the order of worship established by David was always restored.”

These teachings on the Tabernacle of David were not simply treated as historical inspiration for present practice that were good and useful: the practices associated with

28 Note here also the connection to the burnt offering accompanied by the “song of the Lord” and the “trumpets, accompanied by the instruments of King David of Israel,” Chronicles 29:27–28.
29 Note that these scripture passages also include references to things that were established not just under David (and Asaph) but also under Moses and Solomon, especially as regards the burnt offerings and “in the house of his son Solomon.” King Josiah’s story recounted in chapter 34 also includes the purging of idol worship, restoration of the temple, rediscovery of the Book of the Law, and a renewal of the Covenant. The story features the Levites in prominent places in this restoration as “scribes, officials, and gatekeepers” (v. 13). In short, the significance of the story is more contoured and dynamic than simply the appointment of the musicians.
David’s Tabernacle had always been God’s plan for the church. “It is the Father’s intent to restore and maintain Davidic patterns of worship in the New Testament era,” Barry Griffing argued.\(^{31}\) To make that argument, he reached back all the way to before creation and followed an argument from Acts 15:18 that God’s restoration of the Tabernacle of David was not simply known “from eternity” but was part of God’s design. The Tabernacle of David is the pattern God intended for today. Barry’s summary in the Symposium 1982 Guidebook explained that it was the “Fathers [sic] intent even before Lucifer,” alluding to a teaching about God, music, and Lucifer that was popularized by LaMar Boschman.\(^{32}\)

Further citations from the New Testament laid the logical groundwork for the present-day relevance of the Tabernacle teaching: Acts 24:14 shows that Paul was a Davidic worshiper; John 4:19–26 shows that Jesus did not destroy the truth of temple worship (he only transformed the location); 1 Corinthians 10:11 claims Israel’s history profitable for the “last day church”; 1 Corinthians 15:46 shows that worship’s significance is in the spiritual pattern not the natural practices; Revelation 3:7 reveals that the “Key of David” is worship; and Revelation 14 describes the Lamb’s position “in Zion the birthplace of David[ic] Worship” (original emphasis).\(^{33}\) In the teaching outline, Barry then outlined fourteen principles that compare “pre-Davidic” to “Davidic” worship with a fill-in-the-blank section on each one for the “contemporary application.” These

fourteen teachings were, in effect, a summary of virtually all the Tabernacle-related teachings for worship that were developed throughout the Symposium. They consisted of three general categories: (1) the role and responsibility of the worshipers to initiate God’s presence and not just respond to it (principles 1–4), the organizational requirements of the music ministry including training and instruction (principles 5–6, 10–13), and the liturgical make-up of Tabernacle worship: praise, the prophetic song, and pageantry (principles 7–9). Principle 14 concerned the role of festival worship in the life of Israel, a theme that the Symposium saw itself fulfilling through its annual gatherings. The IWS’s self-descriptions as a meeting of the nations in Zion and its regular liturgical practice of a “processional of the tribes of Judah” show this self-awareness.

Though models for worship based on David’s, Moses’s, and Solomon’s tabernacles/temples all circulated during the 1970s and 1980s, the Davidic Tabernacle model became the primary model for structuring access to God through praise at the IWS. The significance of the model is due in large part to the restoration witness of Amos 9:11 and Hebrews 13:15 and the broader set of teachings that quickly emerged around it. The utility and popularity of this model is likely due initially to the web of scriptural connections between the person of King David, the book of Psalms as ancient Israel’s praises, and the role of musical praise (and other arts) in the Tabernacle of David. Other elements particular to the Tabernacle also appealed to the IWS network. First, a (perceived) lack of animal sacrifice that made it a true type for the New Testament
worship of Christ. Second, the spatial organization: there were no internal, structural divisions and all the worshipers had access to the ark of the covenant (read: the presence of God). Third, teachers like David Fischer, Barry Griffing, and Graham Truscott suggested in their sessions that later kings of Israel experienced revival and blessing when they restored the worship of David’s Tabernacle: Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah, and in the post-Babylonian captivity restoration (Ezra 3, esp. verse 10; see also Nehemiah 12). Through the lens of Restorationism, the Tabernacle of David was thus mined for its riches as a paradigm for present day Praise and Worship.

4.3.1 David’s Tabernacle and the Priority of Praise

One of the most critical connections was that between the broader paradigm of praise and the witness of the Tabernacle of David. Within the theological reflection of the IWS’s teachers, the Tabernacle of David seemed to swallow up the classic Latter Rain paradigms that had come before it. First among them was the priority of praise. Though it was already deeply embedded in the theological imagination of the Latter Rain-influenced leaders, its meaning was clarified through its association with the Davidic Tabernacle typological model. The Tabernacle of David provided the contextual and scriptural link between the Old and New Testaments on the priority and power of praise and made it, therefore, relevant to the present-day church at large. What Layzell and subsequent generations knew about the power of praise through their experience in

34 See Blomgren, Restoring God’s Glory, 30.
worship and their understanding of Psalm 22:3 was conveyed and transmuted at IWS through the prism of the Tabernacle of David.

The connection between Psalm 22:3 and the Tabernacle of David was rooted in the restoration prophecy delivered in Acts 15:16 (citing Amos 9:11):

After this I will return and will build again the tabernacle of David, which has fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up...(KJV)

The strength of the language of restoration in this verse lent credibility and a broader framework within which praise was situated (though the interpretation was contested).36 The verse is also rendered in the voice of God, thus making the restoration a work of God and not of man. The restoration of the (worship of the) Tabernacle of David was seen as something that God is doing in the present day and thereby fulfilling this prophecy.

Combined with Hebrews 13:15—the other verse that had been taught by Layzell alongside Psalm 22:3—the Tabernacle context became an interpretive prism through which the practice of Praise and Worship was refracted: “By him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name.” For Layzell, the element of spoken praise, (e.g., the “fruit of our lips”) was a key element. Through the prism of the Tabernacle of David both the elements of “sacrifice of praise” and “continually” each took on a new significance, if not an entirely new

36 It is on this verse in particular that the debate over the purpose of the Tabernacle teaching as a framework for worship hinged. For some, the emphasis was seen in the subsequent verse, Acts 15:17: “that the residue of men might seek the Lord,” i.e., for the purposes of evangelism and not as a paradigm for congregational worship.
Both elements were seen as direct references to the practices of the Levitical priests in the Tabernacle. Even the “fruit of our lips” became more than speaking and was understood to mean singing in particular, given the musical context of Tabernacle worship.

These are just two examples of the way critical verses within the Latter Rain network filtered their prior liturgical understandings through the prism of the Tabernacle of David. In doing so, prior revelations on praise took on new significance and meaning. These new meanings did not erase the original meanings but put theological and practical flesh on them in new, additive ways. They were seen not as a rebuttal of earlier understandings but as an expansion of them—a further revelation of God. Together, this “orthodoxy” and “orthopraxy” constituted what the IWS called “Psalmic Worship” and it had emerged by the late 1970s.38

37 LaMar Boschman makes a similar connection between God’s presence and sacrifice but does not explicitly refer to Psalm 22:3 in his teaching outline but rather Psalm 100:1–2. In a list that draws from across the New Testament Epistles, the Psalms, and major prophets, he comes up with more than a dozen different scriptural references on “spiritual sacrifices” of the worship leader and the accompanying lessons from each scripture reference. See LaMar Boschman, “Worship Leading: The Key to God’s Highest Order” Symposium 1981 Syllabus, 8.

38 At the IWS, sessions dedicated to the Tabernacle of David were offered each year, and the teachers on that theme shifted from year to year. Teachers on this topic included headliners such as David Fischer, Violet Kiteley, and Larry Dempsey. However, by the mid-1980s, the broader conference theme situated the Tabernacle of David within the more general appeal to “Psalmic patterns” for worship. In the 1985 Guidebook, the Symposium directors were actively downplaying the particularity of their background while they emphasized that “[t]he symposium is an area wherein is demonstrated and taught the restoration of Psalmsic patterns of worship to the Church today.” Nevertheless, in that same year, David Fischer alone taught four different sessions explicitly referring to the Tabernacle of David. Titles of Fischer’s sessions included “The Restoration of Davidic Worship in Old Testament History,” “The Tabernacle of David: Its new Covenant Fulfillment,” “The Tabernacle of David: The Crisis of Transition from Old to New,” and “The Tabernacle of David: The Historical Foundation.”
The reference to “Psalmic Patterns” became, in a sense, a veiled reference to the Tabernacle of David in particular. This is evident, for example, in the eighty-page curriculum on “The Restoration of the Worship of the Psalms in the Twentieth-Century Church” that the four conference directors prepared in 1985 for the “Living Word Institute of Worship.” The Institute of Worship was an attempt to codify Symposium teachings into a kind of structured certificate program within the Bible college at Living Waters. The manual included material for four eight-hour courses. The curriculum demonstrates the broader Psalmic patterns for use in a more intensive format and the central role of the Tabernacle of David throughout. Not only was the first session within Part 1 on the Tabernacle of David, but both Parts 3 and 4 of the curricula were expressly on the role of the Tabernacle of David. Notably, Part 2 was organized around the “sacrifice of praise” (see Figure 4.2). In effect, “Psalmic” was largely a veiled reference to the Tabernacle of David.
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Figure 4.2: The Restoration of the Worship of the Psalms in the Twentieth-Century Church, Living Word Institute of Worship at Living Waters Temple (1985): 4.
While the restoration of the Tabernacle of David teaching inspired the pastors and music ministers within the IWS network to search the Old Testament for what, exactly, was part of the worship within the Tabernacle of David, it also inspired them to consult extra-biblical scholarly sources. Early on in the ZionSong Music Notes newsletter, the scholarly work of Marjorie Barber on the history and practice of the song of the Lord (among other topics) was celebrated. Barber had been on staff at both Beall’s Bethesda Missionary Temple in Detroit as well as at Hope Temple in Findlay, Ohio. In Music Notes, Barry Griffing celebrated Barber’s scholarly efforts in commuting to the University of Michigan library to do her study. With no apprehension about the use of scholarly resources for resourcing the biblical understanding of Praise and Worship, Griffing included Barber’s scholarship on multiple pages of each Music Notes newsletter in 1980.  

Beyond the Bible, Alfred Sendrey’s *Music in Ancient Israel* made regular appearances as a resource on ancient Israel and music. Among the various resources highlighted in the Spring/Summer 1982 issue of Music Notes, for example, Sendrey’s book was identified as being “referred to us by Dr. Graham Truscott,” and praised for being the “most thorough work of its kind that we know of” and “reportedly out of print.” Steve Griffing also pointed to Eric Werner’s *The Sacred Bridge* as an

40 Music Notes vol. 2 (1980).
42 Barry Griffing, *Music Notes*, 4.2.
important source. What the two shared was an attempt to describe the available research on the ancient musical and liturgical practices of ancient Israel. This was an important link because of the underlying theology that emphasized the restoration to the church of practices that had been lost. In order to understand what needed to be restored, they turned first to scholarly resources that promised to elucidate what had been lost.

4.3.2 Competing Tabernacle Models

While the emphasis on the Tabernacle of David became a key prism for reading scripture and theologizing on worship at the IWS, it was not the only typological model employed in the broader theological network in which they were embedded. Indeed temple/tabernacle typologies were of general interest to theologians in these networks because of the clear associations of them to God’s presence (the central feature of worship). More so, understanding the way worship operated in these biblical-historical locations was important for identifying the scriptural foundations for correct worship in the present. The question when assessing these other models was: “What can be learned?”

The Tabernacle of Moses was the other model most prominent at both the IWS and in the broader world of Praise and Worship. The variety of influences and leaders within IWS allowed for a diversity of perspectives on the utility of the Tabernacle of Moses model. As a result of this fluidity, IWS teachers played to both sides and used the

---

44 For a discussion for this theological model among others, see Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter two.
Tabernacle of Moses model both as a positive resource for teaching and as a straw-man for the significance of David’s Tabernacle. One of the earliest examples in the Symposium syllabi was Robbie Carder’s 1981 session. Carder, pastor of the church where LaMar Boschman served at the time, began his session by highlighting the difference between access to God’s presence in the Tabernacles of Moses and David.\footnote{Robbie Carder, “David’s Tabernacle: Biblical Pattern for Music Ministry,” IWS 1981 Syllabus, 80.} In a more intense version of the same basic move, David Fischer began teaching a session in 1984 called “Tradition Versus Revival: A Contrasting Study of the Tabernacles of Moses and David,” a session he taught in various versions over the years (see Figure 4.3).\footnote{See, for example, a reimagining of the teaching in David Fischer, “The Tabernacle of David: The Historical Foundations” IWS Syllabus 1988, 74–77. It was not uncommon for teachers to modify and repackage their teachings year by year in order to make the sessions appear fresh for returning attendees. Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020. Note that Graham Truscott was already making a similar historical move in his book \textit{Power of His Presence}, 74, 218–9.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{tabernacle_diagram.png}
\caption{David Fischer, “The Fulfilment of Moses’ Tabernacle in the Tabernacle of David,” IWS Syllabus 1988: 77.}
\end{figure}
As the title suggests, the session interpreted the features and furniture of the Tabernacle of Moses as being typologically fulfilled and expanded through Christ and the Spirit in the Tabernacle of David. Most important of the elements of fulfillment was that the Ark of the Covenant, which represented the presence of God, was now in David’s Tabernacle where worshipers could experience unmediated access to it.

But not all within the Latter Rain network were as affirming of the centrality of the Tabernacle of David typology over and above the Tabernacle of Moses. Judson Cornwall, easily one of the most widely regarded itinerants of the period, spoke regularly at Symposium and within the broader Pentecostal and charismatic contexts on the topic of praise.47 His book Let Us Praise (1973)48 is one of the earliest published volumes on the topic. In it, Cornwall described a typology of Praise and Worship that connects Psalm 22:3 and Psalm 100:4, using the simple architectural model of the Tabernacle of Moses. Describing a crucial moment of development in his early ministry in Praise and Worship, Cornwall described his experience with his own church congregation and outlined the rationale for this connection:

‘Look,’ I said, ‘let’s all gather together at the front of the auditorium. Choir, come off the platform and join the congregation. God’s Word declares in Psalm 100, verse 4, ‘Enter into His gates with thanksgiving, and into His course with praise.’ As they came forward, I went on to explain, ‘In the tabernacle in the wilderness, God’s place of habitations was the Holy of Holies. It sat in a courtyard surrounded by a linen fence which had only one gate. Anyone approaching God came through that gate and walked through the courtyard to get to the tabernacle in which God dwelt. The gate is called ‘thanksgiving’ and the court is called

47 See Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter two.
‘praise.’ That is why Psalm 22:3 declares that God inhabits the praises of His people. The place of His dwelling is in the midst of the courtyard of praise. If we desire to approach God, we must come through praise. If we would enter petitions before God, we must also come through thanksgiving, as Philippians 4:6 tells us: ‘With thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God.’

As might be expected, the emphasis here was on the location of God’s presence and on the dependable access to it through a scriptural logic—a story with echoes of Layzell’s early approach to teaching congregations to praise. Cornwall’s *Let Us Praise* book as a whole shows an earlier stage of praise and tabernacle theology. While a number of the marks are there that would later become pervasive, they are not yet full-fledged. For example, Cornwall’s longest scriptural exegeses related to praise are derived from Psalm 81 and Psalm 149. With Psalm 81, Cornwall connected praise to God’s covenant: if we do six aspects of praise, God will do four things in response. From Psalm 149, Cornwall explored the methods and motivations for praising God. While not tying praise strongly to Restorationism in this work, his message resonated with the core emphasis of Restorationism, especially the importance of praise as a reliable way to encounter God.

In an additive way in the development of Praise and Worship theology during the 1970s and 1980s, one aspect of Cornwall’s emphasis on the Mosaic Tabernacle became central to Praise and Worship at IWS and more broadly: the typological vision of worship

---

50 Cornwall, *Let Us Praise*, 61–79. Chief among the outcomes of praise in this section on Psalm 81 is one related to resisting idolatry and receiving power when engaging with demons (i.e., spiritual warfare).
51 For more on Cornwall’s background and theology, see Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter two.
as an architecture journey into God’s presence. As above, Cornwall built his understanding on Psalm 100:4. Concomitant with this journey was the emerging distinction between the words translated for “praise” and “worship.” Ruth and Lim have argued that though he used the terms synonymously in his 1973 *Let Us Praise*, he had become convinced by the time of *Let Us Worship* in 1983 that they had two different meanings. Not only were they distinct, but one relied on the other: “praise prepares us for worship” and “praise is a prelude for worship.” These two descriptions were bolstered by a longer explanation that “praise is the vehicle of expression that brings us into God’s presence, but worship is what we do once we gain an entrance to that presence.”

Cornwall was a prime mover in popularizing this distinction, though the teaching was already very popular among Symposium leaders.

---


53 Some within IWS saw this distinction as helpful for organizing times of Praise and Worship but had already begun to see it as having weak biblical and theological support. Steve Griffing, for example, suggested that the distinction was an important rhetorical device but saw it breaking down when pressed. Bob Sorge’s *Exploring Worship* likewise challenged the idea that there is a defensible distinction between the two activities. Various IWS teachers had different ways of describing how the congregation’s Praise and Worship related to God’s presence (Bob Sorge, *Exploring Worship: A Practical Guide to Praise & Worship* (Lee’s Summit, MO: Oasis House, 1987)). Nevertheless, the distinction was in use more broadly at and beyond the IWS. Barry Griffing’s session in 1982 on the Davidic Tabernacle described the relationship by saying that praise from the congregation “initiate[s] the presence of God,” putting a high level of agency on the dependability of musical praise to manifest God’s presence. In Charlotte Baker’s *On Eagle’s Wings*, Baker suggested something more subtle that separated out the emerging understanding of Praise and Worship as separate activities. She noted that praise creates an atmosphere in which God is pleased to dwell, while worship is a loving response to that presence (Charlotte E. Baker, *On Eagle’s Wings: A Book on Praise and Worship* (Seattle, WA: King’s Temple, 1979), 30, 46–47. For a longer discussion, see Ruth and Lim, *History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, chapter two. Among Latter Rain leaders, there were likely as many subtle, idiosyncratic distinctions in phrasing this relationship as there were leaders. Nevertheless, as a result of the
Cornwall’s reliance on the Tabernacle of the Wilderness (i.e., Moses) as the primary type for Praise and Worship was distinctive among IWS teachers. For Cornwall, the primary utility of the Tabernacle of Moses was in how it pointed to the mediation of Christ the High Priest for an encounter with God and its architectural structure, including through Praise and Worship. Indeed, Cornwall apparently never adopted a Tabernacle of David theology wholesale, though he was in good fellowship with the IWS leaders who were clearly teaching it at the time. He was not the only one either: the Bealls at Bethesda were another important node in the Latter Rain network that did not adopt the teaching (though they did not condemn it either). Despite the difference in preference for a primary typological model, Cornwall continued to be an influential voice for IWS leaders and a Praise and Worship popularizer for broader Pentecostal contexts.

4.2.4 Biblical Exegesis and the Seven Hebrew Words for Praise

Unlike concurrent worship movements in the 1980s that, for example, used insights from culture and sociology to make up for the apparent lack of directions offered by scripture to govern worship (e.g., the Church Growth Movement), uncovering a “biblical theology” in the pages of Scripture was the exegetical and liturgical modus operandi of Restorationist theologians affiliated with the IWS. The discussion of centrality of these tabernacle typologies, a distinction emerged between the character of praise and the character of worship in the 1970s and 1980s. As we will see in the next chapter, that had important implications for the way musical style, tempo, and orchestration were employed in Praise and Worship music.

54 For a fuller treatment on Cornwall’s use of the Tabernacle of Moses see Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter two.
Cornwall in the section above is a clear example of this. As IWS leaders continued to explore the Psalms and the diverse witness of the Praise and Worship in David’s Tabernacle, additional teachings emerged that continued to move Praise and Worship practice beyond music alone. Consequently, the theology and practice of Praise and Worship continued to expand and develop. By the late 1970s, a common exegetical exercise for these leaders was to look through English language Bible translations for the word “praise” and find the corresponding Hebrew word(s) that had been translated into English as such. Later, they followed the same process for the Greek words for “worship” in the New Testament (understandably finding fewer instances).

In the Symposium network, the codification of this teaching is attributed to Dr. Sam Sasser’s sessions on the “Seven Hebrew Words for Praise.” By 1981, Sasser was leading a session on the topic using an impressive multi-media setup that included three coordinated projection screens and that was a highlight for Symposium attendees that year. It appears, however, that Sasser did not originate this teaching, as others had been teaching it around the same time. Judson Cornwall in his 1973 Let Us Praise, for example, used the Hebrew words in summary form when writing about the biblical

---

56 One example of teaching beyond the Symposium is Olen Griffing’s sermon in the year following his church’s role in hosting the Symposium. Olen Griffing, of Shady Grove Church, gave a sermon on the Seven Hebrew words for Praise on February 7, 1982. In it he suggested that though some of the older members may be familiar with the teaching and the reason why they praise, newcomers may not know why they raise their hands or participate in other activities associated with Charismatic Churches. Special thanks to Dave Nevland, former member of Shady Grove Church, for recovering and sharing this recording.
instructions on how to praise (though not codified as a set of seven).\textsuperscript{57} Charles Trombley’s 1976 \textit{How to Praise the Lord}, appears to be the first publication that expressly laid out the seven Hebrew words teaching.\textsuperscript{58} By the 1980s, this teaching was a standard element in Pentecostal praise literature. Sometimes it was presented in full form and other times not. LaMar Boschman’s \textit{The Prophetic Song} is an example of a text in which the basic hermeneutic of looking to the Hebrew words was presumed and elements of the teaching were sprinkled throughout the book, though it never appeared in full form in one place.\textsuperscript{59}

The hermeneutical exercise of looking for the original meanings in the ancient languages was not new or unique for these Pentecostals, but the results were unique because Tabernacle praise had become a new prism for scripture’s liturgical witness. Pentecostal theologizing relied on the interpretation of scripture performed primarily by anointed individuals, but it also depended upon a few trusted sources such as the \textit{Thompson Chain-Reference Study Bible} and \textit{Strong’s Concordance}. Using these Bible dictionaries and concordances, leaders amassed an impressive list of biblical citations on praise and the repertory of patterns, practices, and outcomes evident in scriptural examples. They took their newfound Hebrew (and Greek) words and began to summarize what the most common and distinctive ones were. Indeed, even when the Jesus People

\textsuperscript{58} Charles Trombley, \textit{How to Praise the Lord} (Harrison, AR: Fountain Press, 1976).
\textsuperscript{59} LaMar Boschman, \textit{The Prophetic Song} (Bedford, TX: Revival Press, 1986).
began exploring the biblical witness on praise, they also did so by turning to biblical word studies.\textsuperscript{60}

A common teaching on the “seven Hebrew words for praise” emerged from a variety of sources and is evident widely across contemporary literature.\textsuperscript{61} Though there are more than seven, the number was reduced in teaching forms, likely for rhetorical effect: towdah, yadah, halal, zamar, barak, tehillah, and shabach. Likewise, teachings on these Hebrew words for praise were also being taught as three sets of three that were organized around the actual bodily practices inferred by the Hebrew words: (1) the mouth in speaking, singing, or shouting praise, (2) the hands being upraised, clapping, and for musical instruments, and (3) bodily movement such as standing, bowing, dancing.\textsuperscript{62} In some IWS syllabi, the teaching was expressly identified as the “seven Hebrew words for praise” and in at least one other case it was only implied or used as the structure for a discussion of praise and the source material remains unnamed and unattributed.

Nevertheless, both the content and the hermeneutic deeply informed each of the primary theological themes and practices discussed in this chapter, especially on the biblical

\textsuperscript{60} See Ruth and Lim, \textit{History of Contemporary Praise and Worship}, chapter three.
\textsuperscript{61} As mentioned above, Charles Trombley is credited with possibly the first publication on this theme in his book \textit{How to Praise the Lord} (Harrison, AR: Fountain Press, 1976). Most recently, this teaching has resurfaced in a book by contemporary worship recording artist Chris Tomlin and Darren Whitehead, \textit{Holy Roar: 7 Words that Will Change the Way You Worship} (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2018)
defense for the use of the arts in Praise and Worship as it was connected also to Psalmonic or Tabernacle of David themes.

4.4 Restoration of Music

4.4.1 Music’s Unique Position

As I have acknowledged above, music became a key feature of Praise and Worship and perhaps the most enduring of the elements associated with the Tabernacle of David typology. This transformation happened not through the star status of musical worship leaders or their recordings, but through their biblical exegesis. As a result of their theological exploration, music was not only elevated to be the central activity of Praise and Worship but the musical leaders themselves were elevated to a new status. The musicians were no longer seen simply as technicians charged with leading the congregation in song. Neither were they seen as artists whose gifts in songwriting or musicianship were a boon for drawing a crowd for evangelistic purposes. Now, because of biblical theologizing, they were understood to enjoy a status akin to the tribe of Levites who offered continual Praise and Worship in the Tabernacle day and night and were responsible for the mediating the presence of God. This transformation was developed out of the Tabernacle of David teaching because, as David Blomgren’s 1985 book *Restoring God’s Glory* summarized, the Davidic Tabernacle was a greater example than Moses’s because “those ministering in David’s Tabernacle offered spiritual sacrifices
only—sacrifices of joy and of Praise and Worship.” In a word, the music ministers became priests whose offered a musical sacrifice to God.

Two authors beyond the Symposium materials helpfully mark the emerging primacy of music by the mid-1980s: Dick Iverson and Judson Cornwall. Iverson, in his 1975 book *Present Day Truths* (with Bill Scheidler), emphasized the benefits of music for Praise. Anecdotally, LaMar Boschman also attributed the strong musicalization of praise within Latter Rain networks to Dick Iverson’s influence. Judson Cornwall also marked the growing significance by the early 1980s. As Ruth and Lim summarize, “[Cornwall’s] 1983 book, *Let Us Worship*, made it quite clear: the one leading the singing had this liturgical responsibility” of bringing people into the presence of God through praise.

As I explore in this section, the Tabernacle of David provided the prism through which multiple features of the restoration of musical Praise and Worship was understood, first in the organization of music ministry and second in the understanding that music leader was a priestly role.

4.4.2 The Restoration of the Due Order of Music Leadership

The musicalization of Praise and Worship was not confined to the congregational practices within a worship service but also deeply embedded in the restoration of the

---

64 Iverson and Scheidler, *Present Day Truths*, 208.
65 Boschman, interview with Adam Perez, July 24, 2019.
leadership order of Tabernacle worship. With descriptions of the organization of musicians in David’s Tabernacle from 1 and 2 Chronicles, IWS teachers extended the scope of the Tabernacle of David typology to a theology of ministry leadership and its structure of authority or governance.

The practical restoration of Praise and Worship to the church began first, Barry Griffing noted, with the “worshipping [sic] elders [i.e., pastors],” then the musicians, then the congregation. It flowed downward through the spiritual leadership of the church in that direction. It was seen as both a spiritual and a God-ordained administrative structure. Barry cited 1 Chronicles 15 as the source, showing that it was David as the leader (not initially the Levitical priests/musicians nor the congregation) whose volitional act sparked revival in Israel:

It was David… not the musicians or the Israelites… who initiated the great pageant of Bringing Up the Ark to Zion. David prepared the place of praise and the praising people. David set the qualifications for the musicians and appointed those who qualified. David himself led the procession and danced before the Lord with all his might. . . We can conclude from studying 1 Chron. 15 and 16 that:

THE WORSHIPPING ELDERS EQUIP AND RELEASE THE WORSHIPPING MUSICIANS IN THEIR MINISTRY UNTO THE LORD.67

Note here the important role of the Elders—the pastors—in restoration. The restoration of Praise and Worship was impossible (if not unbiblical) without the leadership of an elder who had adopted Praise and Worship. Members of the Symposium demonstrated their commitment to the importance of the ministry of the Elder by offering

free registration for pastors and their wives, general sessions by prominent pastors, and breakout sessions reserved for “elders” on the role of the pastor as the key to God’s restoration of the church in Praise and Worship. In other words, IWS teachers emphasized pastors as having a critical role of restoring Praise and Worship to the church.

Though David instigated the revival through his worship, David also empowered and released the priesthood to its ministry before the Lord. Building on scripture’s witness to the leadership structure of the Tabernacle of David, a model for ministry organization soon came into being. Critical to that reworking was the understanding that the work of the Levites was essentially musical and thus applicable to music ministry today. Kevin Connor, for example, argued for the strong connection between God’s presence and music performed by the Levitical priests, calling it their “service of song” in the Tabernacle. Conner was a writer and teacher affiliated with Bible Temple whose works were in circulation among IWS teachers. Connor and others saw this as the ancient equivalent of the modern day “song service” common in Pentecostal and evangelical churches at the time. This lexical sleight of hand helped cement the idea that the music minister had become a priestly role appointed by the local Elder and responsible for the special manifestation of God’s presence through music.68

68 See Kevin Connor, Tabernacle of David, 176. See also Ruth and Lim, History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, chapter two.
How did this work out in both practical and exegetical ways? Barry Griffing described how, early on in his work in the worship ministry at Shiloh, he established a schedule of rotating teams of worship musicians, akin to the “courses” of the Levitical priests appointed to make music in the tabernacle on a schedule. While it may have been functional as much as anything in the mid-1970s (or today), he laid out his rationale for it typologically and theologically. Through the prism of the Tabernacle of David, a scriptural account for music ministry organization was (re)constructed. The musical groups within the music ministry structure included choirs and orchestras as well as singers and the rhythm section, elements that were important to the IWS community that had been developing an orchestral sound. Drawing on the language and structure derived primarily from 1 Chronicles, the “Chief Musician” (as music ministers had begun calling themselves) was the organizational leader of the music ministry, under the Elder.

Graham Truscott’s example (below) from the IWS teaching materials on the organization of the musicians in the Tabernacle of David can be found across literature written by IWS-affiliated teachers:

David—King/Shepherd
Chenaniah—Master of Song
Asaph, Ethan, Heman—Chief Musician
14 Named: 2nd Degree Musician/Singers (1 Chron 15:18)
24 Sons of Chief Musicians (1 Chron 25:1–8)
288 Singers (1 Chron 25:7–31)

69 Barry Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 26, 2020.
Moreover, this structure was directly adapted to sessions on the organization for ministry and applied to the understanding of those within the music ministry being “properly submitted to pastoral leadership.” Likewise, it created a “chain of command” that understood itself to operate directly under “God’s due order”—another euphemism not for the sequence of worship events but for the alignment of musicians under their pastoral leadership.72

Notice, too, the way Barry Griffing’s quotation above describes the function of the “worshiping musicians” as qualified and appointed. The scriptural reconstruction of Levitical ministry aligned with the experience of the IWS leaders in the emphasis on excellence and skill in music (not to mention with their theology). Early and central leaders like Steve Griffing, Mike Herron, Dean Demos, Janet Shell, and Warren Hastings all had degrees in music ranging from an undergraduate degree in composition (Steve Griffing) to doctoral degrees in voice (Dean Demos). The scriptural emphasis on skill in the appointment of worship leaders in the Tabernacle was embedded in that first generation of IWS leaders. The IWS also devoted afternoon sessions each day to develop these musical (and technical) skills. With a diverse audience of church musicians and song leaders, the range of skills sessions was broad. Leveled classes accommodated this

range, while also providing returning Symposium attendees opportunities to increase their musical skills by attending each year.

As Praise and Worship took on an increasingly central role in congregational life, the growing power of the music minister did not go unnoticed. A variety of sessions was offered for easing this transition and developing the concept of team ministry between the pastor and the music minister in a new way. Already in 1982, sessions on offer included Hazel Sasser’s (spouse of Sam Sasser) session “The Relationship between the Musical and Pastoral Staff,” Violet Kiteley’s “The Team Ministry of Pastor and Music Minister” and Warren Hastings’s “Loyalty: The Key in Staff Relationships.” These sessions aimed to ameliorate the potential fears from some pastors who were accustomed to leading the “song service” that they were turning over too much power to their musicians. In some settings, the music minister had long enjoyed leadership of the song service, however, many were also accustomed to having the musicians in a supportive, less prominent role.

In addition to restoring—and thereby elevating—the role of the musicians within the leadership structure of the church, the new priestly role of the musicians in Praise and Worship also helped transformed the sense of the audience for their music-making. Under the Tabernacle of David typology, the role of the musician was seen as a minister to God, rather than minister to the people or to prepare them to hear the sermon (as was the case in older Pentecostal and revival patterns).

Though the onus is put on the Levitical musicians and their musical leadership in the Tabernacle, it should not be misunderstood: the responsibility is for the worship community as a whole to initiate God’s presence faithfully in musical praise. Referencing
1 Peter 2:9 and the understanding that all Christians are part of the “holy priesthood,” all the worshipers were therefore responsible for not only making musical worship to the Lord but for manifesting the presence of God. As David Blomgren wryly noted, “Apparently God requires of us that we come before His presence with singing.” Though this is true for all Christians, it is an important development for Praise and Worship that some of the Levites were appointed and set apart by David for this particular task in Tabernacle worship (1 Chron 25). To come before God’s presence dutifully with singing therefore applied to all the New Testament priesthood of all believers.

4.4.3 The Song of the Lord and the Spirit of Prophecy

As I showed in my review of the early Symposium events in the previous two chapters, the song of the Lord was perhaps the central worship practice at the IWS. As with other worship expressions, it existed in tandem with the restoration of the Tabernacle of David broadly and the Levitical priesthood in particular. In its most developed form, adherents regarded the capacity to flow in the song of the Lord as a

---

73 Blomgren, Song of the Lord, 5.
74 In Warren Hastings’s “The Ministry of the Levites: Their Worship and Work” in the 1983 conference syllabus, he demonstrated what was a standard approach to the role of the music minister as the New Testament fulfillment of the Levitical ministry. Hastings detailed a variety of features and responsibilities from 1 Chronicles relevant to music ministers today: they were appointed by David, set apart spiritually and administratively, freed from other pastoral responsibilities (i.e., available for 24/7 Praise and Worship), they appointed singers and musicians, and maintained a lifestyle of Praise and Worship throughout the day. See Warren Hastings, “The Ministry of the Levites: Their Worship and Work,” IWS 1983 Syllabus, 89–94.
75 Hastings, “The Ministry of the Levites.”
gifting that was bestowed on the entire priesthood of believers (though the exercise of it by the congregation was reduced in later years of the Symposium as the attendance blossomed). As a prophetic function, the theology of the song of the Lord and its practice existed in a dynamic relationship with broader theology of prophecy was the subject of regular plenary sessions and skill labs at Symposium. In order to understand more fully the theology and practice of the song of the Lord at the IWS, it is critical to review briefly the early stages of spontaneous singing in Latter Rain worship.

Two other terms for spontaneous singing are relevant to the discussion of the song of the Lord here: the “heavenly choir” and “singing in the Spirit.” Over the years since the initial restoration of this basic practice of moving from written songs into spontaneous singing of the “heavenly choir” remained largely unchanged among Latter Rain churches. Sometimes the singing was in “earthly tongues that [the singer] had never learned” and sometimes it was simply sung praise using English phrases such as “praise the Lord,” “hallelujah,” or other improvisatory words to God. Others referred to this as a time of “singing in the Spirit.”

---

76 To take just one example, see the Symposium 1982 Guidebook. Barry and Steve Griffing gave a plenary on the topic one day and Larry Dempsey the next. Likewise, Mike Herron taught a Bible session on the topic. Larry Dempsey offered a vocal lab on techniques for “Releasing the Song of the Lord” and Barry Griffing, Steve Griffing, and Mike Herron taught instrumental labs.
77 See chapter two for my discussion of Jim Watt and the restoration of this practice.
79 Warren Hastings, interview with Adam Perez, December 30, 2019. See also Bob Johnson, interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, April 6, 2017. In the interview, Johnson says that the main distinction for the new kind of worship he experienced at Elim Bible Institute “would have been what some call ‘singing in the Spirit,’ spiritual song, [or] the song of the Lord. Just extended times of the congregation lifting their voice. And this does not necessarily mean
within the Latter Rain movement, it was a new feature that initially drew some leaders into the practice of Praise and Worship for the first time.80

Out of the heavenly choir, the particular practice of the song of the Lord emerged. The song of the Lord was generally understood as a prophetic song given by God to the singer. These definitions were derived from word studies of both the English phrases “spiritual song” and “song of the Lord” as well as the Greek phrase “ode pneumatikos.” The text could be a prophetic word for the congregation or, more commonly, a song of praise to God that was given “prophetically” by God. For the Latter Rain prophecy was understood to be restored and this musical form of prophecy was a central feature of the initial restoration and was associated with the laying on of hands.81

In the following section, I describe how the song of the Lord was understood theologically and practiced in Praise and Worship. In particular, the song of the Lord reveals a unique musicalization of the practice of prophecy within congregational worship. To describe the song of the Lord and its development, I use theological descriptions that are found in multiple sources, including Latter Rain book publications, the Symposium Syllabi, and in Barry Griffing’s Music Notes newsletter.

---

80 This is the case for leaders like Tim Smith from Bible Temple as well as Bob Johnson. Because their backgrounds were not in Latter Rain in particular, their first experiences with this type of extended, improvisational singing were exciting. Tim Smith, interview with Adam Perez, January 17, 2020. Bob Johnson, interview with Adam Perez, February 19, 2020.
81 See Faupel, “Latter Rain” in Winds from the North, 248.
4.4.3.1 What is the “Song of the Lord”?

David Blomgren’s 1978 book *The Song of the Lord* was the first book-length treatment of the subject,\(^8^2\) and was highly regarded among IWS leaders as an important and influential resource. In my interviews with Symposium leaders, it was evident that many were aware of the book at the time of its publication, and many interviewees noted that it strengthened and clarified their understanding on the subject. As an instructor and administrator at Portland Bible College, Blomgren and his teaching had a particularly strong and direct influence on the leaders coming out of Bible Temple and beyond through the global distribution network of the materials being produced by Bible Temple Press. The title is somewhat misleading as the book was a wide-ranging overview of the relationship between music’s natural features and use in the spiritual life of Christians. It gives an account of the role of singing in the Old and New Testaments as well as in the early church.\(^8^3\) It concludes with an attempt at explaining the meaning and use of the phrase “psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs” that Paul used in Ephesians 5 and Colossians

---

\(^8^2\) David Blomgren, *Song of the Lord* (Portland, OR: Bible Temple Press, 1976). Blomgren was on staff at Portland Bible College. By the time of its publishing, Blomgren had been sent out to pastor a church in Tampa, Florida.

\(^8^3\) Blomgren cites sources ranging from contemporary Bible concordances and dictionaries to ancient historians Josephus, Philo, and Eusebius. He also cites Alfred Sendrey and Eric Werner whose contemporary work on the history and practice of Jewish music is an important (and lengthy) source for Steve Griffing and others. It is likely the case that IWS leaders were influenced by Blomgren’s book and its sources and turned to the Sendrey and Werner books for further insights. See Alfred Sendrey, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York: New York Philosophical Library, 1960/9); Eric Werner, *The Sacred Bridge: Liturgical Parallels in Synagogue and Early Church Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).
3. These two passages from the New Testament — particularly the phrase “spiritual song” there — provided the scriptural imperative to (re)discover and restore this lost practice. The book climaxes with a detailed account of the different kinds of “spiritual song” in scripture.

For David Blomgren, hymns are distinct from psalms in that they have an element of praise but are directed horizontally—they are for teaching and edification. Psalms, on the other hand, take God to be their primary audience. The category of spiritual songs, however, is not categorized by the hymns’ directionality but by their inspiration: “songs of praise of a spontaneous of unpremeditated nature, sung under the impetus of the Holy Spirit.” A spiritual song can then be either in the manner of a “psalm” (directed to God) or of a “hymn” (to others). A further subcategorization is necessary: that between a “song of praise” and a “song of the Lord.” Again, the song of praise is a spiritual song sung to God while a “song of the Lord” is directed to God’s people. It can have one of five functions: teaching, admonishing, exhorting, edifying, or comforting.

Though his focus was on the practice of singing, Blomgren’s study was also a reworking of the interpretation of 1 Corinthians 12:1–3 and of the broader understanding of the charismatic gifts in that passage. For Blomgren, the use of the word “pneumatikos” referenced “men [sic] who speak by the Spirit.” Consequently, the interpretation of

---

84 For a scholarly exegesis of this text, see Amy Whisenand, "Singing Reconciliation: Moral Practice, Embodied Theology" (Th.D. Dissertation, Duke University Divinity School, 2020).
85 Blomgren, Song of the Lord, 56.
86 Blomgren, Song of the Lord, 11, 64.
87 Blomgren, Song of the Lord, 57.
Paul’s use of this word extended also to spiritual songs “which are sung through a human vessel who is singing ‘by the Spirit.’ It is a song under the direct unction and anointing of the Holy Spirit . . . The spontaneous song with its instant improvising is due to the fact that it is a Song of the Spirit and not the sole product of man’s composition.” For Blomgren, this is what Paul imagined in Ephesians 5 (and Colossians 3).\(^{88}\)

Though Blomgren’s book was perhaps the most detailed and idiosyncratic description of the song of the Lord practice, it was a key resource for IWS teachers. At the IWS, however, a more straightforward understanding took hold. Thus, by the mid-1970s the singing of “spiritual songs” (of one kind or another) was already being practiced and the book became a primary theological resource on the topic.

Just because the song of the Lord was prophetic and inspired did not mean that one could not prepare for the spiritual song outside of the worship gathering. It was commonly understood that singing spontaneous songs to God in one’s personal devotional time was an important and necessary way to prepare for receiving it publicly.\(^{89}\) Some leaders, like Dan Gardner, would improvise new songs to the text of the psalms as a devotional practice.\(^{90}\) Blomgren suggests that studying the word for inspiration, asking God to “birth a ‘new song’,” and having the joy of the Lord are all important ways to prepare to receive it. Blomgren saw exercising the song of the Lord as

\(^{88}\) Blomgren, *Song of the Lord*, 58.
\(^{89}\) See for example Marjorie Barber’s exposition of this theme in ZionSong *Music Notes*, 2.6 and 3.1.
\(^{90}\) Dan Gardener, interview with Adam Perez, February 12, 2020.
critical because improvising new songs would be the work of heaven (citing Revelation 5:9 and 14:3).  

The song of the Lord also factored into the economy of congregational song choices. Barry Griffing, for example, suggested that the passages in Ephesians and Colossians reflected a system of “good, better, best.” Singing Psalms from scripture was good, singing hymns (human compositions) was better, but songs from the Spirit were best.  

It was not that he and others rejected Blomgren’s scriptural interpretation; Blomgren’s categories were just too bulky for popularization. Perhaps more importantly, the specificity did not especially aid people in their interpretation of their experience of receiving the song of the Lord. And so, instead of a deep concern with splitting hairs over the type of spiritual song being delivered, the “song of the Lord” became the overarching category for songs received spontaneously during congregational worship, especially during a time of spontaneous congregational singing. Even songs of praise or prophecy that were received spontaneously outside of congregational worship could be considered a song of the Lord and introduced as such in a congregational worship setting during a time of spontaneous praise singing, as was the case with Dave Moody’s “All Hail King Jesus” at Glad Tidings Temple.

The song of the Lord was an integral feature of Symposium worship services. At Symposium, the song of the Lord would often emerge out of a thematically-organized

---

(and pre-selected) song set of three or four songs that would “jumpstart us into the presence of God.” Leaders would then “let the prophetic atmosphere take over and [they] would go from there.” The worship theme after that period of heavenly choir and song of the Lord was not necessarily the theme with which they had started out. David Fischer described a story from the final evening worship rally at Symposium 1983 in Pasadena at which a forty-five-minute segment of prophetic worship broke out on the theme of bridal intimacy with Christ. Though this theme was not unprecedented, it was somewhat unusual because of Symposium’s strong emphasis on spiritual warfare in worship and conquering for Christ at the time. Moving into the prophetic dimension of the heavenly choir and song of the Lord was the way worship leaders allowed the service to fulfill God’s divine purpose for that service. In the prophetic dimension, the worshipers engaged directly with God and heard God’s voice.

4.4.3.2 The Spirit of Prophecy and the Cloud of Anointing

The song of the Lord was a way of hearing God’s voice and God’s will and word to the congregation in that moment. Understanding it requires an understanding of the role of prophecy and the experience of the flow of the Spirit. An exploration of the role of prophecy for understanding the song of the Lord is required because, according to IWS teaching, the song of the Lord functions under a prophetic mantle, and the “school of the

---

94 David Fischer, interview.
prophets” included education in music. More importantly, the practice of the song of the Lord was part of a broader re-orientation of classic Pentecostal beliefs on the operation of spiritual gifts from a strong emphasis on inspiration to one of volition. Bob Johnson summarized the shift in teaching at the time on spiritual gifts such as prophecy as a move from saying “I’m led to do this or that…” to ‘I will.” This aspect was deeply embedded in the volitional act of praise discussed above. It also resonated strongly, for example, with Word of Faith communities that already had a profound sense of accessing God’s power through an act of spoken faith. The IWS also extended the understanding of the use of Spiritual gifts within Latter Rain circles.

How did the song of the Lord extend the classical understanding of the gifts of the Spirit? By making prophecy available to everyone in congregational worship. It also had a tense relationship with Latter Rain doctrine in that the song of the Lord was ostensibly the evidence of the spiritual gift of prophecy but without the “laying on of hands” that was critical to the way prophecy was understood to be restored in the Latter Rain Revival.

---

95 See LaMar Boschman, *The Prophetic Song*, 48–49. Boschman quotes both David Blomgren and Alfred Sendrey in making the connection to the importance of music training for the prophetic office.
96 The Latter Rain renovated the bestowal or anointing of gifts by the laying on of hands and prophecy. Through the presence of a “prophetic presbytery,” lay persons could present themselves to receive prophecy and the bestowal of spiritual gifts (including the baptism of the Holy Spirit, prophecy, healing, tongues, etc.). Often in Latter Rain churches, special services were held and recognized, and “proven” leaders were invited from elsewhere to minister. Beginning with the original Hawtin party out of the Latter Rain revival and slowly growing over time through a form of apostolic succession, a repertory of these leaders emerged. See also Faupel’s discussion of the operation of spiritual gifts and prophecy in the Latter Rain Revival, Faupel, “The Latter Rain,” 248.
(drawn from 1 Timothy 4:14). Blomgren defended the practice saying that all should “exercise faith that the Lord will use him to bear a message in song to God’s people” even if that person may not have a “ministry” of singing the song of the Lord. In this understanding, the prophetic “mantle” or spiritual gift was understood to rest on the entire congregation during worship. As Blomgren explained, the operation and anointing of spiritual gifts were being refashioned in part through this practice. Through congregational Praise and Worship, the power and presence of God had become accessible to all, for there were no divisions between God and the people in the Tabernacle of David. It was, however, important that the congregation prepare for prophetic song and the presence of God by spending time in Praise and Worship and praising spontaneously. Stein Griffing’s session “The Cloud not the Laser” explored the understanding of this new role of a congregational prophetic anointing and its significance for the song of the Lord. He argued that in prior Pentecostal worship experience, the spirit of prophecy would come upon a single individual “like a laser,” whereas in Praise and Worship the prophetic anointing would fall on the whole congregation “like a cloud.”

More than just achieving access to God or a disembodied Spirit of prophecy, the song of the Lord was understood to be a practice of “releasing” the voice of Jesus in the midst of the sanctuary. Barry Griffing explained it plainly in a section of the *Music Notes*

---

100 Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020.
 newsletter, quoting Revelation 19:10, “the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of Prophecy.” Thus, “a prophetic atmosphere results when we as the congregation sing to Jesus with all our heart, soul, mind, and physical strength.” To hear the song of the Lord in the midst of worship was likened to a kind of duet between the church and Christ. He cited both Psalm 22:22 and Zephaniah 3:7 as examples of the Lord singing in the midst of his people.101 Or, following from Jeremiah 33:10–11, Barry Griffing explained, “As the Bride lifts up her voice in faith, the Voice of our Heavenly Bridegroom responds through the very ones who have brought the Sacrifice of praise into God’s House!” (emphasis original).102 Steve Griffing describes it as a kind of “ping-pong effect” between Christ and his Bride in congregational worship where real communication could take place.103

4.4.3.3 Chord Progressions and the Instruments Song of the Lord

The practice of improvised singing by anyone within congregational worship had practical implications for the musical leaders. Leading Praise and Worship in that context meant having the capacity to improvise an accompaniment when someone was releasing the song of the Lord. “Spontaneous chord progressions,” as they came to be called, were used to support the song of the Lord because if you were to stay on one chord or in one key, as David Fischer summarized, “it gets boring after a while.”104 The key was to cycle

103 Steve Griffing interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020.
104 David Fischer, interview.
through chord progressions to support a melody and allow it to flow for the length of the spontaneous song or time of worship—potentially for long periods of time. Biblically, Barry describes the “Selah” indications in the Psalms as a similar kind of instrumental bridge.\textsuperscript{105}

At the IWS, Joanna Glaeser regularly taught the specific chordal patterns to help facilitate spontaneous worship and the song of the Lord.\textsuperscript{106} Glaeser’s session suggested that the use of instruments provided an arena for prophesy and helped alleviate fear so that a self-conscious singer can release the song of the Lord more easily. She cited as a prime example 2 Kings 3:15 where Elisha requested a minstrel. In Glaeser’s 1985 workshop, she even demonstrated how chordal patterns could be derived from a chorus that had just been sung or during a time of silence where strong cadential gestures should be avoided (i.e., she urged people to play in cycles so as not to sound as if a song is concluding). If a song of the Lord had a particularly strong emotion or attitude, she recommended continuing in spontaneous worship by using the style to continue communicating that message and mood.

Though the keyboard player often structured the harmony for the song of the Lord, orchestral instrumentalists with improvisational skills could and did join in. More than that, a prophetic song could be released purely from an instrumentalist and without words. That is, Christ could give a melody by the Spirit to the orchestra who would then

\textsuperscript{105} Barry Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 26, 2020.
proceed to play prophetically (i.e., under the operation of the Spirit). Examples of this practice in scripture included 2 Chronicles 20, where the song of the Lord began with the instruments and the singer followed, as well as the song of the Lord in 2 Chronicles 29:27 beginning with the trumpets and instruments.\footnote{See LaMar Boschman, \textit{The Prophetic Song}, 51, 80—81.} The assumption here was that God’s purpose for the song of the Lord included the edification of the church. This could be accomplished simply through the feeling or emotional content of music, regardless of its lyrics. God was able to communicate a “message” or “spiritual attitude” in this non-discursive way because of music’s connection to the emotions.\footnote{Boschman, \textit{The Prophetic Song}, 51.} Examples included David playing for Saul and soothing his spirit. The operation of the chief musician in the worship service was to keep this kind of group improvisation together musically. This feature is one of the most unique contributions of the IWS-affiliated Restoration churches.

Orchestra teacher Janet Shell (Findlay, Ohio) taught at the IWS on how to build up school orchestra programs expressly for this purpose. For Shell, the question was not just of teaching musical excellence to children—an aspect important in its own right—but of discipleship. For children to grow up learning to play “under the anointing” is to teach children to hear from God and “release” what God is saying and doing in the congregation. Though it has been largely implied up to this point, the Symposium used primarily orchestral instruments and welcomed participants of any skill level. As Steve
Griffing summarized it, the philosophy was that “everyone plays.” The philosophy of music was an extension of the philosophy of spiritual gifts, but as Violet Kiteley described in a retrospective, “the gifts of the Spirit were not to be relegated to just the platform ministry. Every Spirit-filled believer was to find his or her place in the body of Christ.”

In this section on the restoration of music I have discussed how a complex Latter Rain Pentecostal biblical and theological framework undergirded their approach to music in worship. Unlike some contemporaries in the mainstream music industry at the time, the IWS and its participants saw Praise and Worship music as a practice that was being restored by God and that was intimately related to the restoration of spiritual gifts, especially prophecy. Their approach to music was not incidental or derivative of popular cultural modes but was refracted through the theological prism of the restoration of the Tabernacle of David. Indeed, it was as much about the music as it was about the function of Praise and Worship music ministry within the church and the kingdom of God on earth.

4.5 Restoration of the Arts

While the restoration of Praise and Worship to the church is often most closely associated with Praise and Worship music, the IWS had a broader vision. One of the most
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109 Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020. See also Janet Shell, interview with Adam Perez, April 6, 2020.
unique contributions of the IWS to Pentecostal Praise and Worship was the positive view of the arts and of the integration of the so-called “fine arts” in worship. As we will see in the next section, this was a result of the scriptural study of the worship of the Tabernacle of David that was being restored. Over the years at the Symposium, the arts played an increasingly significant role in worship and teaching at the IWS. This view of the arts was also strongly connected to a broader understanding of the significance of prophecy, as I will show in the section on Todd Farley and mime at the Symposium.

Though the theology around the arts and their modes of scriptural interpretation did not change noticeably from the late 1970s through the late 1980s, professional-level artistic performances became increasingly central to IWS congregational worship gatherings. In particular, the use of the arts shifted away from the performance of large-scale musicals that were offered by the worship departments from host churches and staged with varying degrees of complexity. These types of performances often occupied multiple evenings in the symposium schedule. But, as Jon Eymann suggests, they were not a good use of resources or time for the symposium given the practical goals of the symposium and the limited opportunities (usually three to four evening services) to exhibit other practices. By the late-1980s, therefore, evening performances had shifted to extended congregation “worship rallies” with solo and group “specials” incorporated into the congregational worship event.

---

4.5.1 Introduction to the Arts in IWS Worship

After the high-water mark of theatrical performances with IWS 1982’s “David” musical at Zion Evangelistic Temple, leaders at the IWS hoped to build on that energy for 1983. Over five days, four original musicals, a Christian film, a pottery presentation, and special performances by Christian singer-songwriters Reba Rambo and Dony McGuire were offered at the Symposium. The proximity of Southern California-area churches with large music departments and access to the Sexson Auditorium at Pasadena City College enabled this concentration of musicals. However, by 1988, evening performances were dedicated to “Pageant[s] of Praise” moderated by the IWS Executive Directors and accompanied by the symposium orchestra, choir, pageantry, and art ministries. Though earlier years saw a keynote speaker or sermon each night, by the late 1980s the evenings were purely worship events without any preaching or speaking. Those pageants included special artistic performances (by small groups or individuals and not large-scale church ministries) within the worship service. Mime and ballet were the latest additions to Symposium’s artistic repertoire. While the large-scale musical and dramatic productions often included powerful moments of congregational participation through song, mime and ballet could be incorporated into the congregational worship

112 For example, during the 1983 Symposium in Pasadena, the conference opened Monday night with an evening performance of an original musical “And God Said,” and a midday Tuesday plenary was a children’s musical titled “It’s Time to Praise.” Tuesday concluded with an evening musical “Make His Praise Glorious,” Wednesday evening concluded with a musical “Majesty” by Jack Hayford’s Church on the Way, and Thursday and Friday included selections by the conference choir and orchestra.

113 The service notes were not published, so the content of any one specific service is unknown.
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music (i.e., the primary acts of worship). In effect, the use of the arts increasingly became integral to the congregational worship rather than the reverse, where arts performances included some congregational worship as was the case with the 1982 performance of “David” at Zion Evangelistic Temple. This was a characteristic of Symposium and its network of churches that was not necessarily shared among churches from mainstream Pentecostal denominations (such as the Assemblies of God).\textsuperscript{114} It is important to note that many Symposium-affiliated churches still hosted full evening events of fine arts ministries, but these the Symposium regarded largely as evangelistic events and not a site for congregational worship.\textsuperscript{115}

Notably, classical music and symphonic instruments had already been in use for many years alongside a rhythm section featuring bass guitar, piano or keyboard, and drums.\textsuperscript{116} Congregational dances (choreographed and spontaneous), flag or banner-bearing, and processionals all grew in their organization over the course of the 1980s at IWS. During the same period, professional artists also become more prominent in their performances, especially through the work of Todd Farley and Ballet Magnificat.

Symposium’s inclusive posture toward the use of the arts in worship was an outgrowth of their theological commitments to Restoration. Rather than a simplistic

\textsuperscript{114} Though the churches from the Assemblies of God participated in Symposium, the denomination as a whole did not accommodate Symposium teachings on worship. According to Todd Farley, the Assemblies of God had national youth summer events for theater and other arts; however, the Assemblies of God considered them to be evangelistic and not an appropriate part of congregational worship. Todd Farley, e-mail to Adam Perez, December 5, 2020.

\textsuperscript{115} John Vandervelde, interview with Adam Perez, December 8, 2020.

\textsuperscript{116} Earlier, I discussed the role of the orchestra in connection with Janet Schell and the importance of musical excellence.
imitation of broader cultural trends at the time in Christian or secular music, Symposium teachers looked to the scriptural examples to determine the right use of the arts: musical, theatrict, dance, and visual. Their conclusion can be simply summarized: the purpose and function of artistic forms performed for the worship of God is what made them suitable. In order to fulfill God’s command to “have dominion over the earth,” argued Graham Truscott, “the church will have to become a cultural center.” Just as the Tabernacle of David (Zion) was “the world center,” so too the church today should be the center for “architecture, government, wisdom, religion, culture and all forms of art.”¹¹⁷

Not only was this attention to the arts an expression of rightful dominion, but it was also understood to have an evangelistic impact. Citing the popularity of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, Graham Truscott’s session, “Secular Art: Redeemed to Divine Service”¹¹⁸ suggests that their international broadcasts were attractive not because they “perform anything that projects a Mormon message” but because “unbelievers are attracted to the beauty of artistic excellence.”¹¹⁹ Similar versions appeared in other sessions such as Steve Griffing’s, “Sacred, Secular, and Satanic Music” (1987).¹²⁰ Scripture, according to these teachers, demonstrated how biblical characters redeemed—read: restored—the use of secular arts in their day and age. Given their commitment to

Restorationism, it was the natural conclusion that the same holds true today—in fact more so. Because the arts were given to divine service, they were expected to be both technically excellent and anointed and as *commanded* by scripture.

These two themes of excellence and anointing became a recurring measure of the use of the arts, both in professional-led “specials” and congregational worship. On the one hand, technical excellence in an art form can be judged by “man” and an artist’s skilled use of their art was seen as a prerequisite for ministry leadership. Symposium sessions in the afternoons were taught as skills-based labs. Musical skills were featured early, on while dance and other technical sessions proliferated in the latter half of the 1980s. An example of a musical skills session is Larry Turner’s 1981 session, “Songwriting Skills: Elementary Choral Arranging.” Not only was this session entirely about skills in four-part harmonization, it presumed that a choir was still a foundational element to Praise and Worship music and that arranging was a key skill of the church musician.\(^{121}\) The worship leader was also expected to develop their own performance skills as part of their faithful response to God, even if they had already been “born with a good voice.” Similarly, Christopher Beatty focused on musical skills in his 1983 session that used biblical language to introduce the physical features of good singing:

\(^{121}\) Larry Turner, “Songwriting Skills: Elementary Choral Arranging.”
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In regard to skill and anointing, Truscott pointed to 1 Chron. 15:22: “And Chenaniah, chief of the Levites, was for song: he instructed about the song, because he was SKILLFUL” (KJV; emphasis original).\footnote{Symposium 1988 Syllabus: 261.} On the other hand, more than skill was required; the anointing must also be present. Truscott’s argument for skill also included (what appears to be) a backhanded rebuke of a broader argument that one’s anointing might bypass the need to be skillful: “The anointing is not a substitute for intelligence and skill, nor an ‘excuse’ for lack of discipline. Rather, the Holy Spirit anoints our abilities for His glory.”\footnote{Symposium 1988, Syllabus: 262.} The inclusion of this comment in the syllabus likely indicates a broader sensitivity to the agency of the spirit in bestowing “gifts” within Pentecostalism on the use of arts. Or, as Barry Griffing had said, the worship leader must be “Spirit-filled and Spirit-skilled.”\footnote{Bob Johnson, interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, April 6, 2017.} It was this theological commitment, moreover, that enabled the arts to flourish at the IWS. Together, excellence and anointing empowered a shared (if somewhat vague and contestable) metric for the use of the arts—both congregational and professional—in worship.
There were no styles of music or artistic genres that were deemed inherently sinful, as was being discussed in broader evangelical contexts.\textsuperscript{126} Instead, they were all to be assessed on the basis of their content. One concession can be found in Truscott’s teaching where he suggests that “Satanic” music can be identified because it “willfully conveys a message which is opposed to God and His Word, and which is often created under the direct influence of the Devil or demons.”\textsuperscript{127} This was a high threshold set by the IWS and a position not necessarily shared by their socially conservative Pentecostal and evangelical peers. The contestation over the arts was primarily a doctrinal concern, even if complicated by cultural concerns regarding modesty that are implicated in, for example, the attire of ballet dancers. Nevertheless, the Symposium pushed the ecclesial boundaries on the acceptable use of the arts in congregational worship among Pentecostals and Charismatics because of their theological vision for an expansive scope of Restorationism.

In the following section, I examine three elements of arts ministry that were incorporated into worship through the prism of the restoration of the Tabernacle of David: dance, mime, and pageantry with banners. Though each shared a common theological root and defense through the Tabernacle of David, each one was developed with particular theological accents that gave them distinct roles in worship.

4.5.2 The Understanding and Practice of Dance in Davidic Worship

In 1983, Debbie Roberts, a regular dance teacher at IWS, taught a class on the history of dance. Her intention was to provide a usable history of dance albeit with an overarching narrative of decline. As with other aspects of Davidic worship, IWS teachers regarded dance in worship to have suffered a long history of neglect and decline. Roberts pointed to the so-called “Dark Ages” (between the New Testament and the Protestant Reformation) as the period in which dance fell out of fashion among Christian communities. However, with the dawn of the Enlightenment, there was a “rebirth of [the] arts.” Unfortunately, that rebirth came hand in hand with a divorce between religious and social expressions of dance that led to its condemnation by the Catholic Church. My point here is not to adjudicate the historical record in Roberts’s teaching but to note how it followed the same method as the general historical meta-narrative of Latter Rain thinking, namely a narrative of decline and restoration.

In defense of its present-day restoration, leaders looked to the role of dance in the Tabernacle and its meanings for the Israelite people. Of course, the actual dance steps of ancient Israelites have been lost. Nevertheless, “Hebrew Folk Dance” became a popular style of dance at Symposium and among Restoration churches. Because of the connection between the music and dance, this style would often be paired with songs that leaders often identified as “sounding Jewish.” Patti Amsden was a particular champion of

---

128 Symposium dance teacher Pamala Smith even took a class in Hebrew language and dance through Arizona State University that was offered at a local synagogue. Shiloh Church also had a
these forms of “Hebrew” or “Israeli” dance styles.\(^{129}\) Through the dance and the broader movement ministry, IWS practitioners sought to establish dance as ministry of the church parallel to that of music.

One important and overarching conclusion in the restoration of dance was that “Israel was a dancing nation,” as Pamela Truscott suggested in her 1988 session. If the church today is to be Zion (i.e., where God dwells) we too must become a dancing people, she said.\(^{130}\) This imperative was seen to be both an act of worship commanded by God and to have evangelistic power to convict sinners and bring them into the kingdom of God. Thus, classes at IWS were offered both in the theology of movement (such as Sasser’s “Dance Apologetics”) as well as the practical skills that were taught in the afternoon skills-based lab sessions for a variety of performance skills. Among those teaching was Charlotte Baker, an early and ongoing champion of the role of dance in congregational worship both at her own church and for dancers at IWS. Baker taught regularly on dance at the IWS throughout the 1980s, especially on the ministry development side. Baker was also a mentor to other dance teachers at IWS, among them Pam Chesbro and Pamala Smith.\(^{131}\) The evening worship sessions then provided attendees the opportunity to demonstrate and practice the skills such teachers had taught them.\(^{132}\)

\(^{129}\) Jon and Julie Eymann, interview with Adam Perez, August 13, 2020.


\(^{131}\) Pamala Smith, interview.

\(^{132}\) Not so, of course, for the musicians in the skills-related classes like the keyboard.
Todd Farley, a premier mime and dance teacher at the IWS, has suggested that the use of dance—or “body / movement ministry”—at IWS and in Latter Rain churches can be organized into three general levels.133 These levels generally map onto the stages of development in the dance ministry at the IWS. The first level was congregational dance as an act of praise during the service. This was somewhat limited in its possibilities because of the scale of the space and the limitations of seating, aisles, and other spaces. Most often the whole congregational dance was performed as a modified line dance within each row of seats, affectionally referred to as a “shuffle.”134 This kind of dance was often spontaneous; its simple form required no rehearsal. Even churches like Bible Temple that broke fellowship with IWS over the dance continued to use this style of limited, spontaneous, congregational dance with jumping, spinning, and ad hoc movement.135

The second level of movement Farley considered to be in the style of Miriam and David: a physical manifestation of audible—usually musical—praise. A key scripture for this is 2 Samuel 6, a text that describes David removing his kingly robes and dancing before the Ark only in the linen ephod reserved for the Levite priests.136 Indeed Symposium also adopted some simple costuming for the dance troupes. This type of

133 Todd Farley, interview with Adam Perez, October 24, 2020.
134 See Jon and Julie Eymann, interview with Adam Perez, August 13, 2020. The Eymanns referred to the “shuffle” as a feature of their congregational worship in a special way, and the “Shiloh Shuffle” though Bible Temple and other churches also enjoyed a similar style of shuffle. Tim Smith, interview; Farley, interview.
135 Jon and Julie Eymann, interview with Adam Perez, August 13, 2020.
dance could be spontaneous or rehearsed and could include either a single dancer or a
group of dancers. In a so-called spontaneous small group dance, a dance captain led a
group of dancers in a series of movements in which they had been trained during the
daytime class sessions. This type of dance could happen at any point in the Praise and
Worship when the congregation or dance leader discerned a particularly anointed song or
moment, or when the worship became engaged in spiritual warfare.\textsuperscript{137} Julie Eymann
would teach four segments of dance on the first day of her classes, each one four bars
long with a specific theme (adoration, thanksgiving, warfare, etc.). During the evening
worship services, the dancers would sit on the front two rows and, led by the dance
captain at special moments, would lead out the dancers to do their choreographed
segments. Notably, dance never preceded the sung worship but accompanied it.\textsuperscript{138}

A third level of movement was the more literal interpretation of ideas, song texts,
prophecies, and stories from scripture. Because dance did not have as strong a
correspondence between specific movements and literal meanings as did mime and ballet,
dance remained a figurative or representative expression more easily accessible to
amateurs. This third level of interpreting literal ideas was thus a domain in which
professionals could thrive. In particular, ballet and mime became prominent art forms in
worship services, typically of choreographed presentations. Because mime in particular

\textsuperscript{137} See for example Pam Chesbro’s 1988 session, “The Authority of Our Feet: The Warfare of the
\textsuperscript{138} See also, Debbie Roberts, \textit{Rejoice: A Biblical Study of the Dance} (Little Rock, AR: Revival
Press, 1982).
was a vehicle for literal interpretation of stories, it was also used for interpreting prophecy. By the mid-1980s, between one and three dance or mime presentations would be scheduled between the time of congregational worship and the preaching at the IWS.

4.5.3 Prophetic Gesture: Todd Farley and Miming

Distinct from dance in its capacity for the literal interpretation of an idea or thought, the use of mime had a close association with prophecy and evangelism. Mime was often grouped together with dance under the umbrella of movement or body ministry. Indeed, both mime and dance included choreographed movement, often in groups. But mime grew to have a distinct role in worship that drew on the clarity of its literal gesturing.

The debate over the use of dance—and by extension, the body—in worship had come to a crossroads after the 1983 Symposium. In particular, some leaders questioned whether scripture supported bodily movement in Praise and Worship that was more than the simple expressions of congregational shuffles and raised hands.\textsuperscript{139} Though mime was distinct from dance in many ways, the groups that supported dance as praise and spiritual warfare tended also to support the use of mime. But dance came up against the limits of its own form when it came to the prophetic word.

According to Farley, some in the early 1980s attempted to use the dance as a companion to the interpretation of prophecy. There were difficulties, however, between a literal, spoken prophecy and the impressionistic movements of dance. Though dance

\textsuperscript{139} See also additional description in chapter three.
movements had a repertory of gestures to communicate feeling and emotion, they did not communicate discursively. Mime, however, was a more direct and literal use of movement that itself was particularly apt for story-telling. Both individual and choreographed group miming appeared in the worship at IWS in 1984 and beyond.

When 1983 saw a struggle over movement as a legitimate form of praise in worship at IWS, mime was no exception. Churches and leaders that broke ties with IWS over the issue also largely disapproved of mime. But it was not until after 1983 that mime came into its own at IWS, largely through the work of a young mime named Todd Farley.

Farley’s introduction into miming in Christian worship was at Grandview Christian Center in Washington state in 1977. Farley was twelve at the time. His pastor, Scott McKay, set up a touring mime troupe from the church called the “Rainbow Players.” Farley was the troupe’s youngest member. Farley was attracted to the group because he was zealous to share his faith but, having grown up in Hawai‘i speaking Pidgin English, felt he lacked the necessary communication skills. Through this new, Restoration Revival Movement church in Washington, Farley and the “Rainbow Players” performed in church services and at camps at major Restoration Revival churches up and down the West Coast and gave Farley initial exposure to churches like Bible Temple (Portland, Oregon) and Shiloh Temple (Oakland, California). \(^{140}\)

The troupe had a few set pieces that they would perform for services to accompanying musical selections. Often, the troupe performed for Sunday evening

\(^{140}\) Todd Farley, interview.
services and would use these choreographed presentations to “illustrate the sermon,” the performances being billed as “specials” or “presentations,” not as integral elements to the worship service. Because Sunday evening services were also more evangelistic in nature, the mime and musical accompaniments also focused on evangelistic themes. Don Francisco’s “He’s Alive,” for example, was a folk music-styled selection performed by the group.¹⁴¹ The song featured a first-person narrative of the resurrection through the perspective of the Apostle Thomas closely based on the account in the Gospel of John. Likewise later in the decade, Ray Boltz’s “Watch the Lamb,” a mid-1980s pop ballad written as the first-person narrative of a visitor to Jerusalem on the day of the crucifixion, was similarly popular with mimes.¹⁴² In short, songs with strong narrative elements were best suited to mimed interpretation.

After Farley and his mother left the church around 1982, Farley began his own itinerant ministry in independent churches that drew on the network of contacts he had made while touring with the Rainbow Players. Through this ministry he connected with Symposium co-director Larry Dempsey and his wife, Joan, who had been invited to minister at a church on the same weekend in late 1983. The Dempseys quickly connected with Farley and took him under their wing in ministry. For the next few years, Farley went on the IWS circuit with the Dempseys, performing at regional symposia and church

¹⁴² Ray Boltz, “Watch The Lamb” copyright Shepherd Boy Music (1986), admin. BMG Chrysalis US.
visits around the US and abroad. These IWS-affiliated churches sustained his ministry well into the 1990s.

One of Farley’s strongest theological influences was the popular IWS teacher Dr. Sam Sasser. Sasser taught on a variety of topics at the Symposium, including a 1984 session entitled “Dance Apologetics.” The session was likely a direct response to the 1983 conflict with Dick Iverson over the use of dance and the arts in worship and was strong inspiration for Farley. Citing a teaching of Sasser’s, “Dance: To Be or Not to Be,” Farley drew inspiration and biblical resources for his work. Over the following years, Farley—easily the most skilled mime in the IWS network—performed mime for IWS events and eventually began more formal teaching. While touring part of the year with the Dempseys in the mid-1980s, Farley completed a three-year program in Paris under renowned French mime Marcell Marceau. Upon his return as a master mime in his own right, Farley began an international mime training program that ran concurrently with the 1988 IWS in Orlando. He also published a book, The Silent Prophet with Destiny Image Publishers, a Latter Rain-affiliated imprint.

By 1983, Farley had begun using mime as a form of prophetic utterance in churches that were doing Praise and Worship. Prepared material for mime was primarily used to interpret music that likewise had been prepared in advance for the service and

143 Farley affirms that the symposia led by David Fisher were important sites for him, especially in Colombia (particularly in Cartagena, Cali, and Bogotá).
144 Farley cites the title of Sasser’s 1984 IWS presentation as “Dance: To Be or Not To Be” in his dissertation, p. 118, fn. 29.
145 Eventually, “Revival Press” became the imprint under Destiny Image that was dedicated to Praise and Worship.
was especially useful since music was already a dominant feature of the worship itself. But Farley also mimed while a prophecy was being given. This followed what was already happening, as dancers would “dance out” prophetic movements during Praise and Worship, but mimes did so to a clearer effect. At IWS, the prophecies of Charlotte Baker lent themselves particularly well to this improvised, prophetic miming because of their strong story-like (parable) character.

It was unusual at the time for a mime to lead out in a prophetic movement. Instead, mimes like Farley would typically work in tandem with a known prophet. That being so, however, if mime was (merely?) a bodily interpretation of a prophetic song or word (like of Charlotte Baker’s parables), how were they “prophetic” in their own right and not just illustrative?

For Farley, the theological framework that undergirded mime as prophetic ministry was given to him by a pastor while ministering in a local church: Hosea 12:10. The Amplified Version\textsuperscript{146} of the Bible reads, “I have also spoken to [you by] the prophets, and I have multiplied visions [for you] and [have appealed to you] through parables acted out by the prophets.” (Brackets in original.) For Farley, this verse spurred a flurry of biblical research. What he discovered was that many of the prophets—and even Jesus himself—used gesture in their prophecy and teaching. Farley’s book \textit{The Silent Prophet} (1989) reflects the fruit of this biblical study and his emerging theology at the time. Like many teachers in the IWS network and their books, Farley did much of this

\textsuperscript{146} Now known as the “Amplified Classic” version.
study through Bible reading and concordance research on key words from key scripture passages. By looking to Farley’s book, we can see how his theology of mime and prophecy reflects the broader paradigms of IWS theologizing. Though it was compiled and printed in 1989, the teachings in it were developed during the latter half of the 1980s and provide a relatively contemporaneous picture to the developments at the IWS during that time.147

Farley’s *The Silent Prophet* begins with the Fall of Adam and Eve. What was lost in the garden, Farley suggested, is the rightful use of the body. Mime (and by extension all body ministry) is therefore part of the broader restoration of the good use of the body, in worship and in life. Farley used scripture references from throughout the canon to argue against a dis-embodied spiritual understanding of the restoration of worship. The rightful disposition of one’s spirit and love for God, argued Farley, is expressed through the body. The way in which Romans 12:1 links “bodies as living sacrifices” with a “spiritual act of worship” was an important connection. It echoed an argument made more than a decade earlier by Charles Trombley for raising hands in worship148—a practice that had since become widespread in Praise and Worship. Bodily expressions of worship, for Farley, were being restored as an outgrowth of the broader spiritual restoration. Spiritual restoration alone is incomplete in God’s plan for the holistic restoration of what was lost with Adam and Eve at the Garden of Eden. His argument for

147 Todd Farley, interview with Adam Perez, October 24, 2020.
the restoration of the body culminates in a Christological move, pointing to John 1 and John 15—incarnation and crucifixion—as two quintessential moments of God using Christ’s body to communicate God’s love.\footnote{Farley, \textit{Silent Prophet}, 10.}

While Farley’s arguments for the use of the body are relevant for all body ministry, including dance and pageantry, the question of the body’s \textit{prophetic} capacities was of special concern. For Farley, the mime-as-prophet is less concerned with outlining a theology of a biblical inspiration for prophetic movement than in defending the notion that the biblical prophets used movement and gesture. In particular, Farley looked to how they used movement and gesture to communicate the meaning of their prophecies. At its most basic level, his argument is the age-old adage that “actions speak louder than words.”\footnote{Farley, \textit{Silent Prophet}, 7–9}

Farley argued that each area of the body has a particular capacity to communicate something. Scriptural examples key us into those physical and spiritual meanings. The face, for example, is able to communicate the light of God, joy, life, and health. Like Moses, whose face upon descending from his encounter with God on Mt. Sinai (Exodus 34) was uncomfortably bright, “we can literally and spiritually shine for God.”\footnote{Farley, \textit{Silent Prophet}, 49.} Or, God’s power to deliver is communicated through raising one’s arms. Farley drew on the
story of the Israelites versus the Amalekites in Exodus 17 where Moses’s upraised arms correlated with Israel’s victory in battle (among other occasions in Moses’s life).

Perhaps most important for the mime-as-prophet, Farley saw contemporary mime as a descendant of the communicative gestures of Hebrew prophets. Prophets used mime, he argued, to “clarify, illustrate, and demonstrate” in one of three ways: actions with no narratives, actions with narratives before or after, or actions with narrative given at the same time.¹⁵² Ezekiel is an especially important example for Farley because, pointing to Ezekiel 4–6, he argued that Ezekiel prophesied using only gesture, unless God directly spoke through him. If it was a spoken prophecy, he would begin by saying, “This is what the Sovereign Lord says….“¹⁵³ Farley’s conclusion is that Ezekiel’s prophetic ministry was largely enacted bodily and not spoken in words. Toward the end of the book, Farley also highlights Nathan’s parable for King David as well as the poetic and figurative text of the book of Hosea.

At IWS, when Charlotte Baker’s renowned prophetic parables were illuminated through Farley’s miming gestures (in addition to being supported by a piano or keyboard), the impact of the prophecy was amplified through multi-sensory communication. The multiple artistic modes were seen as both true to the original biblical context where prophecy, music, and movement all coincided, and also powerfully communicative in the present. Indeed, their collective power to manifest God’s presence

¹⁵² Farley, 82–83. Among the examples he lists are eight messengers in scripture, Agabus, Ahijah, the Angel in Revelation, Elisha, Ezekiel, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah.
in Praise and Worship was understood to be a result, at least in part, of the newly restored synthesis of these multi-sensory practices. Together, they affirmed the broader theological apparatus of IWS and the Restoration Revival movement that a restoration of biblical worship had power to inaugurate an ingathering of persons into God’s presence.\(^{154}\)

To enable the communicative power of gestures in the time before (now-ubiquitous) image magnification technology, the audience had to have a direct line of sight to the mime or dancers on the stage. At IWS events, Farley required a 10’ x 10’ or 20’ x 20’ stage just for the dancers and mime. If they were to lead worship through dance like figures in scripture, they argued, they would need a raised platform to be seen. It was the visual equivalent to the microphones for the musicians or speakers (see Figure 4.4 below). The stages were often three to six feet off the ground, depending on the type of space in which they were performing. For churches with a floor that slanted down to the platform (a “raked” floor), a smaller platform was used. For level flooring, like at conference and event centers, a higher platform was needed.

As I mentioned above, ballet was also a later development at the IWS and signaled their attempt to honor the restoration of all the “fine arts” of movement. In 1987 for the first time, leaders invited the Christian ballet company Ballet Magnificat. Ballet

\(^{154}\) Eventually, Farley went on to found Mime-istry International, the largest movement of Christian mime. At its height, it had over six thousand students. On-site teaching was happening in England, Brazil, New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines, and South Africa. His book *The Silent Prophet* was translated into Afrikaans, Spanish, and Dutch.
Magnificat was a professional Christian ballet company that had been founded by Kathy Thibodeaux in Missouri. At the time, the company was known for its full-length story ballets, which it toured primarily through churches through its evangelistic program.\footnote{John VanderVelde, interview with Adam Perez, December 8, 2020. It is unclear how they first became connected to Symposium, but by January 1988, Sam Sasser was touring with them, and VanderVelde credits him with being an important influence on the group. Graham Truscott and his wife Pamela Truscott were also important influences on the group, and they regularly visited his church. For a slightly later example of their work, see Ballet Magnificat, “A Symphony of Movement” (VHS 1991), available at \url{https://www.balletmagnificat.com/symphony-of-movement} (accessed March 22, 2021).} For conference organizers like Steve Griffing, it was only natural that one of the highest art forms in secular dance culture would take center stage in the worship of God. This followed from their general principles regarding the arts that only “the best” was fitting for God. Because of ballet’s more highly choreographed nature—unlike the spontaneous congregational dance that relied on a few key forms that could be employed at any time—it required much more preparation and skill and was therefore reserved for professional dancers like those with Ballet Magnificat.

Symposium 1988 was a particularly strong year for its focus on dance. The conference theme, “Worship the Lord in the Beauty of Holiness” was drawn from 1 Chronicles 16:29,\footnote{See also Psalm 27, invoked at the opening of Lora Allison’s 1988 session “Banners: A Scriptural and Biblical Foundation.” Symposium 1988 Syllabus, 1.} a passage commonly used in defense of dance, pageantry, and banners in worship. Though the song of the Lord remained a feature of the worship practice, it appeared to move out of the limelight as the most novel teaching focus of the conference. At the 1988 Symposium, for example, nine different teachers offered sixteen
different teaching sessions related to dance (not including banners and pageantry more broadly) while teaching on song of the Lord was merely embedded in a handful of classes on broader topics of tabernacle worship and restoration.¹⁵⁷

4.5.4 Banners and Pageantry for King Jesus

The emphasis on the visual and bodily aspects of worship magnified the theological emphases that were already present in Praise and Worship. In particular, the kingly character of Jesus Christ was an important image for IWS worshipers. On one hand, it was deeply embedded in their sense that God was restoring praise (and worship) to the church. The IWS regarded Praise and Worship as the final stage of the restoration of the Christian church. On the other hand, there were particular developments in the theology of Praise and Worship that began to describe the act of Praise and Worship as a process of enthroning God in our hearts and in the spiritual realm of the world. This emphasis on Jesus’ character as kingly or regal was evident throughout the worship of IWS. It was present in song texts and prophetic words, and it was the fundamental rationale for the use of banners and pageantry. As we will see in the next chapter, it was also critical for imagining the musical style of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music Praise and Worship tapes.

¹⁵⁷ Teachers included Patti Amsden, Joanne Cecere, Yvonne Peters, Pamela Chesbro, Jon Eymann, Juliette Eymann, Debbie Roberts, Greg Smith, and Pamela Truscott. Note that just one of those teachers was male and taught a course aimed specifically at men. It seems that though the leaders of artistic forms enjoyed a gender balance, a majority of those interested in these forms were women. This too may have contributed to the increasingly important role of the worship leader as an ordained elder—a position usually reserved for men (though not exclusively). Prominent women like Charlotte Baker and Violet Kiteley were the exception, not the rule.
The concept of “worshiping God in the beauty of His [sic] holiness” had a strong connection to the third of the Old Testament models for worship: the Temple of Solomon. Visually distinct from the simplicity of the Tabernacle of David, Solomon’s temple was understood nonetheless to maintain the priorities of established in the Tabernacle of David. Whereas IWS teachers used Moses’s tabernacle as a resource for relating the mediation of Christ to present day worship and David’s tabernacle was a central prism for the orthopraxy of Praise and Worship, Solomon’s temple was a model for a divine blessing on the visual and spatial elements of worship. Solomon’s temple was bedecked with visually remarkable elements that provided a concrete context on which IWS leaders could pursue another layer of biblical witness on worship—only because it was understood to maintain Davidic principles of Praise and Worship. It did so not by overcoming the other tabernacle models, however, but by resonating with other biblical, theological, and worship themes at Symposium, such as the kingly setting of heavenly worship. Worship at the IWS in the 1980s was not only about one’s personal relationship to God but about the attributes and position of Jesus as King of Kings and Lord of Lords. The IWS was exalting the international kingdom of God.158

Consequently, themes and practices associated with kingship grew in significance at IWS worship, namely the interconnected use of pageantry and banners. A variety of scriptural resources from the Tabernacle typology were also transmuted to a royal setting, such as the idea of “entering [God’s] courts with praise.” “Courts,” in this context, took

on a double valence as a signal for the heavenly realm where Christ is seated on the throne. A variety of conference themes and session titles reflected this emphasis—both musical and visual. Reflecting this emphasis on the arts, Steve Griffing suggested that by the mid-1980s, worship at the IWS was as much for the eye as it was for the ear.

Pageantry connected to the kingly status of Jesus Christ also became an important part of the visual emphasis of Praise and Worship at IWS. In worship services, it was often closely related to dance, for it included planned processions (sometimes with costumes) and the choreographed carrying and waving of banners or standards. In 1983, for example, an evening of worship included a procession in which hundreds of

---

159 See for example, Debbie Olson, “Being a ‘Cupbearer’: Our Ministry to the Lord in Worship,” IWS Syllabus 1983, 59–61. This session suggested the worshiper is like a cupbearer for the king who nourishes the King (with worship), and in return the king provides all that is needed. A short leap is made to suggest that the cupbearer also provides for well-watered sheep and pastures, making the turn to ministry to the congregation. This teaching was not especially influential, but it is based on the fundamental notion of approaching God’s kingly presence in worship. Olson would go on to teach dance at IWS for a number of years.

160 Steve Griffing, Interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020.
participants each took a golden crown (made of paper) and one by one brought them forward and symbolically cast them at the front of the stage, imitating the description of heavenly worship in Revelation 4:10. The same year saw five different sessions on pageantry and banners alone. Among them were sessions by Charlotte Baker such as on “The Role of Pageantry in Biblical Worship,” as well as Janice Loftman’s session on the craft of making banners. Loftman’s session was not simply functional but also spiritual and theological and she suggested to attendees that, “When a banner is lifted, see more than a piece of cloth and a wooden pole. Look beyond [...] and behold your God. The banner is used to draw our hearts towards God and to see things and enter into things that are deeper than those on an earthly plane.” For Loftman, banners helped participants see in the earthly realm what they were yet unable to imagine in the spiritual one. This required excellence; Loftman argued that “Solomon had splendor [so] make God’s banners worthy of His splendor.” Thus, the session included practical considerations such as materials, design elements, costs, and logistical concerns of banner creation. In this way, making banners had a devotional and spiritual benefit for the human creator, she said. These banners were used in corporate worship at the IWS where, by the mid-1980s, there was a regular practice of inviting participants to process with their church groups in a “procession of the assemblies of Zion” carrying banners that represented their

\[162\] Janice Loftman, IWS Syllabus 1983: 72.
churches. The 1986 instance of this practice at Constitution Hall in Washington D.C. promised “thousands of banners, flags, and streamers” (see fig 3.3).

Lora Allison quickly became a go-to leader for banner creation and use at IWS, after first attending in 1984. Allison’s banners were always some of the most visually stunning there, not least for their excessive use of sequins to reflect light and catch the eye (see fig. 4.5). Her rationale is made plain in chapter two, “Making Banners for the King” of her book, which opens thus,

The court has commissioned us for very special service – to make banners for the King: to hang in His palace, to march in His Kingly processions, to announce His imminent coming, to represent Him and His messengers, to declare whose property they adorn, to be a testament to the greatness and wealth of His kingdom – to proclaim by their very quality and design what kind of ruler He is; literally WHO HE IS. It is most important that we understand that banners Make Statements!

On display in the worship services at the Symposium, these banners contributed to a broader emphasis on the visual elements of worship as well as the wide restoration of the arts as fitting for worship. Though music remained the undergirding practice, bodily and visual arts regularly took center stage at Symposium. Within the broader waters of Pentecostal worship, this emphasis was perhaps unique and it developed out of their unwavering commitment to explore the implications of the restoration of the Tabernacle of David for worship today.

4.6 Chapter Conclusion

While chapters two and three argued for the discrete ecclesial context out of which the IWS emerged, this chapter has attempted to make clearer the connection
between IWS theologizing and Praise and Worship in particular. Though Praise and Worship is often described as a musical phenomenon, we see through the IWS that the very phrase itself was derived from the theological reflections of Latter Rain Pentecostal theologian-practitioners pursuing the restoration of the present-day church. Praise and Worship is, first and foremost, a theological paradigm.

This chapter has argued that at the IWS the vision for restoration of Praise and Worship was rooted in historical, biblical, and theological understandings of restoration that were refracted primarily through the typological prism of the Tabernacle of David. Through that prism, IWS leaders had a view of the discrete worship practices they thought were lost to the church and were being restored by God, including the song of the Lord and the use of the arts. Indeed, the IWS’s welcoming posture toward the arts was perhaps unique among Pentecostals and evangelicals at the time. At their core, IWS leaders did not introduce entirely new practices to their ecclesial network but rather drew on existing practices and expanded them—sometimes to their breaking point. Indeed, the seed of many of the theological teachings discussed in this chapter can be traced back to earlier periods in Latter Rain history. Nevertheless, the worship practices at the IWS and the theological insights from which they were derived became the hallmark and source of the IWS’s lasting imprint on the history of Praise and Worship.

The IWS leaders did not engage in the theological reflection merely as a thought exercise in biblical hermeneutics: they practiced what they preached. The Symposium leaders sought to reconnect all of the arts available in the biblical expressions for the worship of the church today. They did so not because such practices were novel or
because they appealed to the sensibilities of their contemporaries—indeed some of the largest Pentecostal groups at the time questioned their interpretations—but because they believed that God was speaking through scripture and their experience to the restoration of Praise and Worship in the present day. As I will show in the next chapter, this theology of worship had a wide influence throughout the church, even if it was not transmitted wholesale in the way it was presented at IWS. The successful dissemination of the core Praise and Worship principles taught by IWS may have been achieved precisely because they were embedded in musical worship and were adaptable to the many diverse charismatic contexts in which they later took root.
Chapter 5. “Behold His Majesty:” The Influence of the IWS on Integrity’s Hosanna! Music

Up to this point I have been discussing the history and theology of the International Worship Symposium as an event through the lens of conference syllabi, interviews, and book publications. Embedded throughout that interwoven narrative of IWS history and theology are references to the broader persons and networks that were impacted by IWS events. I have suggested that the IWS had a wide and direct impact on the worship of many churches across the spectrum of denominations and worship traditions. In the case study I offer in this chapter, I suggested that it was not just the sheer scale of IWS and its mass impact that disseminated Praise and Worship directly to local churches, but that the IWS also made an impact on specific individuals who were key to the popularization and industrialization of Praise and Worship music. In this chapter, I pick up the thread of arguably the most important company in the mainstreaming of Praise and Worship music, Integrity’s Hosanna! Music (IHM), and explore the critical impact that the IWS had on the worship theology of IHM’s leaders and the music they produced.

Emerging out of New Wine magazine in the mid-1980s, IHM became one of the most widely-recognized names in Praise and Worship music. By the late 1980s, their mail order subscription service for Praise and Worship music tapes sold between 150,000
and 225,000 copies of each album on its every-eight-week production schedule.¹ This case study of IHM admittedly brings the conversation back to the significance of the music-industrial history but now within a new framework. As I have noted frequently, Praise and Worship is best known for the music it produced and the way that it became a mainstream expression of musical worship by the end of the twentieth century. Selecting this particular case study is not simply one of convenience or coincidence; it is the most important company for the mainstreaming of Praise and Worship recordings. Rather than argue for the significance of IHM in the worship music industry, I largely take for granted IHM’s significance, popularity, and impact. The growth of Praise and Worship (as much as it is indebted to the dissemination of its music) cannot be understood properly without attention to the reliance of IHM on the IWS events and its leaders. As I will show, this case study is a prime example of how the Jesus People Narrative and the broader sense of a growing music industry within American Evangelicalism is unable to account for IHM’s origins and the Praise and Worship music they recorded. Indeed, it is more accurate to understand IHM recordings as a key partner in the mainstreaming of the theology and sound of IWS Praise and Worship.

In chapter four, I described how restoration and the Tabernacle of David became a prism for worship theology at the IWS. At the end of the chapter, I described how the position and station of Jesus as king was a prominent feature in the liturgical imagination

¹ This number is a range based on estimates given in interviews with Gerrit Gustafson and Mike Coleman. Gerrit Gustafson, interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, July 6, 2015; Mike Coleman, interview with Adam Perez, May 2, 2019.
of the IWS, especially in its use of pageantry and banners. Later in this chapter, I pick up that theme again and show how it informed the musical imagination of the IHM leaders in attendance and became encoded in early IHM albums.

In this chapter, I synchronize my history of the International Worship Symposium with a history of IHM as constructed through interviews with early IHM leaders Michael (“Mike”) Coleman, Don Moen, Gerrit Gustafson, Tom Brooks, and Marty Nystrom. I also draw upon contemporaneous publications related to the founding of IHM. Through all these means I argue in this chapter that there is a deep firsthand and secondhand influence of the IWS on IHM. More so, the IHM capitalized (literally and figuratively) on the groundswell of Praise and Worship music that the IWS helped cultivate among local churches.

I begin the chapter with a brief review of IHM in some recent worship history scholarship. Next, I trace back to the IWS the lines of connection between early IHM leaders. After providing the history of IHM’s direct connection to the IWS, I examine the theological works of Terry Law who, indebted to the IWS, functioned as a secondary influence on IHM leaders. Fourth, I describe the history of the formation and early development of IHM as an organization. I conclude with a discussion of the first tape

2 Michael Coleman was co-owner (with Ed Lindquist) and CEO of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music; Don Moen became creative director in 1988; Gerrit Gustafson was worship leader at Covenant Church at the founding of IHM and served the organization full-time until 1988 when he moved into a consultancy role; Tom Brooks was the exclusive producer and arranger of IHM albums for the first few years; Marty Nystrom joined the company in 1988, serving in song development.
3 I was unable to secure an interview with marketing director Ed Lindquist.
distributed as part of the IHM series, *Behold His Majesty*, to show how various elements of IWS Praise and Worship in IHM’s formation are realized musically on the tape.

5.1 Literature Review

Despite the meteoric rise of IHM in the second half of the 1980s and the important role that it has played in the spread of Praise and Worship music, academic scholarship has largely overlooked its history. Contributions in worship scholarship that attempt to offer historical insight on IHM come from two volumes related to recent changes in Protestant worship including, but not limited to, music. Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong’s *Lovin’ on Jesus* pays special attention to musical style in IHM recordings by analyzing the overall organizational structure of music on IHM’s first release, *Behold His Majesty* and compare it to contemporaneous Maranatha! and Mercy music (affiliated with the Vineyard association of churches) recordings.4 Robb Redman’s *The Great Worship Awakening* attempts to situate IHM within the broader Christian music-industrial development and the “big four” Christian music companies: Maranatha!, Vineyard/Mercy, IHM, and EMI Christian Music Group/WorshipTogether. He describes these companies in relation to rock music sounds—save for IHM, to which he gives no musical description.5 Regarding the background of IHM, Redman argues that that songwriters who were active among independent Pentecostal churches had difficulty

4 Lim and Ruth, *Lovin’ on Jesus*, 59–71, especially 68. Lim used the generic term “album” to denote the recording. The format of the release was actually cassette tape.
getting their songs published and recorded at Maranatha! and Mercy. “To address this problem,” says Redman,

A group of pastors met to form a new company, called Integrity Music, in 1987. Collecting songs from around the country and connecting with leading independent songwriters and worship leaders, the company began releasing a steady stream of projects in a variety of musical styles.⁶

Notwithstanding the factual inaccuracy of his description, Redman’s summary of IHM’s founding—as is the case with the historiography of Praise and Worship more broadly—treats IHM as incidental to the development of the Christian music industry in general and subsumes it into the 1960s Jesus People narrative.⁷

The contribution of IHM to the transformation of worship practices over the last half century has not yet been treated at length in musicological, liturgical, or theological scholarship.⁸ As a result of this oversight, the broader history of Praise and Worship is deficient in a number of ways that, predictably, mirror similar deficiencies that result from overlooking the IWS. First, historians have not adequately accounted for the way discrete themes in Pentecostal liturgical theology are embedded in Praise and Worship musics. In this way, IHM and IWS are intertwined as the early development of IHM was

---

⁶ Redman, *The Great Worship Awakening*, 56–57. In fact, it is surprising that IHM’s musical output remained stylistically consistent for multiple years and over dozens of tapes.
⁷ See chapter one for a lengthier exposition on this topic.
⁸ I have previously written on this topic in “Enthroned Upon Praise: The Early History and Theology of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music” in *Essays on the History of Contemporary Praise and Worship*, edited by Lester Ruth (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2020). My treatment here contains new research on IHM’s connections to IWS and is focused on this particular aspect of their history. In particular, it offers a more detailed history of how the theology of enthronement became a dominant theme in connection to the theological lens of the IWS.
deeply impacted by the IWS. Second, because the 1980s have been under-studied as a historical period in the history of Praise and Worship, both IHM and IWS suffer. Third and finally, insofar as the history of the Christian music industry is a key participant in the spread of Praise and Worship, the particular contributions of IHM as influenced by the IWS must be exposed and explored in order to tell a more coherent and complete history of IWS in particular and of Praise and Worship as a broader phenomenon.

Acknowledging these present challenges to the historiography of IHM and building on the historical and theological portrait of the IWS that I have provided in the previous chapters, I turn now to the case study of the establishment of IHM. In this chapter, I focus on what exactly a deeper understanding of IHM’s development contributes to our understanding of the significance of IWS on the broader Praise and Worship movement. I begin with a description of the impact the IWS had on IHM’s early formation and direction. At the core of my appraisal here is the suggestion that IHM is unlike its Christian music industry contemporaries primarily because it emerged out of an ecclesial and theological context that was distinct from the companies that emerged out of the Jesus People in Southern California in the late 1960s and 1970s. Because of this particular context, IHM’s distinctiveness in the 1980s is evident in the story of the formation of their business and the organization and musical style of their early recordings. In both aspects, there is a deep indebtedness to the IWS.

5.2 Transmission of IWS Praise and Worship to IHM’s Key Leadership

Understanding the direct impact that IWS had on IHM begins first with the story of the IWS’s impact on Terry Law. Law functioned as an initial conduit for IWS Praise
and Worship to IHM and had a clear hand in IHM’s early development. As I will show, Law directed one of IHM’s early leaders to the IWS, connected IHM executives to the person who became the longtime arranger and producer of IHM albums, and helped communicate the theology of Praise and Worship that he learned from the IWS to the IHM leaders. Overall, Law was part of the connective tissue in the formation of IHM though he was never formally involved in the company.

Word of Faith evangelist Terry Law was based in Tulsa, Oklahoma and was deeply connected to Oral Roberts University and to the broader Word of Faith network that was based there. As I described briefly in chapter three, Terry Law’s adoption of Praise and Worship was influenced by his associates within the Word of Faith network who attended the IWS, particularly in their relationship through the Living Sound traveling evangelistic music team. Through them, Law was exposed to Praise and Worship for the first time at through recordings of—and later attendance at—the IWS.

Law’s initial adoption of Praise and Worship is credited to his colleagues Jim Gilbert and Daniel Amstutz. Gilbert was a musician and eventually Praise and Worship leader who led a Living Sound music team that traveled the globe doing musical evangelistic events. Amstutz was a chapel worship leader at Oral Roberts University and a local music minister in Tulsa. In 1982, both attended the IWS at Zion Evangelistic Temple and had powerful experiences that they brought back with them to their networks in Tulsa. Not only did they bring back a new desire to experience Praise and Worship in their respective settings, but they also brought back to Terry Law the tape recordings of IWS worship and plenary teachings sessions. Given the deep affiliation between Law and
these Word of Faith network leaders in Tulsa, it was no surprise that Amstutz and Gilbert were able to influence Law to take seriously Praise and Worship.\(^9\) It was also no coincidence that both Gilbert and Amstutz became regular contributors on the Symposium teaching roster throughout the remainder of the 1980s. Though it is impossible to know exactly which tapes Law received from the conference, his later writing in *New Wine* magazine clearly reflects some of the specific teachings on the history of revival and of Tabernacle worship that were being taught at Symposium 1982.\(^10\)

Law received the tapes from Amstutz and Gilbert at a critical and vulnerable time in his life. Earlier in 1982, Law’s wife had died suddenly and Law was grieving deeply. Though the tapes were reportedly Law’s first encounter with Praise and Worship, a personal encounter with Oral Roberts on praise was also influential. Upon seeking counseling from Roberts regarding his emotional state, Roberts instructed Law to commit to saying words of praise to God every day as a devotional practice. In consequence, Law began to explore the broader power associated with praise, a practice that was a natural steppingstone into Praise and Worship for this Word of Faith healer. Akin to the Word of Faith network leaders in Tulsa, it was no surprise that Amstutz and Gilbert were able to influence Law to take seriously Praise and Worship.\(^9\) It was also no coincidence that both Gilbert and Amstutz became regular contributors on the Symposium teaching roster throughout the remainder of the 1980s. Though it is impossible to know exactly which tapes Law received from the conference, his later writing in *New Wine* magazine clearly reflects some of the specific teachings on the history of revival and of Tabernacle worship that were being taught at Symposium 1982.\(^10\)

Law received the tapes from Amstutz and Gilbert at a critical and vulnerable time in his life. Earlier in 1982, Law’s wife had died suddenly and Law was grieving deeply. Though the tapes were reportedly Law’s first encounter with Praise and Worship, a personal encounter with Oral Roberts on praise was also influential. Upon seeking counseling from Roberts regarding his emotional state, Roberts instructed Law to commit to saying words of praise to God every day as a devotional practice. In consequence, Law began to explore the broader power associated with praise, a practice that was a natural steppingstone into Praise and Worship for this Word of Faith healer. Akin to the Word of Faith network leaders in Tulsa, it was no surprise that Amstutz and Gilbert were able to influence Law to take seriously Praise and Worship.\(^9\) It was also no coincidence that both Gilbert and Amstutz became regular contributors on the Symposium teaching roster throughout the remainder of the 1980s. Though it is impossible to know exactly which tapes Law received from the conference, his later writing in *New Wine* magazine clearly reflects some of the specific teachings on the history of revival and of Tabernacle worship that were being taught at Symposium 1982.\(^10\)

---


\(^10\) See, for example, the connection to these teachings: Larry Dempsey, “The Role of Music in the Panorama of Restoration,” IWS 1982 Syllabus, 67–73 and Barry Griffing, “David’s Tabernacle – Bible Pattern for Contemporary Music Ministry,” 9–15, among other sessions. The same sessions were available in some form at almost every Symposium after 1982, including another by Dempsey in 1983 by the title, “An Historical Overview of Restoration Revivals: 1517–1948.” See chapters three and four for additional session titles and their content.
Faith practice of verbalizing one’s faith in God’s scriptural promises in order to claim them, Law incorporated praise into his broader ministry paradigm, especially the conviction that one’s praise must also be verbalized in order to be effective. Fittingly, the sentiment had clear echoes of Reg Layzell’s early insights on making praise verbal and both appealed to Hebrews 13:15. Eventually, Law was delivered from his deep sorrow and he credited Praise and Worship with being instrumental in helping him overcome that grief.

After his personal and spiritual conversion, his itinerant evangelistic ministry also changed significantly. Having experienced the power of Praise and Worship, Law wanted to convert the music of his evangelistic events with Living Sound to Praise and Worship and instructed his long-time music leader Don Moen to do so. Prior to the transition to Praise and Worship, their repertoire had had a strong focus on evangelism and was using Maranatha!’s and Word, Inc.’s musical repertoire that emphasized the experience of conversion. For Moen and Law, the change was more than stylistic adaptation; it required a repertoire shift in addition to the broader shift in worship theology. But there was a significant problem: Moen had not experienced Praise and Worship and did not know what it meant to lead it musically. In order for Moen to learn Praise and Worship, Law and Moen attended the next annual IWS in 1983 (Pasadena, California).

12 Don Moen, interview with Adam Perez, September 7, 2017.
At the Symposium, Moen and Law had a crash course in Praise and Worship theology and music leadership. They also encountered what they considered some “weird stuff” that they associated with the worship events, in particular, the embodied elements of worship such as dance, pageantry, and other non-musical expressions with which they were unfamiliar. But the teaching sessions were impactful nevertheless, especially the theology of Praise and Worship that they encountered there. In at least one clear example of transmission, Law attended Dean Demos’s class, the “Vow of Praise: The Worshipper’s Devotional Life” and that material later made it directly into one of Law’s books on Praise and Worship.¹³

As a result of his attendance at the IWS, Law took a didactic approach to explaining the power of Praise and Worship, eschewed some of the specific embodiment present at the IWS, and transformed his evangelistic ministry into a more “vertical” worship service with healing ministry that followed after the message.¹⁴ Law continued to tour with this message and became a popular teacher on Praise and Worship, especially after the release of his 1985 book The Power of Praise and Worship.

¹³ Dean Demos, e-mail correspondence, July 16, 2020. According to Demos, his teachings in that session were incorporated into Law’s books, though unfortunately without attribution. Demos included this point in my interview not because he felt slighted by Law for not citing him, but to say how he was pleased that the teaching was out there and impacting others’ lives. Indeed, many teachings on Praise and Worship were repeated in many places without attribution, contributing to the historiographic challenge of working on this topic.

¹⁴ Moen, interview. It is unclear what exactly the “weird stuff” was that Moen refers to, though given the broader reception (or lack thereof) of dance, banners, and pageantry, it is possible that he is referring to these elements.
Though his connection with Law did not come until later, another important future IHM leader also attended IWS 1983: Tom Brooks, who would become the longtime producer, arranger, and keyboard player for IHM. It is unclear what inspired Brooks to attend the Symposium that year, but it had a deep impact on him as a composer and arranger. As I describe at length later in this chapter, the experience converted him to Praise and Worship and it deeply informed his musical and theological imagination. In particular, he was moved by the experience of Jack Hayford’s musical “Majesty,” and the Symposium’s mode of orchestral worship became his primary mode for arranging and recording Praise and Worship—an element that was stylistically distinctive about Brooks and IHM from other major Christian recordings at the time.

The other early IHM leaders, Mike Coleman, Ed Lindquist, and Gerrit Gustafson, also attended the IWS during their formational years. Gerrit Gustafson attended Symposium in 1982 or 1983 where he was first exposed to teachings on Praise and Worship. He attended again with Ed Lindquist in 1986 (Washington DC) and was impressed by the size and scope of the conference dedicated to just this topic.\textsuperscript{15} Gustafson attributed the tabernacle model that was used to organize IHM’s Praise and Worship tapes to the teaching at the IWS and to Tom Brooks (who learned it from IWS as well). By the time of IHM’s founding, CEO Mike Coleman acknowledged that he had personal contacts with the IWS leaders, though the nature of that connection is unknown.\textsuperscript{16}

\textsuperscript{15} Gustafson, interview.
\textsuperscript{16} Coleman, interview.
Thus, all five of the men who were at the center of the early formation and organization of IHM (Gustafson, Coleman, Lindquist, Brooks, and Moen) attended International Worship Symposium regional or national conferences in the early 1980s, where they learned a similar mode of Praise and Worship and musical style. In addition, one of IHM’s first new leadership hires in 1988, Marty Nystrom, was also embedded in the Latter Rain Praise and Worship network. In addition to working at Christ for the Nations Institute in Dallas, he attended the IWS in 1981 and 1984.

Though they all had first-hand experiences of Praise and Worship at the IWS, they had not yet all met each other. The credit for making the initial connections between them goes to Terry Law. In the next section, I discuss the organizational background through which IHM emerged as an organization and the role that Law played in further forming Coleman, Lindquist, and Gustafson, as well as introducing them to Tom Brooks.

5.3 Background of IHM as an organization

Though the history of IHM’s theological influences and its musical style is attributed to the IWS, its organizational history is located elsewhere. The core of IHM as an organization sits at the intersection of two deeply intertwined contexts: *New Wine*

---

17 Gustafson, interview. Nystrom had a stronger affiliation with *Christ for the Nations Institute* in Dallas, Texas, where many of these same teachings and worship styles were being implemented. As an institution that adopted Latter Rain Praise and Worship early on, it was working out of a similar background of spontaneous Praise and Worship, though without the concentration of features developed at IWS.

18 *Christ for the Nations Institute* is an unaccredited Bible college in Dallas, Texas. It recorded and published an annual recording of the songs that were popular each year in their chapel services.

19 Gustafson, interview.
magazine and Covenant Church of Mobile, Alabama.20 These contexts have not been
documented in IHM history in part because IHM was a private company that, unlike the
contemporaneous developments of Maranatha! music or Vineyard Music (a.k.a. Mercy
Records), did not clearly advertise the church or network of churches with which it was
associated. Though Maranatha! and Vineyard Music were centered in Southern
California, IHM and Covenant Church were located in Mobile, Alabama, a distant and
distinct geographic center.21 In addition to the ecclesial and geographic separation, there
has been some confusion about the founding of IHM because it was originally a division
within the print publication New Wine magazine, further obscuring its organizational
beginnings.

5.3.1 New Wine Magazine History

New Wine magazine was founded in 1969 as “The Official Publication of the
Holy Spirit Teaching Mission” out of Ft. Lauderdale, Florida. New Wine magazine
described its work as being to “promote the unity and maturity of the Church and
individual Christians by presenting sound biblical teachings and testimonies from a
variety of Christian authors.”22 Among the authors who contributed to the magazine were
a variety of preachers and teachers from within the Charismatic Renewal movement

20 This section has been crafted largely from my personal interviews with Michael Coleman, Don
Moen, Tom Brooks, Marty Nystrom, interview with Adam Perez, May 22, 2019, an interview by
Gerrit Gustafson by Lim Swee Hong and Lester Ruth, and primary materials from New Wine
(unless otherwise noted).
21 Admittedly, Integrity Music later moved to Nashville, as did other Christian recording
companies that had been located in Southern California.
22 This purpose statement is found in New Wine (July 1985), 2.
alongside the Pentecostal contributors who would increasingly come to dominate the list of contributors by the early 1980s. Around 1978 to 1979, the offices of New Wine relocated from Ft. Lauderdale, Florida to become housed at Gulf Coast Fellowship in Mobile, Alabama.\textsuperscript{23}

Gulf Coast Fellowship was a church community that Pastor Charles Simpson founded in August 1973. Over the course of the 1970s, Simpson fostered a connection to the Shepherding/Discipleship Movement and its pastors who were based in Ft. Lauderdale.\textsuperscript{24} Simpson became a central figure in the movement by the late 1970s. In turn, Simpson’s church became an important node in a robust network of Pentecostal churches affiliated with that Movement and eventually those pastors and publishers of New Wine from Ft. Lauderdale joined Simpson at his church in Mobile.

According to the music minister at the time, Gerrit Gustafson, music was an important feature at the church during this period. Dave and Dale Garratt, the influential New Zealand duo who authored the landmark “Scripture in Song” volumes,\textsuperscript{25} also came

\\[\textsuperscript{23} \text{Elsewhere I have published the name of this church as “Gulf Coast Covenant Church” following the lead of my interviewees. I have since learned that this attribution was a combination of two names—one earlier, one later—from Gulf Coast Fellowship to Covenant Church of Mobile. The original name of the church was Bayview Heights Baptist Church. The church became a hub for the Discipleship/Shepherdng movement and the mother church of many involved in that movement.}\]

\[\textsuperscript{24} \text{For more on the Shepherding Movement, including the leadership of the pastors at Covenant Church of Mobile, see Moore, The Shepherding Movement. Note that this move was also called the “Discipleship” movement by some and had a complex relationship with the ecclesial model of Five-Fold Ministry that emerged out of Latter Rain, though it was not strictly limited to Latter Rain-affiliated churches.}\]

\[\textsuperscript{25} \text{Cf. Lim and Ruth, Lovin’ On Jesus, 109–110.}\]
through the church in mid-1970s (though the church was not yet practicing Praise and Worship). As Gulf Coast Fellowship church grew into the early 1980s, it was re-named Covenant Church of Mobile, purchased a new property, and moved (along with the New Wine/Integrity Communications offices) to a new location on the west side of Mobile. During the early 1980s an elder at the church, Mike Coleman, shifted away from serving the church administration to serving the magazine staff as its president and publisher. Coleman had a background in both music production and finance.

5.3.2 New Wine’s Experiment with Praise and Worship

In 1984, New Wine’s core leadership staff expanded in an important way for IHM’s future. In October of that year, Coleman hired Ed Lindquist as full-time marketing director for the magazine. Coleman had met Lindquist the previous year at a church conference hosted by Covenant Church of Mobile. After their initial connection, Coleman hired Lindquist as a consultant to assist with market research about the kinds of teachings that the magazine’s readers desired to see in its pages. What Lindquist and New Wine learned was that readers desired more teaching on Praise and Worship, marking the growth of awareness of Praise and Worship in the broader Pentecostal and charismatic network of the magazine’s readership. In response, the magazine provided a three-part

26 Michael Coleman, interview by Adam Perez, May 2, 2019.
27 Simpson, “Celebrating Charles Simpson.”
28 Coleman had produced two albums out of the church in the 1970s, one of which was by Pete Sanchez, who would later be featured as a worship leader on the IHM tape series.
29 See a short account of this also in Michael Coleman and Ed Lindquist, Come and Worship: Tap into God’s Power through Praise & Worship (Old Tappan, NJ: Chosen Books, 1989), 12–16.
series of articles written by Terry Law that ran from August through October 1984. Coleman and the *New Wine* editorial board were familiar with Law and Moen as they had previously toured through the church. Law’s articles were based on a series of teachings that Law initially offered as a three-day seminar at Covenant Church in the summer of 1984 (the teachings are discussed at greater length below). In this way, Law had an impact both on IHM leadership as well as on the readership who were potential subscribers to IHM when it launched just 8 months later.

By 1985, the year IHM was launched, Coleman was serving as publisher of *New Wine* and president of the magazine’s parent company, Integrity Communications. Support for the magazine came from a board of directors that was anchored by Charles Simpson (the board chairman), Don Basham, Bob Mumford, Derek Prince, and Ern Baxter, all Pentecostal pastors and teachers affiliated with Covenant Church and central to the Shepherding/Discipleship Movement. Their columns and articles formed the bulk of contributions to the magazine. These teachers also had their own syndicated cassette tape ministries that functioned through the umbrella organization of the magazine as tape-of-the-month subscription clubs. Beyond the editorial board, the list of *New Wine* contributing editors also include notable Pentecostal leaders such as the aforementioned evangelist Terry Law as well as Pastor Dick Iverson of Bible Temple, among others.31

30 “Seeing the Power of Praise and Worship: A Staff Report,” *New Wine* (September 1984), 8.
31 *New Wine* (July 1985), 2.
With the new demand stirred up by Law’s articles on Praise and Worship and the insights gained from Lindquist’s market research, Coleman sought to provide the *New Wine* audience with recordings of actual worship music. The goal of providing musical materials was not simply so that they could demonstrate or reference the kind of musical worship that was discussed in Law’s articles but rather so that people could, through the music, have an experience of the presence of God. Coleman and Lindquist knew that there was some market for Christian music at the time in which other music companies like Benson, Word, Maranatha! and Sparrow/Birdwing operated. But Coleman summarized the distinctive mission and contribution of the Hosanna! Music saying, “I don’t want to do music unless it brings people into the presence of God,” which was a strategic positioning Coleman felt was *not* being met by those other companies.\(^{32}\)

To fulfill this sense of mission, IHM began to search for previously recorded albums that could be (re-)released as part of a subscription based direct-to-consumer club (modeled after the other teaching tapes already offered by *New Wine*). Coleman had background and experience producing albums, and knew that music copyright permissions were difficult to obtain. Rather than license songs to be recorded, Coleman’s goal was to lease the master copy of the original worship tapes that were already recorded and send them out to the Hosanna! music subscription club.\(^{33}\)

\(^{32}\) Coleman, interview.

\(^{33}\) Coleman, interview.
The first advertisement for IHM appeared in the July 1985 issue of *New Wine* with a two-page spread describing the personal benefits of the tapes as important not only for experiencing the presence of God but for other goods too. The advert suggested that Praise and Worship in the Bible was connected to spiritual growth, healing, deliverance, and spiritual warfare.\(^\text{34}\) These topics are reminiscent both of the Hebrew words for Praise and Worship as well as the Word of Faith accent highlighted by Terry Law. Subsequent advertisements continued these themes and reflected the theological perspective circulating within the Latter Rain movement and especially within the IWS (see Fig. 5.1).

\(^{34}\) “*New Wine Introduces Hosanna!*,” *New Wine* (July 1985), 67.
Figure 5.1: Advertisement from the August 1985 (vol. 17, no. 8) issue of New Wine Magazine, back cover.
5.3.3 Early IHM Songs and Albums: Distinctive Origins

Searching for albums that would fit the bill for the subscription club, Coleman came up with only two. Given IHM’s strong connection to Law, they turned first to him and Don Moen. In my interview with Don Moen, he remembers being tapped by Coleman and Lindquist for albums that they might be able to use for IHM but Moen did not have any of his own at the time. Instead, Moen and Law connected Coleman and Lindquist with Tom Brooks. As extremely active itinerants leading hundreds of events per year at their busiest, Law and Moen crisscrossed the United States and made contacts with many church leaders. Two of those visits after their 1983 conversion to Praise and Worship were to Grace World Outreach Center in St. Louis and to Covenant Church in Mobile. Indeed, by the time Law and Moen visited Brooks at Grace World Outreach Center and offered the sessions at Covenant Church of Mobile, Law was preaching that you could be healed when you offer a sacrifice of praise and built a throne for God in your worship.35

Moen described Brooks’s previously-recorded tapes as fitting the unique niche of being both “very anointed and very professional.”36 While other church-based recordings were being released at the time that featured live congregational worship—Christ for the Nations among the very earliest and most prolific—they lacked a high level of production. Brooks, however, had begun making some Praise and Worship recordings at

35 Moen, interview. Tom Brooks, interview with Adam Perez, September 8, 2017.
36 Moen, interview.
Grace and his previously recorded album *Behold His Majesty* became the first IHM release. The album featured Ron Tucker (Brook’s pastor at Grace) as worship leader and was recorded and produced by Brooks at the church two years prior (in 1983). What would become the second IHM release was an album titled *Let Praise Arise*. The album featured John Sellers as worship leader, was produced by Don Collins, and had previously been released on the Birdwing label of Sparrow Records. Of course, two albums were not enough to support an every-eight-weeks subscription service and so IHM faced a dilemma: they did not have a third album and yet one was slated for release in just a few short months.

To meet the need, Coleman, Lindquist, Brooks, and Gustafson began to solicit songs for new recordings from their Latter Rain Praise and Worship connections. In this way, the repertory of IHM albums was sourced from a different wellspring of songwriting and thus distinct from its contemporaries. At the time, Maranatha! relied on primarily singers and songwriters within their Jesus People networks who had recognized names and band identities, i.e., the emerging musical acts from their context. Vineyard similarly relied heavily on leading congregational worship leaders and songwriters internal to their church network. The source of IHM’s early songs was the broader network of spontaneous songs that were being produced *en masse* in the Latter Rain churches and independent Pentecostal churches. They did so initially through the connections they made with their early jaunts to the IWS, Bible Temple’s *Northwest Music Minister’s Conference*, and the *Christ for the Nations* tapes. The Christ for the Nations annual Praise and Worship tapes were an especially critical resource for songs on
the early IHM albums because those albums were already documenting some of the best songs coming out of Latter Rain contexts. Smaller, church-based publications were also resources for IHM, such as Daniel Gardner’s “Songs of Zion,” vols. 1–3, that was available only through Zion Evangelistic Temple. The proliferation of spontaneous songs within the IWS and broader Latter Rain Praise and Worship networks were largely unknown beyond local churches and were not being recorded and published by any other major music company at the time. One example of the transmission of an incredibly popular song that came through Christ for the Nations Institute (CFNI) was Marty Nystrom’s song “As the Deer.” The song, which had become popular within the CFNI community, was eventually recorded on one of CFNI’s yearly albums, and was later recorded again on IHM’s 1987 Praise and Honor album, with Daniel Gardner as worship leader.

The early strategy of IHM was to accept song submissions and comb through them for new, “anointed” songs to accompany a core repertory of songs that were already popular. Marty Nystrom described IHM’s work in this period as “harvesting” songs that were already popular. The church at large had already sorted the proverbial wheat from the chaff, and so IHM’s work was simply to gather them up and put them onto albums to share with the broader church. Brooks wrote arrangements and produced the albums, using a different worship leader for each one. In fact, IHM developed a standing

37 See, for example, the lists of sources for finding new songs listed at the end of each Music Notes newsletter, e.g., Music Notes vol 4.2 (Spring/Summer 1982): 3–4.
38 Gustafson, interview. Nystrom, interview.
relationship with Brooks by contracting him for an exclusive recording and production agreement. Brooks thus arranged, produced, recorded, and regularly played keyboard for the majority of the *Hosanna! Music* series (it ran consistently into the mid-1990s).³⁹

They also initially solicited their readers and listeners for new songs, though they quickly changed their strategy after they became overwhelmed by submissions, with over ten thousand arriving in one year in the late 1980s.⁴⁰ Instead, IHM turned to more of a song and songwriter development model with the hiring of Nystrom, IHM’s first song development director (1988–1992).

Not only was IHM’s song repertoire distinct from its industrial contemporaries because of its use of Latter Rain Praise and Worship sources, so too were elements of its production style. In the 1980s, early IHM leader Gerrit Gustafson suggested that Christian bookstores (and the Christian Booksellers Association more broadly) at the time were looking for recordings like the Maranatha! *Praise* albums that had been a recent success. Those albums were comprised of a few shorter medleys of songs. Thus, there was little interest from Christian bookstores for Praise and Worship music in 1984 and 1985; they reportedly viewed such music as a fad.

What IHM offered, however, were recordings with complete worship sets on each side of the tape (though somewhat short when compared to many congregational Praise

---

³⁹ Brooks, interview.
⁴⁰ Gustafson, interview.
and Worship settings).\textsuperscript{41} Though the songs on the albums were often still organized as multiple sets of thematically connected medleys, there was a meta-structure to the music on each side of the tape. The end of one medley was stitched together with the next medley with either an instrumental transition or perhaps a short, spoken exhortation that had been planned out in advance.\textsuperscript{42} In this way, it mimicked the kinds of transitions between songs that were heard in congregational Praise and Worship services and prominently featured the sound of the congregation or a group of vocalists in the recording mix. In effect, the recordings captured a kind of performed spontaneity that was associated with Praise and Worship services.

Unlike Maranatha!, which recorded a number of different musical acts, IHM primarily recorded their albums using church-based Praise and Worship leaders, some of whom who were affiliated with the IWS. Though some had recordings of their own that enjoyed a modicum of popularity in local and regional circles (Mike Herron and Dan Gardner, for example), the IHM brought these Praise and Worship leaders to a national listening audience for the first time. To put it another way, IHM not only harvested songs that were popularized through the IWS, but it also harvested IWS leaders for their recordings, among them LaMar Boschman and Dan Gardner as well as session musicians from the IWS who played on the albums. Examples of long-standing musicians whom

\textsuperscript{41} In a number of albums, times of spontaneous singing that erupted at the end of a song can be heard briefly before the tape fades out and transitions into a new song.
\textsuperscript{42} Gustafson, interview.
Brooks met at the IWS and who played for dozens of Integrity Hosanna! recordings include bassist Abraham (“Abe”) Laboriel and vocalist Leann Albrecht.  

Tapes from IHM had very high production values compared to Praise and Worship records at the time (i.e., mid-1980s). Though other recordings were being distributed, few studios had the scale and high quality of the recording equipment or studio editing that IHM’s tapes did. This was thanks to the professional skills and equipment of producer Tom Brooks. On one hand were the high production value Maranatha! *Praise* albums that neither attempted to capture the sound of live congregational worship nor were they designed with the flow and structure of a Praise and Worship service. On the other hand, there were the albums like those released from live recordings of the chapel services at *Christ for the Nations Institute* in Dallas, Texas. Those recordings captured the uninterrupted flow of a Praise and Worship service but had a lower production quality and were published in a largely unedited form. Tom Brooks described IHM tapes as attempting to be both “excellent” in production quality and “anointed,” i.e. they had the prophetic and musical flow of a Praise and Worship service in addition to the sound of the congregation on the tape. The recordings were meant to make a listener feel they were part of a worshiping congregation—one that had an IWS-style full orchestra, choir, and worship leader. Almost as a rule, the early IHM tapes

---

43 Tom Brooks suggests that these two musicians in particular were part of the Jack Hayford’s musical production of “Majesty” at Symposium 1983. Brooks, interview. Leanne Albrecht and her husband Carl Albrecht (drummer), as well as Abraham Laboriel played on dozens of Integrity recordings as well as recordings for other companies.

44 Nystrom, interview; Gustafson, interview.

45 Brooks, interview.
began with upbeat songs of thanksgiving and praise before moving into slower tempos and intimate, first-person worship songs. With this context of the distinctiveness of IHM’s early albums established, IHM soon underwent a change in their organization that allowed them to expand their scope and influence.

5.3.4 IHM Goes Independent

Under the subscription pattern described above, New Wine had launched IHM July of 1985. By 1986, however, the primary teachers associated with New Wine began to pursue different avenues of ministry and decided to dissolve their formal ties to Covenant Church, along with their shared leadership of New Wine magazine.\(^46\) Initially, the profit from the subscription revenue of these tapes, along with the sale of other tape subscription programs, was directed back into supporting the work of the magazine.\(^47\) But, facing financial pressures involving both the magazine and a fractured leadership circle, the magazine eventually published its last issue in December 1986—fewer than eighteen months after the first IHM advertisement and after about ten tapes had been released—and was liquidated. At the beginning of 1987, Integrity Communications was rebranded under the leadership of the board chairman, this time as Charles Simpsons Ministries, and Integrity’s Hosanna! Music was sold to Coleman as primary owner, with Lindquist as a partner. The opportunity for Coleman to buy the music division was 

\(^{46}\) Simpson, “Charles Simpson.”

\(^{47}\) Cf. New Wine, October 1986. The announcement of the magazine’s closure includes a note about the way that the profit of the peripheral ministries of New Wine (including IHM) contributed significantly to the financial costs of the magazine but were ultimately unable to continue to make the magazine fiscally viable.
possible because it was the only subscription tape ministry offered by the magazine that was not directly tied to the teaching ministry of one of the leading pastors.\footnote{Coleman, interview. Cf. Simpson, “Charles Simpson,” np. The date of IHM’s founding has been recorded in other sources as both 1985 and 1987. This confusion is due to the sale to Coleman and its incorporation as a private, independent company apart from New Wine in January 1987, while, as mentioned above, the date of its initial music release was July 1985. The confusion is compounded further because, as I show below, the first two albums released by IHM were previously recorded and published under other labels dating back to 1983.} At such an early stage in IHM’s success, it had not yet become clear just how massively popular the service would become.

As IHM’s recordings quickly harvested the best and most popular songs already in circulation by releasing a tape every eight weeks, Nystrom was brought on to help meet the need for newly composed or commissioned songs. On the same day in 1988, both Don Moen and Marty Nystrom joined the IHM team full time, Moen as creative director and Nystrom as a song developer. These two new additions established the core leadership team at IHM—alongside Coleman, Lindquist, Gustafson, and Brooks—with support from approximately sixty staff, the majority of whom had been affiliated with Covenant Church of Mobile.\footnote{Nystrom, interview.} Though IHM spent its first few years as a direct-marketed subscription program, the tapes also found their way onto the shelves of Christian bookstores with the help of a distribution deal with Sparrow Records in 1988.\footnote{Coleman, interview; Gustafson, interview.} Ultimately IHM (later Integrity Media) became one of the two most profitable Christian
music companies and introduced many popular songs and worship leaders to audiences around the world.\textsuperscript{51}

As an independent company after the dissolution of \textit{New Wine}, IHM enjoyed a greater measure of latitude to move between and beyond theological boundaries within Pentecostal churches, the Charismatic Movement, and broader American Evangelicalism. For the IWS, the affiliation with the Latter Rain Revival was a potential stumbling block. For IHM, their affiliation with leaders central to the controversial Shepherding/Discipleship movement through \textit{New Wine} was a potential hindrance. Thus, their organizational independence after 1987 lent them a platform in ways that resound strongly with IWS’s story, too. Indeed, the two together demonstrate the effectiveness of disavowing the specifics of their Pentecostal affiliations for the dissemination and popularization of Praise and Worship in the 1980s.

To make up for the lack of clear denominational affiliation and the consumer base that it might have offered the organization, IHM relied on its connections to leaders in networks like the Latter Rain and the Charismatic movements. It also relied on its roots in the modes of advertising it had carried over from its time as part of \textit{New Wine} magazine. To build on that network of subscribers, IHM continued to pursue new customers by using rented mailing lists to send advertisements and tape samples. Advertising for IHM was also purchased in a variety of charismatic-leaning magazine publications such as \textit{Charisma, Christian Life, Today’s Christian Women}, as well publications more specific

\textsuperscript{51} Coleman, interview.
to Praise and Worship, such as Kent Henry’s *Psalmist* magazine.\textsuperscript{52} The IHM leaders also began attending all the major conferences connected with the Charismatic movement in order to advertise directly to its consumers. With a history of IHM’s early development as an organization and a sense of what made their product distinctive from the broader Christian music industry at the time, I turn now to discuss the way Terry Law did more than make organizational connections for early IHM leaders: he channeled the theology of Praise and Worship that he learned from IWS to this new audience of IHM leaders and *New Wine* readers.

\textbf{5.4 Terry Law’s Teachings on Praise and Worship}

As I began to describe above, Terry Law’s teaching on Praise and Worship was influential for IHM’s founding. To understand the way Law adopted and adapted what he learned about Praise and Worship through the IWS, I turn now to an excursus on Law’s theology as published in *New Wine* magazine and in his book publications in the mid-1980s. As a key voice in the ears of *New Wine* leaders (i.e., the early IHM executives) and readers, Law’s teaching on Praise and Worship is helpful for seeing how he adapted what he learned at the IWS and, consequently, what can be heard on the tapes (the topic of the next section).

Law contributed regularly to *New Wine* magazine and began appearing on the list of its contributing editors a few months before the IHM subscription service was

\textsuperscript{52} Mike Coleman, interview with Adam Perez, date May 2, 2019.
announced in 1985. More than just a coincidental connection to Law through the context of the magazine, Law’s teaching had a direct theological influence on *New Wine*’s readership as well as its leadership. In my interview with Moen, for example, he emphasized that Terry Law’s teaching was not only influential on him personally but also critical in the origins and formation of IHM theologically. Meanwhile, Gerrit Gustafson identified Law as one of the persons he initially heard teaching on Psalm 22:3, that God is “enthroned upon the praises of His people,” that telltale sign of the influence of a Latter Rain theology of Praise and Worship at the IWS. More so, this particular translation of the key word in Psalm 22:3, “enthroned,” already nods to the IWS’s emphasis on the kingly status of Jesus that was already on full display when Law and other IHM leaders attended IWS in 1982 and 1983.

As mentioned above, one particular set of Law’s teachings had an important impact on *New Wine* readership and thus IHM’s early subscribers. Interested in a more intensive teaching event on Praise and Worship at Covenant Church of Mobile, the leaders invited Law for a three-day seminar on Praise and Worship. The content of that teaching was subsequently published in a three-part series in *New Wine* from August to October of 1984, less than a year before IHM was officially announced in July 1985.

---

53 Terry Law first appears as a contributing editor in the March 1985 issue, the first issue that includes the names of any contributing editors. It is unclear whether this new listing reflected the establishment of a new set of roles within the organizational leadership of the magazine or simply the first time this information was published publicly in the magazine. So, Law may have served in this capacity prior to March.

54 Gerrit Gustafson, interview. For more information on the role of Psalm 22:3 and its connection to Latter Rain Pentecostal theology, see chapters two and four.
After Law’s seminars, the staff of New Wine (predominantly members and leaders within Covenant Church) published an anonymously-authored “staff report” in the September 1984 issue and formatted it as an aside within the second installment of Terry Law’s series.\textsuperscript{55} The staff report described the power and impact of the event:

It’s one thing to read about how praise and worship can put Christians in touch with the supernatural realm. It’s quite another to actually see it happen . . . [Law’s] message was a prelude to a healing service that followed it. But in that healing service, \textit{instead of laying hands on each person individually}, Law led in a time of Praise and Worship, during which he asked the Lord to send healing to those in need. Many of the people involved later said that this time of worship was more joyful and more charged with supernatural power than anything they had ever been a part of . . . The entire seminar was a reminder that our praise and worship touches something in the supernatural realm far beyond our understanding—a fact that should encourage us to commit ourselves to praise and worship on a much deeper level than our present involvement. A prophecy during the last session of the seminar challenged the audience not to be afraid to enter this deeper form of worship because \textit{it is actually the gate into the King’s throne room}.\textsuperscript{56}

In this quotation we see at least two very important aspects that are related to characteristically IWS accents on Praise and Worship. First, the author(s) thought it noteworthy to clarify that spiritual healing was \textit{not} accompanied by the laying on of hands as would have been the common practice in Pentecostal healing services. Instead, the IWS understood the spiritual benefits or gifts of Praise and Worship to rest on the entire congregation during Praise and Worship. In short, given Praise and Worship’s

\textsuperscript{55} Terry Law, “Angels in Action” in \textit{New Wine} 16 no. 9 (September 1984): 6–11.
capacity to manifest God’s presence, the laying on of hands was no longer necessary.\textsuperscript{57} The note suggests that Law was combining teachings on the impartation of spiritual gifts through Praise and Worship as taught at the IWS (and novel in regard to prophecy in Latter Rain contexts) with his faith healing background in ways that were new to this particular community. Second, the report notes the connection between the practice of Praise and Worship with the “King’s throne room,” a spatial setting for worship that was featured at the IWS and echoed in Gustafson’s quoting of Psalm 22:3. (I return to this theme at greater length below.)

In the same issue of \textit{New Wine} that first advertised IHM (July 1985), Law also contributed an article on worship, “Call to Worship: God is Looking for a People to Offer Up the Incense of Praise to His Throne.” The title fused language from John 4:23, the Tabernacle models, and the enthronement theme. John 4:23 was an important verse to Law (and others) as an evangelist at heart because of the way it could be used to reframe the goal of evangelism as being not just converting non-believers but transforming people into the worshipers whom “God is seeking.” That language was fused with the image of Levitical priestly (read: musical) praise as incense derived from the Mosaic Tabernacle typology that I discussed in the last chapter.\textsuperscript{58} The article suggested that the Pentecostal revival and Charismatic Renewal movement within the Christian church were ushering in

\textsuperscript{57} Steve Griffing, interview with Adam Perez, February 5, 2020.

\textsuperscript{58} Law, “Call to Worship,” \textit{New Wine} 17, no. 7 (July 1985): 22-23. Law also concludes the article with a note of acknowledgement to LaMar Boschman’s book, \textit{The Rebirth of Music}. Notably, Boschman was also involved early on in teaching at the International Worship Symposium and developed his own worship conferences in the mid-1980s.
a new historical period of revival. Drawing directly on the historiography that was being taught at IWS, Law went on to describe all of Church history as a series of revivals that restored specific truths and practices of Christian worship to the Church. His teaching is a basic reiteration of what was being taught at the IWS in 1983 (and prior): starting with the Protestant Reformation, Law allegorically mapped these restorations onto the three areas of the Mosaic Tabernacle—outer court, inner court, and holy of holies—and the various pieces of furniture within the tabernacle that were also associated with the pattern of thanksgiving, praise, and worship derived from Psalm 100:4. Law suggested that the church today was a priestly people standing at the veil of the holy of holies but who “cannot enter His presence without the shed blood of Jesus or the incense of praise.”

The church, of course, already had the former (the blood of Jesus) but required the latter (praise) to enter into this final revival. Here, of course, we can also notice his incorporation of the Tabernacle of Moses architecture (popularized by Judson Cornwall) in addition to broader restoration and Davidic themes. This final restoration of Praise and Worship would usher in the special period of presence and power of God as King over all the nations and stand as the culmination of all previous restorations. As we will see, this theology was mapped directly onto IHM’s musical products.

59 Law, “Call to Worship,” 23.
60 This interpretation is evident in a variety of sources, including those from Judson Cornwall and Charlotte Baker.
61 While Law was not the only teacher on Praise and Worship, this exploration has shown some of the particular contours of the theology of Praise and Worship circulating in this community, both in person and through the magazine. Other teachers who influenced the Praise and Worship theology of IHM at the time are worth mentioning, including Merlin Carothers and Judson Cornwall. In interviews, Coleman described Merlin R. Carothers’s book Prison to Praise

### 5.5 The Sound of IHM: Echoes of IWS

Up to this point I have been describing the clear and direct impact that IWS had on IHM’s formation and its theological understanding of Praise and Worship. Because IHM is functionally a record company, the discussion must now turn to IHM’s musical products, and in particular to the work that arranger and producer Tom Brooks had on the Hosanna! tape series. In this section, I highlight how the theology and music of Praise and Worship that Brooks learned at the IWS is inflected in the first IHM tape: *Behold His Majesty* (1983/5). The album not only reflects a clear line of influence from IWS but is also an archetype for later IHM tapes as Brooks the primary producer and arranger for the first few dozen albums released in the series. I begin with a brief overview of IHM’s musical style before turning to a closer analysis of the album.

---


⁶² See also Law, *Praise Releases Faith*, 49–51.
5.5.1 IHM Style Overview

Brooks has described his inspiration for the orchestral sound that marked IHM’s musical style as how he envisioned the throne room of God. Indeed, it was also the sound that accompanied his early experiences of Praise and Worship at the IWS where worship was led by an orchestra. Beyond arrangement and orchestration, Brooks wanted to maintain a production value that was able to capture the live worship experience of “leading the [congregation] into the throne room of God, because if we do that, [God] is going to ‘inhabit it’.” Here we see a Brooks echoing the double valence on the reference to Psalm 22:3 that collapses multiple translations, “inhabit” and “enthrone.” Brooks wanted to make the tapes as high tech as possible to preserve the “live excitement [and] live flavor” but without losing the “anointing.” Like Coleman quoted above, Brooks saw this as what made IHM tapes distinct from the Maranatha! Praise albums of the time, which he described as a “tight, clean, studio thing.” As I also noted above, Gustafson and Coleman described that what they were looking for as something with the production quality of the Maranatha! albums with the anointing of the live, minimally produced worship albums that were being released by Christ for the Nations Institute in Dallas, Texas.63 To achieve this “live flavor,” many of the early albums were recorded live, though not all of them.64 In fact, the orchestra parts were not even present for the initial

---

64 In my interview with Dan Gardner, he said that time constraints on the album he was supposed to lead prohibited them from doing a live recording, and instead it was done in Brooks’s studio in St. Louis. For Gardner, this made him uncomfortable because he was used to leading congregational worship and had virtually no experience trying to lead praise and worship in a
recording but were recorded in the studio during the post-production process. Brooks reported that he used professional instrumentalists from the St. Louis symphony to play the parts in order to achieve his desire for excellence on the recordings.65

Thus, with the theology of enthronement and the orchestral style, Brooks’s production style for the Hosanna! album series—as inspired by IWS and agreed upon by IHM leaders—attempted to capture a sense of the experience of live congregational worship as a participation in heavenly worship with its kingly character of God. This theme of enthronement was also central to both the lyrics and the music. Gerrit Gustafson confirmed that the emphasis on the enthronement of God throughout their early years was one that was derived from their experience at the International Worship Symposium.66 This feature is, perhaps, one of the reasons that the Jesus People music-industrial historiography has skewed the historical record away from IHM’s decidedly non-rock based musical stylings.67

The first few years of albums were also patterned as thanksgiving, praise, and worship (following Psalm 100) as some teachers at Symposium like Judson Cornwall were emphasizing as a useful pattern. Admittedly, Gustafson recollected that Tom Brooks was perhaps the person from whom he first heard this pattern as well as the

---

65 Brooks, interview.
66 Gustafson, interview.
person who helped encourage them to abandon a strict adherence to it after a few years because of its restrictive formula for album organization. As Gustafson summarized, thanksgiving, praise, and worship was a good pattern for one to use when beginning to learn Praise and Worship, but the point of worship was simply to respond to God’s presence, as can also be seen in the work of both Bob Sorge and Charlotte Baker. In summary, in both the music style and the format of the tapes, Brooks’s work for IHM was indebted to the IWS.

5.5.2 Behold His Majesty

Knowing Tom Brooks’ centrality in the production of IHM music, it is important to examine further Brooks’s work on the first IHM tape. Admittedly, the tape was produced before Brooks’s formal association with IHM. Given the depth of interpersonal and formational connections described above—and the mere fact that it is the first—the tape can be understood both as an archetype for encoding an IWS theology of musical Praise and Worship in the burgeoning network of Praise and Worship music production at the time, and also as a template for later IHM tapes. I turn now to describe the musical and theological content of the tape and the practical and theological influences of the International Worship Symposium on the sounds Brooks used to encode and communicate that theology.

68 Gustafson, interview. See also, Bob Sorge, Exploring Worship; Charlotte Baker, On Eagle’s Wings.
While little has been written about IHM in general, even less has been written about landmark albums such as this one—save for one treatment in Lim and Ruth’s *Lovin’ on Jesus* that largely overlooks the theological content of the tape and rather focuses on how it structures musical and textual material into “thematic,” interchangeable connections during a praise set.\(^69\) Though smaller sets of songs can and do act like interchangeable building blocks for a “praise set”—and this tape is no exception as no song stands alone and apart from a larger medley—I suggest here that a larger narrative structure of Praise and Worship is also at work. Re-centering the theology of Praise and Worship as the hermeneutic for assessing the narrative arc of *Behold His Majesty* reveals that structure and the significance of its musical and textual themes. To understand the theological significance of the tape and its theological vision, requires a brief exposition of its musical content. For the sake of brevity in illustrating my point, I will examine only side A of the tape.\(^70\)

A timpani roll launches the (roughly) half minute orchestral introduction, executed in the manner of a symphonic overture as it unfolds through a variety of moods.

---

\(^69\) Lim and Ruth, *Lovin’ on Jesus*, 69. This information is also confirmed by Gerrit Gustafson, interview by Lim Swee Hong and Lester Ruth, July 6, 2015. An offhand remark at the end of the album’s analysis—regarding the final song “Praise the Name of Jesus”—summarizes and redirects their analysis of the album’s central textual and theological theme. Someone can be heard saying “Like so much of contemporary worship, the liturgical focus sought to love on Jesus” (p. 68). However, the song’s text does not make direct address to Jesus and, in general, the language of enthronement is central to both the textual themes of the album, and, as I argue here, to the prevailing theology of worship.

\(^70\) The form of the cassette tape is important for recognizing the larger narrative structure of progression into the throne room of God, as each side of the tape is a kind of independent worship set.
and colors, marked by moments featuring the brass, string, and woodwind sections. Ron Tucker, senior pastor at Grace World Outreach, leads the singing on *Behold His Majesty*. The set opens with an orchestral arrangement of Jack Hayford’s “Majesty,” replete with brass fanfares, string swells, and full drum kit. The song launches both the thematic content of the tape, as well as boldly commands the listener to “worship [God’s] majesty.” “Majesty” gives way to an up-tempo, five-song medley led off by Kirk Dearman’s song “[We Bring the] Sacrifice of Praise” which emphasizes the acts of thanksgiving and praise to God. Tracks 7 to 9 comprise a song set that emphasizes love and adoration of God, while tracks 10 to 11 exalt and glorify the name of God and continue to transition the tempo down. Finally, tracks 12 to 14 use language from the book of Revelation, including an orchestrated version of the classic Western hymn “Holy, Holy, Holy,”71 to invoke the setting of heavenly worship around the throne of God. The style of the prelude’s orchestral accompaniment returns prominently to conclude the setting of “Worthy is the Lamb” before fading into rapturous applause and shouting, marking the end of side A of the cassette.

Side B fades into a more up-tempo track, and through the end of the album is generally marked by second person address to God in praise, organized in shorter sets of medleys along similar lyrical themes to Side A. Diverse arrangements and orchestrations provide variety in the musical sound throughout the tape, including solo wind instruments, keyboard synthesizers, and auxiliary percussion. Together, the two sides of

the album were an archetypal example for understanding the theology of Praise and Worship at work in musical sound.

5.5.3 Structure of Behold His Majesty as Enthronement

Side A of Behold His Majesty concludes around the throne of God and its opening track sets up a trajectory toward that end. More than just a powerful song, Brooks had important personal associations with Hayford’s song “Majesty.” While at the IWS in 1983, Brooks had a powerful experience of it under Hayford’s own leadership. The song was featured as part of a larger musical work that was performed by the music ministry from Hayford’s Church on the Way during an evening worship event. The event was perhaps the most galvanizing experience for Brooks on Praise and Worship and he was so moved by it that he rushed down to the front of the auditorium at the conclusion of the musical and introduced himself to Abe Laboriel, the bassist. From then on, Brooks was hooked, especially on the theme of Praise and Worship as a process of enthronement. Hayford’s song featured that theme front and center, and Brooks’s inclusion of the song on Behold His Majesty later that year was a kind of homage to this powerful experience. As Hayford once described the meaning of the song:

“Majesty” describes the kingly, lordly, gloriously regal nature of our Savior—but not simply as an objective statement in worship of which He is fully worthy. "Majesty" is also a statement of the fact that our worship, when begotten in spirit and in truth, can align us with His Throne in such a way that His Kingdom authority flows to us—to overflow us, free us, and channel through us.

The process of enthronement in praise and worship is one that imbues power in and to the worshiper to manifest—taking Terry Law’s teaching as an example—powerful words and acts of healing. At the IWS, the kingship of Jesus Christ and his lordship over the nations was a key feature of their worship imagination and was powerfully demonstrated at IWS 1983 through Hayford’s musical as well as at other planned events. Indeed, IWS co-director David Fischer has remarked that the IWS was all about the position and status of Jesus Christ in those years. More broadly, IWS had centered the theme of enthronement as part of the rationale for the banners and pageantry that it expressed bodily and visually—though those would not make it onto IHM tapes aurally.

Like a Praise and Worship service, the musical flow from Hayford’s “Majesty” to “Worthy Is The Lamb,” which concludes side A of the tape, is designed as a guided progression movement in thanksgiving, praise, and worship into the throne room of God. Each time the worshiper listens, they are meant to participate aurally in a musically-mediated experience of heavenly worship around the throne of God modeled in Revelation 5:12, where the Lamb is exalted on the throne.

---

73 David Fischer, Interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, May 25, 2017.
74 Illustrated banners and standards are, however, visible in the album art that was designed for the tapes.
75 This structure of worship is derived from the progression of the text of Psalm 100 and is a widely circulated pattern for organizing Praise and Worship in this context at the time.
76 For a fuller analysis of the content of this tape, see Adam Perez, “‘Enthroned Upon Praise:’ The Early History and Theology of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music,” in Essays on the History of Contemporary Praise and Worship, edited by Lester Ruth (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2020).
Though *Behold His Majesty* is a key example of how God’s enthronement in worship is sounded in a Praise and Worship recording, it is important to note that enthronement has a discrete history within Latter Rain worship that provides important context for the album. Though the KJV was long the preferred translation of scripture among Pentecostals and evangelicals, multiple translations of Psalm 22:3 emerged in the 1970s. Two new translations in particular became especially popular: the New American Standard Bible (NASB) in 1971 and the New International Version (NIV) in 1977. Both of these new translations—along with the updated NKJV published in 1980—shifted the translation of this critical Psalm 22:3 verse from “inhabitest” to “enthroned.” Relevant to our discussion here, Jack Hayford also produced his own translation of the text that likewise used the word “enthroned.”

The shift in translation is remarkable because of the centrality of Psalm 22:3 within the networks of Latter Rain Pentecostal interpretation that used this verse as the biblical defense of the effects of praise. Functionally, this new translation did not simply supplant the previous translation; it was too entrenched in the system of Praise and Worship recording.

---

77 While the NASB and NKJV retain the connection between enthronement and praise, the NIV’s phrasing puts some rhetorical distance between the two and thus somewhat neuters the instrumentality of praise. Psalm 22:3 in the NIV reads, “Yet you are enthroned as the Holy One; you are the one Israel praises.” Notably, the NIV offers the alternative “enthroned on the praises of Israel” as a footnote. The NASB renders the verse “Yet You are holy, / O you who are enthroned upon the praises of Israel,” offering “inhabit the praises” as a footnote. The NKJV renders the verse, “But You *are* holy, Enthroned in the praises of Israel” (emphasis original). Holy Bible, New International Version®, NIV® Copyright ©1973. New American Standard Bible (NASB), Copyright © 1977, by The Lockman Foundation. New King James Version®. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson.

Worship theology and practice for that to happen. Rather, the new translation built upon the prior one, providing a depth of characterization and theological specificity. No longer was this sacramental promise attached to praise simply a generic “inhabitation” or presence. Rather, newly imbued with kingly character, it strengthened the connection to the person of Jesus Christ and the place of worship in the heavenly throne room. Because God was already understood to become manifestly present here through praise, then enthronement can be understood as the quality and character of that presence. The change in character also precipitated a change in the imagined spatial context of the ‘here’ of worship as exemplified in Behold His Majesty (and other IHM recordings): the throne room as described in Revelation.79

These developments went hand in hand for Brooks, who highlighted the importance of Psalm 100:4 for organizing a Praise and Worship set: “Enter into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise: be thankful unto him, and bless his

79 Earlier Praise and Worship theology did make connections in the KJV from this verse to others verses about praise across the Psalms, as Reg Layzell did to Psalm 100. Others even made connections to the prophetic visions in Isaiah 6 and in Revelation (though not with a sense of sacramental efficacy; cf. Judson Cornwall Let Us Praise, 1973). For example, though Judson Cornwall made the connection to prophetic visions of worship in Isaiah and Revelation, “enthronement” as the vocabulary for worship does not figure into his theology of praise and presence when using Psalm 22:3. Cornwall’s treatment of Revelation is to establish that praise is a fitting response for who God is and what God has done and that it is modeled in Revelation as “vocal, often voluminous… often it is sung” and accompanied by other bodily actions (36). Further, Cornwall returns to Revelation at the end of the book and suggests that it is a hoped-for reality that is yet to come and makes no connection with worship in the present as sacramental participation in heavenly worship (136). But with this “enthronement” translation more concretely at hand through the support of biblical translation, ‘enthronement’ as a primary action of worship was able to take pride of place in the sacramental economy. A grammar of enthronement language became more prominent along with it, especially Kingship-related language and power motifs that frame the divine-human relationship as that of King and subject.
name” (KJV). Combined with the sense of God’s manifest presence in music understood from David’s Tabernacle, these Praise and Worship tapes like *Behold His Majesty* were understood to “usher people into the presence of God”\(^{80}\) who was enthroned in heaven, earth, and in our hearts upon our praise.\(^{81}\)

*Behold His Majesty* became a template for later tapes. The pattern of progression in Praise and Worship into the throne room of God modeled in *Behold His Majesty* would come to mark at least the first four to five years of IHM projects, before such strict adherence to album projects as patterns for worship was diversified.\(^{82}\) Beyond those first few years of bi-monthly releases, the textual themes associated with the enthronement of God remain very evident in the lyrical content and album titles of later IHM albums like *All Hail King Jesus* (1985) and *To Him Who Sits on the Throne* (1985). Even a cursory overview of those early projects reveals a strong emphasis on this theme in song titles and through similar instrumentation.

Ultimately, this specific theological vision as realized in both text and music was a unique contribution of IHM among the “big four” Christian music companies in the 1980s. Notably, this theme was not altogether unique to IHM but was drawn from the broader theological context in which IHM leaders, the guest worship leaders for each tape, and the contributing songwriters were embedded, contexts such as the IWS.

\(^{80}\) This is an Integrity’s Hosanna! Music tagline.
\(^{81}\) Admittedly, this is a preliminary description, and much more could be said here regarding the interaction between the multiple tabernacle models and the emphasis on enthronement.
\(^{82}\) Nystrom, interview, and Gustafson, interview. Later album projects included thematic collections, instrumentals, and other progressions less closely tied to the typological or allegorical temple and tabernacle models of Praise and Worship.
5.6 Conclusion:

In exploring the origins of IHM, I have tried to show how the backdrop of the IWS among other Pentecostal networks of interpersonal and theological influence have shaped the music published and popularized by IHM. Though IHM had multiple sources of influence, powerful and close associations can be tied directly back to the International Worship Symposium. The IWS thus had both a direct and indirect impact on the theology of worship captured on the IHM albums, namely that of musical Praise and Worship as a process of enthroning God. In turn, that theological content encoded on the incredibly popular and influential IHM tapes has had an indelible influence on Pentecostal and evangelical Christian worship in the US and abroad. Focusing on the development of IHM, I have shown how the whole musical artifact carries with it a very specific, Latter Rain Pentecostal theological vision into the ecclesial contexts and marketplace of Praise and Worship music in the mid-1980s.

The influence of IHM, of course, did not stop after their first album or remain within the music-industrial history of Praise and Worship. This case study is not intended to outline the limits of the reach of IWS-inflected Praise and Worship but is an example of how the historical and liturgical-theological work that I have done in the previous chapters can inform contemporary understandings of the musicalized practice of Praise and Worship as it was popularized through multiple avenues.

Indeed, IHM continued to grow in its scope and scale, including by publishing other materials. By the early 1990s, for example, Coleman and Lindquist also began writing and publishing on the subject of Praise and Worship. The February 1990 edition
of the magazine *Charisma and Christian Life* included an excerpt from their book “Come and Worship: Tap Into God’s Power Through Praise & Worship.” The excerpt is titled “Worship: Key to Anointing” with the tagline “Praise & Worship Bring Divine Enablement.” The article briefly explores the concept of anointing and coming into the presence of God to experience healing, providing testimony of how God used Praise and Worship tapes to speak to individuals, and citing Jack Hayford’s book “Worship His Majesty,” revealing the long shadow of Hayford’s impact on IHM leaders from IWS in 1983.

In a word, IHM became the music-industrial mouthpiece for the IWS Praise and Worship theology and practice as the IWS itself waned in the early 1990s. Through IHM we can see how IWS’s influence was not just on the average worshipers, worship leaders, and pastors who passed through the doors of its regional and national events. Admittedly, the earlier popularity of the IWS helped to create a groundswell of demand in congregants to sing Praise and Worship songs. The albums produced by IHM built on that demand, both meeting it and also infusing congregants with the desire to have Praise and Worship in their congregational worship. Like the IWS, IHM’s lack of a clear denominational affiliation helped to introduce Praise and Worship music into congregations that otherwise might have raised suspicion or alarm, indeed presenting

---

Praise and Worship as a movement of God and not of a specific denomination or tradition.

Through this case study of the IHM, we can see how Praise and Worship music emerged out of discrete ecclesial, theological, and musical conditions during the 1980s. The connections between the leaders of IHM were forged through attendance at IWS during the 1980s even as Praise and Worship itself was being developed and popularized there. In particular, the reliance of IHM on the earlier influence of the IWS shows how IHM emerged out of a Pentecostal network largely unaffiliated with the broader network of the Christian music industry that had been developing since the early 1970s. Finally, with a sense of the resources of the IWS history and theology of previous chapters, we can see how the IWS made a distinct contribution to the music-industrial history of Praise and Worship through the unique contributions of IHM.
Chapter 6. Conclusion

Much has happened in Protestant worship since the 1940s. Beginning with roots in the Latter Rain Revival, a new wave of worship theology and practice known as Praise and Worship has become a dominant tradition within global Protestantism. Through the network of churches connected to the Revival, Reg Layzell’s theology of praise as a way to experience God’s presence (drawing on Psalm 22:3) was disseminated in the 1950s and 1960s. In the 1970s, a broader theology around the restoration of Praise and Worship began to emerge that centered the Tabernacle of David as a typological pattern from the Old Testament for worship of the present-day. As a result, an array of biblically-derived worship practices entered the mainstream of the ever-growing network and influence of Latter Rain churches on Pentecostalism as a whole.

Though its origins are in the late 1970s, the International Worship Symposium (IWS) grew rapidly in the early 1980s and disseminated a mature form of Latter Rain-derived Praise and Worship theology and practice. As the IWS gathered participants from diverse geographic areas and ecclesial traditions, it became a primary conduit for standardizing Praise and Worship across a breadth of Pentecostalism. In addition to its direct impact on a diversity of churches and church networks, it also had a significant impact on Integrity’s Hosanna! Music, a company that would go on to define the sound of Praise and Worship music in the late 1980s.

Ironically, however, despite the significance of its role in this larger history of Praise and Worship, with few exceptions the International Worship Symposium and its leaders have been all but forgotten on the pages of Praise and Worship history. There are
several possible reasons for this oversight. The IWS never incorporated itself or branded its own products. The Latter Rain never became an official denomination. The background context of IHM has never been explored. All told, little concrete record remains of the IWS’s place in the history of Praise and Worship, save for the echoes that continue to resonate through the sound of IWS’s touch on other important figures and movements.

Notwithstanding the fact that the IWS has been forgotten in Praise and Worship history, knowing its role in the history of Praise and Worship is critical for understanding how the history of Pentecostal Praise and Worship is deeply theological. In particular, through the case study of Integrity’s Hosanna! Music, I demonstrated how new liturgical and theological understandings can make a critical impact on the musicological study of Praise and Worship. Complementing the discussions I outlined in chapter one on the genre and repertory of praise and worship, chapters four and five provided additional and critical interpretive lenses: theological content and liturgical function. To summarize, Praise and Worship is a theological-liturgical tradition that includes but is not limited to music-making. Though music has become the most well-known of Praise and Worship practices, with the right interpretive lenses we can see now how the music is a window into the impact that Praise and Worship theology has had on the recording industry and in local churches. Praise and Worship theology and the ecclesial context of its creation has thus deeply impacted the music industry, particularly the conditions of song creation, the musical styles and structures employed in Praise and Worship recordings, and the lyrical content of its songs.
6.1 Review of Dissertation Chapters

My organization of the chapters in this dissertation have sought to make a systematic case that the history of Praise and Worship cannot simply be a history of its music, especially as narrowly associated with a single narrative of the development and impact of the Jesus People within American evangelicalism in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Instead, I have sought to show that a more comprehensive history must take into account a rich focus on biblical theologizing understood within the context of ecclesial connections and teaching venues. Consequently, the International Worship Symposium is an exemplar for exploring Praise and Worship history.

In chapter one, I laid out the challenge presented by the current state of the historiography of Praise and Worship as a “music-industrial” history that is rooted in the Jesus People Movement of the late 1960s. This history has become commonplace in musicological, ethnomusicological, and some liturgical research. I explored how ethnomusicological and musicological research has not been well resourced by liturgical historians on this topic in worship history, perhaps in part because of their reliance on the scant historical record provided by James White along with their attention to the megachurch phenomenon, and because they approached the topic of Praise and Worship with a hermeneutic of suspicion. I argued that a fuller history of Praise and Worship must take into account a greater attention to both Pentecostal worship history and the period of the 1980s on which my study of the International Worship Symposium focuses.
In chapter two, I began by reviewing the history of the Latter Rain Revival and its important leaders. I showed in that chapter how important personal and ecclesial networks emerged that propelled Reg Layzell’s core notion of God’s presence in praise throughout churches impacted by the Latter Rain Revival. Key churches and leaders that would become hubs for the IWS received this theological emphasis both directly and indirectly from the Revival. The chapter then documents the first four years of events that would later become known as the International Worship Symposium.

In chapter three, I continued documenting the development, prominence, and eventual decline of the IWS. I highlighted how interpersonal connections and powerful worship experiences helped the conference grow the IWS’s influence into the mid-1980s. As the IWS gathered an increasingly broad constituency through the new geographic centers and ecclesial networks, it became a central site for the popularizing of Latter Rain Pentecostal Praise and Worship. In this year-by-year account, I used personal interviews and conference materials to show what was being taught and how the event was being affected by both new connections and new fractures in its network. In the conclusion of chapter three, I suggested possible reasons why the Symposium’s prominence quickly waned at the end of the decade.

Chapter four is a reconstruction of the core theological witness of the IWS. I suggested that the theme of Restorationism is a direct inheritance of the Latter Rain Revival and that it precipitated the emphasis on the Tabernacle of David typology as a hermeneutic for scriptural insight on Praise and Worship. I argued that the Tabernacle of David was a liturgical prism for the development of other theological themes such as the
primacy of music for Praise and Worship, the role of music ministry in the life of the
church, and the role of the arts. The chapter concluded with a brief exploration of how an
emphasis on Praise and Worship as a process of enthroning God was celebrated through
the use of banners and pageantry.

Chapter five showed how the Praise and Worship theology developed at
Symposium became a key influence on the first major company distributing Praise and
Worship music: Integrity’s Hosanna! Music (IHM). Though IWS events had a direct
impact on churches during the 1980s, it also had a secondary impact for the spread of
Praise and Worship through the music of IHM. The theological impact IWS had on IHM
was most prominent in the emphasis on God’s enthroned presence in Praise and Worship.
The IWS was also a conduit for the songs, worship leaders, musical style, recording style,
and the organization of the albums that were produced in IHM’s early years. Thus, IHM
became the musical mouthpiece of IWS Praise and Worship.

6.2 Further Scope of IWS Influence

This dissertation has focused on the content of conference events and the direct
impact it had in various contexts. It is important to identify further ways that the IWS was
distinct and is notable in Praise and Worship history apart from the events themselves. In
several ways IWS was a groundbreaking forerunner for the infrastructure that maintains
Praise and Worship today.
6.2.1 The IWS: A Forerunner in Conference Worship Teaching

By the 2000s, conferences had popular sites for shaping local church worship practices. But before these recent conferences had proliferated in many contexts, the IWS was a pioneer in the conference teaching format for Praise and Worship that became increasingly standard and popular in the late 1980s and 1990s. Indeed, even during this period, the IWS helped to spark an array of worship conferences across the US, sometimes at the same churches that hosted IWS national or regional gatherings. Just a small (but telling) fraction of these early conferences are documented in the pages of the Barry Griffing’s *Music Notes* newsletter and in newspapers and magazines where these events were publicized.¹

After IWS began leading conferences and teaching local churches how to host Praise and Worship conferences, it took years for other groups to start offering their own conferences. Though music companies are often credited with early Praise and Worship teaching conferences, it took more than a decade after the IWS’s first events for music companies to begin offering their own. Among the music companies that began offering teaching conferences, Maranatha! and Calvary Chapel started the *Worship Leader Workshops* in 1991 featuring their group *The Maranatha! Praise Band* and hosted them seasonally for about five years before those began to decline.² The Vineyard Association

¹ See also the first accounting of upcoming worship conferences in *Psalmist* magazine, a list curated by Tom Kraeuter that became a regular feature of the magazine. Eleven conferences were listed, including a conference at Shady Grove Church, LaMar Boschman’s International Worship Leader’s Institute, *Psalmist* magazine’s own conference, and IWS 1990 (Dallas, Texas). “Worship Conferences” in *Psalmist*, vol. 5.1 (February/March 1990): 31.
² Suzy Stablein, interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, March 9, 2015.
of churches began hosting training sessions for their own worship leaders in the late 1980s, and even then, early Vineyard worship leader Eddie Espinosa sent some of his worship leader trainees to the IWS for additional theological training. Integrity Music started their Seminars4Worship conference series in the mid-1990s.

Notable congregational worship-related conferences also emerged in megachurch contexts but, again, did so years after IWS. Rick Warren’s Saddleback Church hosted their first standalone worship conference, the Purpose Driven Worship Conference, in 2002 (though there was a worship track for the Purpose Driven Church conferences back in 1994). Bill Hybels began pastors’ conferences as early as 1984 where they modeled their “seeker-sensitive” approach to worship into the 1990s, not Praise and Worship. Finally, independent companies within the “worship leader industry” like the National Worship Leader Conference, were not established until the mid-2000s.

---

3 Holland Davis, interview with Lester Ruth, August 27, 2018. Holland Davis suggests his Calvary Chapel changed affiliation from Calvary Chapel to the Vineyard network in 1983 just to have access to training events, including those on worship.

4 Eddie Espinosa, interview with Adam Perez, December 29, 2019. When Espinosa became the primary worship leader after Carl Tuttle, he says he was dissatisfied with what was available for developing the theology of worship and informally sent some of his worship leaders to the International Worship Symposium. Though the worship styles and emphases were different, he believed that they had sound biblical and theological teachings from which Vineyard leaders could learn.

5 Integrity’s Hosanna! Music eventually rebranded as their range of musical offerings diversified into the 1990s.


7 Many thanks to Suzy Stablein, conference organizer for a number of organizations, who provided helpful background on the dating of these conferences.
conferences today that have been studied for the way they employ powerful worship experiences and shape the field of contemporary worship music likewise did not emerge until later. The Passion Conference, for example, was not founded until 1997.

6.2.2 Popular Itinerants Who Built on IWS’s Network

As I described in chapters three and four, the itinerant nature of the IWS events helped to popularize its message. The IWS also amplified the message of the other itinerant Praise and Worship leaders who taught there. In addition to their appearances at the IWS’s national and regional events, many of them led local and regional Praise and Worship conferences and appeared in many churches as guest worship music leaders, teachers, and preachers. In chapter three I discussed how Barry Griffing’s Music Notes newsletter cataloged his itinerancy, Larry Dempsey’s (a fulltime traveling evangelist for the Symposium in the mid-1980s), and that of Mike Herron. Here I want to highlight just one example: LaMar Boschman, though many—if not most—of the IWS faculty enjoyed some level of itinerant ministry.

LaMar Boschman is a prominent example of an itinerant Praise and Worship leader who built off of IWS’s networks. Though he was already embedded within the Latter Rain network of churches in the 1970s, the IWS amplified the visibility of LaMar Boschman’s ministry. Boschman built on IWS networks and resources and eventually offered his own conferences in the mid-1980s and continued his own active schedule of traveling to teach Praise and Worship. Boschman’s two earliest events were the Worship Congress with Ray Hughes in 1984, a weekend event hosted by local churches, and the International Worship Institute. His International Worship Institute was founded in 1986.
and offered a week-long and more formalized curricular sequence than IWS’s more pick-and-choose model (which they were already moving toward in 1985). Boschman continued hosting the IWI well into the 1990s in various formats and in various locations. Boschman is perhaps one of the leaders who remained the most enduringly well-known as a conference teacher and recording artist. Later on, Boschman shared the worship teaching platform with a wide range of prominent leaders such as C. Peter Wagner, Robert Webber, Darlene Zschech, and Chris Tomlin. Boschman also had some success recording albums for Integrity and even today continues to teach on worship through Gateway Church, a multi-site megachurch in Texas known for its popular worship records that was founded out of Shady Grove Church (host of Symposium 1981). Perhaps Boschman’s entrepreneurial leadership is what kept him relevant and involved in the mainstream of Praise and Worship after the influence of other Symposium leaders began to wane in the 1990s. Regardless, his ministry enjoyed a significant boost through his affiliation with the IWS.

As a forerunner in the development of Praise and Worship teaching conferences, the IWS not only determined and affected the developing content of Praise and Worship but also the future sites where it would be spread. This brief overview is intended to demonstrate that the IWS was years—decades in some cases—ahead of the curve in using the conference teaching format for disseminating Praise and Worship. The IWS

---

8 Some Symposium leaders felt that Boschman had lifted their teachings directly from Symposium and implemented it in his own curriculum without attribution.
broke new ground as a worship conference that was unaffiliated with a formal denominational entity and focused singularly on the theme of worship. While it directly spawned a number of smaller Pentecostal conferences, influential Evangelical conferences on the mainstreaming of Praise and Worship did not emerge until much later.

**6.3 The Enduring Influence of Latter Rain Praise and Worship: Potential Further Avenues of Research**

In this dissertation, I have focused on the discrete impact of the IWS on churches and other prominent Praise and Worship institutions. My study of the IWS as instrumental in the shaping of Praise and Worship helps to shed light onto the broader network of Latter Rain Praise and Worship that was developing and operating in the 1980s. It is also more than a history of the IWS’s influence on Praise and Worship music in the 1980s: it models a methodology for how further research on Praise and Worship can draw on the history of biblical theologizing as well as conferences and ecclesial networks to illuminate the broader history of Praise and Worship and its music in the 1980s (and beyond). In this final section, I want to take a step back and consider how the broader IWS-inflected network of Praise and Worship in the 1980s opens up new potential case studies in writing a fuller liturgical, theological, and ecclesial history of Praise and Worship.

**6.3.1 Researching Prominent Contemporary Churches with Praise and Worship History**

I highlighted in chapter five how the IWS influenced a leader in the music industry and suggested that IHM may have helped create demand for Praise and Worship
in their local churches. Of course, the IWS and its affiliates also had a direct impact on churches of many sizes, and I identified some of the most prominent churches in the Latter Rain Praise and Worship network in chapters three and four. It would be impossible to trace the lines of influence from the IWS to the hundreds—if not thousands—of local churches and their leaders who attended the IWS. Nevertheless, there are a number of churches that continue to be prominent and influential in the worship music scene today that have a history dependent not on the Jesus People in the 1960s but on Latter Rain Pentecostal Praise and Worship in the 1980s. Equipped with a new framework for understanding Praise and Worship history, the liturgical and ecclesial history of a number of influential churches warrants further study. Though not an exhaustive list, I explore just four of them below: Gateway Church (the greater Dallas area in Texas), International House of Prayer (Kansas City, Missouri), Bethel Church (Redding, California), and Hillsong Church (Sydney, Australia).

Gateway Church in the Dallas/Ft. Worth area reports 100,000 attendees across its multiple campuses each weekend and has a popular music publishing arm responsible for a number of top worship songs today. One of those sites is the church formerly known as Shady Grove Church, pastored by Olen Griffing and the host of Symposium 1981. Gateway Church founder and senior pastor Robert Morris learned Praise and Worship there and was sent out from Shady Grove to plant Gateway. As Gateway grew and Shady Grove shrank, Gateway incorporated Shady Grove into its network of multi-site
churches. As with other leaders, Morris also attended worship events at Bible Temple in Portland, Oregon.  

Likewise, the worship practices of Mike Bickle’s International House of Prayer (IHOP) in Kansas City owe a debt to Latter Rain Praise and Worship. For example, the concept of IHOP’s 24/7 worship and prayer rooms is a direct adaptation of principles derived from David’s Tabernacle and the understanding that Levitical priests offered Praise and Worship day and night in the Tabernacle. To this day, Bickle as well as IHOP worship leader Misty Edwards teach “the song of the Lord” to worship leaders training at IHOP.  

Already in the 1980s, Bickle published on Praise and Worship-related topics in Kent Henry’s Psalmist magazine. The Psalmist—its title a particularly conspicuous nod to an audience embedded in the typology of Davidic Tabernacle worship—regularly featured Bickle’s writing alongside Symposium leaders like Graham Truscott, Bob Sorge, and Charlotte Baker, beginning with the magazine’s very first issue. Or, in issue 4

---

10 Thank you to Jonathan Ottaway for this insight drawn from an unpublished catalogue of IHOP teachings. Jonathan Ottaway, e-mail to Adam Perez, September 14, 2020.
11 Psalmist was published by Kent Henry, a worship leader affiliated with Victory Fellowship as well as Grace World Outreach Center in St. Louis, where Tom Brooks was on staff and produced the first IHM tapes. Henry was also connected to Dick Iverson and Mike Herron at Bible Temple (Tom Kraeuter, interview with Lester Ruth, September 20, 2019) and later recorded on the Integrity’s Hosanna! Music tape series. He also created his own series of VHS teaching tapes for piano and guitar in Praise and Worship (see advertisements in The Psalmist 4.3 (June/July 1989): 32).
12 The Psalmist, 1.2 (June/July 1985).
Third, Bill Johnson’s Bethel Church in Redding, California has strong roots in the Latter Rain. Emily Snider-Andrews has written a helpful history of Bethel Church and its association with the New Apostolic Reformation (NAR), a movement derived from Latter Rain Revival teachings. Bethel Church is also a member of an organization called the “Revival Alliance” and Bill Johnson is prominent figure in the NAR movement. Snider-Andrews identified Bethel Church in her dissertation as a prime example of a “theology of encountered presence” through music. Snider-Andrews highlights the way Bethel articulates a sacramental mode of living that is derived from a life of worship and, drawing on Ruth and Lim, offers a helpful overview of key theological themes in the sacramentality of worship dating back to the Latter Rain Revival. Though Snider-Andrews make a generic connection between these themes, a deeper level of analysis could be pursued, especially since Johnson’s history before becoming pastor at Bethel is not well documented. Initial evidence suggests that he was a regular attendee at conferences hosted by Bible Temple in the 1980s and that he split his time between the sessions for pastors and the sessions for music ministers at the simultaneous gathering of the Northwest Music Minister’s Conference where Praise and

Worship was practiced. Similarly Sean Feucht, a worship leader who has been affiliated with Bethel (and in the news headlines recently), also has connections to the 24/7 worship movement and owes a deep theological debt to Restorationism and the Tabernacle worship typology described in chapter four.

Fourth, Hillsong Church is a global example of the flows of Praise and Worship and Pentecostalism. Nelson Cowan’s ethnographic liturgical-theological study of Hillsong Church acknowledges that the Latter Rain had an influence on the ministry of Frank Houston, the father of Hillsong’s senior pastor Brian Houston. Frank Houston was a leader within Australian Pentecostalism, especially the Assemblies of God, in the 1970s. Using a variety of oral and published accounts from Brian and his wife and co-pastor Bobbie Houston, Cowan notes that an early passion for charismatic worship helped to transform the church into the global leader it is today. Relevant to the topic of

---

15 Tim Smith, interview with Adam Perez, January 17, 2020. Note that Tim Smith was the music minister at Bible Temple for a period in the 1980s.
17 See Nelson Cowan, “Liturgical Biography as Liturgical Theology: Co-Constructing Theology at Hillsong Church, New York City” (PhD diss., Boston University School of Theology), 70–82.
this dissertation, Hillsong began leading conferences on music in worship in 1986. By 1995, Integrity Music began distributing Hillsong Music through the global networks it had established over the previous years. As with the broader history of Praise and Worship, the historical record on their early Hillsong days, especially in the late-1970s through the mid-1990s, is under-examined. Today, Hillsong Church is credited with some of the most popular congregational worship songs in Protestant churches world-wide.

This initial exploration of just four potential sites is not a comprehensive list of the way influential churches today have roots in the Latter Rain theology of Praise and Worship. Beyond these, historical case studies on churches that once wielded significant influence—such as the churches explored in chapters two and three—would continue to fill out the historical record on the dissemination of Praise and Worship in important ways. I already mentioned in brief the connection between the IWS and music minister Steve Young at Lakewood Church in the 1980s that would complement Bowler and Reagan’s recent (though limited) work on Lakewood around the year 2000. Another prime candidate for such a historical case study is Bible Temple in Portland Oregon. Though I began to sketch out their history through the late 1970s in chapter two, much more attention could be devoted to Dick Iverson’s prominence in the Latter Rain network, the church’s role in the formation of the IWS, and the role of church staff like Tim Smith, Shari Iverson, and Howard Rachinski in the formation of one of the most
influential companies in the current worship music industry, Christian Copyright Licensing International (CCLI).\textsuperscript{19}

\textbf{6.3.2 Extended Music-industrial Cases Studies beyond White and English-speaking Praise and Worship}

This mode of liturgical-historical inquiry can and should be adapted to other important figures and contexts in Praise and Worship history beyond churches that emerged in or after the 1980s. It is especially critical that the history of Praise and Worship—and specifically the role of IWS leaders—be explored beyond white and English-speaking expressions. Doing so would continue to displace the accepted narrative on the Jesus People as the most important influence on Praise and Worship’s development. Indeed, Latter Rain Praise and Worship and its musics have been critical in the Pentecostalization of global Protestant Christianity. More so, critical reflection on the process of global dissemination is anemic without a fuller account of the influence of Latter Rain, including that mediated specifically through the International Worship Symposium.

I want to suggest two important leaders and contexts in the development of Praise and Worship as further topics of study: First, the development of Praise and Worship in Black churches in the United States through the music of Judith McAllister and the West Angeles Church of God in Christ; second, Latin American and Spanish-speaking Praise and Worship through the music and leadership of Marcos Witt. The prominent influence

\footnote{Shari Iverson, interview with Adam Perez, February 26, 2020.}
of IWS leaders can be seen clearly in the early formation of these two massively important cases.

Scholars have recognized the prominent role that Judith McAllister and West Angeles Church of God in Christ has played in adapting Praise and Worship into Black church contexts, especially within the Church of God in Christ (COGIC) denomination. McAllister and West Angeles COGIC’s album *Saints in Praise vol. 1* (1989) is credited as the first prominent album in Black Praise and Worship. A deeper look at the backdrop to McAllister and this album (produced and arranged by Patrick Henderson) reveals multiple levels of connection to the IWS. On the surface, the album’s production style is modeled after the live recordings popularized by Integrity’s Hosanna Music. But the more important element is the theological formation of McAllister and Henderson.

McAllister suggests that the album(s) captured much of what she brought to West Angeles COGIC from her formation during her time at Oral Roberts University—which hosted the IWS just one year prior to her matriculation. McAllister credits two

---

21 Patrick Henderson, Interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, November 8, 2018. Johnson, “‘Oh, For a Thousand Tongues to Sing,’” 301. When discussing the live recording style, Johnson makes a connection to early Maranatha! and Vineyard recordings as a precursor to the performance context and communal atmosphere recording style of the album. In reality, it is Integrity’s *Hosanna!* Music that pioneered this style of recording. Early Maranatha recordings were known for their tight, studio sound and for Vineyard’s Winds of Worship series that features live recordings released until the 1990s.
22 Judith McAllister, Interview with Lester Ruth and Lim Swee Hong, June 7, 2018.
important figures in her adoption of Praise and Worship: Daniel Amstutz and Myles Munroe. As a student at ORU, McAllister led worship at a chapel service under Amstutz and he subsequently affirmed God’s calling on her life to be a Praise and Worship leader. McAllister credits to Munroe her theological formation during a revival at a local church in Tulsa where Munroe was preaching on Praise and Worship. Munroe dedicated his book, *The Purpose and Power of Praise and Worship* (2000), to three prominent IWS figures: Fuchsia Pickett, Judson Cornwall, and Sam Sasser. Thus, through Munroe, IWS teachers were integrally connected to McAllister’s understanding of Praise and Worship.

As for Patrick Henderson, he attended the IWS in 1987 just prior to beginning the *Saints in Praise* project. Henderson also credits the medley style of the album in part to the influence of a book gifted to him by West Angeles pastor, Bishop Blake: ORU professor Paul Wohlgemuth’s *Rethinking Church Music*. Henderson also credits his understanding of Praise and Worship to his visits to Jack Hayford’s Church on the Way.

---

24 McAllister, interview, np, June 7, 2018 See also chapters three and five for Daniel Amstutz’s role in IWS history.
25 Though there is little available theological history on Munroe, he was affiliated with ORU in some capacity and was popular Pentecostal preacher in the Caribbean.
26 Myles Munroe, *The Purpose and Power of Praise & Worship* (Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image, 2000), np. He says of Pickett that she is “a mother in Zion and a true worshiper”; of Cornwall that his “life, ministry, and teaching have been an altar on which the fires of worship and praise have burned for decades”; and of Sasser that he “laid the foundation for my understanding of Praise and Worship.” Given that the IWS sits at the intersection of these three individuals, it is difficult to imagine that Munroe did not attend the IWS at some point (though it is impossible to know for sure).
in Van Nuys, California—visits that Bishop Blake encouraged as part of an intentional program to move West Angeles’ worship from an older choir-led, “spectator style” to a more “participatory and corporate style.”

With regard to the growth and dissemination of Praise and Worship in Latin America, worship leader and entrepreneur Marcos Witt is a central figure. Witt has been called the “the greatest innovator of evangelical music in Latin America” and “possibly the best-known Latin Christian artist.” Son of United States-based missionaries affiliated with a Latter Rain church and Bible college in San Antonio, Texas, Witt had a direct connection to early Praise and Worship. In fact, it was none other than Mike Herron who had a personal impact on Witt when he was just fourteen years old. Witt described the effect of Herron on his life most succinctly in his endorsement of Herron’s book, *Creados para Adorar* (trans: *Created to Worship*), saying, “I was 14 years old when I heard Mike Herron teach about music, praise and worship for the first time... Many of the principles that I learned listening to him for years have been the pillars of ministry today.”

Witt’s musical career began in the late 1980s with projects like

---

28 Henderson, interview.
31 Marcos Witt, in Mike Herron, *Creados para Adorar: El Propósito Espiritual Para la Música* (Lake Mary, FL: Casa Creación, 2003), back cover. The book is interesting in part because it is Herron’s only book and, despite Herron not speaking Spanish, it exists only in Spanish. It appears that the project specifically targeted Spanish-speaking audiences and lent credibility to Herron,
Adoremos (trans: *Let Us Worship*, 1987) and Proyecto: Alabanza y Adoración (trans: Project: Praise and Worship). He later modeled his production style after IHM tapes—many of which Witt himself owned—and eventually became the first worship leader on a new line of Spanish-language IHM tapes. Beyond music, Witt authored books on Praise and Worship that echoed many themes I explored in chapter four, especially the theme of enthronement and the evangelistic role of Praise and Worship. In fact, his first print publication was in an edited collection mentioned above: *An Anthology of Articles on Restoring Praise & Worship* alongside other prominent Praise and Worship figures such as Mike Herron, Steve and Barry Griffing, and Howard Rachinski (the founder of CCLI). Eventually, Witt became the founding pastor of Iglesia Lakewood in 2000, the Spanish-language congregation within Joel Osteen’s Lakewood Church in Houston, Texas.

I present these mini-case studies here as a further demonstration of the ways that the Latter Rain Praise and Worship disseminated through the IWS has permeated the landscape of Praise and Worship history across boundaries. It is tempting to attribute

who, for a time, was working part-time at Iglesia Lakewood as a pastor to the music teams. See also, Mike Herron interview with Adam Perez, February 19, 2020.

developments in Praise and Worship history like those of McAllister and Henderson or Witt simply to the way the Holy Spirit was moving in Praise and Worship in many places, or merely to musical inspiration from Integrity’s Hosanna! Music. However, with the ecclesial and theological context of Praise and Worship newly unveiled, it becomes clear that both were drawing from much deeper wells. Arguing for the musical significance of IHM on West Angeles and Witt would not be false, but only partially accurate because the IWS and its leaders also stand behind IHM historically speaking and are thus a primary theological source for both.

Exploring each of these case studies more fully would advance the central claims of my dissertation about the relative significance of the International Worship Symposium and its leaders in the 1980s on the mainstreaming of Praise and Worship globally. Addressing these cases and others like them would also widen our understanding of the other nodes that operated in the network of Latter Rain Praise and Worship during this period. On one hand, there are many more churches and church networks that have been deeply influenced by the IWS or the Latter Rain Praise and Worship more broadly. In particular, some of these churches are important sites for worship music that is increasingly coming out of a limited number of church-based music groups. On the other hand, there are other important sites and publications that have further broadcast the message of Praise and Worship both in the United States and globally. Ecclesial, theological, and liturgical histories of these and other sites will continue to reveal to researchers the discrete Pentecostal networks and pathways through which the IWS played a key role in transmitting and transforming Praise and Worship in
the 1980s, a contribution that continues to have an indelible impact on global Protestant worship today.
Epilogue

Perhaps the most consistent sentiment shared with me by my conversation partners in this dissertation research was a lament about the current state of Praise and Worship specifically and of worship music more broadly. They believe it has lost its way both theologically and ecclesially. More sadly, these pioneers see very little in common between worship today and their experiences at the height of Praise and Worship’s rise in the mid-1980s. They share these concerns with a wide array of other commentators and detractors of contemporary worship—especially when it comes to the increasingly prominent role of celebrity leaders, music industry power, and the reliance of churches on the trappings of pop concert aesthetics to energize worshipers. They yearn for the simplicity, the fellowship, and the sense of “anointing” that was at once both dependable and elusive in congregational worship. They are concerned that the renovation in worship that they helped to implement and that they believe was God-ordained has lost its way.

I share their reflections because I believe it is important for current worship practitioners to understand their own history and the development of the contexts in which they currently operate. If there are leaders in the church today who seek to renovate contemporary worship practices, there remains an important resource in that work: Praise and Worship’s own history. The current state of worship was neither an inevitable development nor wholly attributable to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit apart from people. Instead, as I have shown in this dissertation, worship today has been the product of the work of discrete individuals and organizations in different times and places. Unearthing these trajectories and laying them bare may provide invaluable
background—if not *the key*—for those who wish to reform the practices of worship today.
Appendix A: “All Hail King Jesus” at Bible Temple, 1977

To give a concrete example of the flavor of the interactions in the midst of Praise and Worship song sharing during the first Symposium gathering in 1977, I detail the conversation and teaching around Dave Moody’s famous song “All Hail King Jesus.” Though Dave Moody, the author of the song “All Hail King Jesus” was not present at the conference, his brother Doug was there. The brothers were both musicians and attended Layzell’s Glad Tidings Temple in Vancouver, British Columbia. On the conference tape, the (unidentified) song leader asks the group if anyone knows the song. Amidst the eruption of various voices in conversation, Doug Moody says, “That’s my brother’s chorus.” Though other responses are muddled, a woman’s voice can be heard speaking, to which the song leader says, “They have it down there already?” to which yet another voice responds saying “It’s everywhere, man.” Doug introduces the song saying, “my brother got this in our church two or three months ago,” referencing the reception of the song as a “prophetic song” from the Lord. Upon the song leader completing the first run-through of the song, Doug Moody chimes in “You changed it.” A voice responds, “How does it go? You sing,” to which Doug responds, “Just the last part you changed. It

1 Using the word author—or even composer—here is not meant to attribute authorship entirely to the individual who is credited with the songs. This is an important caveat given the fact that songs of/from the Lord were described as being “given” by God and “received” or “delivered” by the musicians. At the same time, my conversation partners also talked about songs as belonging to someone, e.g. “Dave Moody’s song, ‘All Hail King Jesus.’”

2 Note that later accounts of the story of the song indicate that Dave received the song mid-week during a break between teaching piano lessons in his home. The song was then introduced on Sunday and is reported not to have gone very well the first time.
doesn’t really matter, I guess, if that’s the way you’re singing it. But it was just given to my brother on a Sunday morning—I was right there—so I just know it’s the right way.” The group responds in laughter. Then a voice asks, “Can we hear it the right way?” Doug launches back into the song, emphasizing corrected notes and note values on each line, not just the ending.

All Hail King Jesus
All Hail Emmanuel
King of Kings, Lord of Lords,
Bright morning star.
And for all eternity
I’m going to praise Him
And forevermore
I will reign with Him

Instead of three even quarter notes in the very first line (beats 2, 3, and 4; beat 1 is a rest) the word ‘Hail’ is lengthened to a dotted-quarter note on beat 3, shortening ‘King’ to just an eighth note on the second half of beat 4. A second change occurs in the second line. Rather than sliding down step-wise on the word “Emmanuel” and coming to rest on scale-degree three, the note sung on “-el” drops down a sixth, resting on the fifth scale degree, before leaping back up the same distance for the start of the third line. Mirroring the changes in the opening line, Doug lengthens the words “King” and “Lord” in the third and fourth line to dotted-quarter notes instead of even quarter notes. The final two lines are distinct. Though the recording quality makes it difficult to understand precisely what words are spoken, it is clear that the text of these two lines had been altered. The text was apparently sufficiently different that it prompted Doug to speak up
and reteach the entire song. The change from even quarter notes at the opening of lines to a dotted-quarter and eighth note figure gives the song a fundamentally different character.

In the initial version, the driving pulse on every beat is reinforced by similar gestures in the accompaniment. The version sung by Doug, however, takes on a lilting quality that softens what could have become a militant chorus and highlights a gentler, sweeter direction to the song. Though the text remains consistent and the accompaniment similar—though somewhat idiosyncratic to the accompanist, as with so many songs transmitted orally—the rhythm Doug teaches is significantly different.

This example of the transmission of Dave Moody’s song at the conference paints a picture of the state of musical worship at the time. The first time the song had been sung/taught had been a mere two to three months prior to the conference, and already it had traveled up and down (at least) the West Coast of the United States and Canada, likely disseminated on one of the weekly tapes of the Sunday morning worship at Glad Tidings. Because the song was primarily aurally transmitted various versions had already emerged that smoothed out the more challenging melodic elements to the song and re-imagined the feel of the accompaniment. The song was not yet traveling by way of a polished recording to which these congregational music leaders could appeal as the definitive version. Rather, through their fellowship in worship, they had the unusual opportunity to (re)learn the song from a source close to the author—his brother. It is important to note too that Doug concedes his initial correction and suggests that the proximity of their rendition to the initial version is not important if it is already in circulation. For Moody, that level of malleability of the song’s form and content was
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natural to the state of congregational worship songwriting at the time and he was rather uninterested in an ur-version that could be identified by a popular or copyrighted version of the song in print or on an audio recording. Sharing songs in this manner was an important function of the Symposium for local congregations. The Symposium was also, as we saw in chapter five, an important site where popular songs were “harvested” for early Praise and Worship recordings in the mid-1980s.
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