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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Rhetorical theorists and critics have devoted attention to the study of genres and the possibility that a rhetorical situation sets the parameters for particular kinds of discourse. Edwin Black's 1965 book gave impetus to this scholarly enterprise when he referred to the notion of "genre" in specifying congregations of rhetorical discourse that share similar strategies, situations, and effects (132-35). Lloyd F. Bitzer elaborated on the concept of "situation"; he defined it as "a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence" (6). Bitzer's influence resulted in critics examining discourse based upon responses to various situations. Rhetorical situations emerge out of an historical context and directly influence the discourse given in response to the situational elements.

The function of "generic criticism" was first introduced by Kathleen Hall Jamieson in her article "Generic
Constraints and the Rhetorical Situation." Along with Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Jamieson established a general definition of "genre": "a classification based on the fusion and interrelation of elements in such a way that a unique kind of rhetorical act is created" (25). Campbell and Jamieson state that generic criticism "allows critics to study how rhetorical acts influence each other and how rhetoric is shaped by prior rhetoric"(6). Generic criticism has allowed critics to study, through classification, speeches of inauguration, celebration, eulogy, and apologia.

In focusing their attention on the genre of apologia, B. L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel detail the similar elements of the genre. After defining apologia as a "personalized defense by an individual of his morality, motives, and reputation", Ware and Linkugel suggest four primary "factors" that may appear in rhetoric of self-defense. These factors are denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence (275).

Two examples of self-defense rhetoric are Nixon's "Checker's Address" and Truman's "Harry Dexter White Affair" speech. These rhetors found themselves defending a particular act to a public audience. The apologia genre examines the effectiveness of a public defense by determining the extent to which the defense follows the prescribed theories of prior rhetoric and the degree to
which the defense meets the expectations of the audience for a particular situation.

The present study examines a case of apologia by a religious leader and televangelist, Jimmy Swaggart. Swaggart found himself in a rhetorical situation which called for a program of defense. It is important, therefore, to discuss the context of that situation.

In February of 1988, in the midst of turmoil surrounding televangelist Jim Bakker, news broke of a moral indiscretion committed by Jimmy Swaggart. Just one year after Bakker was ousted from his empire for his moral and financial misconduct, the religious community was shocked by the news of Swaggart's indiscretion. Swaggart himself had played the role of inquisitor during Bakker's fall and also during earlier accusations against Louisiana rival, Marvin Gorman (Ostling 47). Gorman filed suit against Swaggart for $90 million, maintaining that his ministry was destroyed when Swaggart spread false rumors of his extramarital sexual affairs (King, "Church Orders" A18). Gorman and Bakker were defrocked from the Assemblies of God denomination, and Swaggart expressed little compassion.

Having made an enemy of Gorman, Swaggart found himself under the scrutiny of a private detective that Gorman had hired. The detective reported to Gorman that he had spied Swaggart visiting a prostitute in New Orleans. During
one such visit the detective took pictures of Swaggart entering the hotel, let the air out of Swaggart's tires, and called Gorman. Gorman, disguised in sunglasses and a baseball cap rushed to the scene of Swaggart's moral indiscretion, and the two men discussed Swaggart's problem. It was not until four months later, however, that Gorman released the incriminating photos to the Assemblies of God (Hackett 31).

On February 18, 1988, in Springfield, Missouri, Swaggart met with elders of the Assemblies of God and, according to a press release, openly and honestly confessed his sin. In this private meeting, Swaggart expressed his sorrow and said that he would leave himself at the mercy of the church. Three days later, Swaggart began his public program for defense with a tearful confession from his own pulpit in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. This apology received national attention from the media and may have served as the focal point of Swaggart's public defense.

The following Monday an announcement regarding Swaggart's disciplinary action was made by the Louisiana District Presbytery of the Assemblies of God. The announcement stated that the "evangelist must undergo two years of rehabilitation but that he might be able to return to the pulpit after as little as three months" (King, "Swaggart Action" A12). The reasons stated for the
relatively lenient action were tied to the lack of evidence of actual adultery and Swaggart's emotion-laden confession. This preliminary local decision was overturned one month later by the national leaders of the Assemblies of God. On March 29, Swaggart was ordered by the Executive Presbytery not to return to the pulpit for one year in order that he might be rehabilitated from his "moral failure." This stern "recommendation" was accompanied by the proviso that if Swaggart did not follow this course of rehabilitation "the Executive Presbytery would take action to dismiss him" ("Swaggart is Barred" A1). Swaggart's lawyer, Bill Treeby, retorted the next day that Swaggart would not follow the mandate of the national church leaders and would return to the pulpit on May 22, the date coinciding with the end of the more lenient three month sentence. Treeby reported that Swaggart had "weighed the considerations carefully" and had decided to risk his affiliation with the denomination rather than accept the ruin of his ministry ("Swaggart Defies" A18).

Swaggart did return to the pulpit after three months and was consequently defrocked by the Assemblies of God. Little was reported about the apparent survival of Swaggart's ministry until approximately one year later when Swaggart announced that the ministry had reached a "crisis point" in its fight for survival. Swaggart
threatened that, without an influx of donations, his television ministry would leave the air within a few days ("Swaggart Ministry" B2). One week later, another report was issued by Swaggart stating that the ministry had been saved by "supporters who answered his plea for donations" ("Swaggart Says Ministry" B3).

Although the ministry has suffered a decrease in revenue and the weekly television broadcast has been taken off the air in some areas, today there is some evidence of the viability of Swaggart's overall ministry. He still maintains a large following and earns a livelihood as a televangelist.

The above mentioned situational elements provided the urgency for a program of self-defense by Swaggart. This study will examine the rhetorical strategies employed in his defense. Since apologia has been designated as public discourse stemming from an accusation against a public figure, and because Swaggart's moral character was maligned, it is reasonable to assume that the apologia genre may be applied to this case.

**Statement of the Problem**

This study seeks to determine the extent to which Jimmy Swaggart's program for defense in 1988-89 complies with the expectations of the apologia genre. Specifically, this study seeks to answer the following questions:
(1) What similarities or disparities exist between Swaggart's discourse and the genre as it has been defined by rhetorical theorists and critics?

(2) What variables, if any, may account for departures from the genre?

(3) What critical and theoretical implications do such findings have on the field of generic criticism?

(4) What does a study of apologia in a religious context suggest about the study of apologia in other contexts?

Significance of the Study

The results of this study may prove to be significant in several ways. First, this study may add to the understanding of the apologia genre. Swaggart's specific defense may serve as an example of the genre, and any modifications found may be instructive to the future study of self-defense rhetoric.

Second, this study may illuminate similarities and differences between "plausible-deniability" in political apologies and "non-denial" confessions in theological discourse. The study may suggest a theoretical framework that is able to encompass different strategies arising from a rhetor's professional position. This examination of a rhetor's strategies based on his/her political or religious position may help to define the relationship
between the rhetor's professional role and audience expectations.

Finally, this study may contribute to an understanding of the rhetoric of televangelism. Swaggart's confession may serve as a case study of a contemporary rhetorical phenomenon. The defrocking of Jim Bakker and Marvin Gorman and the loss of their ministries serve as evidence of unsuccessful defense strategies following the denial of damaging accusations. This study of Swaggart's novel approach of an emotionally laden confession may help to instruct future studies.

Scope of the Study

This study will examine the program of Swaggart's defense from February 1988 to February 1989. For purposes of this study, the time frame of Swaggart's defense will begin with Swaggart's confession to the Executive Presbytery of the Assemblies of God and be limited to the financial crisis and turning point of Swaggart's ministry one year later.

This study will examine discourse in three types of media: television, audio tape, and print. The focal point of Swaggart's public defense is the televised confession on February 21, 1988, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. It, therefore, warrants close examination.
The second artifact to be examined will be the relevant portions of an audio tape that was sent to Swaggart's financial supporters in the summer of 1988 just after he returned to the pulpit. This tape warrants discussion because it was the only one of its kind mailed free of charge during the program of defense.

The final discourse to be examined is a series of articles written by Swaggart in his monthly news magazine, The Evangelist. The magazine contains updates on the developments of the ministry, advertisements, and pleas for continuous financial and prayer support. Swaggart writes an article in each issue which is usually pedagogical in nature; however, he often discusses the scandal of 1988. These articles, found in every issue, serve as direct and continuous communication between Swaggart and his target audience (financial supporters). The discourse examined from this particular source will be limited to Swaggart's overt statements of defense over a period of one year.

This study will be limited to examining the effects of Swaggart's discourse from a rhetorical critic's standpoint. That is, effectiveness will be measured by assessing the extent to which Swaggart's discourse meets the expectations of his intended audience as defined by the apologia genre. Consequently, this project will
emphasize the formal aspect of rhetoric by examining how Swaggart uses his available means of persuasion.

Now that the problem has been defined, justifications made, and parameters set, it is important to focus attention on the body of knowledge that pertains to this study.

Review of Literature

In examining a complex figure like Jimmy Swaggart, it is necessary to understand first the areas of his life that influenced him and perhaps the rhetorical situation of his apology. It is also useful to examine works which reveal information about his life, ministry, and his "fall from grace." This review will examine the literature necessary to understand the rhetorical situation faced by Swaggart in his downfall. Finally, this review will suggest which works are the most useful in providing insight into the rhetorical theories utilized in this study. The areas that will be examined are: televangelism; the Assemblies of God denomination; Swaggart's life, his ministry, and his downfall; and the rhetorical theories which apply to Swaggart's apology.

Televangelism

Jimmy Swaggart is a world renowned televangelist with a large following, who has gone to great lengths through his rhetoric to ensure the success of this particular ministry. Because televangelism is so important to
Swaggart, this literature review will include important works that discuss the origins, purposes, and effects of televangelism. Some important works which provide general information in the area of televangelism include Ben Armstrong's *The Electric Church*, William Bluem's *Religious Television Programs: A Study of Relevance*, Dennis Benson's *Electric Evangelism*, J. Harold Ellen's *Models of Religious Broadcasting*, and Don Chase's thesis, *The Evolution of Televangelism's Third Generation: A New Direction in United States Religious Broadcasting*.

Armstrong charts the history of the electric church, looks at the personalities that have built the phenomenon, and discusses the problems that have troubled it. Bluem also examines religious broadcasting through its various programs. He discusses the relevance of church to society, broadcaster to society and religion, and religion to the broadcaster.

Benson's book provides advice to the potential televangelist by discussing the possibilities of this type of ministry, exploring the electric age in religious broadcasting, providing structure on how to approach the medium, and warning of the "demonic dimensions" in the mass media. Ellen's book is "an attempt to describe in symbolic expressions what has been and is happening in the church's use of electronic mass media" (10). Ellen
reports that religious broadcasters often find themselves concerned with funds, timing, and imagination (17). Perhaps these concerns can be attributed to the success or failure of certain ministries.

Chase traces the evolution of televangelism with a "generation" analogy which refers to the first and second generations as the emergence of radio and television, respectively, in the religious community. Chase's third generation then refers to his predictions of the future course of televangelism.

Some other works that relate to the area of televangelism and report on the recent problems faced by many evangelists include Jeffrey Hadden and Charles Swann's *Prime Time Preachers*, Richard Exley's *Perils of Power*, and William Martin's "Perennial Problems of Prime-Time Preachers".

Hadden and Swann provide a somewhat cynical account of the evolution of prime-time preachers and their struggles, politics, and business dealings. Exley discusses immorality in the ministry, suggests what may cause the immorality, and furnishes advice for rehabilitation and the reshaping of fallen ministries. Martin discusses the challenges of prime-time preachers in maintaining finances and the struggle of competing for viewership between televangelists.
In an article in his own newsletter, The Evangelist, Swaggart discusses the history of his personal television ministry. According to Swaggart, the Lord directed him to go on television in 1975. Swaggart believes that "as far as mass evangelism is concerned, there is no tool or medium that even remotely compares with television . . . Television is the greatest large-scale conveyer of speech mankind has ever known, and so it is the greatest tool for mass evangelism the world has ever known" ("Helplessness" 5).

Assemblies of God

Jimmy Swaggart's religious upbringing is rooted in the Assemblies of God denomination. In order to understand Swaggart's religious beliefs, it is important to examine the literature which explores the foundation of those beliefs. Many books have been written on the history of the Assemblies of God denomination. A few of the most noteworthy works include: Irwin Winehouse's The Assemblies of God: A Popular Survey, G. Raymond Carlson's, et. al. The Assemblies of God in Mission, William Menzies' Anointed to Serve, and Vinson Synan's The Holiness Pentecostal Movement in the United States and Aspects of Pentecostal Charismatic Origins.

Winehouse's book was the first authenticated and comprehensive account of the largest Pentecostal
denomination in the world, the Assemblies of God. Winehouse charts their growth and development and goes into detail about what the denomination believes. G. Raymond Carlson, D. V. Hurst and C. E. Homer's book focuses on the implications of the three-fold mission which was first articulated in 1968 (3). Menzies outlines in detail the development of the denomination's organizational structure and traces its history. Synan's books are perhaps the most reputable and academically accepted as they trace the ideological and behavioral roots of the Holiness-Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements of which the Assemblies of God is a part. Understanding the roots of the Assemblies of God denomination helps to provide insight into the religious premises upon which Swaggart based his beliefs and actions.

Swaggart's Ministry and Fall

In 1977, Robert Paul Lamb, along with Swaggart, published a narrative biography of his formative years. The biography traces his humble beginnings and provides insight into the character of Jimmy himself.

The Swaggart Ministry also publishes a monthly newsletter/magazine entitled The Evangelist which informs Swaggart's followers of the ministry's activities and needs. It provides Swaggart with a constant and direct channel of communication with his followers to explain or justify
his downfall and serves as a useful artifact for examination in this study.

Many articles have been written on the events leading up to and following Jimmy Swaggart's confession of 1988. The most useful to this study were George Hackett's article found in *Newsweek*, Edith Blumhofer's article in *The Christian Century*, and Richard Ostling's *Time* magazine account of Swaggart's moral misconduct. Especially helpful to this study were Wayne King's up-to-date reports found in the *New York Times*. Also useful to this study were the press releases provided by the Executive Presbytery of the Assemblies of God.

Since Christian Scripture is an essential resource used by Swaggart in his ministry, it is important to look at those particular Scriptures which Swaggart has come to rely on in his defense. There are many references to forgiveness in the Bible, yet three specific ones often used by Swaggart deserve mentioning: I John 1:9; Matt. 18:21,22; and Mark 11:25,26. John's reference states, "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." In Matthew it is revealed that Jesus instructs all to forgive "until seventy times seven". In Mark, Jesus warns that if one does not forgive, they will not be forgiven.\(^4\)
In order to understand the classification of apologia in generic criticism, it is necessary first to understand the general theories that surround that classification. The work of Edwin Black, Lloyd Bitzer, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Walter Fisher, and Sonja Foss have been quite useful in adding to the body of knowledge about Generic Criticism. These rhetorical theorists have offered premises for the study of genres. They also have described the implications that a situation has on the rhetoric it "demands."

Furthermore, Jackson Harrell and Wil A. Linkugel sought to organize a perspective by which to classify genres in their article "On Rhetorical Genre: An Organizing Perspective." This systematic approach to classifying discourse into genres included root terms for organizing genres: defacto, structural, motivational, and archetypal (264). They also described operations for research: generic description, participation, and application (278-80).

Other theorists sought to classify rhetoric according to similar strategies, situations, and effects. Three articles which describe the apology are: Rosenfield's "A Case Study in Speech Criticism: The Nixon-Truman Analog"; Sherry Devereaux Butler's "The Apologia: 1971 Genre"; and Ware and Linkugel's "They Spoke in Defense
of Themselves". Rosenfield suggests that there are similarities between Nixon's "Checkers Address" and Truman's "Harry Dexter White Affair" speech which could inform future rhetors in compromising situations (450). Butler further develops those similarities and compares them to Kennedy's "Chappaquiddick" address. Finally, Ware and Linkugel suggest four primary factors (278) and subgenres (282-83) which rhetors utilize when speaking in self-defense. Ware and Linkugel's description of the apology serves a more general purpose and proves to be more helpful in this particular study.

One other rhetorical theorist, Noreen Kruse, has added to the study of apologia in recent years. She includes the non-denial apology which Ware and Linkugel neglect. Kruse's classification further distinguishes types of apologia according to the "drive states" of the rhetor. More recently, Kruse defined further constraints of the apologia genre by specifying boundaries on the types of discourse to be included in the genre.

Two classic examples that further explain and apply the apologia genre are Harrell, Ware, and Linkugel's "Failure of Apology in American Politics: Nixon on Watergate" and Wilson's "A Strategy of Explanation: Richard M. Nixon's August 8, 1974, Resignation Address". These
critics agree that Nixon failed to comply with the standards set forth in the apologia genre and, thus, failed to meet the audience's expectations. 5

Finally, one other example that informs this study is the recent work of Sonja Goza who applied the primary factors and subgenres described by Ware and Linkugel to Edward Kennedy's Address to the people of Massachusetts. This analysis, along with those previously mentioned, are helpful in conducting this particular study.

After reviewing the literature necessary in understanding concepts being applied in the study, it is instructive to elaborate on the rhetorical theories that underlie this study.

Method

For purposes of clarity, this section will be divided into categories describing the theories, procedures, and rationale of this inquiry.

Theories

As this study seeks to determine the extent to which Swaggart's discourse complies with the apologia genre, it is necessary to discuss in detail the definitions and constraints associated with apologies. Many scholars have described the genre and defined its parameters. In 1968, Rosenfield discovered constants in the apologia genre when he compared Nixon's "Checkers" speech to Truman's "Harry
Dexter White" speech. Those constants were:

1) Broadcast apology is likely to be a part of a short, intense clash of views.

2) The speaker arguing in the broadcast is not likely to limit the remarks to statements in defense.

3) Most of the facts will be found in the middle third of the speech.

4) The speaker will tend to use arguments that were previously presented and then reassembled for the broadcast presentation. (449)

A few years later Ware and Linkugel provided a broader structure to the genre by defining four types of strategies employed in the speech of self-defense. These common factors include denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. When incorporating the first factor, denial, the speaker denies "participation in, relationship to, or positive sentiment toward whatever it is that repels the audience" (276). In the second strategy, bolstering, the speaker attempts to identify himself/herself with something viewed favorably by the audience (277). The third strategy, differentiation, finds the rhetor separating "some fact, sentiment, object, or relationship from some larger context within which the audience presently views that attribute" (278). This includes asking the audience to defer judgments until a new perspective can be presented
which distinguishes normal behavior from that of special circumstance. In the final strategy, transcendence, the speaker "joins some fact, sentiment, object, or relationship with some larger context within which the audience does not presently view that attribute." Transcendence will "move the audience away from the particulars of the charge at hand in a direction toward some abstract, general view of [the rhetor]" (280-81).

Ware and Linkugel further classify these common factors into subgenres which combine elements from each strategy. These subgenres include:

1) absolution, which combines denial and differentiation strategies and seeks acquittal.

2) vindication, which exhibits the strategies of transcendence and denial and seeks to preserve reputation.

3) explanation, which depends upon bolstering and differentiation and seeks understanding of motives.

4) justification, which employs bolstering and transcendence and seeks approval of actions. (282)

More recently, Noreen Kruse classified the genre according to motivational drive states of the rhetor. According to Kruse "in order to evaluate properly apologetic speaking, it is necessary for the critic to understand not only the rhetorical situation, but the motives of the
apologist as well" ("Motivational Factors" 13). Kruse claims that an apologist's needs will be revealed in the discourse of self-defense and that a rhetor will reply only when they believe that a failure to do so will result in some kind of personal loss.

The needs that a rhetor wishes to reinforce when constructing a non-denial apology are survival, social, or self-actualization ("Motivational Factors" 14). Survival responses will emerge when a speaker feels that his/her security or safety has been threatened. Social responses occur when the rhetor feels the need to restore affection, status, prestige, mastery, or esteem. Self-actualized responses are produced when the rhetor is attempting to maintain an image consistent with unique values and a personal sense of right and wrong. Success or failure of the apologetic discourse is then measured, not by audience response, but by the extent to which a rhetor's needs are maintained ("Motivational Factors" 22).

**Procedures**

The previously mentioned rhetorical theories will be directly applied to Jimmy Swaggart's discourse in his program for defense in order to determine similarities and disparities with the genre. First, this inquiry will apply Ware and Linkugel's primary factors to the discourse, then after the artifacts are analyzed for evidence and
frequency of the factors, they will be categorized according to subgenres.

Second, Kruse's motivational drive states will be applied to Swaggart's program for defense. In other words, this inquiry will seek to find evidence of survival, social, or self-actualized responses in Swaggart's discourse and/or actions during the period of February 1988 to February 1989. A judgment will then be made determining Swaggart's success or failures based on those needs.

In the third, step this study will compare Swaggart's religious apology to past political apologies analyzed by Rosenfield and Butler in order to determine the variables which account for the departures from the genre. This inquiry will seek to determine the extent to which Swaggart's apology complies with the constants provided by Rosenfield and discussed by Butler. Fourth, this procedure will also compare the driving motivational force and the evidence of primary factors found by Kruse and Goza in Kennedy's speech to the drive states and factors found in Swaggart's discourse.

Finally, a discussion of modifications of the genre based on the previous findings will ensue. This discussion will include a summary of the findings, an explanation of the implications of such findings, and suggestions for further research.
Rationale

Throughout history, public figures have been accused of illegal and moral indiscretions and, subsequently have created discourse which provides a self-defense of such accusations. Kruse noted that "the apologia as a genus is as ancient as rhetoric itself" ("Scope" 279). From Socrates, Pericles, and Isocrates to Nixon and Truman, the apology has been a legitimate form of generic study.

More recently, the examples of Marvin Gorman and Jim Bakker have suggested a need for the examination of apologetic discourse in the religious community. Campbell and Jamieson noted that rhetoric is shaped by prior rhetoric and recurring rhetorical action (6). Because there seems to be recurring rhetorical situations in which religious figures have found themselves in a position to defend their character, this inquiry will apply the method of genre criticism. This particular method should determine the extent to which Swaggart's defense is shaped by prior apologia and the potential the defense has for shaping future religious apologia. The study also points to the intriguing differences between political apologies and religious apologies by employing the method of apologia criticism.
Plan of the Study

Chapter two will contain an apologia analysis of Jimmy Swaggart's program for defense. Chapter three will discuss the juxtaposition of Swaggart's discourse to Nixon's, Truman's, and Kennedy's past apologies and discuss short term implications for the genre based on the departures.

Chapter four will provide a summary, a discussion of the results of this inquiry, and suggestions for further research in the area of religious apologias.
NOTES

1 This author prepared a transcript of the nationally televised confession from a video recording of that broadcast.

2 A transcript was made of the overt statements of defense contained in that audio tape.

3 G. Raymond Carlson is the present General Superintendent of the Executive Presbytery of the Assemblies of God.

4 Scripture citations are taken from the King James Version of the Bible, conformable to the edition of 1611, commonly known as the authorized version.
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CHAPTER 2

AN APOLOGIA ANALYSIS OF JIMMY SWAGGART'S
PROGRAM FOR DEFENSE

This analysis will contain a detailed discussion of Jimmy Swaggart's statements of defense over a period of one year. The artifacts to be analyzed are his nationally televised confession on February 21, 1988, an audio tape mailed to Swaggart's supporters in August of 1988, and 13 articles written by Swaggart in The Evangelist. The articles span the period February, 1988 to February, 1989.

The method used to analyze and evaluate these artifacts is derived from Ware and Linkugel's article, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia" and Noreen Kruse's article, "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia." Ware and Linkugel identify four factors common to speeches of self-defense: denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. After the artifacts are analyzed for evidence of the four primary factors, they can be further categorized into subgenres: absolution, vindication, explanation, or justification. This analysis will go one step further and classify Swaggart's discourse according to Kruse's motivational
drive states which are based upon the rhetor's needs. The drive states appear in speeches of non-denial because failure to address such issues would threaten the survival, social, or self-actualization needs of the rhetor.

For purposes of clarity this chapter will be divided into categories of classification: primary factors, subgenres, and drive states.

Primary Factors

Denial

In the area of denial, the rhetorical critic looks for denial of alleged facts, sentiment, objects, or relationships (Ware and Linkugel 276). At the beginning of Swaggart's program for defense in the televised confession, it appeared as if his approach would be one of non-denial. However, as time passed and the initial shock of Swaggart's misconduct wore off, the defense statements began to change. This analysis will demonstrate how Swaggart's statements evolved from non-denial to vague and subtle denial.

In the televised confession, which was only three days after the news of Swaggart's misconduct broke, the evangelist's message was laden with emotional statements of repenting non-denial. For example in the opening statements of Swaggart's discourse, he confesses:
I do not plan in any way to whitewash my sin. I do not call it a mistake, a mendacity, I call it sin. . . . I have no one but myself to blame. I do not lay the fault or the blame or the charge at anyone else's feet. For no one is to blame but Jimmy Swaggart. I take the responsibility, I take the blame, I take the fault.¹

Swaggart discusses his feelings of how "fair" and "compassionate" the media has been in reporting the news of his misconduct (2). He then moves forward to address those that he has "wronged" and "sinned against" (3). After addressing those groups or individuals, Swaggart once again says that he has "sinned" and begs their forgiveness.

While the statements of confession in this initial discourse suggest that Swaggart's approach will be one of honesty, repentance, and non-denial, he makes a few vague remarks which leave room for a shift in attitude later in his discourse. After addressing those he has wronged and begging their forgiveness, Swaggart makes an attempt to somewhat justify his actions. He states that the sin he is speaking of is a past sin and not a present sin:

Maybe Jimmy Swaggart has tried to live his entire life as if though he was not human . . . . that there was nothing I could not do. . . . And
I think this is the reason (in my limited knowledge) I did not find the victory I sought because I did not seek the help of my brother and my sister in the Lord. I've had to come to the realization--this gospel is flawless, even though it is ministered at times by flawed men. (12)

Even though Swaggart's initial response to his audience is one of non-denial, it contains certain vagueness and subtleties that are developed as arguments of defense in later discourse. In the audio tape sent to Swaggart's followers (financial supporters) in August of 1988, a shift in attitude is revealed. Swaggart undermines the credibility of the media accounts of his wrongdoing:

Please don't believe all the garbage that you hear and read. Please don't do that. I take full responsibility for what actually did happen and the Lord told me to keep my mouth shut from then on out. But, please don't believe everything you've heard. (4)

Later in The Evangelist, the media and their sources are assailed several times as malicious liars. For example, in March, Swaggart says that "they were fabricating all types of lies to weaken our financial base" ("The Lord of" 5). And in June, Swaggart says, "I watched as the
news media aired the most vile and disgusting innuendoes that the human mind could manufacture" ("Blessed" 7).

Finally, in October, Swaggart says:

We had suffered much from the innuendoes and falsehoods circulated by the media, but these rumors were so much worse that I wouldn't begin to dignify them with denials. You see, I would have had to repeat those rumors in order to deny them, and I had--and have--no intention of doing that. ("How Do You" 5)

Because Swaggart was so vague about what his "sin" was in his initial discourse, he later was able to deny having any participation in the "rumors" that were being spread by the media. After this vagueness is established, Swaggart begins to address what he feels the real sin was. In June, Swaggart says, "I did not intentionally disobey, but there was one area that I did not quite understand. And even though we may be sincere in our beliefs, if we're sincerely wrong, the result will be the same" ("Blessed" 8). After alluding to a "misunderstanding" both in the televised confession and in the June issue of The Evangelist, Swaggart elaborates on his theory of why he failed:
I feel that basically, this was where I went wrong. I tried, through my own resources, to overcome. And I learned, through incredibly bitter experience, that man's strength has its limitations. . . . [It] is clear to me there was an element of pride here, and Satan will use any minor human weakness to pierce his arrows through our suits of spiritual armor. Pride is one of the, if not the, worst. ("Remember" 8)

Later, Swaggart assures his supporters that he realizes the sin that was at the root of all his problems. He says that the sin he is referring to is "nothing more than the simple but ugly sin of pride" ("How Do You" 6). Note that vagueness has been removed, and the "sin" that Swaggart committed was not pornographic or lustful, but only pride. This shift in argument from vague non-denial to subtle denial is apparent in the February, 1989 issue of The Evangelist:

[W]hat actually happened had little resemblance to what was portrayed over television, was reported in the press, and was fantasized by some preachers. Satan took what actually did happen and turned and twisted it for one purpose only. That purpose? To destroy our integrity,
our character, and the confidence that people have in us. . . . [W]hat was portrayed by the media and some preachers was not the reality of what actually happened. It was actually something else altogether . . . ("Evangelism" 7-8)

Swaggart's initial response to the accusations against him is very repentant and confessional; however, when the intended audience is changed from a national public to his financial supporters, the message changes. This critic feels that Swaggart was deliberately vague about his misconduct so that he could later deny the rumors and shift the emphasis of his sin from one of obscene lust to that of pride.

Bolstering

The second primary factor a rhetor may utilize when facing an accusing public is bolstering. In this strategy, the rhetor tries to associate himself/herself with someone or something that is viewed favorably by the audience (Ware and Linkugel 277). This strategy is employed quite often by Swaggart. Swaggart attempts to identify his life, ministry, and fall with that of well-known Biblical characters.

The first Biblical character that Swaggart identifies himself with is King David. In the televised confession,
Swaggart refers to David's transgressions:

God said to David three thousand years ago,
'You have done this thing in secret, but I will
do what I do openly and before all of Israel.'
My sin was done in secret and God has said to
me, 'I will do what I do before the whole world.'

(4)

Without providing any details of David's sin, the audience
is expected to recall that David committed adultery with
Bathsheba, yet was forgiven and went on to rule Israel
with great success. Swaggart even ends the televised
address with the 51st Psalm which was written by David
after his transgression. The Psalm asks for "mercy",
a "cleansed heart" and a "renewed spirit."

Swaggart refers to David more often than any other
Biblical character probably because he is the one with
whom audiences can identify the most. Swaggart says that
"for every problem the child of God will face, there is
a remedy provided between the covers of the Holy Bible"
and that reviewing David's experiences "will serve to
provide insight on the source of the victories we all need
today" ("The Lord of" 4). Swaggart continues his discussion
of David:

David failed God grievously. His involvement
with Bathsheba, as sordid as it was, was not
his only failing. . . . The Bible is replete with great men of God who suffered intense opposition and difficulties even though they were absolutely and totally in the will of God.

. . . Did God abandon David in this heathen land? No. God didn't leave David for a second. The anointing was still there; the power was still there . . . . ("Sixteen Months" 4-9)

Swaggart also identifies with other prominent Biblical figures, including Peter and Paul: "As Peter was called to the Jews and as the Apostle Paul was called to the Gentiles, I have been called to perform a specific work at a specific moment in time" ("God's Priorities" 10).

The audience is expected to see the parallels between Swaggart's calling and potential successes and the achievements of Peter and Paul.

By identifying himself with flawed men such as Peter, James, and John, Swaggart attempts to convince his audience that God does not demand perfection from his anointed workers. He argues that these men were not perfect. In fact, they were "impulsive" and "overly ambitious." He points out that Peter denied Jesus three times and that James and John argued over who should sit at Jesus' right hand in the kingdom ("Following Jesus" 7). He continues his identification with Peter's flaws by stating that
Peter's problem "was simply the matter of bloated pride [subtle denial] that had to be brought under control" ("Spiritual Warfare" 8). These men were all able to achieve great things in spite of their flaws and Swaggart is associating himself with that ability.

Finally, Swaggart attempts to reinforce the idea that anointed workers of God can fail yet move on to do great things for the Lord. He summarizes this thought by stating:

> Look through the centuries and take a roll call of God's chosen ones who have failed and gone on to better things, and it reads like a spiritual hall of fame: Noah, Abraham, Jacob, David, Isaiah. The list goes on and on. ("Spiritual Warfare" 12)

The open-ended quality of the list encourages the audience to include Swaggart as God's chosen one who failed yet went on to better things.

**Differentiation**

The third strategy a rhetor may employ in discourse of self-defense is differentiation. When using this strategy, the rhetor asks the audience to defer judgments until a new perspective can be presented which distinguishes normal behavior from that of special circumstances (Ware and Linkugel 278). Swaggart does not rely on this strategy
as often as he does the other two, however, one strong argument is implied in the audio tape and elaborated in *The Evangelist*.

Swaggart introduces the argument in the audio tape when he says, "partially because of the call of God . . . we have experienced the suffering of the past few months." After alluding to God's role in the tragedy, Swaggart develops the strategy of differentiation in the ensuing articles of his magazine (5).

The following scenario is created for Swaggart's audience: The anointing of the Holy Spirit upon the life of a preacher gives new power to that person. Satan becomes threatened by that power and his "forces are galvanized." Satan will then feed the human nature of man until Satan "blocks our view and obstructs our horizon." Because of this "all of our shortcomings and failings (sins) are basically time bombs waiting to explode in our lives" ("The Lord of" 4-5).

This scenario is what Swaggart refers to as "spiritual warfare" ("Spiritual Warfare" 4-12). According to Swaggart, humans are constantly struggling between their human nature and their spiritual nature. Swaggart states that "all of our human traits are either virtues, or they are failings" ("The Lord of" 5) and that the Holy Spirit and Satan were contending for his soul ("Sixteen Months" 7).
At the time of Swaggart's indiscretion, he was not his spiritual self, rather he "was acting the role of Satan's dupe" ("Intercession" 8). Thus, Swaggart's failing was a matter of letting his human nature take over his spiritual nature which most people are inclined to do at some time in their lives. According to Swaggart, "Everybody is born with inherent seeds of corruption, and sooner or later those seeds will sprout . . ." ("Blessed" 9).

This argument asks the audience to realize that, at the time of his failing, Swaggart was not his normal, anointed, spiritual self. Rather the audience is to believe that Satan felt threatened by the power that God had given Swaggart. Consequently, Satan was forced to nurture Swaggart's human condition in order to lessen his ability to reach lost souls.

Transcendence

The final primary factor that a rhetor may utilize in discourse of self-defense is transcendence. This strategy will "move the audience away from the particulars of the charge at hand toward some more abstract, general view of [the rhetor]" (Ware and Linkugel 281). Swaggart relies heavily on the strategy of transcendence and asks the audience to view the situation on three abstract levels. This critic will refer to those levels as "the cause", "the prophecy", and "the learning experience."
First, in the televised confession, "the cause" is alluded to when Swaggart states that his ministry has "labored unstintedly and tirelessly to lift up that great name of Jesus Christ." The ministry has told the "weary that He is rest, and the sin-cursed that He, Jesus, is victory" (7). The audience is reminded that in spite of Swaggart's personal failures, the ministry has and will continue to do great things for Jesus.

The "cause" is also referred to in the audio tape when Swaggart attempts to transfer the obligation of God's work to his financial supporters. Swaggart says that God is trying to "make us more productive vessels, that we could be more like Jesus Christ." Swaggart continues to say that "what you do now is going to affect the work of God . . . which will result in the not so distant future of millions of souls coming to the Lord Jesus Christ" (8). Swaggart's final reference to the "cause" in the audio tape is achieved when he concludes by saying:

So, what we're talking about today is souls, eternal souls all over this world. I'm wanting the world to see the love of God, the grace of God, the mercy of God, the compassion of the Lord Jesus Christ in this preacher. And, I'm believing that you are seeing it as well. (9)
Swaggart also alludes to the "prophecy" or the "call" of God in the audio tape. He speaks of the great commission to take the gospel of Jesus to the whole world:

I have to do it because I have no alternative, no choice. That's what God has called me to do. That's what He's laid upon my heart. . . . Were that call not there, I would quit because the hardest thing in the world to do is what we're trying to do in the face of almost total adversity. But, God has said, "Do it", and we have to do it. (5)

Finally, in the audio tape, Swaggart also incorporates the abstract level of "the learning experience." This level asks the audience to believe that there is victory in the tragedies that the ministry has experienced. Swaggart, in reference to the pain and suffering, ironically thanks the Lord for it because he believes that when it is all over that "there will be much fruit that will be gathered from it." He continues to say, "I believe that we'll be a better minister of the gospel, better people, better able to function in the calling that God has laid upon our hearts and upon our lives" (2).

The strategy of transcendence is most often used by Swaggart in The Evangelist. In this discourse, Swaggart
makes an overt attempt to move the audience away from the scandal and toward the three abstract levels. This critic will point out a few of the many transcending statements found on all three levels in *The Evangelist*.

In attempts to move the audience toward abstract thinking, Swaggart states that "we can no longer dwell on our own problems... We [should] occupy our mind with the wonders of God... These thoughts fill our minds and there's no room for negative thinking" ("Remember" 6). Later, Swaggart refers to the abstract level of "the cause." He states:

I know the burden of the hundreds of millions (and even billions) who know not God and who never have had the opportunity to respond to Him... Every individual must be given an opportunity to personally say yes or no to Jesus Christ. Obviously, those who never hear of Him can't do this... If we allow ourselves to be diverted into some other direction, no matter the apparent morality or value of that diversion, we will miss God's clear priorities." ("God's Priorities" 10)

Swaggart makes a poignant attempt to place the burden of his ministry on his audience when he says that "it is Satan's business to get people to shun this ministry
if he can shut us down, millions of souls could be lost" ("How Do You" 9). Not only is the audience obligated to support Swaggart's ministry because of "the cause", but they would be relegating themselves to the work of Satan if they do not.

The abstract level of "the prophecy" is also mentioned in The Evangelist. The audience is to believe that Swaggart's misconduct was a fulfillment of a certain prophecy. Swaggart reports to his followers:

We recently received a letter containing a prophecy. This prophecy stated that powerful forces would try to eliminate the Ministry from the national (and world) scene. ("The Lord of"

The scene is created as follows: God gave Swaggart a great work. Satan tries to destroy it via sin in Swaggart's life. God said that this would happen; however, Swaggart would overcome the tragedy and maintain the victory. The whole situation of Swaggart's tragedy is a fulfillment of God's prophecy, only the audience is to believe that the scenario ends in success. Swaggart explains in the level of "the learning experience" just how such a tragedy can end in success:

I think I have learned something through this terrible episode that will help me to minister
to the broken-hearted with a little more sympathy, the sinful with a little more patience, and the weary with a little more compassion. ("Blessed" 10)

Swaggart continues with his explanation:

And while I know that God never gets glory out of sin, I know He can gain glory from our reaction to what happens. In knowing this, I have to ask myself, "Am I willing to suffer any humiliation, any disgrace, any shame for the cause of Christ?" ("Blessed" 11)

Swaggart summarizes the argument of "the learning experience" by saying that "it was only after I ceased reminding God of my 'victories' and started thanking Him for the learning experience and the chastisement that victory began to come" ("Sixteen Months" 7).

This critic feels that Swaggart makes a conscious effort to move the audience away from the scandal toward more abstract levels. He achieves this by discussing the "prophecy" of God, the "cause" of the ministry, and the "learning experience" which results in victory over tragedy. The audience is to believe that these abstract concepts transcend the particulars of Swaggart's misconduct.
Sub-Genres

Now that the primary factors have been applied to Swaggart's discourse, it is possible to categorize the artifacts according to sub-genres. This categorization process can be achieved by determining the frequency of evidence of any given factor. Consequently, in order to classify Swaggart's discourse according to sub-genres, it is necessary to summarize briefly the ratio of primary factors found in the artifacts.

Swaggart's initial discourse, the televised confession, does not attempt to deny the charges at hand. He remains vague about the confession of specific indiscretions. This vagueness allows Swaggart later to subtly deny the rumors of his misconduct.

Second, Swaggart relies heavily on bolstering. He associates himself with prominent Biblical figures such as King David, the Apostle Paul, Peter, James, and John.

Third, Swaggart attempts to differentiate his natural human condition from his normal spiritual self by discussing the "spiritual warfare" he was undergoing during the time of the indiscretion. This strategy is only alluded to and does not comprise the crux of his defense.

Finally, the strategy employed most by Swaggart is that of transcendence. Swaggart attempts to move the audience away from the particulars of the charge to three
more abstract levels: "the prophecy", "the cause", and "the learning experience."

The heavy reliance on bolstering and transcendence puts Swaggart's discourse in the category labeled "justificative" by Ware and Linkugel. This category not only "permits the accused greater ease in going beyond the specifics of a given charge" as the vindicative address does, but seeks understanding and approval as well (Ware and Linkugel 282).

**Motivational Drive States**

The final step in this apologia analysis of Jimmy Swaggart's discourse will include an evaluation of the artifacts based on Swaggart's motivational needs. This analysis will demonstrate how Swaggart's discourse reflects a concern with the success of his survival, social, and self-actualization needs.²

**Survival**

According to Noreen Kruse, "[w]hen an apologist perceives that the nature of the threat [accusation] concerns his own physical, emotional, environmental, or situational well being, he is most likely to employ a Survival Response" (19). As in any hierarchy, the security of survival needs must first be met before the gratification of more long-range goals such as the social and self-actualization needs can be addressed. It is important,
at this point, to discuss a matter of timing in Swaggart's program for defense.

At first glance, it does not appear that Swaggart attempts to address his survival needs or situational well being until after he addresses his social needs. The situational well being this critic is referring to is the financial status of Swaggart's ministry. In the televised confession, which is the first public address after the news broke of his misconduct, Swaggart does not discuss financial matters at all. However, the February, 1988 issue of *The Evangelist* addresses solely the issue of "Money." Let it be noted that there is a four month processing period between the formulation of an article and the publication of it as Swaggart explains in the June issue of his magazine ("Blessed" 4). Thus, it stands to reason that the analysis of his defense should not include the print discourse from the months of February to June. To the contrary, according to George Hackett, Swaggart knew that his indiscretion would become public knowledge four months prior to his televised confession (31). If that is the case, then the February issue of *The Evangelist* is Swaggart's first attempt to address his motivational needs. Swaggart adheres to the hierarchal rule of addressing his survival (situational well being or financial security) needs first. Because of this prior knowledge,
Swaggart has an advantage over his audience in that he can begin his defense of his survival needs before his audience realizes the motivational drive force behind his discussion of finances.

In his discussion of "Money", Swaggart states that since "the recent 'religious media' scandals, countless articles and editorials have been written to discourage support of all television ministries" (4). Swaggart then asks his followers not to heed these warnings, rather, they should support those ministries in which they are "spiritually fed" (6). They should also give their support to those ministries whose doctrines are "rigidly Scriptural" and whose "results" can be concretely seen (5). That is, they should support those ministries that have won lost souls. This critic finds it logical but ironic that the very issue that discusses these "concrete results" has on its cover a photograph of a stadium full of thousands of people being "Scripturally fed" by the work of Swaggart's ministry.

Swaggart's next attempt to secure his survival or financial needs is found in the audio tape. He explains:

We have a lot of folk that have quit supporting us. . . . Financially . . . we have taken losses almost every week . . . and, of course, you cannot continue like that. There is a stopping place
with those losses. The way it works is--you don't have the money, it doesn't come in, you can't pay the television stations. So gradually you fall further and further and further behind until they give you a phone call and say, 'Have the money here at a certain date, or you're off the air!' That's the way it works. . . . [So] when you enclose a check to help us reach souls, it means an awful lot. (6)

Swaggart continues with his strategy of placing the spiritual burden upon the willingness of his followers to financially support his ministry twice more in his program for defense. In October, he reminds them of God's words, "The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts" ("How Do You" 10). He continues:

God has given you the talents and abilities that allow you to earn that money. He has given you the good health and the ambition to go out daily and exercise those talents. And I feel He is trying to tell you that a part of that money should be going toward the accomplishment of His last-days mission of delivering the Word of Jesus Christ to a waiting world. (10)

Finally, at the same time that newspaper accounts were reporting a threat to the survival of his ministry,
Swaggart makes a final attempt to place the burden of his survival on the shoulders of his followers. He states: "The call of God on my life is dependent upon your support. . . . Won't you give your help to those who may never feel the Holy Spirit's tug on their heart--or feel Jesus' knock on the doors of their souls--unless you and I give them a chance" ("Evangelism" 9).

Now that Swaggart has attempted to assure the immediate survival of his ministry by appealing for financial support, he can begin to address his need to maintain status, power, prestige, and affection.

Social

Kruse reports that, according to A. H. Maslow, "Speakers whose justifications are Social Responses perceive the circumstances leading to their statements as threatening to their power, situational mastery, prestige, status, or the appreciation and affection shown to them by others" (90). In this instance, the apologist will concentrate on the "image he wants to project to a particular segment of society" and "will justify his means by the desired ends, especially if those ends can be interpreted as beneficial to the group" (Kruse 17).

In Swaggart's case, his social responses are very similar to his transcending statements that were reported
earlier. Swaggart attempts to concentrate on his image and justify his means through the abstractions of his transcending statements. In other words, when Swaggart speaks of his ability to fulfill "prophecy" and "save lost souls", he is asking the audience to see beyond his deeds and view him as an anointed man of God with the ability to do great works. Consequently, Swaggart relies as heavily on social responses as he does on transcendence. Swaggart utilizes social responses in the television confession, the audio tape, and several of the articles in The Evangelist.

First, in the television confession, Swaggart continuously refers to himself as an "evangelist" and "minister of the gospel" whose ministry "has been taken through the ether waves, to the great cities of the world . . ." Swaggart also speaks of his relationship with God whom he serves, loves, and worships. He says that the Lord has "saved" him, "washed" him, and "cleansed" him.

In the audio tape, Swaggart briefly makes a social response when he speaks of the spiritual touch of God that his ministry has experienced. The audience is to believe that, in spite of his failings, Swaggart is still a man capable of being used by God.
The abstractions of Swaggart's argument are elaborated more so in his articles. Swaggart refers to himself as an "anointed vessel" and states:

The anointing of the Holy Spirit upon a preacher's message is the only force that will cause souls to be saved, sick bodies to be healed, believers to be filled with the Holy Spirit, and victory to be wrought in the hearts and lives of the believers. ("The Lord of" 4)

Swaggart continues to speak of the "anointing" as he reports, "This message, delivered under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, has resulted in hundreds of thousands throughout the world coming to Christ" ("Sixteen Months" 6). These statements ask the audience to concentrate on Swaggart as a spiritually anointed evangelist whose work will result in benefits to them as Christians.

Swaggart consistently speaks of the "vision" that has been given to him by God to telecast His message in every nation and says that "despite my human shortcomings, I intend to spend the future in His service" ("Blessed" 12). This "vision" or "prophesy" cannot be fulfilled unless Swaggart's followers allow him the power and prestige he once maintained.

Finally, Swaggart attempts to impose a certain image of himself on his audience:
Jimmy Swaggart, in all his great "strength," came up against the powers of darkness—and found himself as helpless as a child in their grasp. And then finally broken and lying at the foot of the cross, he found in his weakness what strength was all about. ("How Do You" 10)

In this argument, the audience is expected to notice how the scenario ends with "strength" and not "weakness." Likewise, in spite of the tragedies the ministry as experienced, Swaggart has been blessed with new power and situational mastery.

Although most of Swaggart's motivational defense strategies rely on social responses, he does attempt to make a few self-actualization responses.

**Self-Actualization**

Kruse reports that an apologist will make self-actualized responses when he feels that the threat of the accusations will "violate his personal, idiosyncratic values or his self image" (15). This type of apologist tends to "stress personal values or matters of conscience and will show a tendency to live according to his own standards, rather than society's" (Kruse 15). Swaggart definitely demonstrates these tendencies.

Swaggart attempts to justify his actions over a period of time by stressing personal values and explaining why
he lives according to his own standards. In doing so, Swaggart explains why he refused to accept the advice and punishment that was forced on him.

Many persons advised Swaggart to see a counselor or psychologist--to seek professional help for his problem. Swaggart responds to his refusal to accept this advice by stating:

I wish I could say in all honesty that such individuals, sincere as they may be, could provide the needed help. But, unfortunately, they can't. Instead, this advice is the road to spiritual, emotional, and perhaps even mental ruin. ("The Lord of" 6)

Swaggart explains that he does not depend on professionals because "their training is not in the Word of God", rather he depends on the power of God to help him. He continues his argument by saying that "deliverance" is what many people need. And, deliverance can be achieved through weeping, sobbing, and repentance. Swaggart explains that the Lord can "revitalize" on the spot, and deliverance is immediate when God forgives ("The Lord of" 7).

Swaggart also develops an elaborate argument explaining his refusal to obey the Assemblies of God discipline measures. He explains that God had forgiven him--that "punishment belongs to God . . . and when God chastises,
no further action is necessary" ("Spiritual Warfare" 11). He continues to explain that God's calling is for Swaggart to evangelize, thus, he chose to obey God rather than men.

Swaggart even apologizes for the manner in which he admonished the failings of other fallen ministers and admits that he was wrong to promote certain discipline measures for those ministers ("Spiritual Warfare" 11). This apology is an attempt to justify Swaggart's new view of discipline now that he has been directly affected.

Swaggart summarizes the justification of his course of action by stating:

We are clearly commanded by God to obey the laws handed down by the civic leaders God has appointed over us. This assumes, of course, that such laws conform to the higher law given to us by God. If this is not the case, we cannot morally obey such laws, but we must be prepared to suffer the penalties for disobeying them. ("Submission" 6).

Thus, Swaggart accepts that he has been ousted from the Assemblies of God denomination and elects to continue his evangelism efforts outside of the denomination. Finally, Swaggart argues that God does not call denominations to evangelize the world, rather He call individuals
("Evangelism" 6). Subsequently, Swaggart will continue his evangelism efforts without the aid of the Assemblies of God.

In summary, this critic has proposed that Swaggart's discourse reveals mostly his need to maintain power and prestige. However, this critic would argue that he relies on social responses in order to achieve the financial security of his ministry which is a survival need. In other words, Swaggart must first maintain the affection of his audience before he can expect them to continue to support the ministry financially. While most of the motivational responses were for social or survival needs, Swaggart also chooses to justify certain actions in the form of self-actualized responses.

Because Swaggart's discourse indicates that his primary driving force is the financial survival of his ministry, and because the viability of his ministry seems evident, this author would classify Swaggart's defense as a success. That is, if success can be measured according to the extent to which a rhetor meets his or her primary goals, then Swaggart is successful in that he maintains a livelihood as a televangelist.
NOTES

1 This quotation is taken from paragraph one of the transcript of the televised confession. Because this author has provided transcripts of both the televised confession and the audio tape in the Appendices, subsequent references will be parenthetically documented according to the paragraph number from which the reference comes.

2 The motivational drive states are based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs as explained in chapter five of Motivation and Personality (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, 1954). While the categorical responses are based on a hierarchy, they are not mutually exclusive. According to Maslow, one drive state need not be entirely gratified in order for another, at a higher level, to be activated. Because this analysis spans a period of one year, it is more likely that evidence of all three drive states would appear in Swaggart's discourse, although usually one motivating drive force is prominent at any given time.
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CHAPTER 3

AN ANALOG CRITICISM OF
POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS DISCOURSE

This chapter will juxtapose Swaggart's discourse to Nixon's, Truman's, and Kennedy's past political apologies. This juxtaposition will be an analog criticism in that the discourse of each rhetor will be compared in such a way that each address has the potential of serving as a reference standard for the other. The comparisons will be based on the analyses conducted in four articles: Rosenfield's "A Case Study in Speech Criticism: The Nixon-Truman Analog", Butler's "The Apologia, 1971 Genre", Kruse's "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia", and Goza's "An Apologia Analysis of Edward Kennedy's Address to the People of Massachusetts". This chapter will briefly discuss the contents and conclusions of each article and compare Swaggart's situation and discourse to the approaches utilized by each author. A discussion of short term implications will follow the analog criticism of Nixon, Truman, Kennedy, and Swaggart's situations and/or discourse. For purposes of clarity this chapter will be divided according to the analysis and theories of each author.
L. W. Rosenfield

L. W. Rosenfield conducted an analog criticism of Nixon's "Checkers Address" and Truman's "Harry Dexter White" speech. He provided a brief sketch of the incidents surrounding the two speeches, a discussion of the similarities in the rhetorical contexts and their divergent features, and a discussion of the critical and theoretical implications of the rhetorical analysis.

According to Rosenfield, "The Nixon fund affair occurred during the 1952 Eisenhower-Stevenson presidential race" (436). In September of that campaign, the New York Post featured a story headlined "Secret Nixon Fund." It was reported that there was a "millionaire's club" that existed exclusively for the financial comfort of Senator Nixon. There was a Democratic outcry for Eisenhower to remove Nixon from the Republican ticket. Eisenhower remained quiet on the matter and chose not to defend Nixon. Nixon, however, decided to make a speech of self-defense and bought thirty minutes of national television air time. Thus, on September 23, five days after the charges, Nixon addressed his public. Rosenfield argues that the speech was divided into three sections: a denial of unethical conduct regarding the campaign fund, a financial revelation of Nixon's personal finances, and a partisan counterattack (436).
Rosenfield's analysis of Truman's rhetorical situation states:

On November 6, 1953, Republican Attorney General Brownell charged in a Chicago speech . . . that one Harry Dexter White, an alleged Communist spy now dead, had been promoted to a sensitive position with the International Monetary Fund during the Truman administration despite knowledge of his spying activities by those who appointed him (437).

During the verbal accusations of the next few days, Truman alleged that he fired White at the proper time. Later, Truman was subpoenaed to testify before the House Un-American Activities Committee regarding the controversy. Truman ignored the subpoena based on his "duty under the Constitution" and chose to make a television broadcast on November 16. Rosenfield argues that Truman also divided his speech into three sections. "He explained his refusal to testify before the H.U.A.C., justified his handling of Harry Dexter White's promotion, and attacked Brownell for having raised the issue" (437).

After providing much detail on the similarities and disparities between Nixon's and Truman's rhetorical situations and discourse, Rosenfield identified four
constants that seemed to him to characterize mass media apologies:

1) An apology broadcast over the media is likely to be a part of a short, intense clash of views.

2) The argument of a rhetor speaking via mass media is not likely to be limited to statements in defense of the rhetor's behavior.

3) Most of the facts will be found in the middle third of the speech.

4) The speaker will tend to use arguments that were previously presented and then reassembled for the media presentation. (449)

It is important to note just how Rosenfield's constants were derived in order to understand the theoretical implications of his conclusions. First, Rosenfield noted several similarities in the "contextual factors" or situations that Nixon and Truman faced (439). Thus, Rosenfield states that "each speaker was propelled by the logic of his situation toward the same, overall rhetorical strategy" (438). Rosenfield then hypothesizes that "other contemporary apologia are likely to display the same combination of attributes" (439). Consequently, Rosenfield sketches the hypothesis that four constants characterize mass media apologia. His hypothesis rests on the assumption
that there are situational and rhetorical similarities between the apologia of Nixon and Truman.

The evidence provided for the first constant is that both Nixon and Truman's accusations and defenses were short lived. That is, they were quickly resolved. Nixon's debate lasted from September 18 to September 24, when Eisenhower finally announced that Nixon was vindicated. And the Harry Dexter White ordeal headlined from November 7 to November 19 (Rosenfield 438).

Such is not the case in the Jimmy Swaggart scandal. The charges were made public on February 18, 1988, and the televised confession was made three days later; however, the statements of defense spanned at least a year as chapter two of this study indicates. The tension from Swaggart's ordeal lasted as much as three months later when Swaggart returned to the pulpit despite the Assemblies of God threat of banishment from the denomination. This study indicates that Swaggart's accusations and defense were not short lived and do not comply with the first constant of mass media apologia as described by Rosenfield. Note that Swaggart's failure to comply with Rosenfield's first constant is based on contextual factors or situational differences rather than rhetorical strategies. That is due to the immoral nature of the accusations and the nature of Swaggart's profession, it stands to reason that the
ordeal would not be short lived. It would take time for Swaggart to re-establish credibility and respect from his audience.

Rosenfield's evidence for the second constant is based on similarity in rhetorical strategy. He argues that both Nixon and Truman used invective as mode of defense. Rosenfield contends that "their speeches abound in ad hominem innuendoes concerning the moral qualities of the accusers, that in each case roughly the last third of the speech is almost entirely devoted to this kind of forensic offensive" (440). Rosenfield hypothesizes that this similarity is based on contextual factors "because they perceived that their situations demanded such tactics" (440).

Swaggart's discourse first indicates that he will not use invective. The televised confession praises the media and the denomination for the way in which they handled the reporting of the accusations. However, the message shifts drastically as time passes. In both the audio tape and the editorials in The Evangelist, Swaggart attacks the media and the denomination, accusing them of reporting "lies" about him. Swaggart reports how hurt he is that most of his suffering has been at the hands of fellow ministers of the gospel. There is a notable difference in Swaggart's rhetorical strategy. Although Swaggart does
use invective at some points in his defense, he neglects to do so in the televised confession. In that respect, he does not comply fully with the second constant.

Rosenfield's third constant is based on his conclusions about "the manner in which documentation was employed to support arguments" (441). Both Nixon and Truman provided documentation in the middle third of their speeches. The documentation is surrounded by denials and counterattacks. Nixon began his factual defense by stating that he had received an independent audit of the entire fund just one hour prior to his televised response. Truman explains that after an examination of the files that dealt with Mr. White, both he and his colleagues concluded that his decisions were the most expedient under the circumstances.

Swaggart definitely does not comply with this third constant as he does not provide any documentation whatsoever. As reported in chapter two, Swaggart intentionally remains very vague about his misconduct. Later he is able to offer a subtle denial of the charges. Therefore, no evidence is provided for his audience. Swaggart explains that the specifics of his failings are between him and the Lord. Although Swaggart's choice to avoid specifics is notably different from the rhetorical choices of Nixon and Truman, his strategy seems plausible
for a Christian audience. That is, Swaggart eludes specifics by stressing his private and personal relationship with the Lord--something that his target audience should be able to understand and accept.

In deriving the fourth constant, Rosenfield concludes that no new arguments were developed in either Nixon's or Truman's speeches. According to Rosenfield, "All the key ideas, and even the insults, can be found scattered in public statements made by the two speakers in the weeks prior to their television addresses" (442). Each speech apparently represented a summation of the rhetorical strategies which seemed to have been most effective with the public on previous occasions (443).

In Nixon and Truman's case, the substance of their remarks remained the same. In Swaggart's case the substance of the defense changed over time. Because Swaggart did not deny the charges or provide any evidence to the contrary, the information given in the televised confession was in no way new. However, in the audio tape and in The Evangelist, many new arguments were assembled. When Swaggart changes his non-denial approach to vague and subtle denials, he also provides new information. When he attacks the media and the denomination for lying, this is new. When he says his failure was due to "pride", this is new. And when he says that God allowed the tragedy to happen
so that Swaggart could become a better minister, this is new. Thus, Swaggart's defense does not comply with Rosenfield's fourth constant.

While the previous findings demonstrate that Swaggart did not comply with Rosenfield's constants, it will be argued later that Swaggart's success cannot be measured against those constants. Several years after Rosenfield published his article describing the parameters of the apologia genre, Sherry D. Butler applied his theories to yet another mass media apology. In 1986, Butler compared Edward Kennedy's "Chappaquidick" address of 1969 to the constants defined by Rosenfield. While Rosenfield first examined contextual factors before noting rhetorical similarities, Butler examines and compares only Kennedy's rhetoric of self-defense to Nixon and Truman's. Butler classifies Kennedy's discourse a failure because of its failure to comply fully with the constants that were previously set. She explains that his failure to do so "partially illuminates the deficits in the 1969 apologetic equation" (288).

Sherry D. Butler

In comparing Kennedy's discourse to that of Nixon and Truman's, Butler found that Kennedy's statement was not part of a short, intense clash of views. Butler explains that Kennedy's crisis which began on July 25,
1969, "instilled new energy in his critics" (283). According to Butler, the public and press continued to accuse Kennedy for months. The controversy did not subside until January, 1970, following the Kennedy Edgartown inquest. Thus, Kennedy's situation is similar to Swaggart's in that neither of their controversies complies with Rosenfield's first constant. In other words, their initial mass media appeals did not mark an end to the accusations, rather, the appeals indicated a beginning of a long and hard fought self-defense.

Butler also contends that Kennedy did not comply with Rosenfield's second constant. That is, Kennedy did not incorporate offensive strategies, such as invective, in his discourse. Perhaps this is because Kennedy did not have a well defined enemy, as Nixon and Truman did. Butler states, "Kennedy could only speak of 'rumors.' He had no enemy to attack, no one but himself upon whom he could place blame. The Senator had to construct a plausible defensive case" (284).

Like Kennedy, Swaggart chose not to use offensive strategies in his televised confession; however, Swaggart did have an enemy, Marvin Gorman. Nevertheless, in the year following Swaggart's self-defense, he does not mention the name of Marvin Gorman nor attack him. Swaggart later shifts his defense to include offensive strategies.
He accuses the media of reporting rumors. He also names "Satan" as the enemy who seeks to destroy the ministry. While Swaggart limits his televised confession to defensive remarks, he does progress into a more offensive strategy as time passes. Swaggart's initial responses are more similar to Kennedy's than to Nixon's or Truman's.

Unlike Swaggart, Kennedy did comply with Rosenfield's third and fourth constants. Butler suggests that Kennedy incorporates a preponderance of facts in the middle third of the speech. Kennedy offers the audience an allegedly strict accounting of the events of July 18 and July 19 (284). Butler also argues that Kennedy's "television account of the Dyke Bridge accident was an elaboration of his July 19 statement to the press. While Kennedy became more explicit in his chronicle of events, he added no new arguments" (284).

In comparing Swaggart's discourse to Kennedy's, this critic found that Swaggart's strategies are similar to Kennedy's in that neither rhetor adheres to all four of Rosenfield's constants. While Swaggart does not comply with any of the four, Kennedy complies only with two. Perhaps the reason for the similarities in discourse can be traced back to similarities in contextual factors. While Nixon and Truman's speeches allowed for defenses based on plausible denial, neither Kennedy nor Swaggart
had the option of denying the charges. The evidence against both rhetors was fairly substantial. While Nixon and Truman were both in a position to deny illegal activity, Kennedy and Swaggart had to restore credibility after being involved in immoral or irresponsible actions. Also, the uniqueness of purchasing television air time in 1952 and 1953 for a national defense may have produced a quieting effect, whereas the mass media apologies of Kennedy and Swaggart were not deemed out of the ordinary by their national audiences. Consequently their controversies did not constitute a short, intense clash of views.

Can Kennedy and Swaggart be considered failures in their attempt to defend themselves because of their failure to adhere to Rosenfield's constants? Noreen Kruse would argue that the success or failure of a rhetor's remarks cannot be measured by audience response alone or by the failure to comply with specific parameters. She argues that success should be measured according to the motivational drive state of the rhetor. Kruse explains, "When the critic is aware of the apologist's motives he will then be able to evaluate the discourse according to whether or not the speaker has achieved the ends he set for himself" (14). The successes or failures of a rhetor,
according to Kruse, should be measured against the attainment of his or her personal goals, not whether the audience accepts or rejects the message.

**Noreen Kruse**

Kruse classifies apologetic discourse "according to the drive states aroused by the rhetorical situation" (13). In order to derive this classificatory scheme, she uses Maslow's hierarchy of needs. She explains:

> [S]ince the nature of an individual's unsatisfied desires will, to a great degree, determine his behavior . . . the message an apologist delivers is a behavioral product one can study to determine which of the apologist's needs must be satisfied.

(13)

Kruse classifies Kennedy's address to the people of Massachusetts as a Survival Response. She explains:

Although his national political future was doubtful after the fateful accident, his primary need was directed toward the retention of his Senate seat. If he were to lose his position in the Senate he would not only sacrifice his national base of political operations, but he would be stripped of power with Massachusetts as well. (19)
While Swaggart incorporated both Social and Self-Actualization Responses as well as Survival Responses, this critic discovered that his primary need seems to be to assure the survival of his ministry. Thus, like Kennedy, Swaggart's discourse can be classified as a Survival Response. If this is the case, each rhetor's defense must be considered somewhat successful because of Kennedy's retention of his Senate seat and Swaggart's retention of his ministry. Thus, neither Swaggart nor Kennedy should be considered failures due to the mere fact that they do not comply with very limiting constants that have been previously set. This author contends that Rosenfield was too quick to proclaim that his four constants are universal in the genre of apologia. He provided a list of theoretical assumptions for rhetorical strategies based on similarities of context. Because his conclusions are derived from contextual factors, his theories cannot be reasonably applied to the discourse of future apologists whose situations may be quite different.

Although both Kennedy and Swaggart demonstrated a need for situational well being, their approaches were quite different. This divergence will be discussed in the following comparison of Sonja Goza's apologia analysis of Kennedy's speech to that of the analysis provided in chapter two of this study.
Sonja Goza

Goza conducted an apologia analysis of Kennedy's speech based on Ware and Linkugel's four primary factors and subgenres. While she is not a nationally recognized scholar, her study provides a useful comparison in that the approach of her analysis is similar to the approach of this study. Because the approaches are similar, a more direct comparison can be made between Kennedy's discourse and Swaggart's.

In her study, Goza identified Kennedy's target audiences and evaluated his success based on his ability to restore credibility with his audiences. Kennedy's primary audience was identified by Goza as the people of Massachusetts, as the title of the speech indicates, and his secondary audiences as his Senate colleagues and the national public (4).

In her analysis, Goza reports evidence of each primary factor. According to Goza, Kennedy includes both explicit and subtle denials in his speech as well as an overall strategy of non-denial. That is, although Kennedy explicitly denies the rumors of being intoxicated and participating in immoral conduct, he does not deny his involvement in the accident (6).

Like Kennedy, Swaggart's discourse reflects different forms of denial. Kennedy relies on explicit and subtle
denials, but the crux of his defense is non-denial. Likewise, while Swaggart's defense relies on vague and subtle denials, his main strategy is non-denial. Neither rhetor bases his defense on the strategy of denial.

Goza argues that Kennedy relies heavily on bolstering. He reminds the audience that he is a Kennedy and repeatedly employs the family name (6-7). This heavy reliance of bolstering is very similar to Swaggart's program for defense. While Kennedy relies on his family legacy, Swaggart associates himself with prominent Biblical figures.

According to Goza, Kennedy utilizes the strategy of differentiation in two distinct ways. First, he presents himself as "a man overcome by the situation" (7). He then attempts to distinguish his "normal" self from his "altered" self caused by the cerebral concussion he had suffered (9). This technique is very similar to the language of Swaggart's defense. Swaggart attempts the same type of defense in his references to his spiritual warfare. At the time of his indiscretion, according to Swaggart's narrative, he was under the influence of Satan's power. He confesses that he was not his normal, spiritual self. One disparity between the two situations, however, is that Kennedy relies heavily on the strategy of differentiation while Swaggart merely touches upon this strategy in his discourse.
Goza finds that "Kennedy does not attempt transcendence from the situation until the end of his speech when he begins to speak of the courage it takes to overcome tragedy" (10). Swaggart, on the other hand, relies heavily on the strategy of transcendence as chapter two of this study indicates.

Kennedy's reliance on bolstering and differentiation strategies places his speech in the category labeled "explanitive" (Goza 10-11). A rhetor who practices this type of defense assumes that if the "audience understands his motives, actions, beliefs, they will be unable to condemn him" (Ware and Linkugel 282).

Swaggart's discourse was classified by this author as "justificative" because of the combination of bolstering and transcendence strategies. This category encompasses discourse that seeks approval of actions.

Goza concludes that Kennedy's speech was partially successful in that it met the needs of his primary audience, the people of Massuchesetts (14). Kennedy, however, was not able to restore his presidential credibility with his national audience.

This critic maintains that Swaggart also was partially successful in that his primary audience (financial supporters) responded to his defense and continued to
support him. He was not successful, however, in maintaining his credibility with the Assemblies of God or his national public.

Thus, both Swaggart and Kennedy were successful in meeting their primary needs. While both rhetors incorporated all four primary factors in their discourse, they chose different strategies to form the crux of their defenses. Kennedy chose to rely on bolstering and differentiation while Swaggart chose bolstering and transcendence as his main defense. This indicates that the means of persuasion available to politicians might differ somewhat from the means available for religious leaders. Perhaps the difference in their professions explains the divergence of emphasis in their respective defenses.

Discussion

Before discussing the short-term implications of the previous comparisons, this author would like to trace the evolution of the theories utilized in this analog criticism in order to make a point. First, Rosenfield derived four constants of the apologia genre based on the similar contextual and rhetorical factors found in Nixon's 1952 and Truman's 1953 mass media apologies. Second, Butler compared only the rhetorical factors of Kennedy's apology to Nixon and Truman's defenses. She neglected to compare
the similarities or disparities of Kennedy's rhetorical situation with Nixon or Truman's. Thus, her evaluation that Kennedy's apology is a failure is based solely on the presumption that one who does not adhere to the constants detailed by Rosenfield cannot be successful.

Third, Kruse analyzed Kennedy's apology according to the motivational drive states of the rhetor. Kruse based her evaluation on the extent to which Kennedy achieved his desired goals. Fourth, Goza analyzed Kennedy's apology by trying to establish the presence of the primary factors predicted by Ware and Linkugel. Finally, this author compared the results found in chapter two of this study to those of Rosenfield, Butler, Kruse, and Goza.

As suggested in the introduction of this chapter, an analog criticism will compare discourse in such a way that each address has the potential of serving as a reference standard for the other. If that is the case, then how may the previous comparisons instruct rhetors or rhetorical critics? Should the addresses of Nixon and Truman serve as a reference standard for the choices made by Kennedy and Swaggart? This author argues that Rosenfield's approach of comparing the rhetorical situations of each rhetor before examining the similarities in their discourse has merit. However, assuming that all mass media apologia contain certain constants based on Rosenfield's
limited data seems to be a hasty generalization. This generalization may lead to hasty evaluations made by rhetorical critics who are studying the discourse of apologists in very different situations. For example, Butler's evaluation of Kennedy's discourse seems to be swayed by Rosenfield's constants. Had she first examined how Kennedy's rhetorical situation differed from the others, she might have concluded something altogether different.

This author contends that a critic must first examine the rhetorical situation of an apologist before making an evaluation as to whether one rhetor's address should serve as a reference standard for the other. That is, guidelines for evaluation should not rely on contextual factors when the rhetor being examined might be facing different circumstances altogether.

In summary, this comparison discovered that Swaggart's defense did not comply with the apologia genre as defined by Rosenfield. However, Swaggart's discourse did reveal evidence of Ware and Linkugel's four primary factors. Also, it was determined that Swaggart's defense diverged from Nixon and Truman's, yet was somewhat similar to Kennedy's.
Now that an apologia analysis and an analog criticism of Swaggart's defense have been conducted, conclusions can be drawn from the findings of this study. The next chapter will summarize the findings, answer the questions posed at the beginning of this study, propose modifications for the apologia genre, and recommend directions for further research.


CHAPTER 4
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The previous chapters analyzed Swaggart's 1988-89 program for defense and compared his discourse to the past defenses of Nixon, Truman, and Kennedy. In the second chapter, Swaggart's discourse was examined for evidence of the four primary factors: denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. It was determined that Swaggart incorporated to some extent all four factors with a heavy reliance on bolstering and transcendence. His discourse was then labeled "justificative" according to Ware and Linkugel's classification system because Swaggart relied on the combination of bolstering and transcendence and sought approval of actions. Next, Swaggart's defense was classified as a survival response based on Noreen Kruse's motivational drive states because his motivating drive force appeared to be the financial viability of his ministry.

The third chapter included an analog criticism of Nixon, Truman, Kennedy, and Swaggart's self-defenses. This analysis examined the similarities and disparities that exist between Swaggart's discourse and predictions
for it based on the research of Rosenfield, Butler, Kruse, and Goza into earlier political apologies.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the critical and theoretical implications of the previous findings. Specifically, this chapter will:
1) answer the questions posed in chapter one of this study
2) suggest modifications for the study of religious apologia
3) present an update on Swaggart's defense and his standing in the religious community, and
4) propose recommendations for future research.

The Questions

What similarities or disparities exist between Swaggart's discourse and the genre as it has been defined by rhetorical theorists and critics?

The first disparity that exists between Swaggart's discourse and past political examples is found in Swaggart's initial confession. Swaggart was very emotional and repentant. He begged for forgiveness and wept openly. Most rhetorical theorists do not address this strategy of repentance in their definition of the apologia genre. Noreen Kruse is the only critic who addresses the non-denial approach, but she does not discuss the option of begging and weeping. Butler advises politicians not to use this approach because "pity is not the emotion respected by
most Americans. Empathy that turns to sympathy often becomes contempt" (288). While most politicians would never consider this approach for fear of losing credibility with their audiences, Swaggart appears to have improved his ethos with this strategy.

Swaggart's inclusion of bolstering strategies is similar to Kennedy's political defense and complies with the strategies predicted by Ware and Linkugel. The only difference is that Swaggart associates himself with prominent Biblical characters while Kennedy identifies himself with the Kennedy legacy.

In the area of differentiation, Swaggart chooses to distinguish his "spiritual" self from his "human" nature. In this "spiritual warfare", Swaggart explains that he temporarily lapsed to the control of Satan. Thus, Satan can be blamed for causing turmoil in Swaggart's life. This strategy is similar to Kennedy's technique of distinguishing his normal self from the wounded man who reacted poorly to dire circumstances.

Whereas Kennedy did not rely very heavily on transcendence, Swaggart chose this strategy perhaps on the basis of an analysis of his target audience. Swaggart was speaking to a Christian audience who could empathize with the overall emphasis of the Swaggart ministry in spite of his personal failings. While transcendence is a strategy
employed in the apologia genre, Swaggart's heavy reliance upon it seems to be somewhat unique.

Swaggart incorporates many of the strategies that are predicted by Ware and Linkugel, and his discourse is somewhat similar to Kennedy's apology to the people of Massachusetts. He did not, however, incorporate any of the constants that had been predicted by Rosenfield or the previous standards that had been set by Nixon or Truman.

What variables may account for departures from the genre?

The first variable that may account for Swaggart's apparent departure from the genre as defined by Rosenfield is the rhetorical situation that led to Swaggart's defense. Because the similarities that Rosenfield found to exist between Nixon and Truman were derived from contextual factors, it stands to reason that if the contextual factors in the Swaggart case are at all different, the discourse likewise will differ.

In Nixon and Truman's defenses, there was an option of utilizing the defense of plausible-deniability, whereas Swaggart had no other choice but to present a statement of non-denial. The Executive Presbytery had already been handed photos of Swaggart with the prostitute. There was no denying Swaggart's participation in the misconduct.
The immoral nature of Swaggart's act was also different from the acts of Nixon and Truman. If found guilty, Nixon and Truman could have faced criminal charges; consequently, direct denial was necessary and might prove to be beneficial to them. It is important for rhetorical critics to determine if the charges against an individual are immoral or illegal. That is, a critic's evaluation of an apologist should be based on the appropriate responses made by the rhetor, and the nature of the act (immoral or illegal) may determine what might be appropriate for a particular situation.

Another variable that may account for Swaggart's departure from the genre is the nature of his profession. Nixon, Truman, and Kennedy were all political figures whose audience comprised of colleagues and a voting public. Swaggart's target audience consisted of Christian supporters. Swaggart was not running for office, yet he had to re-establish credibility with those who followed his ministry and supported him financially. Because of this factor, Swaggart could rely on his audience's Christian obligation to be compassionate and forgiving. A tearful confession might yield forgiveness in a Christian context. This author argues that a voting public would not be so eager to forgive their political leaders in the same circumstances because of the different value context.
Furthermore, the strategy of transcendence becomes a very powerful tool in Swaggart's defense in light of the values of the target audience. It becomes relatively easy for Swaggart to move his audience away from the specifics of the charge toward a more abstract view of the potential Swaggart has for fulfilling God's great commission. Swaggart's ultimate goal of saving lost souls creates an urgency of mission that authorizes his audience to overlook his failures in order that he might achieve a higher, more pressing agenda.

The two variables, Swaggart's situation and religious position, suggest that the apologia genre may be expanded to include self-defenses that might fall within a religious value system. This expansion may allow rhetorical critics to examine the rhetoric of other religious leaders more objectively. At this point, it is necessary to examine thoroughly the critical and theoretical implications that this study has on the genre.

What critical and theoretical implications do such findings have on the field of generic criticism?

This study determined that Swaggart's discourse departed from the apologia genre in several ways. Swaggart did not comply with any of the four constants provided by Rosenfield. Although there was evidence of the four
primary factors described by Ware and Linkugel, Swaggart's non-denial approach was somewhat different.

Can Swaggart's discourse be considered a failure because it departs from the established genre? Generic criticism presumes that if the rhetoric that falls under a certain category does not comply with the expectations of that category, then the discourse is lacking. This critic would argue that the expectations should not be determined only by whether an apologia reflects a prior classification scheme. A successful use of the available means of persuasion also may be assessed by the extent to which the discourse adapts to the specific audience to which the rhetor is speaking. Thus, if Swaggart's discourse does not comply with the classification of apologia, it should not be presumed a failure. Rather, the uniqueness of Swaggart's situation and the nature of his profession may provide a new dimension to the genre. The apologia genre may be expanded to accommodate techniques of adaptation to a Christian audience who expects their religious leaders to defend themselves in a specific manner. If the genre is expanded, then Swaggart's discourse may have the potential of serving as a reference standard for future research into apologia in situations where appeals for forgiveness may be a rhetorical resource.
In addition, this study indicates that rhetorical critics should examine more closely the rhetorical context of an apologist's situation before making an evaluation of the defense. Butler's study serves as evidence for this argument. Because Butler compared only the discourse of Kennedy to Nixon and Truman, she concluded that Kennedy's address was a failure because it did not comply with Rosenfield's constants. Had Butler compared the differences in Kennedy's situation to the contextual factors that Nixon and Truman faced, she might have drawn other conclusions.

This study indicates that a past apology cannot serve as the only reference standard if the rhetorical situations are different. Rhetorical critics who base their evaluations on reference standards should be careful to consider all of the contextual factors that may contribute to the choices that an apologist makes.

What does the study of apologia in a religious context suggest about the study of apologia in other contexts?

As pointed out earlier, audience expectations in a religious context may be different than the expectations of a voting public in a political context. A religious leader who is defending his/her character in front of a Christian audience has certain rhetorical resources available to him/her. First, it benefits the religious
leader to appear repentant because the Christian audience is accustomed to linking repentance and forgiveness.

The religious rhetor also has the opportunity to transcend the specifics of human failure. The Christian audience may be able to overlook the faults of the religious apologist because of the prior and future good deeds of the speaker. The Christian audience may be susceptible to the claim that the religious leader's ability to accomplish the work of God is more important than the condemnation of his or her failures.

The study of apologia in a religious context suggests that scholars should expand the scope of their studies beyond the discourse that falls within a certain genre. This author suggests that rhetorical critics should not only examine how an apologist responds to certain charges, but they should base their evaluations on who the accused is, what the accused does professionally, what the accusations are, when the accused responds, and why the accused may respond the way he or she does. For example, is the accused a politician or a religious leader? Do the accusations concern an immoral or illegal act? Does the accused respond at a time when mass media apologies are unique and eventful as they were in 1952 and 1953? Or, is a television appearance expected by their audience? What needs must the rhetor fulfill in his or her address?
This author feels that only after all of these questions have been answered can a thorough evaluation be made.

This study suggests that rhetorical critics should be wary of using reference standards alone to evaluate discourse. That is, a critic should not use the defenses of Nixon and Truman as the only reference standard for Swaggart because the rhetor's situations were quite different. That is not to say that reference standards cannot be used when all contextual factors have been taken into account.

**Suggested Modifications**

This author offers several suggestions for the expansion of the apologia genre to include apologies made by religious rhetors. It is important to note that these are only suggestions and should be applied only when all of the contextual factors of future situations have been considered.

The following suggestions for the genre of "Religious Apologia" are based on the findings of this study. Religious apologia are likely to reflect some of the following characteristics. The discourse is likely to:

1) appear repentant and compassionate.
2) limit remarks to defensive statements.
3) rely heavily on bolstering and transcendence.
4) rely on speeches of vindication or justification.
5) build arguments over a period of time.

A religious leader who appears repentant and compassionate may find that this strategy humbles the apologist and assures the audience that the apologist is in a position to be forgiven. Christians are reminded in the Bible that if one humbles themself in the sight of the Lord, they shall be lifted up (James 4:10). According to F. J. Dake's commentary on this particular Scripture, "lifted up" refers to when, in Biblical times, "mourners and penitents used to lie on the ground, and roll themselves in the dust. When forgiven penitents arose from the earth and clothed themselves in clean and better garments" (262).

If religious leaders attack their accusers, then it appears that they are not consistent with the doctrine of compassion. In order to expect compassion from their audience, religious rhetors must practice compassion for their accusers. A verbal attack would not enhance religious apologist's credibility with their intended audience. Thus, the most coherent use of rhetorical resources is to rely on statements of defense in order to achieve their goals.

Religious leaders have certain rhetorical resources that uniquely benefit them. Religious apologists can
identify themselves with prominent Biblical figures who achieved great things in spite of their human failures. These Biblical characters can be universally identified by a Christian audience. In addition, religious leaders can transcend the specifics of their wrongdoing to emphasize the ultimate plan of God to win lost souls. These strategies draw upon the historical tradition and have a certain narrative fidelity with audiences.

If there is any evidence against the religious leader, it is unlikely that a denial will absolve the religious leader of wrongdoing. Rather, apologists in a religious tradition may seek to preserve their reputation by vindicating themselves or seek approval of actions based on a justification of the incident. The latter two approaches will most likely meet the expectations of the religious community. These two strategies incorporate the bolstering and transcendence techniques of the apologia genre.

Swaggart's successful defense suggests that religious leaders may build their statements of defense over a period of time. This requires that they maintain a constant communication source between them and their audience, whether it be via television, tape, or print. Time allows the audience to overcome the initial shock of the scandal.
and allows the audience to become open minded to a later justification of the incidents.

Finally, religious leaders may need to examine carefully their personal situations before making any rhetorical decisions. The question should be asked, "To what extent is this particular situation similar to the reference standard set by previous apologists? Based on the answer to that question, it should also be determined, "To what extent should this defense follow the strategies prescribed by the reference standard"?

**Update on Swaggart**

It is important to note that Jimmy Swaggart's defense did not end with the time period of this study. Swaggart continued to build arguments in defense of his actions and motives. Two important articles appeared in *The Evangelist* after the time limits of this study. In October, 1989, Swaggart wrote an article entitled "Bible Repentance." In the article, Swaggart reiterates previous statements of bolstering and transcendence and makes a statement that supports his reliance on the theory that repentance yields forgiveness. Concerning the scandal of February, 1988, Swaggart states, "If we expect deliverance from any type of bondage or from the powers of darkness, we absolutely
must repent fully or deliverance will not be forthcoming" (6). Swaggart concludes the article by stating in poetic form:

Bible repentance.
It is the answer for the world.
It is America's answer.
It is your answer. (7)

Swaggart boldly introduces a new argument in October of 1989 in his article entitled, "The Two Sins That God Will Not Forgive." The first sin is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, a rather traditional theme. The second is refusing to forgive others. Swaggart says, "When we do not forgive, we render ourselves unworthy of God's forgiveness. So unforgiveness becomes the second sin that God does not forgive" (6). Swaggart says that one must forgive with God's kind of forgiveness. He explains:

Whenever we say, 'I forgive you, but I cannot come to your crusades, or participate in any of your revival meetings, or support you in any way,' then our forgiveness is not the God kind of forgiveness. (6)

According to Swaggart, the scenario is as follows: One must forgive in order to be forgiven. One must forgive with a God kind of forgiveness. God's forgiveness is complete and unconditional. If one does not continue to
support the one to be forgiven, then the individual has not truly forgiven the offenders. Therefore, in order for God to forgive ones sins, one must continue to support financially those who have trespassed. The rhetorical critic may see the inherent logic and the ingenuity of this argument as well as its self-serving aspects.

It is important to note that before Swaggart can justify writing an argument like this, he must first address another issue. Swaggart calls this issue "confessing the sins of others." In the past, Swaggart was guilty of this very thing. He was very prompt to judge the sins of others. He was also very outspoken in his judgments. How can someone who has been so condemning in the past, expect compassion from others? Swaggart justifies this phenomenon by simply stating he was wrong to be judgmental in the past and begs forgiveness for doing so. He states:

God knows I have been forced to this kind of awareness myself. With hot, scalding fears I've had to beg God to forgive me and then take myself out of the judging business. . . . I had to wonder how proficient Jimmy Swaggart had become at confessing the sins of others. May God forgive me for this and help me to never do it again. ("Two Sins" 4)
Swaggart attempts to overcome his past condemnations by simply asking for God's forgiveness and for the audience's forgiveness of his past and present sins. There are two levels of forgiveness that Swaggart must obtain from his audience. First, his audience must forgive his "confessing the sins of others", and second, they must forgive his immoral conduct. This progression of reasoning supports the "learning experience" argument in this study. Swaggart claims that because he has encountered the tragedy of 1988, he is now a better minister in that he is more compassionate and less condemning.

The previous discussion indicates that Swaggart's program for defense extends beyond the time constraints imposed on this study. Some other occurrences have indicated that Swaggart's defense was somewhat successful.

Swaggart has founded a new denomination, called the World Evangelism Fellowship, and on November 24, 1989, he ordained 21 new ministers to the fellowship. Swaggart's ministry has been extended to reach a world-wide audience.

In February, 1989, Swaggart reports that his "telecast has begun airing in China, reaching about 330 million people there each week" ("Evangelism" 3). In May of that same year, he reports that the telecast is "airing in France, with a coverage area that includes over 25 million people" ("The Tree" 3). And in August, he reports that the ministry
has just ordained Reverand Manoel Ferreira from Brazil to World Evangelism Fellowship ("By My Spirit" cover).

A discussion of Swaggart's continued defense, his new denomination, and his world-wide evangelism helps to update Swaggart's situation and position. The new pieces of evidence indicate that Swaggart's defense has been somewhat successful. His target audience has been receptive, and his overall goal to maintain a ministry has been accomplished.

Recommendations

Because Swaggart evidently has continued his statements of defense, rhetorical critics might benefit by examining this continued defense and the progress Swaggart makes in his ministry. Rhetorical critics might also benefit from examining the different strategies utilized by different religious rhetors. For example, a critic could compare Swaggart's defense to the defense of Jim Bakker in his scandal and the trial that followed. What variables contribute to the difference in their rhetoric following their respective scandals?

Rhetorical critics might follow closely other religious apologies and determine if this study can serve as a reference standard for future religious apologists. This would expand the data base and lend credence to the findings herein. Critics might also question whether
religious discourse in one religious community can serve as a reference standard for discourse in another. Would a Buddhist priest follow the same strategies as Swaggart? How would the audience expectations differ from a Buddhist apology to a Christian apology?

This study indicates that the classification schemes of genre studies should not be evaluated so rigidly. Other theorists, Jamieson and Campbell, have also indicated the hybrid nature of genre studies: "Genres are not only dynamic responses to circumstances; each is a dynamis--a potential fusion of elements that may be energized or actualized as a strategic response to a situation" ("Rhetorical Hybrids" 135). Jamieson and Campbell propose that scholars should "confound efforts to construct exhaustive generic taxonomies" because of the variable elements of any situation (144). Rather, critics should view genres as rhetorical hybrids which consist of subtle blends of generic elements.

In past studies, rhetorical scholars have tended to emphasize political rhetoric. This study attempts to go beyond the boundaries of politics into the religious community. This author suggests that critics in the future enhance rhetorical theory by exploring apologies in sports, science, and corporate business. Intercultural or gender differences might warrant a comparison of apologies across
cultures or genders.

A critic might also ask if there are new ways to look at speaker motivation. There seems to be an overreliance on the theory of Maslow's hierarchy in Kruse's research. A critic could ask, for example, how Burke's theory on motivation might be applied to the non-denial apology.

Finally, this study indicates that an apologist's defense might be viewed as a systemic process. That is, if there is a change in the context of the situation, then that change might effect all the other elements in the overall defense. How might a systems analyst view the study of apologia? What new perspectives could they provide that this study can only suggest.

The previous recommendations suggest that this study has in no way exhausted the possibilities available in the study of religious apologia. Although this study has answered several questions in regards to generic criticism, the apologia genre, and religious apologia, many questions remain.
NOTES

1 This Scripture reference is taken from the King James Version of the Bible. The commentary note is taken from F. J. Dake. Dake's Annotated Reference Bible. Atlanta, GA: Dake Bible Sales, Inc., 1963.

2 This information was taken from a live television broadcast of Swaggart's Thanksgiving Crusade. Trinity Broadcast Network. KTBO TV 14 in Oklahoma City, OK.


___. "The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil."

Ware, B. L., and Wil A. Linkugel. "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia."
APPENDIX A

TELEVISION ADDRESS
Everything that I will attempt to say to you this morning will be from my heart. I will not speak from a prepared script. Knowing the consequences of what I will say, and that much of it will be taken around the world (as it should be). I am positive that all that I want to say, I will not be able to articulate as I desire, but I would pray that you will somehow feel the anguish, the pain, and the the love of my heart. I've always, every single time that I have stood before a congregation and a television camera, I have met and faced the issues head on. I have never sidestepped or skirted unpleasantries. I have tried to be like a man and to preach this gospel exactly as I have seen it without fear or reservation or compromise. I can do no less this morning. I do not plan in any way to whitewash my sin. I do not call it a mistake, a mendacity, I call it sin. I'd much rather if possible (and in my estimation it would not be possible) to make it worse, than less, than it actually is. I have no one but myself to blame. I do not lay the fault or the blame or the charge at anyone else's feet. For no one is to blame but Jimmy Swaggart. I take the responsibility, I take the blame, I take the fault.
2 Many times I have addressed the media in a very stern manner, and I have chastised them for what I thought and believed was error in their reporting their investigations. This time I do not. I commend them. I feel that the media, both in print and by television and radio, have been fair and objective and even compassionate. Ted Koppel on Nightline, I feel did everything in his power going the second, third, fourth, fifth, and tenth mile to make doubly certain that what he reported was at least as fair and as honest as he, the spokesman for this world famed news program, could make it. And I thank him for his objectivity, his kindness, and his fairness. And I also want to express appreciation to the entire media everywhere, but especially here in Baton Rouge. Channels 9, 2, 33, and the newspapers, the radio stations, they've been hard, but they have been fair, they have been objective, and at times, I believe, they have even been compassionate. Even my old nemesis, John Camp, that we have disagreed with very strongly, and I love you John, and in spite of our differences, I think you're one of the finest investigative reporters in the world, and I mean that.

3 I want to address myself, as best as I know how, to those that I have wronged--that I have sinned against. First of all, my wife, Frances. God never gave a man a
better help-mate and companion, to stand beside him. And as far as this gospel has been taken through the ether waves, to the great cities of the world and cover this globe, it would never have been done were it not for her strength, her courage, her consecration to her redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ. I have sinned against you, and I beg your forgiveness.

4 God said to David three thousand years ago, "You have done this thing in secret, but I will do what I do openly and before all of Israel." My sin was done in secret and God has said to me, "I will do what I do before the whole world." Blessed be the name of the Lord!

5 God could never give a man (a father, a minister of the gospel) a finer son than he has given me and his mother. Donnie and my beautiful and lovely daughter, Debbie—Donnie has stood with me. I have relied upon him. And in these trying days, his mother and myself, we do not know what we would have done without his strength, his courage, and his utter devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ. Donnie and Debbie, I have sinned against you, and I beg you to forgive me.

6 To the Assemblies of God, which helped bring the gospel to my little beleaguered town when my family was lost without Jesus. This movement and fellowship that girdles the globe, has been more instrumental in taking this gospel
through the sturgeon night of darkness, to the far flung hundreds of millions than maybe any effort in the annals of human history. Its leadership has been compassionate, kind, and considerate, and long-suffering toward me without exception, but never for one moment condoning sin, both on the national level and this esteemed district level. But to its thousands and thousands of pastors that are godly, that uphold the standard of righteousness; its evangelists, that are heralds and criers of redemption; its missionaries of the front line of darkness holding back the tides of hell; I have sinned against you, and I have brought disgrace and humiliation and embarrassment upon you. I beg your forgiveness.

7 This church, this ministry, this Bible College, the professors, this choir, these musicians, these singers that have stood with me on a thousand crusade platforms that have labored unstintedly and tirelessly to lift up that great name of Jesus Christ. To tell the weary that He is rest, and the sin-cursed that He, Jesus, is victory. My associates, and no evangelist ever had a greater group of men and women given by the hand of God, have stood with me unstintedly, unflaggingly. I have sinned against you. I have brought shame and embarrassment to you, and I beg your forgiveness.
8 To my fellow television ministers and evangelists, you that are already bearing an almost unbearable load, to continue to say and tell the great story of Jesus' love. I have made your load heavier, and I have hurt you. Please forgive me for sinning against you.

9 And to the hundreds of millions that I have stood before in over 100 countries of the world, and I've looked into the cameras, and so many of you with a heart of loneliness needing help have reached out to the minister of the gospel as a beacon of light, you that are nameless, most I will never be able to see you except by faith. I have sinned against you. I beg you, forgive me.

10 And most of all, to my Lord and my Savior, my Redeemer, the one whom I serve, and I love, and I worship. I bow at His feet, who has saved me and washed me and cleansed me. I have sinned against you, and I would ask that your precious blood would wash and cleanse every stain until it is in the seas of God's forgetfulness never to be remembered against me anymore.

11 I say unto you that watch me today, through His mercy, His grace, and His love, the sin of which I speak is not a present sin. It is a past sin.

12 I know that so many would ask, "why?" Why? I have asked myself that ten thousand times through ten thousand tears. Maybe Jimmy Swaggart has tried to live his entire
life as if though he was not human. And I have thought
that with the Lord, knowing that he is omnipotent and
omniscient, that there was nothing I could not do. And
I emphasize with His help and His guidance. And I think
this is the reason (in my limited knowledge) I did not
find the victory I sought because I did not seek the help
of my brother and my sister in the Lord. I've had to come
to the realization--this gospel is flawless, even though
it is ministered at times by flawed men. If I had sought
the help of those that love me with their added strength
(I look back now) and I know that victory would have been
mine. They have given me strength along with the compassion
of our Savior in these last few days that I had needed
for a long, long time.

13 Many ask, as I close this, "Will the ministry
continue?" Yes, the ministry will continue! Under the
guidance, leadership, and directives (as best as we know
how and can of the Louisiana district of the Assemblies
of God) we will continue to take this gospel of Jesus Christ
all over the world. I will step out of this pulpit at
the moment for an undetermined, indeterminate period of
time. And we'll leave that in the hands of the Lord.
The Bible College, and these young men and young ladies,
whom I have tried to be a standard for and have miserably
failed-its most esteemed president, Ray Trask--I too beg
you the future pastors and evangelists and missionaries to forgive me. But, this Bible College will continue.

14 I close this today with the words of another man that lived three thousand years ago. And I started to say who committed sin that was worse than mine, but I take that back. No. And if the Holy Spirit will allow me to borrow his [David's] words, I will give you that which is as real now as it was when it was penned in Jerusalem.

15 Have mercy upon me, O God, according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions.

16 Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.

17 For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.

18 Against thee, thee only have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.

19 Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

20 Behold, thou desirest truth in the inward parts: and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom.
21 Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash, and I shall be whiter than snow.
22 Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice.
23 Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all mine iniquities.
24 Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me.
25 Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit from me.
26 Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with thy free spirit.
27 Then will I teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee.
28 Deliver me from bloodguiltiness, O God, thou God of my salvation: and my tongue shall sing aloud of thy righteousness.
29 O Lord, open thou my lips; and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise.
30 For thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offering.
31 The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, I God, thou wilt not despise.
32 Do good in thy good pleasure unto Zion: build thou the walls of Jerusalem.

33 Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt offering and whole burnt offering: then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar. (Psalm 51)

34 Thank you, Thank you, and God bless you.
APPENDIX B

AUDIO TAPE ADDRESS
I just must say, thank you. Under the most trying times, you have supported us, you've stood with us, you've prayed for us, you've been a port in a time of storm, you've been a harbor to all of our family, to this evangelist especially, and to the work of God in general. . . I think our supporters today mean more than they have ever meant to us. . . . You are a part of the body that could mean so much to so many precious lost souls. So I must just say, thank you for that."

2 "I want to give you a little update on the ministry, where we're going and what we're doing. First of all, spiritually, we have experienced a touch of God. The Lord has taken us to a place and position that I'm so grateful to him for. You know we've undergone a pain and suffering that words cannot describe but, oddly enough, I thank the Lord for it because I believe when it's all over there will be much fruit that will be gathered from it. I believe
that we'll be a better minister of the gospel, better people, better able to function in the calling that God has laid upon our hearts and upon our lives. . . ."

[At this point, Frances gives a message which supports Jimmy's arguments.]

3 "I am compelled (you're listening to a driven man, I'm literally driven) because of that call that's there. We're seeking God almost day and night."

4 "Please don't believe all the garbage that you hear and read. Please don't do that. I take full responsibility for what actually did happen, and the Lord told me to keep my mouth shut from then on out. But, please don't believe everything you've heard. Just remember that. . . ."

5 "Partially because of the call of God that I am mentioning, we have experienced the suffering of the past few months that has come our way. And I have every plan, because I believe this is what God has said, 'Do', to take the gospel of Jesus Christ to the whole world. . . . I have to do it because I have no alternative, no choice. That's what God has called me to do. That's what He's laid upon my heart. . . ."

6 "The finance is the last thing I want to talk to you about. . . . We have been holding on by the skin of our teeth the past few months. We have a lot of folk that have quit supporting us. We have a lot of new ones that
have come on. But, we have suffered, we have hurt. . . .
Were that call not there, I would quit because the hardest
thing in the world to do is what we're trying to do in
the face of almost total adversity. But, God has said,
'Do it', and we have to do it. . . ."

7 "Financially. . . we have taken losses almost every
week . . . and, of course, you cannot continue like that.
There is a stopping place with those losses. The way it
works is--you don't have the money, it doesn't come in,
you can't pay the television stations. So gradually you
fall further and further and further behind until they
give you a phone call and say, 'Have the money here at
a certain date, or you're off the air!' That's the way
it works. . . ."

8 "What you give . . . affects the entire planet
. . . God is working out things in our own lives to make
us more productive vessels, that we could be more like
Jesus Christ. What you do now is going to affect the work
of God in several ways. First, I believe that you will
look back and say, 'I'm so thankful that I stood with
brother Jimmy Swaggart.' Your prayers and your giving
now will translate, not only in helping us at the moment,
but insuring that we're able to continue and don't lose
the ministry which will result in the not so distant future
of millions of souls coming to the Lord Jesus Christ.


I believe God has told me that, and I believe that it will happen. That means that whatever you do now becomes very, very important. . . ."

[At this point, Donnie speaks of the financial needs of the ministry.]

9 "When you enclose a check to help us reach souls, it means an awful lot. It means the whole world. So, what we're talking about today is souls, eternal souls all over this world. I'm wanting the world to see the love of God, the grace of God, the mercy of God, the compassion of the Lord Jesus Christ in this preacher. And, I'm believing that you are seeing it as well. . . .

10 [Prayer] ". . . Lord, [supply] as you would desire it that this financial need for thy cause and thy work that we have. And you said in your word that the silver is mine, and the gold is mine (speaking of yourself). And then when they give, if they can, I'm asking that you return it to them, pour them out blessings that they won't even be able to receive, heaped up, shaken down, and running over. And then above all, as Paul stated, that fruit may be laid up to their account in heaven. I ask it all in Jesus' name. Amen and amen."
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