

Journal of Aggressive Christianity

Issue 6, April - May 2000

In This Issue:

Journal of Aggressive Christianity
Issue 6, April - May 2000

The Salvation Army Is Marching Along

Have you had a prayer meeting like this at your corps?

An All Night Meeting at The Salvation Army
as reported in the "Newcastle Daily Chronicle"

Column: Send the Fire

Emerging Army, Emerging Ministry

by John Norton

Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel

Female Ministry

by Catherine Booth

JAC Exclusive Interview

Commissioner Peter H. Chang

retired leader of The Salvation Army in
Korea and USA-West

Column: The Primitive Salvationist

In Defense of Officership

or, How in heaven's name can you begin to imagine
a better way to win the world for Jesus?

by Stephen Court

Get a life, join these guys, make a difference.

Alien Outreach

by Steve Carroll Jr.

12 Year Old Sex

by Catherine Booth

Column: The Final Word

A Street Level Apologetic

by J. Edward Read

An All Night Meeting at The Salvation Army

Reported in the "Newcastle Daily Chronicle", England
Wednesday, 21 May, 1879

The Salvation Army was known in its earliest days as nothing less than a sensation. Newspapers dispatched correspondents to report on it. This critical account provides a unique glimpse into the history of a movement that changed the face of 19th century religion.

(By our Special Correspondent)

It is a lamentable confession to make, but my present business is to describe the indescribable. Allow me to make a preliminary statement. Since Saturday afternoon I have been a humble follower in the rear of the Salvation Army. It has been very heavy marching. When I look at the programme of operations I am astonished at what I have gone through. I have been to "parades" in the morning, to exhibitions and the presentation of colours in the afternoon, and to special services at night. Pleasure has degenerated into toil; yet I resolved, if possible, to keep up to the last.

After a hard experience on Monday I made tracks for Handyside's Hall, at Gateshead. There was to be an all night prayer meeting; but I assured myself that the leaders of the Salvation Army would be as tired as I was, and that if they were resolved not to go home till morning, they would at least make up their minds to be off at the first glimmer of sunrise. But the energy of these people is wonderful. The same faces have been visible, and the same voices have been heard, at all the meetings which have been held since Saturday; yet here again the "Hallelujahs" were as full of spirit and determination, and far more overpoweringly noisy, than ever.

If ever I go to an all night prayer meeting again, I shall take something to steady the nerves. Such a terrifying gathering as that which was held last night has, I should think, never been seen before - not in the wildest excesses of Primitive Methodism; nor among Mrs. Girling's people, when there was a great "move of the spirit;" not in Italy, among the followers of the latest Messiah. I am lost for things with which to compare such an exhibition. Pandemonium on a fete day; Bedlam let loose; the madness and noise of a Bacchanalian orgie without the wine - well perhaps these are feeble types of what I feel it impossible to describe. I speak calmly, without prejudice one way or the other - on the whole, perhaps, with a disposition to think kindly of the extraordinary movement which is stirring the sister boroughs of the North - yet I can only describe the all- night meeting of

the Salvation Army as something more nearly approaching the hell which these people are struggling to avoid than the heaven which they are striving to secure.

Handyside's Hall is a large uncompleted building, which is reached by a flight of stairs. There is plenty of air and space, and though a large audience assembled in it on Monday night, there was room for one still larger. There was, therefore, no excessive closeness of atmosphere. I am thus particular lest it be supposed that some circumstances to which I shall have occasion to refer were brought about by excessive crowding and want of air.

The people present, taken as a whole, were the roughest lot I have seen at any of these meetings. The crowd on the river banks at a boat race is comparatively good-looking and respectable. Here the close-cropped bullet-headed youth in the muffler was the rule and not the exception. Taking a policeman into my confidence, I asked him if he knew any of these young men. "Know any of them?" he said. "Why, I know them all. This one is from Newcastle; the other sitting near him is one of the worst roughest we have"; and so he went on, with a description almost as long as the catalogue of ships in Homer. There was a fair sprinkling of women amongst the audience, too; and most of these were young ones, who did not appear to have been much troubled, previously, with thoughts about religion. I went to the meeting at about two o'clock. It had then been going on for some two or three hours; but so far it was very orderly and cool. There was a long, low platform in the middle of the room, round which the "Hallelujah Lasses," the "Converted Sweep," the "Hallelujah Giant," and other notabilities concerned with the movement were seated. The General was giving out a hymn, accompanying his delivery of it with all those grotesque movements which seem quite natural to him and are so extraordinary in anyone else. Singing was followed by what is called "Witnessing," various officers of the Salvation Army narrating their experience of "what the Lord had done for them." About half an hour was occupied in this wise; and, but for the ordinary interjections of enthusiasm, the time passed quietly enough. It would have been impossible to guess at what followed.

The author of the "Ingoldsby Legends" tells us that in one of the most popular and delightful of these stories, that Roger, the monk,
Got excessively drunk;

So they put him to bed, and they tucked him in.

I am not quite certain that some more stringent measures ought to be adopted with regard to the victims of religious hysteria. Some things which may be for the soul's benefit are certainly not for the body's health.

On Monday night - rather, I should say, on Tuesday morning - the General requested his audience to sit still and sing when the "witnessing" was concluded. He gave out these lines:-

I need Thee every hour, Most gracious Lord!
No tender voice like Thine can peace afford.

I need Thee, oh I need Thee: Every hour I need Thee,
Oh, bless me now, my Saviour! I come to Thee.

The words were taken up by the whole audience; the chorus was rolled out to a rattling tune, and was no sooner finished than it was commenced again with additional vigour. This chorus might have been sung perhaps a dozen times when there was a shrill scream, a bustle round the platform, and a general rise of the audience. Seats were mounted; hands were raised in the air; the singing was mingled with loud "Hallelujahs," burst of vociferous prayer, shouting, and hysterical laughter. To add to the confusion four of the forms fell backwards, and threw their occupants into a common heap on the floor. So great was the commotion in the centre of the room, so terrifying was the din, that this incidence, which would have thrown an ordinary congregation into uproar, passed almost unnoticed. Sinners were creeping to the penitent form; the Salvation Army was rejoicing; fully one third of those present acted as if they were more or less insane.

It is written that the angels rejoice when one sinner turns to repentance. Surely, this was no type and example of their rejoicing. Several figures are bent double near the platform, groaning and wringing their hands. The "Hallelujah Lasses" have surrounded them; the tall figure of the proprietor of the "Hallelujah Fiddle" gyrates around them; the sweep is dancing and shouting "Glory be to God;" and the "General" is smiling placidly and twiddling his thumbs. It is an extraordinary scene; more extraordinary still is the Babel of sounds which seems to shake the walls even. At a distance, confused shouts blend into something like harmony. On a Northumberland Plate Day you may stand in the middle of the Moor and hear the shouting of the crowd and the "two to one, bar one" of the betting men only as a confused hum. But shut in between four walls, such noises as are here made sound horrible. Penitents! Are these penitents who kneel on the form and wring their hands? Or are they persons struck with the contagion of overwrought enthusiasm? The irrepressible sweep has bounced onto the platform, shouting, "Glory, hallelujah," and waving a greasy ostrich feather which some poor penitent has consented to tear from her bonnet. In the short intervals of his excitement the sweep is intent on the collection of "idols." Before long he is in possession of a short clay pipe; of a dressed bird from a bonnet, and of various other trinkets. Unfortunate sweep! He waves these trophies so wildly, and his hands are so full, that the "cutty" drops from his fingers and is smashed to pieces on the floor. This is one item less for the next exhibition.

As may be seen from what I have written, until penitents "throw themselves at the feet of Jesus," as it is called, a meeting of the Salvation Army is a tolerably sane affair. The fat is at once in the fire, however, when penitents come forward. Let me endeavour to recall some details of the fearfully confused scene which was to be witnessed at half-past three o'clock on Tuesday morning. By dint of climbing as high as the forms will allow, I can see over the heads of a large part of the audience, which has also taken to standing on the seats, a little of what is going on round the platform. One can only take it in piecemeal. Half a-dozen crop-

headed youths - boys they are, indeed - are praying vociferously, with their faces towards me. Did I say praying? I only suppose they were. It was vociferous shouting, with closed eyes. Their bodies sway to and fro; their hands are lifted, and brought down again with a thump on the form; they contort themselves as if they were in acute agony. The hymn resounds high above their prayers; the sweep is still brandishing his trophies; everybody is carrying on a separate service on his own account. Meanwhile the "lasses" are busy with the work of conversion. It proceeds by stages, with a separate hymn for each. The final stage is reached with the singing of "I do believe, I will believe, that Jesus died for me." The process being thus rendered complete, the converts retire to their seats with red faces. Let us follow one of them. He is a broad-faced, shock-headed youth, of about twenty. A few minutes since, he was foaming out of a well-developed mouth. Now he is dancing about the floor, shouting "hallelujah" and wringing the hands of all those who will yield their arm to him. Anon he will mount one of the forms, and shout his experience into the middle of a hubbub which condemns him to remain unheard. Then he will waltz round again, alternately laugh and cry, and go through a new course of hand-shaking. He has in fact been converted.

Honest Isaak Walton has left us a beautiful description of the effect of Dr. Donne's preaching. He tells how it confirmed the halting, encouraged the faint, and convinced the unbelieving. It was gentle in its effects. Those who felt its power most betrayed it least, except in the after tenor of their lives. Here, however, was an extraordinary effect produced without anything that can be called preaching. It was the singing that appeared to be most powerful. Will it be believed that the scene which I have endeavoured to describe was repeated, with still more startling results? Such was the fact. After more singing, there was another rush to the penitent form, another repetition of the same hymns, of the same gesticulations, of the same frantic prayers. But a quite new interest was added. I watched the proceedings for some time from my point of vantage on a back form; and then struggled through the crowd to get a look at the penitents. They had fainted away. Here lay a woman in a dead swoon, with six "Hallelujah lasses" singing round her, and not one of them trying to bring her round even by so much as sprinkling water on her face. On the other side of the platform was a man lying at full length, his limbs twitching, his lips foaming, totally unregarded. Whilst the sweep was brandishing his trophies, whilst the "General" was leading the singing, whilst the people were praying or shouting as the whim took them, the penitents whose repentance had been the cause of so much rejoicing were lying unconscious. I appealed to the "Hallelujah Giant." The General had stated on Monday that he was not a quack doctor, but a real doctor. It struck me as peculiar that he should sit there singing under such circumstances, and I said, "Really, cannot you do something to bring these people round?" "My good man," he replied, "won't you sit down? They will come round all right." They may have done so - both their recovery and their conversion may have been complete - but it was hard to stay there and witness so much of what looked like gross inhumanity.

When I came away people were swooning all over the place. I had to step over a man in a fit in order to get to the door. When I reached the street and the pure air it was a fresh, grey morning. The sun had written its crimson streaks in the sky; but they had been blotted out by a soft mist. All would have been quiet had not the stillness been broken by the sounds of Bedlam upstairs. It was too early for the most "wealthy and wise" people to rise yet; but here, in a large room, were two or three hundred people - none of whom had been to bed, many of whom had gone through all the tremendous labours of the "Council of War" - all in a state of nervous exultation which defies ordinary comprehension. "Is this a common sort of thing here?" I asked of the policeman outside. "Very," he said, "but it has reduced our charge-sheet, and I haven't had a case for two months." I didn't ask him if it was as good for the persons who took part in such "services" as it was for the charge-sheet. Neither he nor I could properly answer that question.

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

Emerging Army, Emerging Ministry

by John Norton

We live in a time of tension between emerging and competing Salvation Armies. Only one will survive.

My own ministry experience is about as old as my Command. I came for the first time to the Russia/CIS Command in 1992, just after its birth. We have grown up together. As Youth & Candidates Officer I had opportunity to travel and came to see that our rapid growth has caused us to develop multiple identities. It is not clear in my mind who we are anymore. Better stated, we are marching in many different directions!

Now as a corps officer of a very new corps, the question we are asking ourselves is who and what are we to become. The choices are almost limitless. I think the mistake would be in trying to be too many things to too many people. We will be much more successful if we go in one direction. But what direction will that be?

RE-CREATION

As The Salvation Army of the twentieth century was radically different from the Army of the nineteenth, so will this new century bring about a new Army. What worked for William Booth didn't work for Frederick Coutts, the world had changed and so a new Army was necessary. Today that "new creation" is old and so our Army is in need of re-creation again. The twentieth century Army, with an emphasis on duty, policy administration, and hierarchical leadership, is now as obsolete as the Model T Ford and vinyl records. It is fading fast and in some places already gone.

In this time of transition, frustrations arise as some try desperately to nurse the old Army back to health, while others work at beating it to death. We need to develop a greater sense of urgency on the one side and greater sensitivity on the other. The way forward then will include embracing the idea that we are an ever-evolving organization. Of course, it was Catherine Booth who said that our only continuity is our constantly changing methods. She asserted, "The great fundamental principle of The Salvation Army is the law of adaptation - that is, making the means suitable to the end." (Roger Green, CATHERINE BOOTH, p214.) In our organizational systems, we are learning to remain flexible for constant change and growth. Second, we are learning to put energy into thinking

through the issues of the emerging Army so we can better direct it in the way we want it to go. A new Army will emerge, either by design or default.

There could be nothing worse than sleeping through the changes happening all around us only to wake up to find a new Army we do not want. What is needed then is a true re-creation, bringing the best of both past centuries into what we ourselves will now contribute, for the purposes of a new relevant and significant Army for the twenty-first century.

EMERGING ARMIES

There seem to be at least three Armies emerging on the horizon, all of which are potentially just around the corner and all of which are very different from one another. All these potential Armies are different from the Army of the twentieth century.

The question should not be which of these three do we most resemble, but which one do we want to become? Or better yet, which one does God want us to become? Our future is not already decided, we can become any one of these three or even something yet unnamed. The Army can be anything we can dream, although perhaps that should be more of a warning than a license for experimentation! The following are three word pictures of these three potential and emerging Armies.

1. COMMANDO

This future Army would resemble more a military unit, the commandos of the wider Christian community. In ecclesiastical language, The Salvation Army would be more like a Protestant order, similar in its relation to the wider church as catholic orders are to Catholicism. The peculiar calling of this particular Protestant order would be evangelism and meeting human need, as we have done for over one hundred years.

This future Salvation Army would not be the best place for every convert, many would have to be encouraged to be involved in other parts of the Christian community. Necessarily we would have to build greater bridges with local churches. The Army would not be a church itself, perhaps even allowing for nominal membership for soldiers and officers in other churches of their choice, for receiving the sacraments and other rites. Officers would be highly trained, although they would not be ordained ministers because that ministry would be left to the churches.

The Army would be a place for a committed few who are willing to maintain certain lifestyle disciplines and a high level of involvement. Like any religious order, individuals would have to be called into it by God and willingly assume

special vows (Articles of War). It would therefore be smaller, not fixated on growth. Leaders would be highly disciplined, motivated, and authoritarian.

The Army's activities would reflect its military-like singularity of purpose, perhaps more like a guerilla force than any traditional army. This Salvation Army would place all its resources and emphasis on finishing the Great Commission.

2. CHURCH

The Salvation Army Church would have a uniqueness that would give loose reference to our military metaphor coupled with an emphasis on evangelism and social action. The military reference would have more to do with our theological understanding of spiritual warfare than any actual organizational significance.

Leadership will become much more democratic. Corps pastors and territorial leaders will be elected, not appointed. Most decisions will be made at the individual church level with large financially independent congregations driving the organization. The General will have lost the current task of appointing the next generation of decision makers, but will have a new role as spiritual leader and mentor as well as becoming a significant public voice on issues of morality, justice, and peace.

Soldiership will be membership in the church and as such its requirement will be broadened to include all believers. Some will find it difficult to tell casual smokers or drinkers that their lifestyle restricts them from membership in the Army, if that Army is to be a reflection of the wider body of Christ (remember that C.S. Lewis smoked and drank his whole life).

Lifestyle restrictions will become the debate of this future Army as lines are drawn over what is acceptable behaviour and what is not.

3. CHARITY

This future would see us evolve into a popular social organization, with a Christian emphasis. This is already happening in some first world territory's where the Army has very large shelters for the homeless, community centers, or recycled clothing depots, and yet very small insignificant corps ministries. This is not to say that charity and social work are not important aspects of what we want to keep, most would argue they are part of the gospel itself, but yet our unique historical emphasis on social ministries has led to a professional social work that is often far from our mission.

The truth is that in some places we are afraid to cut our secular social work programs because we feel we need the money they bring in or we need the public support we gain from such work. Officers in these centers do not speak about statistics in terms of numbers of soldiers or converts but in terms of the

size of their budget (the bigger the budget, the bigger the appointment). The danger of course is that these programs begin to control and they can be so easily justified in our minds because we are in fact helping people. A further complication and danger is that the charity Army has developed most noticeably in North America and Europe, and these areas have unmatched power over the Army world because they are the source of funding for just about everything in the rest of the world.

In many of those Western territories the largest number of conversions are happening in large institutions. Therefore it is incorrect to speak about the large institutions not having a ministry at all. However, by and large these ministries are being developed through paid staff (officers or employees) with little contact with corps.

In the end, the charity Salvation Army will squeeze corps out of existence as they are over and over again given low priority in comparison to the endless demand the charity will place upon our best human and organizational resources.

ONE ARMY, NOT THREE

As I have floated the idea of these three emerging Armies around and among different Salvationists, reactions are varied. No one feels totally comfortable with any one of them. Most lean towards either the Commando or Church. Most would leave the Army if we just became the Charity Army. My fear is that we will just become a mixture of all three, something new, ugly, and irrelevant.

We are afraid to make a commitment. We don't want to consciously choose one over another. We like aspects of all three of the emerging Armies. But in relinquishing the right to choose, we turn the future over to one of our enemy's tools - Time. As the years roll along the Army will just slowly drift into becoming something new, like a boat without a keel. In time we will end up going somewhere but only to where the currents and the winds take us. It is to that place, that unknown re-creation by default, that I shudder to think of. We cannot keep talking about getting mobilised and getting ready for War if we don't know where the battle is or who we are fighting.

OUR GREATEST STRENGTH AND GREATEST WEAKNESS

My fear is that aspects of these Armies can potentially work in harmony, that we will not choose one over the other. Can we live with an Army that is a bit of

everything all mashed up together? Is it really acceptable for us to become every possibility? Would it not be better for us to choose one thing and do it really well?

One of our mottos would have us "meet human need", but can we really continue to hold up such a non-specific statement? That statement could be used by medical doctors, firemen, politicians, and prostitutes. How generic! Of course, meeting human need is what we are about in the sense that we understand it, but the statement is so vague it is being used to defend our involvement in almost anything and everything that might have a philanthropic result! It is about as generic as a do-good statement could possibly be.

It is often stated that one of the great strengths of The Salvation Army is its diversity. This is true, of course, especially in our internationalism. However, every strength has the potential to become our greatest weakness. Satan has used this ploy over and over throughout church history. We need to be careful that our diversity does not pull us apart into too many distinct Armies.

Secular leadership theory's current trend is for commercial organizations to find a singular product purpose. Multi-national organizations are selling off other business interests to become global leaders in one thing. Nokia makes cell phones and won't try to compete with McDonald's in making hamburgers. Bill Gates has not pushed Microsoft into the steel manufacturing industry or the banking sector. Global competition (i.e. where success and survival are the same thing) is all about being the best at one thing.

This theory is based on two presuppositions, first that if you are not the world leader at something you will eventually become irrelevant and disappear. Second, that the world market is too big and competitive for any one organization to do two things really well. We need to learn this lesson in The Salvation Army. Our very survival depends upon it.

In the Christian community, the most successful groups today tend to be parachurch organizations. Usually their success and growth is related to the fact that they are not trying to be everything to all people. These organizations are simply trying to do one thing and one thing well. Campus Crusade for Christ is trying to reach students. Navigator's has done discipleship. The Billy Graham Association has tried to do evangelism. Gideons International has successfully placed Bibles into every hotel in most major centers around the world. These are by and large organizations with a singular purpose and as such have been successful at what they do. On the other hand, the large do-everything denominations are on the decrease and many are alive in structure only.

The Salvation Army in the nineteenth century did one thing really well: we got people saved and put them into ministry. The Salvation Army in the twentieth century did one thing really well: we met people in their place of need.

The question then is what will we do really well in this new century? Let's figure that out, quit trying to be everything to everyone, and get on with it.

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

Journal of Aggressive Christianity
Issue 6, April - May 2000

Female Ministry

or, Woman's Right to Preach the Gospel.
by Catherine Booth

In Christian history, Catherine Booth is the defender of a woman's right to preach.

"And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy." -- Joel.

PREFACE.

The principal arguments contained in the following pages were published in a pamphlet entitled *Female Teaching*, which, I have reason to know, has been rendered very useful.

In this edition all the controversial portions have been expunged, some new matter added, and the whole produced in a cheaper form, and thus, I trust, rendered better adapted for general circulation.

Our only object in this issue is the elicitation of the truth. We hold that error can in the end be profitable to no cause, and least of all to the cause of Christ. If therefore we were not fully satisfied as to the correctness of the views herein set forth, we should fear to subject them to the light ; and if we did not deem them of vast importance to the interests of Christ's kingdom, we should prefer to hold them in silence. Believing however that they will bear the strictest investigation, and that their importance cannot easily be over-estimated, we feel bound to propagate them to the utmost of our ability.

In this paper we shall endeavour to meet the most common objections to female ministry, and to present, as far as our space will permit, a thorough examination of the texts generally produced in support of these objections. May the great Head of the Church grant the light of His Holy Spirit to both writer and reader.

FEMALE MINISTRY; OR WOMAN'S RIGHT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL.

THE first and most common objection urged against the public exercises of women, is that they are unnatural and unfeminine. Many labour under a very great but common mistake, viz. that of confounding nature with custom. Use, or custom, makes things appear to us natural, which, in reality, are

very unnatural; while, on the other hand, novelty and rarity make very natural things appear strange and contrary to nature. So universally has this power of custom been felt and admitted, that it has given birth to the proverb, "Use is second nature." Making allowance for the novelty of the thing, we cannot discover anything either unnatural or immodest in a Christian woman, becomingly attired, appearing on a platform or in a pulpit. By nature she seems fitted to grace either. God has given to woman a graceful form and attitude, winning manners, persuasive speech, and, above all, a finely-toned emotional nature, all of which appear to us eminent natural qualifications for public speaking. We admit that want of mental culture, the trammels of custom, the force of prejudice, and one-sided interpretations of Scripture, have hitherto almost excluded her from this sphere; but, before such a sphere is pronounced to be unnatural, it must be proved either that woman has not the ability to teach or to preach, or that the possession and exercise of this ability unnaturalizes her in other respects; that so soon as she presumes to step on the platform or into the pulpit, she loses the delicacy and grace of the female character. Whereas, we have numerous instances of her retaining all that is most esteemed in her sex, and faithfully discharging the duties peculiar to her own sphere, and at the same time taking her place with many of our most useful speakers and writers. Why should woman be confined exclusively to the kitchen and the distaff, any more than man to the field and workshop? Did not God, and has not nature, assigned to man his sphere of labour, "to till the ground, and to dress it"? And, if exemption is claimed from this kind of toil for a portion of the male sex, on the ground of their possessing ability for intellectual and moral pursuits, we must be allowed to claim the same privilege for woman ; nor can we see the exception more unnatural in the one case than the other, or why God in this solitary instance has endowed a being with powers which He never intended her to employ.

There seems to be a great deal of unnecessary fear of women occupying any position which involves publicity, lest she should be rendered unfeminine by the indulgence of ambition or vanity ; but why should woman any more than man be charged with ambition when impelled to use her talents for the good of her race. Moreover, as a labourer in the GOSPEL her position is much higher than in any other public capacity; she is at once shielded from all coarse and unrefined influences and associations; her very vocation tending to exalt and refine all the tenderest and most womanly instincts of her nature. As a matter of fact it is well known to those who have had opportunities of observing the private character and deportment of women engaged in preaching the gospel, that they have been amongst the most amiable, self-sacrificing, and unobtrusive of their sex.

"We well know," says the late Mr. Gurney, a minister of the Society of Friends, "that there are no women among us more generally distinguished for modesty, gentleness, order, and right submission to their brethren, than those who have been called by their Divine Master into the exercise of the Christian ministry."

Who would dare to charge the sainted Madame Guyon, Lady Maxwell, the talented mother of the Wesleys, Mrs. Fletcher, Mrs. Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Smith, Mrs. Whiteman, or Miss Marsh with being unwomanly or ambitious. Some of these ladies we know have adorned by their private virtues the highest ranks of society, and won alike from friends and enemies the highest eulogiums as to the devotedness, purity, and sweetness of their lives. Yet these were all more or less public women, every one of them expounding and exhorting from the Scriptures to mixed companies of men and women. Ambitious doubtless they were; but theirs was an ambition akin to His, who, for the "joy that was set before Him, endured the cross, despising the shame:" and to his, who counted all things but dung and dross, and was willing to be regarded as the off-scouring of all things that he might win souls to Jesus and bring glory to God. Would that all the Lord's people had more of this ambition.

Well, but, say our objecting friends, how is it that these whose names you mention, and many others, should venture to preach when female ministry is forbidden in the word of God? This is by far the most serious objection which we have to consider--and if capable of substantiation, should receive our immediate and cheerful acquiescence; but we think that we shall be able to show, by a fair and consistent interpretation, that the very opposite view is the truth. That not only is the public ministry of woman unforbidden, but absolutely enjoined by both precept and example in the word of God.

And, first, we will select the most prominent and explicit passages of the New Testament referring to the subject, beginning with 1 Corinthians xi. 1-15: "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoureth his head. But every woman that prayeth or prophesieth with her head uncovered, dishonoureth her head: for that is all one as if she were shaven," etc. "The character," says a talented writer, "of the prophesying here referred to by the apostle is defined 1 Corinthians xiv. 3, 4, and 31st verses. The reader will see that it was directed to the 'edification, exhortation, and comfort of believers;' and the result anticipated was the conviction of unbelievers and unlearned persons. Such were the public services of women which the apostle allowed, and such was the ministry of females predicted by the prophet Joel, and described as a leading feature of the gospel dispensation. Women who speak in assemblies for worship, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, assume thereby no personal authority over others; they simply deliver the messages of the gospel, which imply obedience, subjection, and responsibility, rather than authority and power." Dr. A. Clarke, on this verse, says, "Whatever may be the meaning of praying and prophesying in respect to the man, they have precisely the same meaning in respect to the woman! So that some women at least, as well as some men, might speak to others to edification, exhortation, and comfort. And this kind of prophesying or teaching was predicted by Joel ii. 28, and referred to by Peter (Acts ii. 17). And, had there not been such gifts bestowed on woman, the prophecy could not have had its fulfilment. The only difference marked by the apostle was, the man had his head uncovered, because he was the

representative of Christ: the woman had hers covered, because she was placed by the order of God in subjection to the man; and because it was the custom both among Greeks and Romans, and among the Jews an express law, that no woman should be seen abroad without a veil. This was and is a custom through all the East, and none but public prostitutes go without veils; if a woman should appear in public without a veil, she would dishonour her head--her husband. And she must appear like to those women who have their hair shaven off as the punishment of adultery." See also Doddridge, Whitby, and Cobbin.

We think that the view above given is the only fair and common-sense interpretation of this passage. If Paul does not here recognise the fact that women did actually pray and prophesy in the primitive Churches, his language has no meaning at all; and if he does not recognise their right to do so by dictating the proprieties of their appearance while so engaged, we leave to objectors the task of educing any sense whatever from his language. If, according to the logic of Dr. Barnes, the apostle here, in arguing against an improper and indecorous mode of performance, forbids the performance itself, the prohibition extends to the men as well as to the women; for Paul as expressly reprehends a man praying with his head covered as he does a woman with hers uncovered. With as much force might the doctor assert that in reproving the same Church for their improper celebration of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. xi. 20, 21), Paul prohibits all Christians, in every age, celebrating it at all. "The question with the Corinthians was not whether or not the women should pray or prophesy at all, that question had been settled on the day of Pentecost; but whether, as a matter of convenience, they might do so without their veils." The apostle kindly and clearly explains that by the law of nature and of society it would be improper to uncover her head while engaged in acts of public worship. We think that the reflections cast on these women by Dr. Barnes and other commentators are quite gratuitous and uncalled for. Here is no intimation that they ever had uncovered their heads while so engaged; the fairest presumption is that they had not, nor ever would till they knew the apostle's mind on the subject. We have precisely the same evidence that the men prayed and preached with their hats on, as that women removed their veils, and wore their hair dishevelled, which is simply none at all. We cannot but regard it as a signal evidence of the power of prejudice, that a man of Dr. Barnes's general clearness and acumen should condescend to treat this passage in the manner he does. The doctor evidently feels the untenableness of his position; and endeavours, by muddling two passages of distinct and different bearing, to annihilate the argument fairly deducible from the first. We would like to ask the doctor on what authority he makes such an exception as to the following: "But this cannot be interpreted as meaning that it is improper for females to speak or to pray in meetings of their own sex." Indeed! but according to the most reliable statistics we possess, two-thirds of the whole Church is, and always has been, composed of their own sex. If, then, no rule of the New Testament is more positive than this, viz. that women are to keep silence in the Churches, on whose authority does the doctor license them to speak to by far the larger portion of the Church.

A barrister writing us on the above passage, says "Paul here takes for granted that women were in the habit of praying and prophesying; he expresses no surprise nor utters a syllable of censure, he was only anxious that they should not provoke unnecessary obloquy by laying aside their customary head-dress or departing from the dress which was indicative of modesty in the country in which they lived. This passage seems to prove beyond the possibility of dispute that in the early times women were permitted to speak to the "edification and comfort" of Christians, and that the Lord graciously endowed them with grace and gifts for this service. What He did then may He not be doing now? It seems truly astonishing that Bible students, with the second chapter of the Acts before them, should not see that an imperative decree has gone forth from God, the execution of which women cannot escape; whether they like or not, they 'shall' prophesy throughout the whole course of this dispensation; and they have been doing so, though they and their blessed labours are not much noticed."

Well, but say our objecting friends, hear what Paul says in another place:-- "Let your women keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn* anything, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church" (1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35). Now let it be borne in mind this is the same apostle, writing to the same Church, as in the above instance. Will any one maintain that Paul here refers to the same kind of speaking as before? If so, we insist on his supplying us with some rule of interpretation which will harmonize this unparalleled contradiction and absurdity. Taking the simple and common-sense view of the two passages, viz. that one refers to the devotional and religious exercises in the Church, and the other to inconvenient asking of questions, and imprudent or ignorant talking, there is no contradiction or discrepancy, no straining or twisting of either. If, on the other hand, we assume that the apostle refers in both instances to the same thing, we make him in one page give the most explicit directions how a thing shall be performed, which in a page or two further on, and writing to the same Church, he expressly forbids being performed at all.

"Learning anything by asking their husbands at home," cannot mean preaching. That is not learning, but teaching "the way of God." It cannot mean being inspired by the Holy Ghost to foretell future events. No woman having either taught or prophesied, would have to ask her husband at home before she knew what she had done, or understood what she had said. Such women would be only fit to "learn in silence with all subjection." The reference is evidently to subjects under debate.

The Rev. J. H. Robinson, writing on this passage, remarks: "The silence imposed here must be explained by the verb, to speak (lalein), used afterwards. Whatever that verb means in this verse, I admit and believe the women were forbidden to do in the Church. But what does it mean? It is used nearly three hundred times in the New Testament, and scarcely any verb

is used with so great a variety of adjuncts. In Schleusner's Lexicon, its meaning is traced under seventeen distinct heads, and he occupies two full pages of the book in explaining it. Among other meanings he gives respondeo, rationem reddo, præcipio, jubeo; I answer, I return a reason, I give rule or precept, I order, decree." In Robinson's Lexicon (Bloomfield's edition), two pages nearly are occupied with the explanation of this word; and he gives instances of its meaning, "as modified by the context, where the sense lies, not so much in lalein (lalein) as in the adjuncts." THE PASSAGE UNDER CONSIDERATION IS ONE OF THOSE TO WHICH HE REFERS AS BEING SO "MODIFIED BY THE CONTEXT." Greenfield gives, with others, the following meanings of the word: "to prattle--be loquacious as a child; to speak in answer--to answer, as in John xix. 10; harangue. plead, Acts ix. 29.; xxi. To direct, command, Acts iii. 22." In Liddel and Scott's Lexicon, the following meanings are given: "to chatter, babble; of birds, to twitter, chirp; strictly, to make an inarticulate sound, opposed to articulate speech; but also generally, to talk, say."

"It is clear then that lalein may mean something different from mere speaking, and that to use this word in a prohibition does not imply that absolute silence or abstinence from speaking is enjoined; but, on the contrary, that the prohibition applies to an improper kind of speaking, which is to be understood, not from the word itself, but, as Mr. Robinson says, from 'the context.' Now, 'the context' shows that it was not silence which was imposed upon women in the Church, but only a refraining from such speaking as was inconsistent with the words, 'they are commanded to be under obedience,' or, more literally, 'to be obedient:' that is, they were to refrain from such questionings, dogmatical assertions, and disputations, as would bring them into collision with the men--as would ruffle their tempers, and occasion an unamiable volubility of speech. This kind of speaking, and this alone, as it appears to me, was forbidden by the apostle in the passage before us. This kind of speaking was the only supposable antagonist to, and violation of 'obedience.' Absolute silence was not essential to that 'obedience.' My studies in 'Biblical criticism,' etc., have not informed me that a woman must cease to speak before she can obey; and I am therefore led to the irresistible conclusion, that it is not all speaking in the Church which the apostle forbids, and which he pronounces to be shameful; but, on the contrary, a pertinacious, inquisitive, domineering, dogmatical kind of speaking, which, while it is unbecoming in a man, is shameful and odious in a woman, and especially when that woman is in the Church, and is speaking on the deep things of religion."

Parkhurst, in his lexicon, tells us that the Greek word "'lalein,' which our translation renders speak, is not the word used in Greek to

signify to speak with premeditation and prudence, but is the word used to signify to speak imprudently and without consideration, and is that applied to one who lets his tongue run but does not speak to the purpose, but says nothing." Now unless Parkhurst is utterly wrong in his Greek, which it is apprehended no one will venture to affirm, Paul's fulmination is not launched against speech with premeditation and prudence, but against speech devoid of these qualities. It would be well if all speakers of the male as well as the female sex were obedient to this rule.

We think that with the light cast on this text by the four eminent Greek scholars above quoted, there can be no doubt in any unprejudiced mind as to the true meaning of "lalein" in this connection. And we find from Church history that the primitive Christians thus understood it, for that women did actually speak and preach amongst them we have indisputable proof. God had promised in the last days to pour out His Spirit upon all flesh, and that the daughters as well as the sons of mankind should prophesy.

And Peter says most emphatically, respecting the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, "This is that which is spoken of by the prophet Joel," etc. (Acts ii. 16, 18.) Words more explicit, and an application of Prophecy more direct than this does not occur within the range of the New Testament.

Commentators say, "If women have the gift of prophecy, they must not use that gift in public." But God says, by His prophet Joel, they shall use it, just in the same sense as the sons use it. When the dictation of men so flatly opposes the express declaration of the "sure word of prophecy," we make no apology for its utter and indignant rejection.

Presbuteros, a talented writer of the Protestant Electoral Union, in his reply to a priest of Rome,* says:--

"Habituated for ages, as men had been, to the diabolical teaching and delusions practiced upon them by the papal 'priesthood,' it was difficult for them, when they did get possession of the Scriptures, to discern therein the plain fact, that among the primitive Christians preaching was not confined to men, but women also, gifted with power by the Holy Spirit, preached the gospel; and hence the slowness with which, even at the present time, this truth has been admitted by those giving heed to the word of God, and especially those setting themselves up as a 'priesthood' or a 'clergy.' As shown in page 66, God had, according to His

promise, on the day of Pentecost poured out his Holy Spirit upon believers--men and women, old and young--that they should prophesy, and they did so. The prophesying spoken of was not the foretelling of events, but the preaching to the world at large the glad tidings of salvation by Jesus Christ. For this purpose it pleased God to make use of women as well as men. It is plainly the duty of every Christian to insist upon the fulfilment of the will of God, and the abrogation of every single thing inconsistent therewith. I would draw attention to the fact that Phoebe, a Christian woman whom we find in our version of the Scripture (Rom. xvi. 1) spoken of only as any common servant attached to a congregation, was nothing less than one of those gifted by the Holy Spirit for publishing the glad tidings, or preaching the gospel. The manner in which the apostle (whose only care was the propagation of evangelical truth) speaks of her, shows that she was what he in Greek styled her, a deacon (diaconon) or preacher of the word. Our translators speak of her (because she was a woman) only as 'a servant of the Church which is at Cenchrea.' The men 'deacons' they styled ministers, but a woman on the same level as themselves would be an anomaly, and therefore she was to be only the servant of men ministers, who, in the popish sense, constituted the Church!"

The apostle says of her--"I commend unto you Phebe our sister, who is a minister (diaconon) of the Church which is at Cenchrea: that ye receive her in the Lord, as becometh saints, and that ye assist her in whatsoever business she hath need of you." To the common sense of disinterested minds it will be evident that the apostle could not have requested more for any one of the most zealous of men preachers than he did for Phebe! They were to assist "her in whatsoever business she" might require their aid. Hence we discern that she had no such trifling position in the primitive Church as at the present time episcopal dignitaries attach to deacons and deaconesses! Observe, the same Greek word is used to designate her that was applied to all the apostles and to Jesus Himself. For example: "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister (diaconon) of the circumcision" (Rom. xv. 8). "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers (diaconoi) by whom ye believed" (1 Cor. iii. 5). "Our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers (diaconous) of the new testament" (2 Cor. iii. 6). "In all things approving ourselves as the ministers (diaconoi) of God" (vi. 4). The idea of a woman deacon in the "three orders!"--it was intolerable, therefore let her be a "servant." Theodoret however says, "The fame of Phebe was spoken of throughout the world. She was known not only to the Greeks and Romans, but also to the Barbarians," which implies that she had travelled much, and propagated the gospel in foreign countries. See Doddridge, Cobbin, and Wesley, on this passage.

"Salute Andronicus and Junia, my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners, who are of note among the apostles; who also were in Christ before me"

(Rom. xvi. 7). By the word "kinsmen" one would take Junia to have been a man; but Chrysostom and Theophylact, who were both Greeks, and consequently knew their mother tongue better than our translators, say Junia was a woman. Kinsmen should therefore have been rendered kinsfolk; but with our translators it was out of all character to have a woman of note amongst the apostles, and a fellow-prisoner with Paul for the gospel: therefore let them be kinsmen!

Justin Martyr, who lived till about A.D. 150, says, in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, "that both men and women were seen among them who had the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit of God, according as the prophet Joel had foretold, by which he endeavored to convince the Jews that the latter days were come."

Dodwell, in his dissertations on Irenæus says, "that the gift of the spirit of prophecy was given to others besides the apostles; and, that not only in the first and second, but in the third century--even to the time of Constantine--all sorts and ranks of men had these gifts; yea, and women too."

Eusebius speaks of Potomania Ammias, a prophetess, in Philadelphia, and others, "who were equally distinguished for their love and zeal in the cause of Christ."

"The scriptural idea," says Mrs. Palmer, "of the terms preach and prophesy, stands so inseparably connected as one and the same thing, that we should find it difficult to get aside from the fact that women did preach, or, in other words, prophesy, in the early ages of Christianity, and have continued to do so down to the present time to just the degree that the spirit of the Christian dispensation has been recognised. And it is also a significant fact, that to the degree denominations, who have once favoured the practice, lose the freshness of their zeal, and as a consequence, their primitive simplicity, and, as ancient Israel, yield to a desire to be like surrounding communities, in a corresponding ratio are the labours of females discountenanced."

If any one still insists on a literal application of this text, we beg to ask how he disposes of the preceding part of the chapter where it occurs. Surely, if one verse be so authoritative and binding, the whole chapter is equally so; and therefore, those who insist on a literal

application of the words of Paul, under all circumstances and through all time, will be careful to observe the apostle's order of worship in their own congregations. But, we ask, where is the minister who lets his whole Church prophesy one by one, and himself sits still and listens while they are speaking, so that all things may be done decently and in order? But Paul as expressly lays down this order as he does the rule for women, and he adds, "The things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord" (ver. 37). Why then do not ministers abide by these directions? We anticipate their reply--"Because these directions were given to the Corinthians as temporary arrangements; and, though they were the commandments of the Lord to them at that time, they do not apply to all Christians in all times." Indeed; but unfortunately for their argument, the prohibition of women speaking, even if it meant what they wish, was given amongst those very directions, and to the Corinthians only: for it reads, "Let your women keep silence," etc.; and, for aught this passage teaches to the contrary, Christian women of all other Churches might do what these women were forbidden to do; until, therefore, learned divines make a personal application of the rest of the chapter, they must excuse us declining to do so of the 24th verse; and we challenge them to show any breach of the Divine law in one case more than the other.

Another passage frequently cited as prohibitory of female labour in the Church, is 1 Timothy ii. 12, 13. Though we have never met with the slightest proof that this text has any reference to the public exercises of women; nevertheless, as it is often quoted, we will give it a fair and thorough examination.

"It is primarily an injunction," says the Rev. J. H. Robinson, "respecting her personal behavior at home. It stands in connection with precepts respecting her apparel and her domestic position; especially her relation to her husband. No one will suppose that the apostle forbids a woman to 'teach' absolutely and universally. Even objectors would allow her to teach her own sex in private; they would let her teach her servants and children, and perhaps, her husband too. If he were ignorant of the Saviour, might she not teach him the way to Christ? If she were acquainted with languages, arts or sciences, which he did not know, might she not teach him these things? Certainly she might! The 'teaching,' therefore which is forbidden by the apostle, is not every kind of teaching any more than, in the previous instance, his prohibition of speaking applied to every kind of speaking in the Church; but it is such teaching as is domineering, and as involves the usurpation of authority over the man. This is the only teaching forbidden by St. Paul in the passage under consideration."

"If this passage be not a prohibition of every kind of teaching, we can only ascertain what kind of teaching is forbidden by the modifying

expressions with which didaskein stands associated: and, for anything these modifying expressions affirm to the contrary, her teaching may be public, reiterated, urgent, and may comprehend a variety of subjects, provided it be not dictatorial, domineering, nor vociferous; for then, and then only, would it be incompatible with her obedience."

The Rev. Dr. Taft says, "This passage should be rendered 'I suffer not a woman to teach by usurping authority over the man.' This rendering removes all the difficulties and contradictions involved in the ordinary reading, and evidently gives the meaning of the apostle." "If the nature of society," says the same writer, "its good and prosperity; in which women are jointly and equally concerned with men; if in many cases their fitness and capacity for instructors, being admitted to be equal to the other sex, be not reasons sufficient to convince the candid reader of woman's right to preach and teach because of two texts in Paul's epistles, let him consult the paraphrase of Locke, where he has proved to a demonstration that the apostle, in these texts, never intended to prohibit women from praying and preaching in the Church provided they were dressed as became women professing godliness, and were qualified for the sacred office."

"It will be found," says another writer, "by an examination of this text with its connections, that the teaching here alluded to stands in necessary connection with usurping authority, as though the apostle had said, the gospel does not alter the relation of women in view of priority, for Adam was first formed, then Eve."

"This prohibition," says the before-named barrister, "refers exclusively to the private life and domestic character of woman, and simply means that an ignorant or unruly woman is not to force her opinions on the man whether he will or no. It has no reference whatever to good women living in obedience to God and their husbands, or to women sent out to preach the gospel by the call of the Holy Spirit."

If this context is allowed to fix the meaning of didaskein in this text, as it would in any other, there can be no doubt in any honest mind that the above is the only consistent interpretation; and if it be, then this prohibition has no bearing whatever on the religious exercise of women led and taught of the Spirit of God: and we cannot forbear asking on whose skirts the mischief resulting from the false application of this text will be found? Thank God the day is dawning with respect to this subject. Women are studying and investigating for themselves. They are claiming to be recognised as responsible human beings, answerable to GOD for their

convictions of duty; and, urged by the Divine Spirit they are overstepping those unscriptural barriers which the Church has so long reared against its performance.

Whether the Church will allow women to speak in her assemblies can only be a question of time; common sense, public opinion, and the blessed results of female agency will force her to give us an honest and impartial rendering of the solitary text on which she grounds her prohibitions. Then, when the true light shines and God's words take the place of man's traditions, the Doctor of Divinity who shall teach that Paul commands woman to be silent when God's Spirit urges her to speak, will be regarded much the same as we should now regard an astronomer who should teach that the sun is the earth's satellite.

Another argument urged against female preaching is, that it is unnecessary; that there is plenty of scope for her efforts in private, in visiting the sick and poor and working for the temporalities of the Church. Doubtless woman ought to be thankful for any sphere for benefiting her race and glorifying God. But we cannot be blind to the supreme selfishness of making her so welcome to the hidden toil and self-sacrifice, the hewing of wood and the drawing of water, the watching and waiting, the reproach and persecution attaching to her Master's service, without allowing her a tittle of the honour which He has attached to the ministration of His gospel. Here, again, man's theory and God's order are at variance. God says, "Them that honour me I will honour." Our Lord links the joy with the suffering, the glory with the shame, the exaltation with the humiliation, the crown with the cross, the finding of life with the losing of it. Nor did He manifest any such horror at female publicity in His cause as many of His professed people appear to entertain in these days. We have no intimation of His reproving the Samaritan woman for her public proclamation of Him to her countrymen; not of His rebuking the women who followed Him amidst a taunting mob on His way to the cross. And yet, surely, privacy was their proper sphere. On one occasion He did say, with reference to a woman, "Verily, I say unto you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her" (Matt. xxvi. 12; see also Luke vii. 37-50).

As to the obligation devolving on woman to labour for her Master, I presume there will be no controversy. The particular sphere in which each individual shall do this must be dictated by the teachings of the Holy Spirit and the gifts with which God has endowed her. If she have the necessary gifts, and feels herself called by the Spirit to preach, there is

not a single word in the whole book of God to restrain her, but many, very many to urge and encourage her. God says she SHALL do so, and Paul prescribes the manner in which she shall do it, and Phebe, Junia, Philip's four daughters, and many other women actually did preach and speak in the primitive Churches. If this had not been the case, there would have been less freedom under the new than under the old dispensation. A greater paucity of gifts and agencies under the Spirit than under the law. Fewer labourers when more work to be done. Instead of the destruction of caste and division between the priesthood and the people, and the setting up of a spiritual kingdom in which all true believers were "kings and priests unto God," the division would have been more stringent and the disabilities of the common people greater. Whereas we are told again and again in effect, that in "Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free, male nor female, but ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

We commend a few passages bearing in the ministrations of woman under the old dispensation to the careful consideration of our readers. "And Deborah, a prophetess, the wife of Lapidoth, she judged Israel at that time," etc. (Jud. iv. 4-10). There are two particulars in this passage worthy of note. First, the authority of Deborah as a prophetess, or revealer of God's will to Israel, was acknowledged and submitted to as implicitly as in the cases of the male judges who succeeded her. Secondly, she is made the military head of ten thousand men, Barak refusing to go to battle without her.

Again, in 2 Kings xxii. 12-20, we have an account of the king sending the high-priest, the scribe, etc., to Huldah, the prophetess, the wife of Shallum, who dwelt at Jerusalem, in the college; to inquire at her mouth the will of God in reference to the book of the law which had been found in the house of the Lord. The authority and dignity of Huldah's message to the king does not betray anything of that trembling diffidence or abject servility which some persons seem to think should characterize the religious exercises of woman. She answers him as the prophetess of the Lord, having the signet of the King of kings attached to her utterances.

"The Lord gave the word, and great was the company of those that published it" (Ps. lxxviii. 11). In the original Hebrew it is, "Great was the company of women publishers, or women evangelists." Grotius explains this passage, "The Lord shall give the word, that is plentiful matter of speaking; so that he would call those which follow the great army of preaching women, victories, or female conquerers." How comes it that the feminine word is actually excluded in this text? That it is there as plainly as any other word no Hebrew scholar will deny. It is too much to

assume that as our translators could not alter it, as they did "Diaconon" when applied to Phebe, they preferred to leave it out altogether rather than give a prophecy so unpalatable to their prejudice. But the Lord gives the word and He will choose whom He pleases to publish it; notwithstanding the condemnation of translators and divines.

"For I brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and redeemed thee out of the house of servants; and I sent before thee Moses, Aaron, and Miriam" (Mic. vi. 4).

God here classes Miriam with Moses and Aaron, and declares that He sent her before His people. We fear that had some of our friends been men of Israel at that time, they would have disputed such a leadership.

In the light of such passages as these, who will dare to dispute the fact that God did under the old dispensation endue his handmaidens with the gifts and calling of prophets answering to our present idea of preachers. Strange indeed would it be if under the fulness of the gospel dispensation, there were nothing analogous to this, but "positive and explicit rules," to prevent any approximation thereto. We are thankful to find, however, abundant evidence that the "spirit of prophecy which is the testimony of Jesus," was poured out on the female as fully as on the male disciple, and "His daughters and His handmaidens" prophesied. We commend the following texts from the New Testament to the careful consideration of our readers.

"And she (Anna) was a widow of about fourscore and four years, which departed not from the temple, but served God with fastings and prayers night and day. And she coming in that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the Lord, and spake of Him to all them that looked for redemption on Jerusalem" (Luke ii. 37, 38). Can any one explain wherein this exercise of Anna's differed from that of Simeon, recorded just before? It was in the same public place, the temple. It was during the same service. It was equally public, for she "spake of Him to all who looked for redemption in Jerusalem" (see Watson on this passage).

Jesus said to the two Marys, "All hail! And they came and held Him by the feet, and worshipped Him. Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go, tell my brethren that they go before me into Galilee" (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10). There are two or three points in this beautiful narrative to which we wish to call the attention of our readers.

First, it was the first announcement of the glorious news to a lost world and a company of forsaking disciples. Second, it was as public as the nature of the case demanded; and intended ultimately to be published to the ends of the earth. Third, Mary was expressly commissioned to reveal the fact to the apostles; and thus she literally became their teacher in that memorable occasion. Oh, glorious privilege, to be allowed to herald the glad tidings of a Savior risen! How could it be that our Lord chose a woman to this honour? Well, one reason might be that the male disciples were all missing at the time. They all forsook Him and fled. But woman was there, as she had ever been, ready to minister to her risen, as to her dying Lord--

"Not she with traitorous lips her Savior stung,
Not she denied Him with unholy tongue;
She, whilst apostles shrunk, could danger brave;
Last at the cross, and earliest at the grave. But surely, if the dignity of our Lord of His message were likely to be imperiled by committing this sacred trust to a woman, He who was guarded by legions of angels could have commanded another messenger; but, as if intent on doing her honour and rewarding her unwavering fidelity, He reveals Himself first to her; and, as an evidence that He had taken out of the way the curse under which she had so long groaned, nailing it to His cross, He makes her who had been first in the transgression, first also in the glorious knowledge of complete redemption.

"Acts i. 14, and ii. 1, 4. We are in the first of these passages expressly told that the women were assembled with the disciples on the day of Pentecost; and in the second, that the cloven tongues sat upon them each, and the Holy Ghost filled them all, and they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance.

It is nothing to the point to argue that the gift of tongues was a miraculous gift, seeing that

the Spirit was the primary bestowment. The tongues were only emblematical of the office which the Spirit was henceforth to sustain to His people. The Spirit was given alike to the female as to the male disciple, and this is cited by Peter (16, 18), as the peculiar speciality of the latter dispensation. What a remarkable device of the devil that he has so long succeeded in hiding this characteristic of the latter day glory! He knows, whether the Church does or not, how eminently detrimental to the interests of his kingdom have been the religious labours of woman; and while her Seed has mortally bruised his head, he ceases not to bruise her heel; but the time of her deliverance draweth nigh."

"PHILIP THE EVANGELIST HAD FOUR DAUGHTERS, VIRGINS, WHICH DID PROPHECY." FROM EUSEBIUS, THE ANCIENT ECCLESIASTICAL

HISTORIAN, WE LEARN THAT PHILIP'S DAUGHTERS LIVED TO A GOOD OLD AGE, ALWAYS ABOUNDING IN THE WORK OF THE LORD. "MIGHTY LUMINARIES," HE WRITES, " HAVE FALLEN ASLEEP IN ASIA. PHILIP, AND TWO OF HIS VIRGIN DAUGHTERS, SLEEP AT HIERAPOLIS; THE OTHER, AND THE BELOVED DISCIPLE, JOHN, REST AT EPHESUS."

"And I entreat thee also, true yokefellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers" (Phil. iv. 3).

This is a recognition of female labourers, not concerning the gospel but in the gospel, whom Paul classes with Clement, and other his fellow-labourers. Precisely the same terms are applied to Timotheus, whom Paul styles a "minister of God, and his fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ" (1 Thess. iii. 2).

Again, "Greet Priscilla and Aquila, my helpers in Christ Jesus; who have for my life laid down their own necks; unto whom not only I give thanks, but all the Churches of the Gentiles" (Rom. xvi. 3, 4).

The word rendered helpers means a FELLOW-LABOURER, ASSOCIATE COADJUTOR,* working together, an assistant, a joint labourer, a colleague. + In the New Testament spoken only of a co-worker, helper in a Christian work, that is of Christian teachers. ++ How can these terms, with any show of consistency, be made to apply merely to the exercise of hospitality towards that apostle, or the duty of private visitation? To be a partner, coadjutor, or joint worker with a preacher of the gospel, must be something more than to be his waiting-maid.

Again, "Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, who labour in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, which laboured much in the Lord" (Rom. xvi. 12). Dr. Clarke, on this verse, says, "Many have spent much useless labour in endeavouring to prove that these women did not preach. That there were prophetesses as well as prophets in the Church we learn, and that a woman might pray or prophesy provided that she had her head covered we know; and, according to St. Paul (1 Cor. xiv. 3), whoever prophesied spoke unto others to edification, exhortation, and comfort, and that no preacher can do more every person must acknowledge. Because, to edify exhort, and comfort, are the prime ends of the gospel ministry. If women thus prophesied, then women preached."

"There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28). If this passage does not teach that in the privileges, duties, and responsibilities of Christ's kingdom, all differences of nation, caste, and sex are abolished, we should like to know what it does teach, and wherefore it was written (see also 1 Cor. vii. 22).

As we have before observed, the text, Corinthians xiv. 34, 35, is the only one in the whole book of God which even by false translation can be made prohibitory of female speaking in the Church; how comes it then, that by this one isolated passage, which, according to our best Greek authorities, * is wrongly rendered and wrongly applied, woman's lips have been sealed for centuries, and the "testimony of Jesus, which is the spirit of prophecy," silenced, when bestowed on her? How is it that this solitary text has been allowed to stand unexamined and unexplained, nay, that learned commentators who have known its true meaning as perfectly as either Robinson, Bloomfield, Greenfield, Scott, Parkhurst, or Locke have upheld the delusion, and enforced it as a Divine precept binding on all female disciples through all time? Surely there must have been some unfaithfulness, "craftiness," and "handling of the word of life deceitfully" somewhere. Surely the love of caste and unscriptural jealousy for a separated priesthood has had something to do with this anomaly. By this course divines and commentators have involved themselves in all sorts of inconsistencies and contradictions; and worse, they have nullified some of the most precious promises of God's word. They have set the most explicit predictions of prophecy at variance with apostolic injunctions, and the most immediate and wonderful operations of the Holy Ghost in direct opposition "to positive, explicit, and universal rules."

Notwithstanding however all this opposition to female ministry on the part of those deemed authorities in the Church, there have been some in all ages in whom the Holy Ghost has wrought so mightily, that at the sacrifice of reputation and all things most dear, they have been compelled to come out as witnesses for Jesus and ambassadors of His gospel. As a rule, these women have been amongst the most devoted and self-denying of the Lord's people, giving indisputable evidence by the purity and beauty of their lives that they were led by the Spirit of God. Now, if the word of God forbids female ministry, we would ask how it happens that so many of the most devoted handmaidens of the Lord have felt themselves constrained by the Holy Ghost to exercise it? Surely there must be some mistake somewhere, for the word and the Spirit cannot contradict each other. Either the word does not condemn women preaching, or these confessedly holy women have been deceived. Will any one venture to assert

that such women as Mrs. Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Fletcher of Madely, and Mrs. Smith have been deceived with respect to their call to deliver the gospel messages to their fellow-creatures? If not, then God does call and qualify women to preach, and His word, rightly understood, cannot forbid what His Spirit enjoins. Further, it is a significant fact, which we commend to the consideration of all thoughtful Christians, that the public ministry of women has been eminently owned of God in the salvation of souls and the edification of His people. Paul refers to the fruits of his labours as evidence of his Divine commission (1 Cor. ix. 20). "If I am not an apostle unto others, yet doubtless I am to you: for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord." If this criterion be allowed to settle the question respecting woman's call to preach, we have no fear as to the result. A few examples of the blessing which has attended the ministrations of females, may help to throw some light on this matter of a Divine call.

At a missionary meeting held at Columbia, March 26th, 1824, the name of Mrs. Smith, of the Cape of Good Hope, was brought before the meeting, when Sir Richard Otley, the chairman, said, "The name of Mrs. Smith has been justly celebrated by the religious world and in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope. I heard a talented missionary state, that wherever he went in that colony, at 600 or 1000 miles from the principal seat of government, among the natives of Africa, and wherever he saw persons converted to Christianity, the name of Mrs. Smith was hailed as the person from whom they received their religious impressions; and although no less than ten missionaries, all men of piety and industry, were stationed in that settlement, the exertions of Mrs. Smith alone were more efficacious, and had been attended with greater success than the labours of those missionaries combined." The Rev. J. Campbell, missionary to Africa, says, "So extensive were the good effects of her pious exhortations, that on my first visit to the colony, wherever I met with persons of evangelical piety, I generally found that their first impressions of religion were ascribed to Mrs. Smith."

Mrs. Mary Taft, the talented lady of the Rev. Dr. Taft, was another eminently successful labourer in the Lord's vineyard. "If," says Mrs. Palmer, "the criterion by which we may judge of a Divine call to proclaim salvation be by the proportion of fruit gathered, then to the commission Mrs. Taft is appended the Divine signature, to a degree pre-eminently unmistakable. In reviewing her diary, we are constrained to believe that not one minister in five hundred could produce so many seals to their ministry. An eminent minister informed us that of those who had been brought to Christ through her labours, over two hundred entered the ministry. She seldom opened her mouth in public assemblies, either in prayer or speaking, but the Holy Spirit accompanied her words in such a

wonderful manner, that sinners were convicted, and, as in apostolic times, were constrained to cry out, 'What must we do to be saved?' She laboured under the sanction and was hailed as a fellow-helper in the gospel by the Revs. Messrs. Mather, Pawson, Hearnshaw, Blackborne, Marsden, Bramwell, Vasey, and many other equally distinguished ministers of her time." The Rev. Mr. Pawson, when President of the Wesleyan Conference, writes as follows to a circuit where Mrs. Taft was stationed with her husband, where she met with some gainsayers:--'It is well known that religion has been for some time at a very low ebb in Dover. I therefore could not help thinking that it was a kind providence that Mrs. Taft was stationed among you, and that, by the blessing of God, she might be the instrument of reviving the work of God among you. I seriously believe Mrs. Taft to be a deeply pious, prudent, modest woman. I believe the Lord hath owned and blessed her labours very much, and many, yea, very many souls have been brought to the saving knowledge of God by her preaching. Many have come to hear her out of curiosity, who would not have come to hear a man, and have been awakened and converted to God. I do assure you there is much fruit of her labours in many parts of our connection."

Mrs. Fletcher, the wife of the sainted vicar of Madeley, was another of the daughters of the Lord on whom was poured the spirit of prophecy. This eminently devoted lady opened an orphan house, and devoted her time, her heart, and her fortune, to the work of the Lord. The Rev. Mr. Hodson, in referring to her public labours, says, "Mrs. Fletcher was not only luminous but truly eloquent--her discourses displayed much good sense, and were fraught with the riches of the gospel. She excelled in that poetry of an orator which can alone supply the place of all the rest--that eloquence which goes directly to the heart. She was the honoured instrument of doing much good; and the fruit of her labours is now manifest in the lives and tempers of numbers who will be her crown of rejoicing in the day of the Lord." The Rev. Henry Moore sums up a fine eulogium on her character and labours by saying, "May not every pious churchman say, Would to God all the Lord's people were such prophets and prophetesses!"

Miss Elizabeth Hurrell travelled through many counties in England, preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ; and very many were, through her instrumentality, brought to a knowledge of the truth, not a few of whom were afterwards called to fill very honourable stations in the Church.

From the Methodist Conference, held at Manchester, 1787, Mr. Wesley wrote to Miss Sarah Mallett, whose labours, while very acceptable to the people, had been opposed by some of the preachers:--"We give the right hand

of fellowship to Sarah Mallett, and have no objection to her being a preacher in our connection, so long as she preaches Methodist doctrine, and attends to our discipline."

Such are a few examples of the success attending the public labours of females in the gospel. We might give many more, but our space only admits of a bare mention of Mrs. Wesley, Mrs. Rogers, Mrs. President Edwards, Mrs. Elizabeth Fry, Mrs. Hall, Mrs. Gilbert, Miss Lawrence, Miss Newman, Miss Miller, Miss Tooth, and Miss Cutler, whose holy lives and zealous labours were owned of God in the conversion of thousands of souls, and the abundant edification of the Lord's people.

Nor are the instances of the spirit of prophecy bestowed on women confined to by-gone generations: the revival of this age, as well as of every other, has been marked by this endowment, and the labours of such pious and talented ladies as Mrs. Palmer, Mrs. Finney, Mrs. Wightman, Miss Marsh, * with numberless other Marys and Phebes, have contributed in no small degree to its extension and power.

We have endeavored in the foregoing pages to establish, what we sincerely believe, that woman has a right to teach. Here the whole question hinges. If she has the right, she has it independently of any man-made restrictions which do not equally refer to the opposite sex. If she has the right, and possesses the necessary qualifications, we maintain that, where the law of expediency does not prevent, she is at liberty to exercise it without any further pretensions to inspiration than those put forth by that male sex. If, on the other hand, it can be proved that she has not the right, but that imperative silence is imposed upon her by the word of God, we cannot see who has authority to relax or make exceptions to the law.

If commentators had dealt with the Bible on other subjects as they have dealt with it on this, taking isolated passages, separated from their explanatory connections, and insisting on a literal interpretation of the words of our version, what errors and contradictions would have been forced upon the acceptance of the Church, and what terrible results would have accrued to the world. On this principle the Universalist will have all men unconditionally saved, because the Bible says, "Christ is the Saviour of all men," etc. The Antinomian, according to this rule of interpretation, has most unquestionable foundation for his dead faith and hollow profession, seeing that St. Paul declares over and over again that men are "saved by faith and not by works." The Unitarian, also, in support of his

soul-withering doctrine, triumphantly refers to numerous passages which, taken alone, teach only the humanity of Jesus. In short, "there is no end to the errors in faith and practice which have resulted from taking isolated passages, wrested from their proper connections, or the light thrown upon them by other Scriptures, and applying them to sustain a favourite theory." Judging from the blessed results which have almost invariably followed the ministrations of women in the cause of Christ, we fear it will be found, in the great day of account, that a mistaken and unjustifiable application of the passage, "Let your women keep silence in the Churches," has resulted in more loss to the Church, evil to the world, and dishonour to God, than any of the errors we have already referred to.

And feeling, as we have long felt, that this is a subject of vast importance to the interests of Christ's kingdom and the glory of God, we would most earnestly commend its consideration to those who have influence in the Churches. We think it a matter worthy of their consideration whether God intended woman to bury her talents and influence as she now does? And whether the circumscribed sphere of woman's religious labours may not have something to do with the comparative non-success of the gospel in these latter days.

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

Interview with
Commissioner Peter H. Chang

General John Gowans was quoted in the most recent issue of The Officer (bi-monthly journal) saying, "We had the glowing example of Commissioner Chang who was a Korean but who had experience in the USA so that he was able to become a TC in Korea and America." Glowing is a word often used to describe this man. His life glows with the presence of Christ such that in a very humble and human way people around him are aware that he is a man walking with his God.

J.A.C.: For those who haven't read THE GIFT OF GOD yet, please tell us about your unique background, how you came to know Jesus, and how you came to know The Salvation Army.

P.H.C.: When Commissioner Herbert A. Lord was a Captain in Korea, he invited my grandfather, a farmer, to an Army meeting. Through my grandfather's conversion, so my father came to know Him as well and then our entire family. Though I enjoyed the surroundings of a Christian environment at home, I came to realize for myself how much God loved me and that I had to make my own decision for Christ. This happened when I was 16 years old. Ever since then, I have loved my Lord with a deep passion and gave my life to Him serving Him in The Salvation Army.

J.A.C.: You've been a pioneer through your life, breaking man-made barriers with almost every new appointment. How do you believe we should exploit our world-wide leaders, male and female, in the 21st century?

P.H.C.: We need to take risks so as to be nurturing and cultivating particular potential future leaders. The risk presupposes it may not work as we would hope, however unless we take that risk we cannot have the reward of having leaders who possess new thinking and a new approach, those who may be suitable for the new century.

J.A.C.: What is the most significant part of your ministry today? Is it the writing, the preaching, the legacy of your two most recent commands, Korea and USA West, or something else?

P.H.C.: I must admit that I am not a writer nor am I an outstanding preacher other than teaching His words. My ministry these days is more that of an encourager and being helpful to others in anyway I can as a retired person. How grateful I am that the Lord somehow still continues to use me in a special and unique way.

J.A.C.: What are your dreams for The Salvation Army?

P.H.C.: I dream our Army to be taking a leading role in the Christian Church as a model and example in reaching out to the people with the Gospel. As The Army, we can be so complacent knowing how God has used the Army in the past and also uses us in the present. We need though to be having a new strategy, constantly changing in tune with the times as we move into this new century.

J.A.C.: You have written about recipients of the Order of the Founder in FIGHTING FOR HIS GLORY. Other than those worthies, who has been most influential in shaping you into who you are today?

P.H.C.: My own parents really: my mother with patience and loving care, my father with discipline, straightforwardness and responsibility for mission. Reverend Hahn, Kyong-gik has influenced me in his pastoring ways and Professor Park, Chang-hwan for academic study.

J.A.C.: You are a broadly-educated man. Which books have influenced you most?

P.H.C.: Of course, the Holy Bible is the book which has most influenced me. Additionally, in my thinking, Professor Johnness Hoekendiek's "The Church Inside Out" made a big difference to me.

J.A.C.: Can you tell us of any memorable preaching you have heard, and what made it outstanding?

P.H.C.: Rev Hahn of the Young Nak Church. He would preach in simple terms, straight from the Word. Yet his exposition of the truth was in-depth and with authority.

J.A.C.: What is God teaching you these days?

P.H.C.: God teaches me humility as well as an understanding of this new area of life. He is teaching me in financial areas of life these days too.

J.A.C.: Who are your heroes?

P.H.C.: George Scott Railton.

J.A.C.: What is your most memorable spiritual experience?

P.H.C.: My most memorable spiritual experience took place after the Korean War, as I was dedicating my life for service as an officer of The Salvation Army.

J.A.C.: Please comment on the state of Aggressive Christianity in the 21st century. How relevant is primitive salvationism?

P.H.C.: The message and principles of Salvationism are very relevant to and for the 21st century. Perhaps, though, we may need to adjust to and adopt new methods of communication.

J.A.C.: Do you have a message to soldiers on various fronts around the world?

P.H.C: As soldiers we must positively engage in the battle. This is our responsibility as well as our privilege. We just cannot wait and see what happens. The command of the Lord has already been given very clearly. It is for us to carry out His mission in the battle. I pray for you and support every step you are taking as you follow His leading.

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

In Defense of Officership

or, How in heaven's name can you begin to imagine a better way to win the world for Jesus?
by Stephen Court

You know, I'm pretty tired of hearing people slam officership. I recognize that not every example is the most attractive, captivating way to throw away your life. But the devil has really pulled one over on us to have devised such a pervasive disdain for the vocation.

Mind you, I'm writing to soldiers who are sold out and committed to winning the world for Jesus. The rest of you can surf on over to armybarmy.com. This is definitely not for you.

NO OPTIONS

Meanwhile, all of the rest of you who dismiss the idea of officership out of hand need to pay a little attention. First up, it's not like you have an option. That's right, you have no option. If you're still reading, you're not some slacker teenager who responded to an earnest appeal by a youth leader to accept Jesus with a casual, 'yeah, I'll take some,' and who have never graduated beyond an occasional Daily Bread reading.

You love Jesus. You're an active soldier. And you know what? You have no option.

Are all to become officers? Yes, all who are adapted for it. We go on the lines of adaptation. If you are cut out for being an Officer, an Officer you must be, and Officer you will be, or it will be so much the worse for you both here and hereafter' (William Booth, THE GENERAL'S LETTERS (1896), p20).

You see, I only want what's best for you! And officership is definitely the best kind of life any warrior can imagine.

SATURATED INTENSITY

Think about it for a minute. You get to invest all of your energies, all of your passion, all of your gifts and skills and abilities towards the fulfillment of the

mission to win the world for Jesus. So your days are filled with prayer, Bible saturation, evangelism, and discipleship.

There's no down time. And the Army provides for your needs while your at it. So you have no worries.

I know a few who are afraid to sign up because they want to protect their freedom. They've missed the boat. The Biblical concept of freedom comes only when we sell ourselves away to slavery. With slavery to Jesus comes freedom. Until these 'freedom-lovers' sign up, they'll never optimize their impact, never accomplish God's plan A for them.

Sure there are other things you could do. You could get rich and donate a billion dollars to minority college scholarships. You could invent some drug that will cure AIDS. You could get famous galloping around the weekend gridiron.

But stop and look at those puny pursuits. Who wants to be a millionaire? These pursuits pale in comparison with leading warriors in the eternal conflict against the devil and his armies. And besides, all you'd end up with is educated, healthy, entertained sinners agonizing eternally in hell. Now, you may be called by God to do something specifically like one of those professions. Fine. God bless you.

THE FEW?

But for everyone else, it's your responsibility to prepare for officership. Every good soldier prepares for officership in the hope that she will be considered qualified to take on vocational leadership in the Fist of the Body of Christ (aka The Salvation Army).

"Why should the war suffer? Why should the enemy triumph? Why should the battle languish for want of leaders when you are the very people, possess the very gifts- have been saved for the very purpose of carrying it on?" (William Booth, 1886. THE GENERAL'S LETTERS. p20).

Exactly. And there's no life like it. You are best positioned to fulfill the mission as an officer. There are no worldly entrapments. There are no limitations or restrictions. There is nothing but the prospect of much hot and furious fighting, saving souls from hell for heaven forever, and ultimate victory and glory pay.

So, what I'm saying, from my experience, is that there is absolutely nothing I'd rather be doing- except to be doing it better. My friends make big money in the world. But how can a pay cheque compare to leading the Army of God, building the Body of Christ, guiding the Family of God, heading up construction of the Temple of God, ruling in the Kingdom of God?

"If you are qualified for this business, I want you to set your house in order. Bid farewell to your loved ones" (William Booth, 1886. The General's Letters. p19).

And GO!

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

Alien Outreach

by Steve Carroll, Jr.

A few years ago four teens at a small divisional event in Massachusetts decided that God had made them "different" for a purpose. After a few hours lively bowling (where one of them was thrown down the alley but didn't quite make it to the pins), they spent the rest of the night under the stars talking about everything: from wondering how afghans can keep you warm if they have so many holes to the theological implications of the existence of extra-terrestrials. The next day something happened.

That morning they were challenged by the guest speaker to live differently. The speaker made it clear that God wanted His children to be in the world among non-Christians leading lives that were distinct. They were to be aliens. This appealed to these four guys, who were already considered the divisional clowns. Now they had an excuse. With the anthem "I wanna be just like me," they took on the name Alien Outreach and traveled the division, showing up at corps dances, parties, divisional roller skating and any other youth events. The early members made up chants and put together dances to popular Christian songs like "Jesus Freak." They were successful. People joined in when they broke out in song. Once they even had the entire divisional youth group chanting with them. Then God challenged them a second time. They realized that they were not really as different as they had originally planned. Popular, yes; different, no. They made a commitment that night to challenge their peers to live lifestyles that were so radically different that people would know they were Christians. Since then, Alien Outreach has grown from four guys to four separate ministry teams, with a total of 45 active members. Each team has its own medium for ministry as well as its own character. The teams travel separately and occasionally come together for larger events which AO has named "Landings." Every team has a leader who began the team because he or she saw a need or felt that a certain medium would be effective.

The AO Drama Team

Drama was the first tool AO used; in the beginning it was almost all they did. The drama troupe still remains the most active of the ministry teams and is used extensively by the Massachusetts division. "We don't do skits," team leader Chris Long explained. "We seek God to find the most effective way of getting our message across. Sometimes we get real serious and personal, other times we want people to laugh. We will do anything, any time." The drama team doesn't

just act, they rely heavily on crazy antics and outrageous stunts, and audience participation is common.

Most material performed by the drama team is written by members of the team or by other AO members.

The AO Worship Band

"I don't care how good you are as long as you are walking closely with God and you are willing to practice," Jimmy Eager boldly declares to his ever-changing group of musicians. Jimmy, who at 19 works full time as a needs assessment counselor in a Boston Area homeless shelter, loves to worship God! "I do it any chance I get." He leads his corps worship team, is active in the divisional praise band and still finds time to train and lead the AO team. The AO worship team usually leads worship at least once a month. Amazingly, while they have a core of regulars, every time they have participated in a program the band has had different musicians. Jimmy sees this as both a challenge and a joy. "It means we are growing. As long as they are dedicated to the event they commit to, we can always find a place for them. The main goal is that they have a solid testimony. If they are not walking with God, they have no right to be singing about it!"

The Dead Evangelists' Society

This group includes the five members of AO who feel a responsibility for delivering the message at AO events. They spend much of their free time studying the words of the great evangelists from the past. (as well as some who are current). A great emphasis is placed on early Army history and on current preaching and evangelism techniques. The group meets twice a month to pray for each other, trade books and share experiences. Seventeen-year-old Donnie Piercy, who is already a gifted speaker, reveals that "The hardest part about preaching is that once I finish, everybody is going to watch how I live everyday. I try to be honest and open about myself so people know that I still struggle with lots of things."

The NNE team

This ministry team, in its early stages, includes four guys and two girls from the Northern New England Division who feel compelled to get the youth of their division excited about serving God. They have vowed to accomplish this using any means they can. After practicing for two months they are joined the Massachusetts teams in a series of Holy Week meetings. Steve Guest, a former member of the drama team, is helping to start AO in Northern New England. "Once we get our feet wet we will go to our own division and set it on fire," he said. "I can't wait!"

The Christian Underground

AO also publishes a monthly Internet newsletter aimed at exciting Salvation Army youth. Its purpose is to help equip young Salvationists for ongoing ministry, as well as motivate them to action. The Christian Underground has featured such writers as Steve and Sharon Bussey, who are the youth mission and evangelism specialists for the Eastern Territory, and Matt Costley, the student pastor for the Holy Trinity Church of Brompton, one of the largest churches in England. But the bulk of the articles are submitted by everyday Army young people who are wrestling with real problems and are willing to share the answers they have found so far. The direct circulation of the Christian Underground is pushing 1,000 people, mostly young people and youth leaders in the Eastern Territory, but with a growing number of national and international subscribers.

Alien Outreach is different. While they are all Salvationist dedicated to the Army, the groups were not started by the Army and they organize and develop their own ministry. A commitment is required of any one who would like to join. "All we ask is that they be willing to practice what they are going to preach, which means living the radically distinct Christian life to which God calls everyone," explains 20-year-old Josh Jones, who is viewed as the groups spiritual leader. "Our message needs to be heard. Being a Christian means changing your citizenship from earth to Heaven, than becoming ambassadors and trying to get others do the same."

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

12 Year Old Sex

FEBRUARY 6TH, 1884

by Catherine Booth

At a large meeting at Exeter Hall, London, called to protest against the State regulation of vice in England, Catherine Booth, delivered the following speech. The age of assent at that time was 12. Through the efforts of The Salvation Army the age was raised to 16. The resolution to which she spoke read as follows:--

"That this meeting looks with confidence to the House of Commons, and to Her Majesty's Ministers, to complete the work already commenced, by the total repeal of the so-called Contagious Diseases Acts, and hopes to see the Government of our country cleared from all complicity with the traffickers in vice. It trusts that laws may be passed in the future having more regard to the equal treatment of men and women, and for the better protection of the young; and requests the Chairman to sign a Petition to this effect, on behalf of this meeting, and send copies of the Resolutions to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P.; the Marquis of Hartington, the Earl of Northbrook, and Sir W. Vernon Harcourt, M.P."

Mrs. Booth said:-- Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I feel that I can most heartily move the resolution which you have just heard read. I can do so, because with its fundamental doctrine, I am agreed. The next best thing to doing the right, is to be willing to pause and retract when we have done wrong. I take it as a sign of nobility, either in an individual, or in a Government when a false step has been taken, either through inadvertence--or, as Mr. Gladstone says, 'through obscurity'--for he says these Acts were introduced into the English Statute Book in obscurity. I take it as a sign of nobility, if one having made a false step is willing to retract it. (Cheers.) And therefore, I gratefully, as one of the women of England, acknowledge the action of the English Government in thus retracing its steps. And I also praise God fervently for the wisdom given to the Government in the re-consideration of this question--and I earnestly pray, (and I am sure every pure-hearted man and woman will say

'Amen'), that God will continue to give this wisdom to the Government, and will enable them presently to blot off from the Statute Book laws so infamous.

Apart from this rectifying action on the part of the Government, I must confess that the deepest feeling of my soul in rising to speak on this subject is that of intense shame! shame that it should be necessary at this period of our national history, to stand on this Exeter Hall platform to plead for the repeal of such measures as those you have discussed to-night.

I can only conceive of one greater shame possible, and that would be, to shrink from the necessity which has been imposed upon us.

I do not know how other friends feel, but I have felt almost ashamed that I have become only recently acquainted with this question. Having been engaged every day of my life in striving to destroy the roots not only of unchastity, but of all impurity, I considered that I was doing the best thing to promote this kind of purity--but when dear Mrs. Butler, some two years ago, sent me a pamphlet, I felt reproved that I had not acquainted myself with the matter sooner, for I feel that every true woman in England, who will really examine the question, must feel bound to give her influence towards the repeal of these abominable Acts. I have been told, and I dare say our friends on the platform have been told, that it is a disgrace for a woman to meddle with this question. But I say if measures are passed which are so obnoxious that it is a disgrace and abomination to discuss them--the odium of such disgrace rests with those who instituted them. (Cheers.) And not with those who offer themselves as the butt of public ridicule and scorn in their efforts to get them repealed. (Cheers.)

For my own part I look forward with admiration and reverence on those noble few who have taken the lead in this movement, and especially on dear Mrs. Butler, who has endured the worst insinuations of bad men, and the contempt of uninformed or weak women, in carrying forward this agitation for repeal. I say all honour to them. Future generations will call them blessed. (Hear, hear.) Their experience has been to us a wonderful and beautiful exemplification of the truth that to the pure all things are pure. And nothing more so than the exposure of impurity for its destruction! May God bless the noble band who have been enduring for sixteen years ignominy, contempt, and misrepresentation, our Chairman amongst the number, and all who have helped them.

1st. I would say don't allow this to be regarded as a class question. I have seen several notices in the newspapers of the last few days with reference to this movement, and I see that the opposers of this agitation are particularly careful to speak of the legislation which we are considering, as for a particular class at whom primarily the law aims--but I say we must utterly repudiate this representation--for although this question

does refer to a particular class of the community, it is a national question, and will react with terrific force of consequences on the whole population, if this system should be kept in operation. A great French writer has said it is the law of eternal justice that man cannot degrade woman without himself becoming degraded, (Hear, hear), and alas! we have abundant proof of that in history. Therefore let us watch with eagle eye,--and I intend to do my share, as far as other arduous duties will allow me, in helping this movement,--I say, let us be careful, for this action in respect to women will have a terrible reaction on the men of England. We cannot degrade women without degrading men. We find wherever woman has been regarded merely as the instrument of man's pleasure or gain there, men are low and mean and sensual, and I was going to say devilish. (Applause.) And I was also going to say that I thanked God it was so, because justice is the foundation of all real improvement. We have as much right to be considered as men--and perhaps future generations will find out that we are quite as important in the scale of being. I sometimes smile when I hear of 'Woman's influence on Society,' as if woman were not part of society, and in this country, at all events, the larger half. (Laughter.) If all the women had been of my mind these laws would never have taken effect. I would have fought against them while I had a drop of blood left in my body. (Cheers.) No police officer or magistrate should ever have made me submit to them. I admire the women who have thrown themselves from buildings in preference to submitting to them, and I believe that these women will prove to have been pioneers in this movement for moral purity. We know the truest test of a nation's moral condition, is the sanctity or profanity of its treatment of women--we know this, and therefore I say that any measures or laws which tend to break down those great barriers which God has placed around the natural modesty of woman are the greatest outrages which can be perpetrated on any people. And the women of England, and the men too, ought to combine to wipe them from the Statute Book--and, unless they repent, wipe the makers of them out of our Senate,--God help us to do so! Why do I call it outrage? Because these measures make vice a necessity. I am not ashamed to say that it is only a few months since I took that idea in, since I understood what that meant. It seemed to me too monstrous to believe. I thought the promoters of the movement must be exaggerating, I could not believe my eyes or ears that it was propounded in this Christian country that vice was a necessity. What would our forefathers have said to that? Could we not refer this to experience. Have we not some of us had fathers of whom we have been proud, and brothers and husbands whose purity we would vouch for as equal to our own? Have we not some of us sons of whose purity we are as confident as that of our daughters? Can we not summon our experience, and put our foot on this monstrous doctrine of devils that vice is a necessity? (Cheers.) Vice a necessity! Surely there are some necessities that you are bound to look after, and that the Great God above will hold you answerable for looking after. These necessities are to look out for the purity and liberty of your children; to look after the influence of England on the nations of the earth; to look out that this

nation does not fall away by its impurity; as we have heard to night, and as history has told you that many nations have already done. To look to the condition of the untaught and uncared for masses; to look after the spread and propagation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. These are necessities that we have to look after. LET THE DEVIL LOOK AFTER THE NECESSITY OF VICE.

(Applause.) But I say as a Christian, that no Government has any right to have anything to do with the making of provision for vice and trying to increase temptation thereto by making out that vice can be indulged with safety. Oh! thank God that is a lie! (Hear, hear.) Do you think God Almighty is going to be cheated out of his penalties by the Acts of the Select Committees? (Laughter and Applause.) Oh! dear no! I read of some of the lamentations of these foolish people of whom Solomon spoke--of people who had been led as an ox to the slaughter--thinking it was perfectly safe. But the biter was bitten. Young men mind! Do not take these foolish assurances, or in your case, also, the biter will be bitten, God will not be cheated of his penalties and retribution for crime in that fashion. A FALSE SECURITY IS WORSE THAN NO SECURITY AT ALL. Beware of these houses over the door of which instead if its being written 'This is the way to Hell, this is the gate to the pit' is written 'You may walk in here with perfect safety.' Beware! for the consequences of your sin will overtake you, and you will be like those I was reading about, in that you dared to set God's laws which are written in your consciences--at defiance. But my time is going.

I say further that this legislation is of the devil because it proposes to put vice on an equality with virtue. How does this sound in English ears? Can you believe it? I say let us away with such legislation --this has nothing to do with party politics. I have nothing to do with politics, but I have to do with righteousness--let us insist on this great moral question being settled irrespective of parties. This is a question which ought to arouse the conscience of the whole nation, then I say do not allow it to be regarded as a party question.

2nd. I would say:--Let every man and woman whose eyes are open to the tendency of these Acts remember that the genius, the spirit of these Acts, that which formed them and carried them will not rest here. The same demon which would level all distinctions between vice and virtue--morality and licentiousness--has got his eye on your religious liberties!! Look out! We have need to remember that 'the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.' (Hear, hear). We of the Salvation Army know something of this, sadly too well. (Hear, hear). The same rulers who patronise vice--the same rulers who barter over the souls and bodies of unsuspecting children, pass police regulations to put down and root out all manifestations of vital godliness

wherever they find it, and many of them are now engaged in the Herod-like work, hunting for the God Child in order to destroy Him. They aim at the destruction of your religious liberties, and it behoves every Christian man in this country--lay or ministerial--every man or woman as far as his or her ability will allow, to mount the walls of Zion, and sound down the sleeping ranks of the professed soldiers of the Cross, the alarm note that they should be up and watching that this fiend should not take away liberties for which our forefathers fought and bled.

One word more in conclusion. How are we to fight this evil? You must work, work--and I would say with reference to this movement as I do with the one with which I am more intimately connected--if you want to help us in the great strife against evil, in the hand to hand fight with the devil--spread information--scatter intelligence--be at the trouble to open the eyes of your neighbours and friends. Give your friends pamphlets and books. I can tell you some of them have astonished me. I read some paragraphs taken from the report of a debate in the House of Commons, which made me doubt my eyesight, with respect to the age at which female children should be answerable for their own ruin. I could not help the blood rushing to my temples with indignant shame. I could not help rubbing my eyes and reading again and saying, do my eyes deceive me? Could this ever have happened in the House of Commons in England? Oh! my God, are we come to this? I did not think we were so low as this--that one member should suggest that the age of these innocents should be heightened to 14, and that another suggested it should be not so high. Another that it should be reduced to 10, and oh! my God, pleaded that it was hard for a man--HARD--for a man! --having a charge brought against him, not to be able to plead the consent of a child like that. I would not tell what, but for the grace of God, I should feel like doing to the man who brought that argument to bear on my child. (Applause.) I have a sweet innocent little girl--many of you have also--of 14, as innocent as an infant of any such things--what, if a man should make an application of this doctrine to her. Well may the higher classes take such care of their little girls? Well may they be so careful never to let them go out without efficient protectors. But what is to become of the little girls of poor unprotected widows? Of the little girls of the working classes of this country? I do not know who these men were who discussed this matter of ages. It is a good thing I do not just now. But I think we ought to know. Still, I do not care who they were. I say I could not have believed that in this our country such a discussion amongst so-called gentlemen could have taken place. I talk a good deal about the masses, and I know a good deal about them, but I am bound to say that I do not believe there could be found twelve roughs in any tap-room in England who would be parties to, or tolerate such a discussion. (Loud Applause.)

I think in view of such discussions and their consequences, it is time that we women had some kind of capacity bestowed upon us for looking after ourselves, and after our children!! (Applause.) Then, I say again, work, work, and spread information! Don't think you will repeal these Acts by wishing them repealed. Don't imagine you will repeal them by sentimentalising about them. Nor even by praying about them, unless you work too. It is one of the greatest mistakes that people pray their hypocritical prayers, and then sit down and do nothing. We of the Salvation Army believe in prayer--we spend whole nights at it often,--but we believe in work too. We believe God has conditioned his working on our working, and if we will use the power and influence, and talent, and spirit which God has given us, He will work with us, and God and man will combine to blot out these infamous laws for ever!

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.

Street Level Apologetic

by J. Edward Read

Commissioner Ed Read was The Salvation Army International Evangelist until his retirement. Today he is in demand as a noted speaker and author.

Ray is not broke, but he's not rich either. Oh, in the old B.C. days, he made a lot of money. And lost it all - through dishonesty. Somebody did not pay what they owed him.

But Ray is not bitter about that. In fact, he says, "If I hadn't been flat financially, I probably never would have realized my need of Christ."

So Ray knows as much as most of us about money- its power, its fascination, and its perils. That's why he won't make a coffee cup the first step to Mammon.

"Why not?" his friends (some of them Christians) ask. "You just paid for a beverage." He responds, "The moment I roll up the rim to see if I got a winner, I prove I hoped for more than a cup of coffee."

When he got saved, the Lord gave Ray two powerful passions: one, a hunger for spiritual truth as set out in Scripture; two, a deep desire to help others find what he found, eternal life with Jesus.

And when someone finds the Lord, Ray begins discipling him or her. One of them, a lady, brought a big addiction with her, the hard-to-break habit of gambling. It's for her sake too, that Ray will not compromise. "Where would my influence with that convert go?" he asks, "If I rolled up the rim?"

I completely agree with his position on this. And I add one more thing: gambling is enslaving because covetousness is idolatry.

The roll of the rim, the toss of the dice, the ticket on the lottery all confess one thing: chance rules my life.

The Salvationist who recites doctrine two of our creed says he believes the infinitely perfect God is 'Governor of all things.' I love that! It is the basis of

peace in a chaotic world. I lay my head down every night on a pillow of the sovereignty of God.

That confidence would go the moment I began to worship Lady Luck. You who roll up the rim, even if you win a million, lose every time. Ray, a new Christian, got hold of that truth, and it helps explain the developing- and beautiful- fruitfulness of his life and witness.

Copyright © 2000 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

To comment on this article write to JAC@armybarmy.com

Please include your name, address, and email address. Your comments may be published.