

# **JOURNAL OF AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY**

# **JAC Online**

**Issue 56, August 2008 - September 2008**

Copyright © 2008 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

## In This Issue

### JOURNAL OF AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY

Issue 56, August 2008 – September 2008

Editorial Introduction *page 3*

Captain Stephen Court

Mission *page 5*

Lieut.-Colonel Ian Southwell

What the College Taught me *page 13*

Lieut.-Colonel Raymond Finger

Nehemiah: Man with a Cause *page 17*

Lieut.-Colonel Raymond Finger

Advance! *page 22*

Major Allen Satterlee

Two Grand Old Williams: Mr. Gladstone meets General Booth *page 24*

Tom Aitken

Debating with the Dead: William Gladstone reads Catherine Booth

*page 36*

Tom Aitken

Button Holing *page 47*

Commissioner Wesley Harris

Rights and Responsibilities of Covenant *page 48*

Captain Michael Ramsay

Are we a Metaphor? *page 56*

Anthony Castle

## **Editorial Introduction**

by Captain Stephen Court

Greetings in Jesus' name, friends. Mercy and peace to you from God our Father. I trust the battle progresses well on your front.

Welcome to another great issue of JAC, #56. There has been a recent bump in JAC archive interest in the Salvosphere as Cadets in different countries, and other keen Salvos are dipping into the treasure of several hundred articles on and around our great passion and cause. The articles from #56 will take an honoured place in that August collection a few months from the August 1 2008 release, as this issue is chock full of serious contributions.

We're excited to welcome a few new JAC writers in this issue as well as some familiar names to the table of contents.

Lieut-Colonel Ian Southwell, until recently the IHQ representative for Training around the world, and currently the President the Australia Southern Territory Missionary Fellowship, delivered a lecture on Salvo global mission to Cadets that provided the basis for this article: Mission. This is a good refresher and resource for those so inclined (we'd like to think all JACos are so inclined!).

Lieut-Colonel Raymond Finger, Chief Secretary, has two pieces in the current JAC. The first is the sequel to last issue's Nehemiah: Man with a mission, called Nehemiah: Man with a cause, in which he plays out the leadership mission of Nehemiah. This is an original lecture to Cadets.

The second Finger offering is a lecture delivered to Cadets entitled, What The College Taught Me, But I Could Only Learn As An Officer. You can't buy this kind of juice from senior leadership. You can only get it in JAC!

Major Allen Satterlee, well-known Salvo author, has sounded the War Cry to Salvos around the world in Advance! "To not advance is to die" argues the Major in this compelling piece.

Commissioner Wesley Harris continues blessing JAC and its readership with pithy thought. This month the Commissioner is on about Button Holing.

We're blessed to have author Tom Aitken contribute related articles from lectures delivered on Prime Minister Gladstone and the Booths. Aitken is the author of Blood And Fire, Tsar and Commissioner: The Salvation Army in Russia, 1907-1923. In Debating With The Dead, Aitken analyses the Gladstone's margin notes of a Catherine Booth book that had come into his hands. In Two Grand Old Williams: Mr. Gladstone meets General Booth, he breaks down their meeting around In Darkest England and the Way Out.

Captain Michael Ramsay's favourite subject seems to be covenant. And he gives us more meaty stuff in Covenant Rights And Responsibilities. It is another contribution to help Salvos understand our important commitment.

And Anthony Castle, whose JAC article "Are We A Metaphor?", continues to stir up passionate debate in several territories, has offered us an updated edition of that article.

As usual, I invite you to tell ten friends to plunge in to your pick of the Issue. Enjoy.

Much grace,  
The Editors

## Mission

by Lieut.-Colonel Ian Southwell  
*President,  
The Salvation Army,  
Australia Southern Territory World Mission Fellowship*

### Jesus – a Man with a Mission

The Gospels leave us in no doubt that Jesus' greatest desire and aim was to bring the whole world to accept the kingship of God his Father.

Mark 1:15

15 "The time has come," he said. "The kingdom of God is near. Repent and believe the good news!"

Matthew 10:5-7

5 'These twelve Jesus sent out with the following instructions: "Do not go among the Gentiles or enter any town of the Samaritans. 6 Go rather to the lost sheep of Israel. 7 As you go, preach this message: 'The kingdom of heaven is near.'

Initially, Jesus wanted to gain the support of the chosen people of Israel for his mission to take the good news to the world. They had been chosen, not for privilege, but to fulfil God's initial vision for their great ancestor Abram and the world (Genesis 12:2-3):

2 "I will make you into a great nation  
and I will bless you;

I will make your name great,  
and you will be a blessing.

3 I will bless those who bless you,  
and whoever curses you I will curse;  
and all peoples on earth  
will be blessed through you." (My emphasis)

Hence his focus initially was on the 'lost sheep of Israel.' If they could be 'found' (see the parables in Luke 15), they could be put to work world-wide.

When Samaritans came to hear him near Jacob's well, Jesus saw 'fields ready for harvest' (John 4: 35-38).

35 Do you not say, 'Four months more and then the harvest'? I tell you, open your eyes and look at the fields! They are ripe for harvest. 36 Even now the reaper draws his wages, even now he harvests the crop for eternal life, so that the sower and the reaper may be glad together. 37 Thus the saying 'One sows and another reaps' is true. 38 I sent you to reap what you have not worked for. Others have done the hard work, and you have reaped the benefits of their labour."

When Greek seekers came to visit him just before his passion, Jesus could see this as a foretaste of the world being drawn to him (John 12:20-32).

20 Now there were some Greeks among those who went up to worship at the Feast. 21 They came to Philip, who was from Bethsaida in Galilee, with a request. "Sir," they said, "we would like to see Jesus." 22 Philip went to tell Andrew; Andrew and Philip in turn told Jesus.

23 Jesus replied, "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified. 24 I tell you the truth, unless a kernel of wheat falls to the ground and dies, it remains only a single seed. But if it dies, it produces many seeds. 25 The man who loves his life will lose it, while the man who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life. 26 Whoever serves me must follow me; and where I am, my servant also will be. My Father will honour the one who serves me.

27 "Now my heart is troubled, and what shall I say? 'Father, save me from this hour'? No, it was for this very reason I came to this hour. 28 Father, glorify your name!"

Then a voice came from heaven, "I have glorified it, and will glorify it again." 29 The crowd that was there and heard it said it had thundered; others said an angel had spoken to him.

30 Jesus said, "This voice was for your benefit, not mine. 31 Now is the time for judgment on this world; now the prince of this world will be driven out. 32 But I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself." (My emphasis)

### **Our biblical mandate for mission**

Following his atoning death and resurrection, Jesus commissioned and equipped his followers to take the message to the world.

Luke 24:45-49

45 Then he opened their minds so they could understand the Scriptures. 46 He told them, "This is what is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, 47 and repentance and forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. 48 You are witnesses of these things. 49 I am going to send you what my Father has promised; but stay in the city until you have been clothed with power from on high." (My emphasis)

Matthew 28:16-20

16 Then the eleven disciples went to Galilee, to the mountain where Jesus had told them to go. 17 When they saw him, they worshiped him; but some doubted. 18 Then Jesus came to them and said, "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. 19 Therefore go and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, 20 and teaching them to obey everything I have commanded you. And surely I am with you always, to the very end of the age." (My emphasis)

Acts 1:8

8 But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth." (My emphases)

The Acts of the Apostles outlines the progress of that mission from Jerusalem to Judea, to Samaria, to Asia and to Europe within a generation. Your reading of church and Salvation Army history will help you comprehend the spread of Christ's message 'to the ends of the earth'.

The task has not been easy. Jesus never promised it would be! Christians have faced opposition by followers of other great world religions such as: Judaism, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism; and also in areas where animistic practices are common. 'Missionary' became a misunderstood and reviled term because certain world powers manipulated

the efforts of sincere Christians. Missionaries were identified with traders, enslavers and colonising invaders in the 18th to 20th centuries in some parts of Africa and China. Sadly, less-than-Christlike behaviour by some followers of Christ in certain situations reflected badly on the church and our Saviour. The pressures of constantly re-teaching the message to each new generation take their toll, too. Fast progress is rare.

### **International overview of Salvation Army mission**

“Where can I find such heathen as these?” William Booth asked as he saw the poverty and degradation in the East End of London in the 1860’s. His heart for mission throbbed in tune with the heart of his Saviour. Members of the successively named East London Special Services Mission, East London Christian Mission, The Christian Mission and The Salvation Army fanned out – officially or unofficially – across England. Then they moved on to Scotland and the Channel Isles (1879); USA, Ireland and Australia (1880); France (1881); Canada, India, Switzerland and Sweden (1882); Sri Lanka, South Africa, New Zealand, Isle of Man and Pakistan (1883).

In other words, within five years of becoming The Salvation Army, we had outposts in Europe, North America, Africa, Australasia and Asia – five continents!

Frederick Coutts, p.140 points out that, ‘National boundaries meant less and less to him (William Booth). “I thought”, he once wrote to Bramwell, “that the word ‘foreign’ had been banished from Salvation Army language.” “In our attempts to save the lost”, he declared, “there must be no limitations to human brotherhood.”’

By William Booth’s promotion to Glory in 1912, Army work had commenced in 35 other countries. On his death bed, he made this request of his son, Bramwell:

‘I have been thinking very much about during these last few nights about China. I greatly regret that the Lord has not permitted me to raise our flag among that wonderful people. Promise me that you will begin the work in China.’ (Check-hung Yee, p.2)  
Today The Salvation Army works in 115 countries and uses 175 languages including tribal languages to communicate the Gospel (The Salvation Army Year Book 2008. p. 29f).

The following map comes from the back inside cover of The Year Book 2008.

Namibia and Mali, not marked on the map, now have a Salvation Army presence in 2008.

The scope of our work

The scope of our work largely depends on the greatest needs of the people in the country in which we work.

- Proclaiming the Gospel is the first and foremost priority, in languages the national people understand and in culturally sensitive manners.
- Needed administration in business, finance and property especially.
- Medical programmes (hospitals, clinics, mobile, and specialist centres).

- Education programmes (schools from kindergarten to high school, vocational education, staff training, universities and colleges).
- Social services (residential; day care; addiction dependency support; services to armed forces; emergency relief operations; services to the community such as: courts and prisons, counselling, employment programmes, accommodation, anti-human trafficking, and agriculture projects including water supply, electricity supplies and micro-credit projects.)
- Training of local people to provide ministry and leadership in all the fields mentioned above in a Christian context and within the ethos of The Salvation Army.

#### Personnel Needs, and Ideal Qualifications

##### Who do we need to do this work?

- Persons with a deep love for the Lord, with an established prayer life and knowledge of God's word and the Christ-culture.
- Persons with psychological, emotional and social maturity (people-skills), and in good physical health.
- Persons with specialist skills in one or more of the areas mentioned above in The Scope of our Work section above.
- Persons adaptable enough to work in different cultures with limited resources and, if needed, in different languages to their own.
- Persons who are humble enough to be teachable.
- Persons with enough knowledge and skill so as to be able, ideally, to work without a translator in a language other than their own. Some can be learned in Australia such as: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese (Mandarin), Hindi, Indonesian, Korean, Russian or other European languages. Arabic and Nepalese may be helpful for the future.
- Persons prepared to work long hours, often in difficult climatic conditions, with few opportunities to de-brief; all the time attempting to reflect the beauty of Jesus in what they do.
- Persons prepared to be 'servant leaders' to equip national personnel to take over their roles.
- Persons prepared to serve for two or three years without any return to their homeland that is paid for by the Army – except in the case of the death or serious illness of a parent or child.
- Officers with most of the qualifications outlined above, usually with a minimum of three to five years of good experience in their homeland.

A quarterly Service Opportunities List is issued to all territories by the International Personnel Department of International Headquarters. This list is compiled from what territorial/command leaders indicate are the current needs that are impossible to cover within that territory/command. National visa restrictions make movements of personnel around the world for service very difficult at times. Your territorial personnel secretary or overseas personnel secretary could keep you up-to-date with current needs.

Prayerfully consider the needs listed now and prayerfully reflect on the potential needs such as countries in the '10-30 Window' roughly between latitudes 10o and 30o north of the equator (North Africa, Middle East, China, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam; plus former Soviet Union countries, and North Korea ...)

Share these needs and opportunities with suitably qualified soldiers you know. Some of these may be delighted to serve internationally and return to their corps enriched in spirit and experience – or step into officership.

Prayerfully consider the gifts and talents God has graciously given you. Could these be used beyond your country in the interests of Christ's mission? Should you be offering for such service? Should you be preparing for such service with language, cultural or other specialist skills such as those mentioned above?

If you are an officer and have skills, abilities and availability to serve beyond these shores, inform your leaders – in writing. Keep on reminding them of your availability year by year – in writing! Learn all you can about the scope and needs of Army work internationally. You will be asked where and in what type of specialised field you feel you can best serve to fulfil Christ's mission. Seek to equip yourselves with knowledge, skills and attitudes – including, above all, a passionate love for the Lord – that will allow you to be the most use in his service.

What if you are a soldier, with dedication and skills outlined above? Two-year or three-year terms of service are available in mission situations outside your homeland in many of our grant aided territories supported financially by The Salvation Army. Speak and write initially to your local corps officer or divisional commander about your conviction regarding doing mission service outside of your homeland. (They will be the first to interview and recommend you – or otherwise.) Outline your testimony to your relationship with God. Provide a CV (curriculum vitae) outlining your family situation, schooling, qualifications and professional experience. Indicate with your application how much notice you would need to give to your present employer. If you are married, you should make a joint application. If you have school-aged children, be sure to state this as early as possible and indicate their educational levels. As with officers, state where you believe your knowledge and skills would best be used. Be aware that processing applications may take six months to a year due to challenges of international communications, plus visa and work permit processing. Do not resign or seek leave from your present work until you have confirmation of acceptance and your actual appointment.

Seriously consider, however, if God is calling you to be an officer. My observation over 20 years of service out of my homeland is that you can do so much more and have better short and long-term support for international mission work if you are an officer. Of course, officers usually bring tested qualities of dedication and availability. Mostly they can serve as and where needed. Such availability makes a significant positive difference and opens doors to easier placement in international mission initially and on return to one's homeland.

Terms shorter than the standard three or two years have to be negotiated by the individual. Such negotiations need to take place with the territorial or command leader in the particular territory of proposed service rather than International Headquarters. Terms of service, travel costs, luggage support, insurance and so on all have to be

negotiated individually. For very short terms, they may become your responsibility entirely. Grant aided territories have little flexibility in these matters due to lack of available finance.

If you are a non-Salvationist friend of the Salvation Army with specialist skills and a heart for world mission, you can also be involved. Some of the staff at our secondary schools and hospitals in Africa have been dedicated Christians from other denominations. They were seeking opportunities to make positive differences in the lives of young Africans – and did so. This would apply particularly if your own church or associated mission agency cannot offer you suitable opportunities. All of the steps outlined for soldiers (full members of the Army) as outlined above would be required for you. Probably more detailed scrutiny would be given to your application and recommendations sought from your church minister and others who know you well. You will understand that we want to protect the reputation of The Salvation Army worldwide for high integrity and credibility. You would take similar steps for any who wanted to work in your denomination!

### **Financial Needs**

Most territories and commands in Third World Countries are grant aided from International Headquarters. To give the needed support to these Grant Aided Territories, International Headquarters needs increasing Self Denial giving from all territories.

Please set the example for others by giving at least One Week's Salary (allowance) on Missionary Sunday annually. My wife and I have done so for many years – even when we served in grant aided territories ourselves. Much of our Salvation Army work in the developing world would not be possible without the generous support of Salvationists and friend in the developed world.

### **Prayer Needs**

If you cannot go to the frontline for international mission service, please pray for those who do. Pray also for those national officers and soldiers who work there. They need all the spiritual and material support we can possibly give them.

News of Army work is readily available from many sources. For instance: <http://www1.salvationarmy.org/ihq/>, The Salvation Army International Headquarters website, carries much current news. Save it as a Favourite on your Internet browser!

The Salvation Army Year Book (annual); All the World (monthly); On Fire (fortnightly) are all excellent sources of information and inspiration.

World Mission Fellowship (or similar territorial support group)

The Salvation Army World Mission Fellowship in the Australian Southern Territory has been operating for 53 years (although under the name The Salvation Army Missionary Fellowship until October 2006). Our Fellowship supports the Overseas Personnel Office in this Territory. We do this by trying to keep the territory up-to-date with news about

officers and non-officers who serve internationally. We try to provide spiritual and moral support for such personnel before, during and after their overseas service.

Your territory may have an equivalent group. If not, you may want to encourage your territory to commence one.

Currently we have 244 members (including some from overseas) who, for a fee of (A) \$10.00 annually, receive the monthly (or bi-monthly) Intercessor Letter with news from our personnel around the world. Members also receive an annual Prayer Calendar (updated from time-to-time) with a person, family or other significant topic listed daily for prayer. Additionally, we have a weekly international prayer topic so that each Salvation Army territory, command or region is the focus for one week each year.

The Intercessor Letter can be delivered by post or electronically to save the environment and postage. Whatever we save, or fund-raise, the Fellowship uses the money to provide small Christmas recognitions for those on international service in grant aided territories; or a small recognition when they leave for or return to overseas service. If you are interested in becoming a member and obtaining our Intercessor Letter, contact our Secretary, Captain Tim Lynn at [timothy.lynn@aus.salvationarmy.org](mailto:timothy.lynn@aus.salvationarmy.org) or The World Mission Fellowship, PO Box 479, Blackburn, Vic 3130, Australia.

We hold a monthly meeting in Melbourne on the first Monday of each month (except January) currently at Inala Chapel, 220 Middleborough Road, Blackburn South, from 6.30 – 7.45 pm. In these meetings we receive reports from those serving internationally, spend time in prayer and usually hear from someone on homeland furlough or who has recently served internationally. Meetings are held for South Australian members and visitors four times a year at Norwood Citadel in Adelaide.

Having been supported in prayer and love gifts by the Fellowship during the 20 years of our service internationally, my wife and I commend to you membership of the Fellowship (or your territorial equivalent). The prayer support of the Fellowship is wonderful!

May I encourage any officer-readers to invite your people in each appointment to be members of your territorial fellowship as well? The more prayer support we have for those on the front line of international mission, the better they will be able to fulfil Christ's mission.

### **Conclusion**

The world mission of our Lord still continues today. If your area of mission can only be in your homeland, serve here faithfully. Give sacrificially to assist the mission. Pray for those serving internationally. Encourage your people to give and to pray as well. Look for those with potential to serve internationally and encourage them to prepare.

If you have skills, abilities and availability to serve beyond your shores, apply as outlined above as soon as possible. Learn all you can about the scope and needs of

mission work internationally. Seek to equip yourselves with knowledge, skills, attitudes and, above all, a passionate love for the Lord that will allow you to be the most useful in his service.

If you are still a student, seek courses of study that will help you make positive contributions to the lives of others in developing countries. Grow in your spiritual experience and be as involved as you can in your local corps. In so doing you will learn much that will help you to fulfil Christ's mission on earth in the years ahead.

Reference List:

Coutts, Frederick. 1974. *No Discharge in this War, A one volume history of The Salvation Army*. Hodder and Stoughton, London.

The Holy Bible, New International Version. 1978, 1980, 1985. International Bible Society, New York, USA.

The Salvation Army Year Book 2008. 2007. The Salvation Army International Headquarters, London.

Yee, Check-hung, *Good Morning China – The Chronicle of The Salvation Army in China 1916-2000*. 2005. The Salvation Army Crest Books, Virginia USA

**What the College Taught me**  
***But what I could only learn as an Officer***  
by Lieut.-Colonel Raymond Finger

Officership has evolved and it continues to do so and you hear it at best when speaking with older officers who reflectively say things like, ‘when I was a cadet’ or, ‘when I was your age’ or, ‘back in my day.....’

All they’re really saying is, ‘Officership is different now.’ But one thing has never changed and that is; this is an Officer Training College.

From time to time when I am in Canberra, travelling to and from the airport we pass Duntroon, the prestigious Royal Military College for officer training, where this country's finest military personnel are trained. Driving through the College can be quite an experience, to see pristine lawns, immaculate buildings and grounds with perfectly uniformed officers walking with distinctive military correctness, is impressive.

It seems to me that the objective of both Colleges may not be dissimilar, theirs, is military leadership, whilst ours is spiritual leadership.

I would not say that our language is the same, but our terminology may be similar, we would each speak of an enemy, we both teach strategy, and we have our own leadership “Bible.”

We each have our “rules” of engagement. We have corps, they have corps, we have divisions, and they have divisions, we have rank, they have rank. We are trained to lead and they are trained to lead.

That is the purpose for which Colleges like these exist to prepare people for battle, to help them know what to do when the moment comes.

I applied myself well during training, I studied, I was not an A grade achiever, but I worked hard and I felt ready to go to my first assignment with eager anticipation.

But you know, in training it all seemed so easy, we would hit and run, there one moment and gone the next, we had salvo celebrity status, we were a novelty. We were young, full of passion and enthusiasm, everyone loved being around cadets, we were gods and I think deep down we loved it.

When I was commissioned, I was appointed back to the Training College were I served for a further two years before being appointed to the Altona Corps.

But it wasn’t long before I became overwhelmed by the enormous difficulty and challenges that seemed harder than I had imagined. I was alone. I had so few able

people to help me in the battle. All the crowds had gone chasing after the new Cadets that had entered training.

The soft environment of the training college gave way to the rugged reality of living in the truth and it was then that my weakness, vulnerability, inexperience and spiritual immaturity were exposed, I felt naked and ashamed. I felt ill-equipped for what I needed to do, I began to realise that in fact, I knew so little.

I felt like a fraud, incompetent and in that moment of truthful reflection, I came to accept the reality that I had come to love the Army and Officership more than I loved God. The mission meant more than the Master.

My personal holiness was little more than legalism that instructed the way I should live and what I should teach. I served the Church with God at the fringe.

The college had given me the framework, the Bible knowledge, the doctrinal understanding, the time and space for spiritual reflection, instruction on principles and procedures, pastoral and practice.

Generally speaking, I received it only as learning and knowledge and failed to transition it as, the way of God within me.

My heart and passion was to, “go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” Mark 16:15.

I wanted to go and “do the work of an evangelist.” 2 Timothy 4:5

I felt I had learned what it was an Officer was called do, but I had failed to learn what an Officer is intended to be. I had not as readily learned what it was to be a man of God, a priest, a prophet or a pastor.

Since that time my Officership has been a quest for spiritual depth and I know live in the mystery of Philippians chapter 2 and verse 5.

It matters little to me how you contextualise the verse within the chapter, but I am captured by the idea of the mind of Christ, knowing full well that it is the mind that instructs so much of our being.

The truth is, I think this is the real deep down quest of all Christians that was spoken of by Paul when he wrote.

Philippians 3:7-10 (Amplified Translation)

7But whatever former things I had that might have been gains to me, I have come to consider as one combined loss for Christ's sake.

8Yes, furthermore, I count everything as loss compared to the possession of the priceless privilege (the overwhelming preciousness, the surpassing worth, and supreme

advantage) of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord and of progressively becoming more deeply and intimately acquainted with Him [of perceiving and recognizing and understanding Him more fully and clearly]. For His sake I have lost everything and consider it all to be mere rubbish (refuse, dregs), in order that I may win (gain) Christ (the Anointed One),

9And that I may [actually] be found and known as in Him, not having any [self-achieved] righteousness that can be called my own, based on my obedience to the Law's demands (ritualistic uprightness and supposed right standing with God thus acquired), but possessing that [genuine righteousness] which comes through faith in Christ (the Anointed One), the [truly] right standing with God, which comes from God by [saving] faith.

10[For my determined purpose is] that I may know Him [that I may progressively become more deeply and intimately acquainted with Him, perceiving and recognizing and understanding the wonders of His Person more strongly and more clearly], and that I may in that same way come to know the power out flowing from His resurrection [which it exerts over believers], and that I may so share His sufferings as to be continually transformed [in spirit into His likeness even] to His death, [in the hope]

All of this has something to do with the contemplative life that is simply that part of me that goes further into Him.

I live content with the mystery of a spiritual life that goes from depth to depth and a sense of God that cannot be understood as much as experienced and lived. And for me it is like entering the matrix, of a world within a world, connected and lived and despite my inability to know it fully, some how it is understood.

I have known the limitations of trying to lead out of my own logic and learning, and as a result made so many mistakes that at the time, I thought were all right, but I am of the view that I now lead out of spiritual soundness and depth. With I think, fewer errors of judgement.

In my ministry these days, I am frequently challenged by presenting issues that are beyond my natural self and have to do with ethics and values and sometimes the challenge of managing the tension between principles and compassion.

I am so dependant upon the mind of Christ, but understand only too well that the mind of Christ lives within my humanity, with all its faults, frailty and inconsistency.

The spiritual depth of my leadership could only have come about by being faced with the different and at times difficult challenges of ministry.

When confronted by environments that required my being there, that required my attention, that threw me into chaos and at times where I felt compromised, they took me out of my world of certainty and I either surrendered to it, or rose to it.

During my days in training, if you had asked me if I had surrendered my life to Christ, my answer would have been, absolutely yes! But I have come to discover that the real test of the surrendered life, is when it is lived among people and not in the pulpit.

Real surrender to God comes on the battlefield after you roll out every big gun you've got, and find that you are losing ground big time.

Real surrender to God comes after you try every formula; strategy and idea you have, only to find that you can't even get out of the starting blocks.

Real surrender to God comes, when you find that all the knowledge, learning and information you have, doesn't mean a thing to those who sit in your company with problems that you have no idea what to do about.

Real surrender to God comes when your best intentions are misunderstood and people are walking out the door determined they will not be back.

Real surrender to God comes when you arrive at the moment of knowing:  
I count everything as loss compared to the possession of the priceless privilege (the overwhelming preciousness, the surpassing worth, and supreme advantage) of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord and of progressively becoming more deeply and intimately acquainted with Him.

The college directed me in applied spiritual learning, but I only learnt it as an officer, because I had to live it and live in it, so as to discover myself, my limitations, weaknesses and how much more I needed to know.

The college exposed me to spiritual warfare, but I could not be a leader in spiritual warfare when every Wednesday and Sunday I went out on placement for a few hours and then retreated back into the garrison.

I could only learn by living in the battle, by being wounded, healing and learning from it and facing it again and again.

By growing up, by being tall and by growing down into the enabling grace of God who is the one who gives me the ability to do His work.

They taught me this at the training college, but I could only really have learnt it as an officer.

It is only since being an Officer that I have come to genuinely understand what is meant by the scripture.

“Greater is He that is in you, than he that is in the world.” John 4:4

## **Nehemiah – A Man with a Cause**

by Lieut.-Colonel Raymond Finger

*Officer Training College – Spiritual Day*

When Mother Teresa was awarded the Nobel Prize for her work in the slums of Calcutta, she declined an invitation to travel to Geneva to be presented with the prestigious honour. Her reason being that, 'she did not have the time as it would detract from her work!'

That my friends, is a LEADER WITH A CAUSE

Some one who will not allow anything to get in the way of them achieving their God given task.

Our worlds are filled with distractions and these do not necessarily come from outside the Army, but can come from within.

One of the most significant moments in the life of a Salvation Army officer takes place in the privacy of the Training College Lecture Hall, when the Officer's Covenant is signed in the presence of the Territorial Commander, Training Principal and Staff and Cadets.

"I will live to win souls and will not allow anything to turn me aside from seeking their salvation as the first great purpose of my life." This is 'LEADERSHIP WITH A CAUSE'

This morning I spoke of Nehemiah, a Man With A Mission, and that mission was to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem.

Now I speak to you about, Nehemiah, A Man With A Cause, and the cause was the, 'rebuilding a nation of God's people'.

"When Sanballat the Horonite and Tobiah the Ammonite official heard about this, they were very much disturbed that some one had come to promote the welfare of the Israelites."

Nehemiah 2:10

An effective leader will have only one cause, but will engage in many missions in order to achieve his purpose.

Go back to Nehemiah chapter 1

v.2 Hanani, Nehemiah's brother came to him and told him about the people and the condition of the City.

“3 They said to me, ‘those who survived the exile and are back in the province are in great trouble and disgrace. The wall of Jerusalem is broken down, and its gates have been burned with fire.’”

v.4 Nehemiah wept and he prayed -

But in his prayer, was his concern for the broken walls and burnt gates, or was his passion for the people?

NEHEMIAH 1:5-11

The nation had lost sight of God, their disobedience and neglect meant that the very land God had given the nation which was called the ‘Promised Land’ had become the Plundered Land. They were a people financially, spiritually, morally and relationally, impoverished and bereft.

The one time, proud, dignified, strong, wealthy, independent nation was nothing more than a remnant of nomads - troubled and disgraced!

This is the picture that burnt deep into the heart of Nehemiah and he could not escape the inward compulsion to - do something about it!

The walls and the gates of Jerusalem were once a symbol of strength, of dominance and power..... Nehemiah saw the potential to build the nation from the outside in. Rebuild the walls; restore the magnificent gates and the pride the nation will begin to rise up out of the rubble with the walls.

And as the Book of Nehemiah unfolds you find the nation returning, a people unified in purpose, determined to live again and the continual theme of Nehemiah being spoken;  
REMEMBER, THE INSTRUCTIONS  
REMEMBER THE LORD

THE SPIRITUAL HEART RESTORED

By rebuilding the magnificent Temple, Zerubbabel and Ezra restored the spiritual heart of the nation. The people turned back to God and away from their sinful disobedience and disregard. People began to come home to their city of their forefathers and home to God.

REBUILD THE WALLS

But you know, restoring the spiritual heart is only the beginning, because there are things you have to do, you also have to rebuild the walls.

The walls in your life and mine are the inward strengths and determinations that are repelling temptations each and every day.

It includes our powers of reason, character, sensibilities that prevail against illogical thoughts and irrational persuasions.

Each one of us has values and conscience that stands in the face of subtle suggestion and galvanises us in times of potential compromise.

Elsewhere in the Bible these walls are described as the armour of God.

Ephesians 6:10-18

“10 Be strong in the Lord and in his mighty power..”

“13 Therefore put on the whole armour of God, so that when the day of evil comes, you may be able to stand your ground, and after you have done everything, to stand. 14 Stand firm.....”

Illust. In the movie ‘Kingdom of Heaven’ starring Orlando Bloom, set in the time of the medieval crusades in the holy land, Jerusalem is surrounded and under siege by the Islamic King Saladin. After days of horrific fighting that included the city walls being pounded by catapulted boulders. It is reported to Saladin that the wall has been weakened by one of the gates, with the comment, “this will be our entrance into Jerusalem.”

Not only do we need to rebuild the Temple of our God, but also the walls that help protect us from the fiery darts of the evil one that comes in many forms.

When he spoke of the full armour of God, Paul also reminded the Church.

Ephesians 6:12

“Our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms.”

There is not one of us with eyes to see and powers to know the rulers and authorities of this dark world.

Neither is there one who has the divine grace to fully understand the presence or the powers of the forces of evil in heavenly realms.

God alone knows, sees and understands the dark world and He has equipped us by the power of His Holy Spirit who lives within us to enable and empower us to stand, when the day of evil comes.

That does not imply that we will not take a hit, or a pounding in our daily pursuit of the cause of Christ, but it does mean that we will be enabled by the grace of God sufficient that there would be no entrance for the enemy into our Jerusalem.

God restores his Temple in which His Holy presence lives, my dear friends, the walls belong to us, to ensure they are safeguarded by the personal disciples of our daily

resolve to be and to live in fellowship with God. To give no foothold, and at times of weakness when we secom, to repent and strengthen our resolve.

Let's understand the subtlety with which the enemy seeks to destract the cause of Christ and weakness through which he would seek to find an entrance into Jerusalem.

#### . Nehemiah 2:18-19 Personal Ridicule

“Let us start rebuilding, so they began this good work. 19 But when Sanballat, Tobiah and Geshem heard about it, they mocked and ridiculed us.”

The ridicule was directed at Nehemiah and his team. Personal ridicule, who among us wears that with ease and comfort?

Personal ridicule is personal, it is intended to be personal, because it takes away attention from the work and focuses on the individual and it hurts, causes self doubt and we question our purpose.

But it doesn't stop there.

#### . Nehemiah 4:1 Anger and Public Ridicule

“When Sanballat heard that we were rebuilding the wall, he became angry and was greatly incensed. He ridiculed the Jews 2 and in the presence of his associates and the army of Samaria, he said, “What are those feeble Jews doing.”

I get it, if private ridicule doesn't work and seems to have no affect on progress, you then start to attack the followers and try and destabilise them, belittle them and hopefully undermine the leader who has called them to a task. Confuse them, call into question what they are doing and it might just all fall apart.

But it did not!

#### . Nehemiah 6:5-6 Scandalise the ministry

“The, the fifth time Sanballat sent his aide to me with the same message, and in his hand was an unsealed letter in which was written. “It is reported among the nations and Geshem says it is true- that you and the Jews are plotting to revolt, and therefore you are building the wall. Moreover, according to these reports you are about to become their King 7 and have even appointed prophets to make this proclamation about you in Jerusalem.”

Now any public scandal that potentially involves bringing in the outside authorities is bound to take your attention off the task while you mount an elaborate defence to justify and prove your innocence.

Personal ridicule, public ridicule and scandal are boulders designed to pulverise you, drain your emotional energy, sap your spiritual resources, immobilise your senses and eventually lead you to a point of missional and causal abandonment.

This is the kind of battle that comes frequently to people in ministry, attacks from satan that has one agenda and that is to destroy your defences, interrupt your cause, stop your mission and find a way into your Jerusalem where he seeks to attack the very Temple of God.

The pathway to spiritual success is strewn with obstacles for the leader and it is one, which calls for a profound spiritual commitment.

“I will live to win souls and will not allow anything to turn me aside from seeking their salvation as the first great purpose of my life.”

### I'LL NOT TURN BACK

If crosses come, if it should cost me dearly,  
To be the servant of my servant Lord,  
If darkness falls around the path of duty,  
And men despise the Saviour I've adored.

I'll not turn back, whatever it may cost,  
I'm called to live, to love and save the lost,  
I'll not turn back, whatever it may cost,  
I'm called to live, to love and save the lost.

If door should close then other doors will open,  
The word of God can never be contained.  
His love cannot be finally frustrated,  
By narrow minds or prison bars restrained.

It tears should fall, if I am called to suffer,  
If all I love men should deface, defame,  
I'll not deny the One that I have followed,  
Nor be ashamed to bear my Master's name,  
John Gowans

## **Advance!**

by Captain Stephen Court

Southern Spirit – February 20, 2008

Never in its history has The Salvation Army been more split between greatness and failure, advance and retreat, zeal and coldness. There are places in the world where the forward march is a full gallop. In other places the withdrawal is just as pronounced. In another the blur of battle makes it impossible to report the full extent of the enemy's rout. What's different where the Army surges?

First, there is an utter confidence in God's Word. There is no hint of doubt as to whether it is the true Word of God, any misgiving that there might be mistakes contained in its pages, any foolish speculation about how it compares to other holy books in the world. Its words transform. Its counsel enlightens. Its commands guide. But if you are dismissing the things you don't like, when the trumpet sounds you'll miss the advance.

Second, victory is expected. No doubt, there is sin in the world and evil is afoot. No question that Satan devours all he can with an insatiable hunger for more. But he shall not have the last word; sin will not win the day. For the Lamb has come not only to bleed but to conquer. There is no iniquity greater than the blood of Christ. There is no soul beyond the reach of the One who came to claim the wayward world. When a soul is won there is no time to sit back and enjoy the fruits of victory. There are more souls and more opportunities to push the enemy closer to the abyss.

Thirdly, there is a stone-hard conviction that The Salvation Army is God's instrument in the world. Barefoot soldiers proudly wear their wrinkled and stained uniform with no concern as to how fashionable it is or worse yet, puzzle over whether to wear that or a pair of jeans or a pretty dress. The flag is not just something trotted out for ceremony but the standard that proclaims the Army's message and rallies the troops when the enemy assails. Corps buildings are not known for their architectural appeal but are judged by how effective they are at being the maternity wards of the Kingdom.

The cost is counted and it is reckoned to be a bargain. Nothing is owned that cannot be sacrificed. No place is home that cannot be forsaken should the call come to go to the next town or the next country. No limitation of ability or education or talent stands in the way of rushing forward to the war. Salvationists do not weigh their service in the Army by how fulfilling it is or whether they can find the right fit of their spiritual gifts with a comfortable ministry.

The question is never, "How can we be expected to do this?" Rather, the belief is that is the challenge has been given, then God by His grace and power will see to it that it can be done. And if we fail, and failures are quite frequent, it will mean that we regroup and attack again. If we cannot speak the language, we will learn it. If we cannot stand in

front of people, we will continue to get up and do it until we can. The work is too important to wring hands and whimper about the conditions.

To not advance is to die. No war is ever won on the defensive, no victory claimed when the call to arms is unheeded. We cannot win by conducting the war as we have. We have been infested with the culture of plenty when self-denial is demanded, of seeking success instead of conquest, of playing video games instead of fighting a war. God forgive us for satisfying ourselves by watching from the grandstands the victories happening somewhere else. Let's advance as the Army God raised us up to be.

## Two Grand Old Williams: Mr. Gladstone meets General Booth

by Tom Aitken

*Gladstone Umbrella, St Deiniol's Library, 14 July 2007*

On 29 October 1890, William Booth, General of The Salvation Army, wrote from his headquarters at 101 Queen Victoria Street, London, to William Gladstone, four times Prime Minister, at the castle across the road:

*'My Dear Sir,*

*'I have the pleasure to forward you by this post my book "In Darkest England" with the full assurance that the subject of which it treats and the "Scheme" it sets forth will be regarded by you as of sufficient importance to ensure your careful consideration.*

*'With sincere respect,*

*'Yours faithfully...'*

The copy is in the library here, inscribed 'With faith and hope, William Booth'.

You may think that Booth was presumptuous in that he does not crave the Grand Old Man's indulgence or otherwise grovel. Rather, he asserts 'full assurance' of Gladstone's 'careful attention'.

Was he merely writing according to the conventions? Or was he actually confident? The answers to those questions will tell us much about Booth but also something about Gladstone. Perhaps I should settle questions about my baseline in advance by saying unequivocally that I share with Roy Hattersley the view that, for all their faults, William Booth and his wife Catherine 'deserve a place in the pantheon of Great Victorians'.

Back to 1890: Until not long before that time the press, when referring to Booth, had habitually fenced the designation 'General' with inverted commas. In this they were following the lead of Queen Victoria, who in 1878, when what had been the 'Christian Mission' was renamed 'The Salvation Army', complained that Booth's assumption of the title 'General' and his foundation of an Army within her realm usurped prerogatives that were hers alone. But—and this illustrates one of his remarkable abilities—he turned the tables on her four years later. He had invited Her Majesty to contribute to an appeal for funds and received a message regretting her inability to do so. The brush off, however, included mollifying words of glacial approval: Her Majesty felt 'much satisfaction that you have, with other members of your society, been successful in your efforts to win many thousands to the ways of temperance, virtue and religion'. Booth, scenting a PR coup, published the letter, in well-spaced type with bold headlines, on the front page of *The War Cry*. It was read out to thousands of cheering Salvationists assembled in the Alexandra Palace to celebrate the 17<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the foundation of the Christian Mission. As St John Ervine writes, this was 'an example of Booth's extraordinary ability for turning a snub into a compliment and almost persuaded people that the Queen had contributed to the Fund or that her refusal to do so was...due to... sheer shortness of cash'. (Later, after Victoria's death Edward VII showed an interest in The Salvation

Army—after which Booth was welcomed by royalty and heads of state all over the world.)

Meanwhile, in 1890, the year when he wrote to Gladstone, he pulled off another, albeit rather different, PR coup. He had been planning for some time a scheme of social regeneration and to launch it by publishing a book. Casting about for a title he happened to read a book published that year by Henry Morton Stanley, intrepid Welsh explorer and finder of Livingstone. Stanley called his book *In Darkest Africa*, and Booth immediately put the concept to his own use. His book and the associated scheme were called *In Darkest England and the Way Out*.

Nowadays, I suppose, we would blench at any reference to 'darkest Africa'. Booth did not blench and was blunt about his reason for appropriating the opprobrious word:

*'...while brooding over the awful presentation of life as it exists in the vast African forest, it seemed to me only too vivid a picture of many parts of our own land. As there is a darkest Africa is there not also a darkest England... May we not find a parallel at our own doors, and discover within a stone's throw of our cathedrals and palaces similar horrors to those which Stanley has found existing in the great equatorial forest? ...As in Africa it is all trees, trees, trees, with no other world conceivable; so is it here—it is all vice and poverty and crime.'*

It was this book he sent to Gladstone in late October and this scheme for which he sought his aid as sponsor. The book took hold of the public's conscience and imagination, selling 200,000 copies in its first year. It was also savagely attacked. Booth's use of statistics, it was claimed was loose, exaggerated and tendentious. He gave the impression of believing that he was the first person ever to notice the condition and sufferings of what he called 'the submerged tenth'. Furthermore, his passion for systematic social amelioration was strangely new-fangled: until about 1887 he had set his face against taking his evangelical army in the direction of large scale social work. Worst of all, although his name appeared alone on spine and title page, he had not written the book himself.

Hostile critics made much of this alleged deception of the public. There is still some disagreement among historians as to who wrote what, but it seems clear that Booth had in fact written a good deal of the material at the bedside of his dying wife, Catherine. After her appallingly painful death early in 1890 (she had refused an operation for breast cancer) he asked the crusading journalist and friend of the Army W.T. Stead to recommend a competent journalist who could pull it into shape. Stead volunteered to do it himself. Later he wrote to a friend that phrases written by him appeared in every chapter and he had enriched Booth's material with quotations from historians (especially Carlyle) and other writers whom Booth had almost certainly never read. But Stead also asserted publicly that to claim that book and scheme were his or anybody else's but Booth's was absurd. (However I must stop talking about Stead, however, or we'll never get to Gladstone; suffice to say that Stead was a red-bearded ball of energy, self-styled pope of journalism whose telegraphic address was 'Vatican, London' and add that his association with The Salvation Army over many decades was colourful, to say the least.

He lost his life aboard the Titanic.) To be fair to Booth, he did include an acknowledgement of 'literary help' in the 1890 Preface.

Two relatively junior Salvation Army officers were also involved. Frank Smith, a committed socialist known to his fellows as 'the red Major', was one. The other was an American woman called Suzie Swift. It seems clear that it was these two who pushed Booth towards social work. Both, however, have tended to be written out of the story by Salvationist historians. Partly this was because Booth was nothing if not an egotist. The pronoun 'I' appears over and over again in the text in contexts where a more sensitive man would have written 'We'. It is also the case that Smith and Swift in a manner of speaking wrote themselves out of it, blotting their copybooks seriously and quite soon, by leaving the Salvation Army. Smith henceforward pursued social reform as a socialist rather than a Salvationist, serving on the London County Council and, at the age of 75, as MP for Nuneaton. Swift went back to America and became a nun.

By the time Gladstone and Booth met, shortly before Christmas, Gladstone may or may not have read *In Darkest England*. Certainly, however, he would have read the four long letters written to The Times by T.H. Huxley, excoriating Booth, his book and the scheme. Huxley, the Richard Dawkins of his day, known as 'Darwin's bulldog' wrote 12 letters to the Thunderer, some of them very long, between December 1 and January 22. These letters would, if anything, have caused Gladstone to look on Booth with benevolence, since he himself had tangled publicly with Huxley on the subjects of Darwinism and religion.

A few quotations will give you Huxley's tone:

Booth's leading propositions, he writes, include the notion that *'the only adequate means to... reformation of the individual man is the adoption of that form of somewhat corybantic Christianity of which the soldiers of the Salvation Army are the militant missionaries.'*

*'Whoever becomes a Salvation officer is henceforth a slave, helplessly exposed to the caprice of his superiors.'*

*'Few social evils are of greater magnitude than uninstructed and unchastened religious fanaticism; no personal habit more surely degrades the conscience and the intellect than blind and unhesitating obedience to unlimited authority.'*

As well as this torrent of correspondence Huxley wrote a pamphlet about the Darkest England scheme under the catchy title *The Wrong Way to do the Wrong Thing*.

What was the scheme and was it any good? Its intention was to end unemployment in Britain by progressively by taking the jobless into city workshops and moving them thence to farm colonies and, finally, to overseas colonies. Thus, people from the kingdom's worst slums and hell-holes could be helped to find their way out. This idea, as Booth had acknowledged early in 1889, was taken from a pamphlet on poverty by the Earl of Meath, which the noble Irish lord, developed in his book. *Social Arrows* (1886)

Booth had borrowed ideas from other secular reformists as well as from religious sources. You will notice that that the scheme to an extent posits the continuing extent and power of the British Empire, a point that made it less than universally popular amongst American Salvationists. Gladstone, perhaps, could have heard echoes of his own much earlier scheme for settling British transportees in Queensland, which I talked about here three years ago.

Were scheme and book any good? For a long time after Booth's death sociologists and social historians tended to discount it, preferring their disciplines to be uncontaminated by religious revivalism. Undeniably William's namesake, Charles Booth wrote in *Life and Labour of the People* (1889) a more measured and even-handed book. And, by interviewing the people themselves he gave his readers the truth of their attitudes and feeling, whereas. William Booth's equivalent was reports written by Salvationist officers, who naturally interpreted what they described according to their Salvationist mind-set. One of the things that academics most disliked about Booth's book is that they have spotted that it is not in any real sense a sociological account. Rather, as Roger Joseph Green, one of Booth's many biographers explains, it develops a Wesleyan theology of personal and social redemption, seen initially side by side as equally necessary but different in kind, later as two sides of the same coin.

Some institutions set up in connection with the scheme, still exist but have evolved. There is a farm at Hadleigh in Essex owned and run by the Salvation Army. The farm is a commercial venture, a rare breeds centre which subsidises the Army's social fund. It also houses an Employment Training Centre for people with learning disabilities and long-term unemployed, teaching them carpentry, catering, office skills and computing, estate management, horticulture, retail and graphics. The city workshops—now called Adult Rehabilitation Centres—are still to be found, particularly in the United States.

The Overseas Colonies have gone the way of the British Empire.

But the principal legacy of the scheme is the irreversible trend it set in motion whereby the Salvation Army became known in all of the 111 countries where it operates as providers of care and emergency support rather than as the evangelical mission it originally was. This is often regarded as a mixed blessing. It is ruefully admitted to be the case that without subsidies from governments and donors the Salvation Army might by now have ceased to exist, or at least dwindled almost to vanishing point. Nevertheless, these tensions have their constructive side. And, despite Huxley's complaints about the supremacy of William Booth, it was the loyalty and obedience he inspired which allowed the Army to survive the radical change from revivalist movement into something altogether more original.

But insofar as there was a 'darkest England' in 1890, I suppose we must accept that it is still there.

We will hear later on some of what Gladstone said to Booth on the subject but we will also see that, as often happened when Booth was hob-nobbing with royalty and public figures, he does not always seem to understand exactly what is going on.

The Booths had tried to enlist Gladstone's aid twice previously. In 1881, during a wave of violent attacks on Salvationists all over the country, the magistrates of Stamford in Lincolnshire wrote to the Home Secretary, Sir William Harcourt asking for advice as to what they should do if the Salvation Army appeared on their patch and was attacked by roughs. Harcourt, evidently not much committed to defending of rights of assembly, opined that '...while Salvation Army processions not being illegal in themselves... cannot be legally prevented', the magistrates, might obtain a sworn information from the Chief Constable that such a demonstration 'might provoke hostility' and intervene forcibly to prevent it. (Demo in Parliament Square, anyone?) Booth wrote indignantly to Gladstone. *The Times* and the *Solicitors' Journal* reprovved Harcourt on legal grounds. There was a widespread storm of protest which in the long run did the Army good. Meanwhile, however, the violence continued, apparently with the blessing of the authorities, who continued to send Salvationists to jail because they had been attacked.

Gladstone appears not have responded. He may well have been preoccupied, since that was the month in which Charles Stewart Parnell was arrested and held without trial. Even Gladstone might have found it difficult to reprove the Home Secretary for a putative suppression of civil rights in Stamford when a real one was taking place in Dublin.

Fourteen years later, in 1885, national affairs once again prevented Gladstone from acceding to a request from the Booths. Mrs Booth wrote to him asking that a bill which had been talked out earlier in the year be reintroduced so that the age of consent could be raised to sixteen, which would make it easier to combat the trade in very young prostitutes which W.T. Stead had dubbed 'The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon'. Gladstone replied that he sympathized and the government had introduced the bill in the first place. But 'at a moment like the present' he could only regret that he 'could not undertake to examine personally the questions you touch on'. The 'moment like the present' was the moment when Gladstone's government fell in the wake of the fall of Khartoum and the death of Gordon, and mounting violence in Ireland. It was Lord Salisbury's Conservative government which presided over the scandalous period when Stead mounted his newspaper campaign and he and Bramwell Booth staged a mock abduction to show how easy it was to trade in young girls. Both ended up in court and Bramwell barely escaped a jail sentence.

I don't intend to suggest that Gladstone can be held to account for these events, merely to point out that when in 1890 William Booth asked once more for Gladstone's help with his Darkest England scheme, his 'full assurance' that consideration would be given was something of a triumph of hope over experience. But, he may have reasoned that since Gladstone was now out of office he might, if he retained any of his former prodigious energy, be pleased by the idea of another cause to fight for.

There appears, however, to have been no very swift response. Less than a fortnight after his first letter, on 11 November, Booth wrote again asking specifically for financial support for his scheme—or for an endorsement of some kind to encourage other possible donors. He appended a list of existing donors and the amounts they had subscribed, with ranged from £50 to £1500—not insignificant sums—which was just as well, given that Booth required £100,000 to commence operations. (He had immediate second thoughts about “required”, substituting the less peremptory “needed”. Both letters, you will understand, were written in his own hand, with occasional crossings out.)

Whether Mr Gladstone responded to Booth’s suggestions I do not know.

Time passes. Some time in November or early December, Gladstone heard from Booth again. The General would be conducting meetings at Keighly on Sunday 20 December and would like if Gladstone agreed, to call on him at Hawarden on his way back to London. (As you know, this requires a noticeable detour and Booth was at this date still traveling everywhere by train.)

So, to the meeting... (I quote) ‘Three o’clock on Monday afternoon, December 21<sup>st</sup>, had been fixed by Mr Gladstone for my interview with him at Hawarden Castle, and passing over from Keighly... I reached the beautiful park in which it is situated a few minutes before that time’.

Mrs Gladstone made him feel at home. ‘I was cold through, and Mrs Gladstone saw it. Putting one of those delightful old-fashioned easy chairs—the manufacture of which is a lost art so far as this country is concerned—before the great, open fire, she insisted upon my getting a thorough warm, and we were soon talking away as though we had been acquainted for years.

‘In a few moments the door of the adjoining room opened, and in walked Mr Gladstone, stretching out his hand, greeting me in the heartiest manner, and putting an end to the little colloquy with the ladies by summoning me forthwith to the library.’ Mrs Gladstone remarked how cold Booth was and Gladstone told her that he would find the library warmer.

Studying Gladstone’s appearance as they talked Booth found no trace of the hardness he had detected in photographs: ‘...intelligent, expressive quick and commanding in a high degree, his face appeared equally sympathetic’.

Gladstone made sure the fire was well stoked then asked Booth if he preferred to be addressed as ‘General’. The reply Booth says he gave is a masterpiece of disingenuity:

I replied ‘Yes,’ that was the appellation ordinarily given me, that I thought it duly signified my position, and I accepted it for that reason. I explained that I had not sought it, and was at the beginning strongly opposed to its use; but that having come to be the head of what was known as an Army, there seemed to be no alternative but to accept the title.

How I wish I could have watched Gladstone listening to this. But I should add that not long after, when he read and annotated Catherine Booth's book *The Salvation Army in Relation to Church and State*, he approved of her statement that 'with an Army no other method could be better'.

Gladstone agreed that titles had value. Booth enlarged on the theme that military ranks were everywhere understood: 'No matter how poor, untrained, or undisciplined a man might be, he knew the meaning of "Captain" when he joined a corps, and that it implied authority and obedience.

"Yes," remarked Mr Gladstone, "everybody knows the meaning of 'Captain.'"

After this, Gladstone may have narrowed his eyes a little, asking a series of searching questions about the Army's organization and methods. How did its central leadership keep control in so many distant parts of the world without stifling local action and initiative? Were many of the officers in non-English-speaking countries sent out from England? How many such officers were there? He was surprised by the answer that between two and five hundred were sent out every year, commenting that this was remarkable evidence of the strength and vitality of the movement. He was further impressed by the news there were over 12,000 Salvation Army officers worldwide and that something considerably over a million sterling, made up from collections from Salvationists and donations by well wishers, was necessary to keep the organization going. Interestingly Booth was unable to be sure of precise figures of membership and financial figures. He did not tell Gladstone that the person who would have had such facts at his fingertips was his son and Chief of Staff, Bramwell.

They discussed the Army's impact in Europe, touching on the gradual improvement of relations with initially hostile governments and Booth's view that they had received no more opposition from Catholic than from Protestant clergy. Gladstone was particularly interested in the Army's impact in Italy where, it may surprise you to know, it has been permanently established—after one false start—since 1893. They discussed conversion, self-denial, Cardinal Manning, Salvation Army publications and self-righteousness. Gladstone was dismayed at how often this last was criticised by religious folk. He could not imagine how anyone could ever suppose that anything he had done was worthy of being set before God, but for all that, any form of righteousness was better than none.

In the middle of the conversation Gladstone asked, with apologies, the question which makes this amiable conversation historically important. Had arrangements been made for choosing Booth's successor and if so, what were they? He was clearly amazed by the answer, that Booth had nominated his successor and the name, known to no one but himself, was held in a sealed envelope. He could if he saw fit change it at any time. His successor's first duty would be to nominate his own successor, following the same procedure. This had been formalized in a Foundation Deed enrolled in the High Court.

Gladstone thought this legal precaution wise but his mind clearly boggled at the strangeness of the provision. As Booth puts it, ‘...he seemed to wander over the whole world, looking in upon every work—Religious, Philanthropic and Secular’—in order to find a similar instance. He thought there might be some as late as the sixteenth century. ‘Even the Pope is elected by a conclave of Cardinals’, he said with what, I would guess, was a certain asperity.

Booth admitted that there was a scheme, ‘now being completed, for providing against the possible contingency of a General passing away who had neglected the appointment of his successor, or who, for some calamitous reason, had been proved incapable for, or unworthy of, his position, and for soliciting a new General in an Assembly of all our Commissioners throughout the world.’ He mentioned some possible reasons which might make this necessary, to which Gladstone added, interestingly, heresy.

It is hard to tell, of course, but there is a possibility that Booth was rather pleased that the conversation took this turn. When, nearly eight years later, another Deed Poll was drawn, it was said to have been the result of Gladstone’s advice. Three clauses provided for the removal of a General from office by a specially summoned High Council of Commissioners) on grounds of (to summarise) lunacy or physical infirmity (four to one majority required), misconduct (nine to one majority required), or unfitness for office (75% of votes required).

By one of those very sad ironies that stud human history, this provision has only once been invoked, and the hapless victim was William Booth’s son, Bramwell. This is not the occasion to go into what happened in detail but I will offer two comments. The first is that Bramwell felt bound to preserve The Salvation Army as the organization his father had conceived and created. This included the sealed envelope. He refused to contemplate an election instead and this in the end did for him. We do not know who his choice of successor was because his envelope was burned unopened. However it is salutary to note that it was widely thought that he had chosen his daughter Catherine. Some of you may remember the sparky old lady who enlivened Parkinson’s and other television chat shows in the late 1970s. She died aged one hundred. Had she become General she would undoubtedly have stayed in post until her death as William had done and as Bramwell intended to do. Whether almost one hundred and twenty years of continuous Booth leadership would have been a Good Thing many Salvationists would doubt. The other point I would make is that the politics of deposing Bramwell and eliminating the sealed envelope required him to be deposed under clause 3—unfitness for office. This, unsurprisingly, was savagely resented by the Booth family and remains a sensitive issue within the Army.

Before William Booth left the castle that December afternoon Gladstone asked whether there was a book giving an account of the Army’s history and methods. Booth said he would send one. Gladstone may have been surprised and less than pleased when the package arrived. It contained 17 books, many of them thick ones. Quite a few were by

William himself. However, General did have the grace to enclose enclosed a note indicating which specific parts of each book might be of most use to Gladstone.

(Three of these books, incidentally, are on the shelves in the library here. One has annotations. Others may be over at the castle. I hope to find out this afternoon—and see whether they show any sign of having been looked through.)<sup>[1]</sup>

You may be interested in Booth's assessment of his host. The General was a shrewd and blunt judge of his fellow human beings, but he never quite got over the fact he was a former pawnbroker's apprentice who in old age found himself taking tea with royalty and statesmen. Whenever such a conversation took place an account of it would be published in *The War Cry* or, as in this case, as a small book. Booth's account of his meeting, at Buckingham Palace in 1909, with Queen Alexandra, the Dowager Empress of Russia and Princess Victoria is a classic of unconscious comedy.

Here is some of what he has to say about Gladstone:

*'Mr Gladstone is as rapid as he is a forcible and interesting talker. He scarcely paused for a moment in his friendly cross-examination, every question bearing directly and intelligently either on one of our principles of action, or some important aspect of the results that follow. There was not a wasted word. There was not a vestige of that conceited method of interrogation which is intended to assert the superiority of the interrogator and to mark his condescension in being willing to receive the information one has to convey. Nor was there a hint of that impatience which is so common in the manner of some men when dealing with what they are pleased to call "emotional religion". Nothing could have been more impressive or more charming than the quiet dignity and the thoughtful gentleness, and yet lightning penetration, with which Mr Gladstone discussed with me the Salvation Army, its system, its peculiarities, its principles, its future, that afternoon.'*

Note the use of the term 'cross-examination'. Booth occasionally seems to suggest that he may have asked questions of Gladstone but he records none. The overwhelming impression given by his account (I think unintentionally) is that Gladstone asked all the questions, shaping the discussion as he wished. Indeed, since Booth makes no mention of the Darkest England scheme being discussed, it may be that Gladstone deliberately kept it at bay, not wanting to have to make a direct refusal to become overtly a supporter.

Apart from his conversational acuity Gladstone impressed Booth in other ways. His '*unaffected earnestness*' tops the list. Booth was used enough to important people asking 'commonplace questions' with only languid interest'. In contrast, Gladstone's unmistakable concern to hear and know what the Army was doing and what was the inner meaning of it all moved him deeply. The way Gladstone went straight to 'the very vitals' of each subject as it came up and the disinterestedness of his questions and manner also impressed him. He had no ulterior motive of personal axe to grind. (That's my cliché, not Booth's—and I suppose that in this context it's unfortunate!)

He was carried away by Gladstone's unhesitating flow of beautiful and expressive words, exact shades of meaning and mellifluous delivery. 'It is a luxury to listen to him. It is a shame for him to be silent.'

How unlike the views of their own dear Queen!

Booth concluded with A SALVATIONIST QUESTION—AND THE ANSWER:

*'My Salvationist friends will ask me how far I was impressed with Mr Gladstone's religious realizations? I shall answer that I had not much opportunity for judging; but I may say that not only was the whole tenour of that conversation favourable to such a conclusion, but that there were passages in that interchange of thought, views and feelings, and feelings that produced on my mind very forcibly the impression that, among the many things carefully considered and experimentally known to W.E. Gladstone, are the governing influences of the Holy Spirit and the saving grace of God.'*

When Booth returned to London he produced an account of the conversation for publication. He says in a letter to Gladstone that he had originally had no intention of publishing their talk. This may indeed have been the first time he had done such a thing; if so he made up for lost time in the following two decades. Meanwhile, he assured Gladstone that his interest in the Army's work would be 'a cheer to my people throughout the world... in their desperate struggle with sin and misery; and what may be far more important may induce others possessing influence and authority in this and other countries to look more closely into our doings.'

Gladstone wrote in reply that their talk had helped him 'to look out upon the wide world and reflect with reverence on the singular diversity of the instruments which are in operation for recovering mankind, according to the sense of those who use them, from their condition of sin and misery; and encourages hearty good will towards all that, under whatever name, is done with a genuine purpose to promote the work of God in the world...'

I don't think that Roy Hattersley is right when he writes that Booth's account 'showed every sign of Mr Gladstone fulfilling an unwelcome commitment with patience and courtesy'. Gladstone could easily enough have avoided the commitment had he wanted to. However I agree with Hattersley that the conclusion of Gladstone's letter to Booth, which is printed in the pamphlet comes very close to being a reproof:

*'Your account will go forth on your own responsibility, and will not, I apprehend, require me to take any step with regard to it.*

*'Believe me to remain, with all good wishes,*

*Faithfully yours,*

*'W.E. Gladstone*

*'Hawarden*

*'Jan. 2, 1897'*

Things moved quickly in those days. The conversation took place on December 21. Booth's published introductory note is dated Jan 6 and the book was in print soon after.

Perhaps the meeting between the two can best be summed up by the remark that Isaiah Berlin borrowed from the Greek poet Archilocus: 'The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing'. We all know about the many things Gladstone knew. The one big thing that Booth knew was that mankind needed to be saved.

Thank you.

### **Bibliography**

Berlin, Isaiah, *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An essay on Tolstoy's view of history*, London, 1999

Booth, Catherine, *The Salvation Army in Relation to Church and State*, London, 1883

Booth, William, *A Talk with Mr Gladstone at His Own Fireside*, London, 1897

*In Darkest England and the Way Out*, London 1890

Ervine, St John, *God's Soldier: General William Booth*, London, 1934

Hattersley, Roy, *Blood and Fire: William and Catherine Booth and Their Salvation Army*, London, 1999

Murdoch, Norman H., *Origins of The Salvation Army*, Knoxville, 1994

William Booth's *In Darkest England and the Way Out: A Reappraisal*, Nampa

Sandall, Robert, *The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. Two, London, 1950

*The History of the Salvation Army*, vol. Three, London, 1955

had no intention of publishing their talk. This may indeed have been the first time he had done such a thing; if so he made up for lost time in the following two decades. Meanwhile, he assured Gladstone that his interest in the Army's work would be 'a cheer to my people throughout the world... in their desperate struggle with sin and misery; and what may be far more important may induce others possessing influence and authority in this and other countries to look more closely into our doings.'

Gladstone wrote in reply that their talk had helped him 'to look out upon the wide world and reflect with reverence on the singular diversity of the instruments which are in operation for recovering mankind, according to the sense of those who use them, from their condition of sin and misery; and encourages hearty good will towards all that, under whatever name, is done with a genuine purpose to promote the work of God in the world...'

For all that, I cannot argue that Roy Hattersley is wrong when he writes that Booth's account 'showed every sign of Mr Gladstone fulfilling an unwelcome commitment with patience and courtesy. And, as Hattersley also writes, the conclusion of Gladstone's letter to Booth, which is printed in the pamphlet comes very close to being a reproof:

'Your account will go forth on your own responsibility, and will not, I apprehend, require me to take any step with regard to it.

'Believe me to remain, with all good wishes,

Faithfully yours,

'W.E. Gladstone

'Hawarden

'Jan. 2, 1897'

Things moved quickly in those days. The conversation took place on December 21. Booth's published introductory note is dated Jan 6 and the book was in print soon after.

Thank you.

### **Bibliography**

Booth, William, *A Talk with Mr Gladstone at His Own Fireside*, London, 1897

*In Darkest England and the Way Out*, London 1890

Ervine, St John, *God's Soldier: General William Booth*, London, 1934

Green, Roger Joseph, *Theological Roots of In Darkest England and the Way Out*, Nampa

Hattersley, Roy, *Blood and Fire: William and Catherine Booth and Their Salvation Army*, London, 1999

Murdoch, Norman H., *Origins of The Salvation Army*, Knoxville, 1994

William Booth's *In Darkest England and the Way Out: A Reappraisal*, Nampa Sandall, Robert, *The History of The Salvation Army*, vol. Two, London, 1950  
*The History of the Salvation Army*, vol. Three, London, 1955

#### ERVINE, ST JOHN GREER 1883-1971

St John Ervine was born in Ballymacarret, Belfast. After working for three years in an insurance office he emigrated to London at the age of eighteen. For a short period in 1915 he was manager of the Abbey Theatre, where his plays *Mixed Marriage*, *June Clegg* and *John Ferguson* had already been successful. He was wounded as a lieutenant in the Dublin Fusiliers, and had a leg amputated. He settled in the south west of England. He wrote biographies of Craigavon and Carson, of William Booth, Oscar Wilde and George Bernard Shaw, as well as publishing seven novels including *The First Mrs Fraser* and some plays, such as *Boyd's Shop* and *Friends and Relations*. Until 1939 he was drama critic for the *Observer*. He became a member of the Irish Academy of Letters and from 1933 to 1936 was Professor of Dramatic Literature for the Royal Society of Literature. His work reflects the change in his political stance away from nationalism and socialism towards unionism.

---

<sup>[1]</sup> I found only Booth Tucker's *Life of Catherine Booth*, which had not been annotated. This probably means that it went unread. I hope to discuss the book and Gladstone's annotations of it in a later paper. I would guess that Gladstone found Catherine on paper a more kindred spirit in some ways than he found her husband in person: she had a calmer, better-trained mind to ally to her equal reserved of fervour.

## **Debating with the Dead: William Gladstone reads Catherine Booth**

by Tom Aitken

Let me remind you of - or acquaint you for the first time - with the situation as I left it last year. Shortly before Christmas 1890, William Booth, General of the Salvation Army, arrived at Hawarden to visit Mr Gladstone. Booth had himself proposed the visit, saying that it was possible for him to call in on his way back to London from Keighly. (Perhaps I should add that he was travelling by train.) Booth had recently published a book, *In Darkest England and the Way Out*, and he had enclosed a copy of it, hoping that Gladstone would read it and, carried away by the arguments therein, subscribe to a scheme whereby the submerged tenth of British society, a prey to drink and other forms of degradation in the industrial cities of the period, could be taken by stages from city rescue centres in the cities to farm colonies in the countryside and thence to the no doubt eagerly receptive colonies of the rampant British Empire--Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand where, given the passage of time and the civilizing influence of useful work and the Christian faith, they would in due course become farmers and players of cricket and rugby and whence they would return to teach the decadent sinners of the old world a lesson or two. I jest, mildly, as you will appreciate but Booth was in earnest and, having founded the Salvation Army as, originally, the Christian Mission, in 1865, had found himself will-nilly in charge of a world-wide movement which had persuaded people from an amazing variety of races and cultures that he was on to something that would help them get a grip on their social problems and perhaps on their spiritual ones as well.

Gladstone and Booth conversed for a considerable time before Catherine Gladstone intervened to give Booth a late lunch and send him back to London. Gladstone had, with the evasive skill for which he was so much admired by his opponents, avoided committing himself to any sort of financial assistance. He succeeded in quizzing Booth very thoroughly while giving away, in all senses of the phrase, very little himself. He asked Booth to send him a short book giving an account of the Salvation Army's aims and methods.

Booth, however, was a practised exploiter of the great and the good. Back in London he wrote an account of the conversation, which he published as a pamphlet. He had sent a typescript to Gladstone, who allowed him to proceed while making it clear that he expected not to have to engage in any further correspondence on the matter. If the pamphlet came as something of a shock to the ageing politician, the response to his request for "a short book" may have been another: a package of 17 books arrived by post, some of them anything but short. Some of these survive in the libraries here and in the castle across the road, mostly, as far as I have been able to judge, untouched.

One, however, did hit the spot and Gladstone read it and annotated it in his characteristic way. It was by Booth's wife, Catherine Mumford Booth--who had died of horrific breast cancer not long before Booth and Gladstone met. It was a trim 92 pages long. Entitled *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and State*, it consisted of the

texts of lectures delivered on successive Tuesday afternoons in March 1883, to an audience of miscellaneous clergy in the Cannon Street Hotel in the City of London. These, "with additions", were published by the Salvation Army for a wider audience in 1889. Mrs Booth had given a number of such series of lectures for interested listeners and these, together with sermons in fashionable quarters such as Kensington and St John's Wood and other speaking engagements, were a necessary source of additional income for the organization that she and her husband led, in the early decades of its growth. Mrs Booth was better educated and more widely read than her husband, but would have been the first to recognize that they played different, but complementary roles. He may have been a better rouser of the masses--the Booth's would have deplored the term "rabble-rouser" on a number of grounds--but she provided the still, small voice of reasoned argument. Both, however, were convinced of the reality of such horrid forces and possibilities as sin, hell and damnation. But we can scarcely imagine William Booth speaking for more than a few minutes on such an academic sounding topic as *The Salvation Army in Relation to Church and State*.

My purpose in this paper is to examine what Mrs Booth said and chart the posthumous discussion, so to speak, which Gladstone, through the medium of his marginal annotations, conducted with her.

Catherine Booth had, she says, two objectives in first delivering, then publishing these lectures. The first was to "convey not only the earnest convictions of my own mind, but also those of my husband and those most closely associated with him in the direction of the Army..." The second was to "counteract the gross misrepresentations and monstrous assertions now being so vigorously circulated by many who should be better employed..."[1]

Mrs Booth's first lecture, delivered on Tuesday 13 March 1883, began with a survey of the parlous state of the nation. The army's "special sphere", she said, was the "dangerous classes... the ruffianly element..." Chaos and revolution loomed. An attempt to blow up a government office, the subsequent escape of the perpetrators and the continuing discovery of other plots made it clear that something must be done. Sounds familiar, doesn't it? Be that as it may, mere expansion of the police force was not, she asserted, enough. The vast mass of the population, untouched by civilization or Christianity, was at the mercy of infidels and socialists. Agitators in France, Germany, Spain and the United States openly advocated and arranged for the destruction of public property and of life. Even the Nihilists in Russia--who usually, after all, concentrated on the destruction of just one family--were perhaps no more threatening in their country than the native-born article was in England. The amazing thing was that the genteel classes failed to recognize the true state of affairs.[2]

Throughout this preamble Mrs Booth clearly attributes the threat of this horrendous mob to the twin evils of their godlessness and to the drink trade, and when she turns her attention to the more abstract question of *The Salvation Army and the State*, she lists a series of advantages that the State derived from the Army's work in converting individual members of this submerged, drink-sodden, foul-mouthed, contemptuous

mass. First, the Army created respect for law by refining the individual conscience. As things were, she asserted, people submitted to the law--when they did--only under threat of punishment. Conversion would bring them to understand the desirability of good order and to work for rather than against it.[3] It would reduce the necessity for and therefore the expense of, jail accommodation.[4]

The section of society most responsible for this godlessness was actually not the masses themselves but the polite middle classes. They were obstinately and foolishly blind to the fact of the numbers of people untouched by God, conscience or respect for law. Partly this was through a lack of concern for their fellow men, partly because of an inadequate understanding and practice of the Christian beliefs that they claimed to embrace. But for everyone, repentance and the fear of God are the only way in which men can learn to respect other men. Until lately, Catherine Booth argues, this respect was ingrained in the majority of people. People might argue that it was ingrained by superstitious means--but such useful superstition was preferable, in her opinion, to the total disregard for orderliness which currently obtained.[5]

The Salvation Army--she continues (while I leap aboard a passing summary)--taught the Universal Brotherhood of Man, Better Morality, Self Improvement, Better Social Conditions and Regeneration of Parents (as well as the rescue of that great threat to domestic stability, Fallen Women) in order to Save the Children. And, it taught its converts, the ranks of the saved, how to be good and reliable labourers.[6]

Until this point in the discussion, Gladstone's marginal pencil has remained inactive. Now, on page 24, it springs into action. What rouses him, following Catherine's reflections on her "sad and awful" realization that the masses wanted nothing to do with "quiet and genteel" methods of rescue, is this statement:

"Bishops, clergy, ministers, philanthropists, are forced to confess themselves powerless to reach them." This looks as if it is the moment when Gladstone stopped merely skimming and decided that Mrs Booth was worth of an attentive reading, since he puts a vertical line in the margin to indicate interest and a v, indicating approval. Thus, writer and reader end the first chapter in agreement. Gladstone, thinking back to his own rescue work, may have had some fellow feeling with Catherine's Booth's further statement that "common sense and Christian charity alike say, Send them such instrumentalities as they will and can appreciate. Stoop as low as you lawfully can to pick them up, rather than let them wax worse and worse while you are standing on your dignity."[7]

However, a very few lines later, at the beginning of Catherine's second lecture, on the Salvation Army and the Church, delivered the following Tuesday, 20 March 1883, Gladstone's pencil interjects his Italian expression of reservation, *ma* (but). Given that he had approved her statement that church leaders among others, had confessed their inability to reach and engage the masses it seems surprising that he has reservations about a statement which no doubt struck Mrs Booth as a simple corollary of that one, about "the terrible fact, ascertained by carefully taken statistics, that prior to the commencement of our operations, ninety per cent of these masses never entered

church, chapel, or mission hall." [8] It's not altogether clear what it is that gives him pause.

Was he suggesting that the statistics were wrong, or that Mrs Booth was misquoting or misunderstanding them? Was he wanting to say, Surely the situation is not quite so bad? Or was he feeling that Mrs Booth was inclined to take The Salvation Army's sincere wish for increased church attendance as a result of its work as an achieved statistical fact. The evidence for this last interpretation is slightly contradictory. Against it is the fact that in his own selective index at the end of the book, he does not list this page under his entry "statistics". That could be a simple omission. On the opposing side of the question we must note other indexed marginal notes under an entry that is a little difficult to read but which I take to be "Their [i.e.] the Salvation Army's superiority" (according, if I understand him, to their own judgement).

Among these, page 31 elicits 3 Xs indicating disapproval, equally spaced through the following passage:

"we have also raised a force of men and women who are now WORKING IT OUT, to an extent that no people preceding us, so far as Church history shows, have ever conceived of--a people who have had a more comprehensive idea of their responsibility, both as individuals and as an organization, than ever existed in the world before. There have existed exceptional men, many, thank God; but as an organization there is no record since the days of Apostles of a body that has so encompassed the Divine idea, all its members being taught to make all the other objects and aims of life subservient to the one grand purpose of preaching the gospel to every creature, and striving to win every soul with whom they come in contact to its salvation." [9]

Gladstone may well have thought, in effect, What about the Wesleyans? Mrs Booth might have replied that her husband had left the Methodist New Connection precisely because he thought them insufficiently instant and constant for the kingdom.

However, there two other markings--one indexed under "their superiority", one not--in which Mrs Booth extols her own organization and, far from drawing Gladstone's reproof, elicits his approval. The first reads, apropos the Salvationist's early searches for a way of seeking out and saving the lowest of the low, as follows:

"We tried committees, conferences, and all sorts of governments, showing how far we were (until God revealed it to us) from the grand military idea which is now proving such a wonderful power in organizing the converts for aggressive effort." [10]

The second of these further utterances praising Salvationist innovations, comes from a "pastor" who "went back to Paris from our Congress opening (which [she notes in passing] so offended some people), saying, The worship of the Salvation Army [i.e. its absence of liturgy] is destined to become the worship of the future." [11]

It is probably significant that Gladstone found far more to annotate in Catherine's lecture on the Salvation Army and the Churches than he did in the first on the Salvation Army and the State. The two lectures were probably assumed by Catherine to employ exactly

the same approach, but actually differ considerably. In the first, the State as such is presented merely as an institution that is despised and ignored by some of its members and insufficiently defended by others. In the second, the Church is seen as an entity that is in large part hostile to the Salvation Army. Therefore, although Catherine's primary assertion is that (in italics) "We are not hostile to the Churches", much of it consists of complaint that the churches are often critical of the Salvation Army. There is, however, a certain waspishness in her tone, neatly encapsulated in a statement that Gladstone does not annotate: "No, we do not attack either organizations or individuals. All we find fault with is SIN; but if some people in the in the Churches find that the cap fits, we cannot help it." But he does mark as interesting the second sentence of what follows: "It is one of our most emphatic instructions to our officers [that]: "It is not your business to go and find fault with other people. Rejoice in all the good done, by whomsoever it is done."[12]

Her second italicized headline is: "Neither are we indifferent to the opinion or sympathy of the Churches. "We desire and value: the sympathy and prayer and assistance of all good men." Gladstone approves what follows: "We care very little about creeds. God has shown us that all forms are very much alike, when the spirit has gone out of them. "We believe that God cares very little about our sectarian differences and divisions. The great main thing is the love of God and the service of humanity; and when we find people actuated by this motive, we love them by whatever name they are called."[13]

Her third point--not italicized--is that they--church and state---share the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity. Gladstone finds her summary of those doctrines interesting: ":the Fall, the universal call to Repentance, Justification by Faith through Jesus Christ, a life of obedience, Heaven and Hell."[14]

Catherine, however, does not hesitate to declare the main difference between the Army and the rest: that difference lies in its aggressiveness. What follows from that, however, attracts the triple-barreled Gladstonian row of crosses I have already mentioned. She asserts there has never been, since Apostolic times, any organization "that has so compassed the Divine idea" to bring all men to salvation.[15] You can almost hear Gladstone asking, in Gilbert's words. To Sullivan's music, "What, never?"

However, she quickly regains Gladstone's approbation by her assertion that she and her husband were not driven to plumb the "moral cesspools of the country" by lack of success in ordinary pastoral work. "Our path," she writes, "embraced all the comforts and prospect of a successful ministerial career; but as by miracle (I cannot account for it in any other way) we were led into this particular description of work."

Had Catherine been minded to anticipate the judgement of some later historians she might have added that part of that inspiration came from William Booth's disinclination to recognize any controlling power other than his own--God (and possibly Catherine herself) always excepted. It should I think be added, as Catherine goes on to suggest, that in meeting the fighting, dog-fancying, heavy drinking, child-neglecting and wife-

beating reprobate Bills, Bobs and Jacks of the East End, Booth encountered an aggression which in some ways resembled, and certainly stimulated his own, producing in time a movement that grew of its own aggressive and expansive force.[16]

Like Gladstone himself, I take a breather at this point to notice an piece of anecdotal evidence, adduced by Catherine, which clearly appealed to that side of Gladstone which enjoyed popular theatrical knockabout comedies. Catherine is discussing some of the officers who were created from members of the toughs of London's East End. One of these was "once a poor rag-picker, a woman who was rescued from drink and depravity, though a woman of good natural ability: [W]hen her husband was worsted in a fight, he used to hand over his opponent to her, and she could manage him. Gladstone finds this both interesting and worthy of approval.

We return from this comic vignette to the related serious topic; the need for aggressive Christianity. "Will anything less", Catherine writes, "than this determined hand-to-hand fight with evil serve to stem the tide of sin and demoralization which threatens our national life? What a long time the Church has been singing--I don't want to reflect on anybody we have to remember that she was talking to an audience of clerics--but how long has the Church been singing:--

"Onward Christian Soldiers, Marching as to war, With the Cross of Jesus Going on before"? How long have we been singing: - "Am I a soldier of the Cross?" And yet how little hand-to-hand fighting with sin and the devil![17]

Gladstone draws a line alongside this final exclamation. At a first reading it is perhaps surprising that he marks nothing in Catherine's almost immediately following passage, which might, I would have thought, attracted his attention, for or against:

"A further difference between us and the majority of the Churches is, the resuscitation of the SUPERNATURAL, of the DIVINE. Here, I think, is our real power. We do not underestimate intellect. God forbid. We have developed, as somebody said the other day, a large amount of intellectual power amongst the masses; because, you see, God's gifts are far more generously and impartially distributed than we are apt to imagine. Polish is not power; education is not intellect. We have found that out in the Salvation Army if we had not done so before. Nevertheless, ours is not a religion of of intellect, of culture, of refinement, of creeds, or of ceremony or forms. We attach very little importance to any of these in themselves. We gladly take hold of some of these, and use them as mediums through which to convey the living energy of the Spirit; but the POWER IS IN THE LIFE, not in the form: The vital point is the life--the spirit. We have resuscitated this old-fashioned religion. We defy infidels to account on natural principles for the results we have to show:"[18]

There has been no response from the great interlocutor as yet, and there is nothing for some sentences to come. Then, perhaps by employing theological terminology--which is not without its irony--she earns a tick and a line in the margin:

"I receive many letters from people after reading our books, congratulating us that we do not teach the Antinomian doctrines of a great deal of the evangelistic teaching of this day, that we don't preach the "only believe gospel," but that we preach repentance towards God, as well as faith in Jesus Christ, and a life of OBEDIENCE TO GOD and

that, without this, mere theories and creeds will only sink people lower into perdition:"[19]

He finds a further statement one step up in interest from this: a remark attributed to an MP:

"If it were only for the material benefits you are conferring by the reformation of all these drunkards and blackguards, bringing them back to useful occupations and to the position of reliable citizens, you deserve well of your generation."[20] The lecture is rounded off with the assertion that Salvation Army is ONE IN AIM with the Churches-- "the enlightenment and salvation and exaltation of the people"--but also puts in a plea of help in return for the help which the Salvation Army has rendered the Churches, a plea which interests Gladstone: It is one of the disadvantages under which we have laboured, that as our people get more refined and prosperous, many of them go off to the Churches, leaving us to struggle on with the masses beneath; and these are the people who could most help us with funds. Therefore we feel we have a double claim upon the sympathy of Christians. As they get so much help from us, they ought to help us roll the chariot on ahead and do the pioneering and scavenging."[21] (Gladstone was clearly struck by this last phrase, because he indexes it.)

Mrs Booth was not among those who regard business and the profit motive as evil in themselves. In her third lecture, *Business Principles in Religion, Illustrated by the Working of the Salvation Army* she comes close to paraphrasing Dr Johnson to the effect that No man but a blockhead ever worked except for money. Provided that such men strove righteously for profit--and, better still, gave some of it to the Salvation Army--she found no fault in them. What she prefers to say is that Christians should look for results from their labours. "We cannot see", she asserts, why religious establishments should be kept going without reference to the results"--and just in case what she means by this has been misapprehended, she spells it out: the Church should not be content to labour over a static number of souls, but should continue to make "appreciable aggression upon the territory of the enemy outside". In other words, souls must be won. Once again, she doesn't want to reflect on anybody, but "Christians of this generation "do not act on this principle" They "lose the end in the means", they (and this is where Gladstone gives her a double line for interest, "they rest in the labour without looking for adequate profits." There must be hard work applied to definite ideas of aims and ends, commonsense must be applied, and the warfare for the salvation of mankind must be conducted without sentimentality and "with at least as much care, sagacity and persistency as men bestow on earthly enterprises for gain or glory". [22]

So far so good, but then, so far as Gladstone is concerned, Catherine goes too far, drawing an admonitory "ma". She writes: "Jesus Christ and His apostles left us free as air as to modes and measures, that we may provide that kind of organization most suited to the necessities of the age. There is not a bit of "red-tapism" in the whole of the New Testament." I don't want to bore you with second guesses as to Gladstone's perturbation, but perhaps I should remind you that there is at least one procedural instruction in the New Testament: "Do this in remembrance of me", an injunction the

Salvation Army agreed to follow only in an idiosyncratic way not recognized by most of the rest of the Church.

However, the common sense of Mrs Booth's argument soon banishes any sense Gladstone may have had that the intentions of Jesus were being ignored or slighted; a double line and a v greet her suggestion that the people she wants to save may legitimately be induced to pay attention by "some novel or startling announcement, so that [i.e. so long as] the terms are innocent. What does it signify that they are strange and unconventional? Look at the sagacity of worldly men in advertising; think of the size and cost of their bills. Why do they go to such expense and trouble? Because they know that, in the rush and drive of this age, little unostentatious notices will not be looked at. Why should we be content with such for our Master's business...? We have numbers in our ranks today who were enticed out of the public house by our music and processions. Does it signify how we get hold of such men as laid the dynamite in the Government offices if we do get hold of them? (Gladstone's pencil comes out again to show his interest.)[23]

He objects again, however, when she comes back to a version, perhaps more highly coloured than hitherto, of one of her frequent awful warnings: "I often think how the higher classes will curse their fastidiousness when their MANSIONS ARE BURNING ABOUT THEIR EARS! How they will wish then that they had helped the Salvation Army." [24] Has he tired of this point? Does he find it crudely exaggerated? Does he think the enlightened self-interest of these mansion-owning classes will have kicked in before the torches are lit? Does he--heaven forbid--begin to suppose that this sounds like incitement to riot?

He makes two further marginal interventions, both positive. The first is a little illegible, but I think it is NB--alongside an assertion that "some of the huge forms and cumbrous organizations handed down to us only hamper good and true men. The second, concerns a matter which may make it seem that for some critics any stick was good enough to take a swipe at the Salvation Army; she defends the taking out of mortgages to finance building of additional halls for evangelical work, asking--Gladstone clearly thinks reasonably--"Are there not mortgages on half the chapel property in the land?" [25]

So we pass to the fourth and final lecture: The Probable Future of the Salvation Army. This begins by reiterating Catherine's need and purpose to do away with unfounded prejudice--and an immediate counter-claim that in fact there is nothing in Church history to compare with the speed and extent to which prejudice has been broken down, by comparison with the great revival movements of the past. Gladstone at various other points has queried this repeated claim of uniqueness in The Salvation Army's history of, at the time of publication, not quite 30 years. But Mrs Booth exhibits some degree of historical awareness, immediately conceding that, "the facilities for travel and spreading information are much greater than in bygone times". She might, of course, have pointed out that facilities for spreading misinformation were equally enlarged. It is perhaps time for me to come clean and admit that I think her repeated theme of persecution is not by

any means mere paranoia any more than is her idea that many of the culprits were people who professed to be Christians. Gladstone's first annotation in this chapter, is a line and a v--indicating, if I may remind you, both interest and approval--alongside this statement: "Of course Satan knows that everything depends on our being believed to be sincere, consecrated, disinterested people, and therefore he has done his utmost to start all manner of doubts, suspicions, and misrepresentations concerning us; and certainly he has found plenty of agents, mostly, alas! In the shape of professing Christians, ready to help in this evil work." [26]

This is, of course, a more complicated question than she is willing - naturally - to concede. She felt that she was doing the will of God; therefore, Christians who criticized her work must be doing the work of the devil. It is, I assume, equally the case that when T.H. Huxley contrived to extract the number 666 from the letters making up the name William Booth, he was doing much the same thing in reverse. It is also the case that Mrs Booth was unable to conceive any possibility of good in alcohol and therefore assumed that anyone who "used" it--as her puritan descendents say now--was wickedly self-indulgent and weak-willed, she was bound to be at odds with the Victorian religious establishment. But her experience of out-of-control drinking was, both in her childhood and from observation in her adult years, such as to make us at least understand her point of view.

Some of her other reiterated claims noticed by Gladstone need critical attention. The statement that her husband had "left a prosperous and happy ministerial career" trusting in God to look after himself, her and their four children under the age of five is at least partly a simplification. Had she qualified her assertion by saying, "what might seem to others to be" prosperous and happy, she would have been nearer the mark. She uses the statement here to suggest that, had he really been driven by an insensate yet coldly calculated ambition to be a kind of Protestant pope, he wouldn't have started by throwing over what he had and leaping headlong into the stormy sea of faith. All any of this means, I suppose is that we can contrive to find, as happens to suit us, simple or complex explanations to fit the facts of any case. But on her side of the argument, the fact remains that although, after the first heady days, he was never particularly content with his lot on the Methodist circuit, William Booth did take an enormous risk when he abandoned the Methodist New Connection for mission work in the Mile End Road. Simply because he was subsequently to become the sort of person who could invite himself to tea with kings, queens, prime ministers and governors general, to say nothing of Presidents, and who later still would be hailed by so sceptical an onlooker as Roy Hattersley as one entitled to be called an Eminent Victorian, we are not obliged to suppose that this was what he intended all along. He may have had the air of an Old Testament prophet, but he was not as far sighted as all that. (Gladstone, I must add, was apparently happy with Mrs Booth's view about her husband's "happy and prosperous ministerial career", awarding it a line and a v.) [27]

We are drawing towards an end. As I have noted already, Gladstone commends Catherine's delight in the "grand military idea" that she believed had made The Salvation Army uniquely effective. He is very interested by her encomium of her children,

who have embraced 'the life of toil, self-sacrifice and devotion: and though all the mother in me often cries, "Spare them!" my soul magnifies the Lord because He hath counted me worthy of such honour.' Other points to which he awards lines and, mostly, vs, in her peroration are: the assertion that faith must go hand in hand with good works; the Army's innovations in its manner of worship; the huge impact of its numerous women officers; the good effects that she says the Army has had upon the churches; and her claim that thieves and harlots SEND FOR THE SALVATION ARMY OFFICER WHEN THEY ARE DYING.

Catherine Booth's concluding paragraphs are directly concerned with the Army's possible future. Gladstone particularly notices, again often with vs: her defence of its one-man government; its acceptance of the fact (contrasted with "popery") that its members are not condemned leave it for other churches; her view that, should the Army ever lose its true spirit it should die at once rather than linger uselessly on; and that it should never settle down into a sect "if prayer and faith or prudence and foresight can prevent it".

There is an appendix addressing a topical controversy, which I will not discuss here. I will, however, mention that this document of five-and-half-pages is awarded five ticks. Not bad! I conclude by quoting the conclusion of the lectures themselves, a passage Gladstone marks as interesting, and make two short general comments of my own. Here are Catherine Booth's last five sentences:

"It is a wonderful achievement to get something about God, and religion, and eternity into our public prints, where they have so long been shut out! And I must say that the secular press has done us a great deal more justice than the religious. All honour to them! I am bound to say, that in common honesty I hope the religious press will learn better by-and-by. If they don't, they will be the sufferers and not the Salvation Army."

Reading the lectures through and relating them to Gladstone's annotations, I think it is possible to detect generally a rising level of enthusiasm in his response. As I have recorded there are three "ma"s and three admonitory crosses. After page 55 (of 92) he indicates no further reservations.

And, thinking both of the meeting between the two grand old Williams which I discussed in this place last year and of Gladstone's posthumous communion with Booth's promoted-to-glory wife and colleague (another grand old Catherine) via a book published only 18 months before her horribly painful death, something else strikes me--a strong feeling that Gladstone, whatever he may have thought of the Salvation Army's theology and methods, recognized and approved in the Booths something of his own determination to keep on fighting for what he believed in until he was removed from the scene.

Thank you.

[1] CB, pp. iii-iv.

[2] CB, pp. 1-3

[3] CB, pp. 7-9

[4] CB, p. 24

[5] CB, pp. 9-11

[6] CB, pp. 11-24

[7] CB, p. 25

[8] CB, p. 27

[9] CB, pp. 31-32

[10] CB, p. 68

[11] The first International Congress took place in 1884, which suggests that this reference may have been on of the "additions" made to the lectures at the time of publication. Some press comment suggested that the Congress may have been staged in order to distract public attention from the Maiden Tribute scandal, when Bramwell Booth, William and Catherine's eldest son, was persuaded by W.T. Stead, the crusading editor and originator of the phrase, to help him abduct a girl in order to show how easy it was for the trade in infant prostitution to flourish in London at the time. Stead went to jail, but Bramwell Booth was acquitted.

[12] CB, pp. 27-28

[13] CB, pp. 28-29

[14] CB, p. 29

[15] CB p. 30

[16] CB, pp. 31-33

[17] CB, p. 38

[18] CB, pp. 38-39

[19] CB, pp. 39-40

[20] CB, pp. 39-41

[21] CB, pp. 40 & 44.

[22] CB, pp. 47-50

[23] CB pp. 52-53

[24] CB p. 55

[25] CB, pp. 56 & 61

[26] CB, pp. 63-65

[27] CB, p. 67

## **Button Holing**

by Commissioner Wesley Harris

I read a report which stated that only about four per cent of North American evangelicals had ever led anyone to Christ. That statistic was a challenge because all Christians should be intentional about leading people to the Saviour. It should be what we are all about as a Salvation Army. But is it?

Commissioner Catherine Bramwell-Booth told me that in the early days people were often reluctant to get into a railway compartment occupied by a uniformed Salvationist because they could expect to be 'buttonholed' and challenged as to whether or not they were 'saved'.

William Booth had set an example. One of his former secretaries told me that if he travelled in a cab or a train he would almost invariably challenge the driver about his spiritual condition. The same went for the wealthy host or hostess in whose home he had been billeted. Does that sound 'scary'?

Nowadays habitual 'button-holers' seem to have disappeared from among us. In fact we might be embarrassed if they reappeared and we could make a case that their reappearance would be counter-productive. We could affirm that rather than trying to force an immediate entry into another soul we should first look for the key of friendship and take time to establish some rapport before raising spiritual issues. Different people in different ways may lead a soul step by step to Jesus. Fair enough?

But now is the day of salvation. How much more time can we count upon? Is salvation the point and purpose of all we do? Or don't we care enough about a person's soul salvation to be willing to try all means in order to bring it about sooner rather than later, if possible. Some time may be no time! Has that master passion which brought us into being become cooled over the years? Would perusal of our corps seekers' registers lead us to question whether we are still a Salvation Army in the fullest sense of the term, or have we become something else?

In recent years our corps have become more and more involved in welfare work for which we gain public approval and even government grants. Personally, I welcome this development and even as a corps officer did my utmost to bring it about. But in pressing the need for social salvation and the relief of physical deprivation we must be sure that we see it as an expression of the gospel and not a substitute for it. The spiritual imperative must remain at the heart of all we do. The best service we can render to anyone is to introduce them to Jesus Christ.

Satan may come up with some plausible reasons why we should not be direct and intentional in our 'aggressive Christianity'. He may even suggest perfectly good things which could deflect us from the primary purpose for our existence. Keeping the first thing the first thing is not easy but it is imperative.

## **Rights and Responsibilities of Covenant** **- a look at Judges 2**

by Captain Michael Ramsay

Judges 2:1,2: The angel of the LORD went up from Gilgal to Bokim and said, "I brought you up out of Egypt and led you into the land that I swore to give to your forefathers. I said, 'I will never break my covenant with you, and you shall not make a covenant with the people of this land, but you shall break down their altars.' Yet you have disobeyed me. Why have you done this?"

This is a disappointing but very important passage from which to launch the stories of the Judges.[1] Reading a few verses further (Joshua 2:1-5) we learn why the Israelites and their allies suffer hundreds of years of oppression:[2] the cycle of sin, enslavement, repentance, deliverance, and sin again - which repeats until Israel finally descends into civil war and anarchy - this whole downward spiral[3] stems from one disobeyed promise; a disregarded covenant.

How we live in our covenant relationships has significant implications; our promises, our covenants are very important to God. The Lord promised His people that He would never break His covenant with them (Judges 2:1; cf. Lev 26:42-44, Deut 7:9). As such, instead of being released from our covenants before the Lord simply for disobeying them (cf. Romans 7:2), there are often serious consequences that result from taking our covenants lightly (cf. Num 33:55; Josh 23:13).

This is important for us as Salvationists to remember because we do have the opportunity to enter into rich and strong covenant relationships with the Lord in the form of our Officers' and Soldiers' covenants. It is important too for all of us living in the new covenant era of the post-resurrection world and especially for those of us living in the so-called 'First World' where litigation, broken contracts, and divorces[4] occur on a daily basis both inside and outside the churches. As Christians we should all be aware of exactly what we are getting into when we enter into a covenant. When we enter with the LORD as either a partner or a witness, we should realise to what we are agreeing.

### **Covenants are good.**

Covenants with and before God are good things. The Lord uses covenants to give us direct access to strength, security, and blessing. The Lord made a promise to Abraham (Genesis 12) that all the nations of the earth will be blessed through him and this promise is ultimately fulfilled through Jesus Christ. The Lord made a covenant with Abraham (Gen. 15) that his descendants would at some point in time occupy the land promised to him. The Lord is faithful to His word. He does not break his covenants.[5] He is bound to us through His covenants.

This is good news and, as we have discussed in JAC before (Issues 52, 40) the most common word for covenant in the Hebrew Bible is berit[h], (mentioned 286 times).[6] Berit[h] in all probability comes from the Akkadian word for 'to shackle'[7] so the image

of a covenant with (or in the presence of) the LORD then is of one actually being bound, shackled to him with a tie that will not be broken, a chain that cannot be severed.[8]

These covenantal ties are strong and trying to break them – like trying to snap out of iron shackles – will be unsuccessful and will naturally result in unpleasant consequences. Judges 2:3: "...you have disobeyed me.... Now therefore I tell you that I will not drive them [the Canaanites] out before you; they will be thorns in your sides and their gods will be a snare to you." It is important for us to remember that there are consequences that result from rebelling against our covenants.

The episode around this covenant referred to in Judges 2 is particularly interesting. It relates to the covenant of Genesis 15 and it refers also to the covenant experience of Joshua 9.[9] God commanded Israel not to make a covenant with the Canaanites (Cf. Deut 7:1-6; 20:16-18);[10] God told the Israelites to destroy the Canaanites.[11] (This was after the people of Canaan had graciously been given 400 years and still did not repent of their own sins, cf. Gen 15:16.)

### **There are natural results of rebellion against covenants.**

The Israelites did not follow in a proper covenant - Joshua 9:3ff:

"...when the people of Gibeon [who were Canaanites] heard what Joshua had done to Jericho and Ai, they resorted to a ruse [they tricked them]: they went as a delegation whose donkeys were loaded with worn-out sacks and old wineskins, cracked and mended. The men put worn and patched sandals on their feet and wore old clothes. All the bread of their food supply was dry and mouldy. Then they went to Joshua in the camp at Gilgal and said to him and the men of Israel, "We have come from a distant country; make a treaty with us.""

Notice that the Canaanites lied to Joshua and the Israelite leaders; the leaders were tricked when made the treaty with the Canaanites (Joshua 9:15) - without first discussing the matter with God - and in doing this they disobeyed their earlier covenant with the LORD.

Betraying a promise to YHWH is not a trivial matter. In the book of Judges alone (and the breach of this particular covenant will come up again in other books: Joshua 9, 2 Samuel 21) generations of people suffer as a result of their forefathers' broken promise to God. For hundreds of years, their children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and even more than that experience the consequences of continuing in rebellion against this covenant and this promise. The natural results of not respecting our covenants with or before God (whether or not we are tricked into them, whether we consult God before we call Him as a witness: Joshua 9) can be devastating. There are consequences for ignoring our covenants and betraying our promises.

A contemporary example from the marriage covenant.

This should be easily understandable for us because this same thing still happens in our world today. Think about the children who are raised in broken homes. Think about the children whose parents rebelled against their marriage covenants with each other and before God<sup>[12]</sup> (Romans 7:2; 1 Corinthians 7:10-14; Luke 16:16-16; Mark 10:1-12; Matthew 5:32, 19:9: You will note in these references that – even if one ‘goes out on a limb’ in order to argue that you no longer need to live with the one you with whom you are covenanted in marriage – there is still no NT provision made for marrying a second or subsequent spouse while the one you covenanted before God with is still alive.) One is not released from one’s covenants simply by disobedience to them. God takes all our covenants seriously. There are consequences for not walking in a proper covenant.

Some of the consequences for rebelling against the marriage covenant through divorce are immediate and some of the immediate consequences are the struggles of how to raise a child in two separate homes with two separate sets of rules. Some of the immediate consequences are the challenges involved in that fact that whatever the problem was that split up the marriage in the first place was obviously never resolved: mom or dad still moved out. Some of the immediate consequences of disregarded marriage covenants are that children from broken homes are more likely to be ‘latch-key kids’ and less likely to have access to all the material and emotional support that their peers do. Some of the immediate consequences include the possibility that, at best, one may only ever get a good night kiss from one of their single parents.

But there is more than that in our world today; there are consequences for future generations as well. Many people who get divorced once wind up getting divorced twice or even thrice.<sup>[13]</sup> Children of divorce are more likely to be divorced themselves<sup>[14]</sup> and perpetuate the devastating cycle that contributes to generations and generations and generations going without the emotional, spiritual, and other support that only comes from strong marriage covenants.

This is sad because there is a great benefit from continuing in a strong covenant relationship but when we stray from it there are often devastating results. As one continues to read through the book of Judges, it becomes obvious that much misery comes as a direct result of the Israelites’ disobedience to their covenant with the Lord. There are consequences for not walking in proper covenants.

### **If we rebel against a covenant we are not released from it for bad behaviour.**

Relating to the disobeyed covenant in Judges 2, we learn from in Joshua 9 that the Israelites were tricked into making this covenant agreement with the Gibeonites (who are Canaanites). They didn’t realise that in so doing they were defying their previous promise to God. They entered into this new agreement under false pretences. The Gibeonites lied to them but that doesn’t change the fact that Israel is now bound through the covenant her leaders made with the Gibeonites before God (Joshua 9:18; Judges 2:2). The leaders themselves are well aware that they are bound to keep this covenant (Joshua 9:18); when the Israelites find out that they have been tricked, they don’t nullify the agreement: they realise that it is not within their authority (or power) to do so; Israel

still does not attack the Gibeonites. They don't attack the Gibeonites because –even though they have been lied to, even though they have been tricked, even though they have been deceived – they are still bound to God and the Gibeonites via this treaty. Simply disobeying a covenant does not render it void (cf. Judges 2:1; Romans 3:3-4, 7:2; 1 Corinthians 7:10-14; Luke 16:16-16; Mark 10:1-12; Matthew 5:32, 19:9).[15] There are consequences for disregarding a promise but because we disobey a promise made before God does not render that covenant void (Romans 3:3,4).[16] God says, through His angel, Judges 2:1: “I will NEVER break my covenant with you.” The covenant with or the covenant before God is not nullified; the ties are not severed, just because one disobeys God.

There is another interesting point about the agreement that Israel enters into here (Joshua 9) that sets the stage for the book of Judges. Israel enters into a covenant with God first (cf. Genesis 15:7-21; Exodus 34:12-13; Numbers 33:55; Joshua 23:13) and this covenant says that He will give them the land and that they will not make a covenant with the Canaanites: they will instead destroy the present inhabitants of the land. Then the Israelites –without consulting God- enter into the second covenant with the Gibeonites (who are Canaanites) promising that they will not destroy them and in the process Joshua and the Israelites disobey the first covenant agreement with God.

### **The Both / And of Covenant.**

Israel is understandably held to its original agreement with YHWH. It is understandable that Israel suffers the consequences (Judge 2:2-3; Exodus 34:12-13; Numbers 33:55; Joshua 23:13) for disobeying God by making this competing covenant. What is interesting, however, is that the Israelites are also held accountable to this new covenant with the Gibeonites, which they made before God even though they made it contrary to the expressed command of God (2 Samuel 21; Joshua 9, Exodus 34:12-13; Numbers 33:55; Joshua 23:13). The Israelites disobeyed God in making this second covenant but they are still held accountable to it. God holds them accountable to both covenants: the one that He initiated and the one that He forbade.[17]

In Judges 2, we read of the consequences for breaking the first covenant with God and in 2 Samuel 21 we see the consequences the Israelites suffer for breaking the second, competing covenant with the Gibeonites. God holds us to our promises. Whether we are lied to, tricked, or even enter into a covenant that is against the Lord's commands, God holds us to our covenants that are made with Him either as a witness or as one of the parties Himself.

2 Samuel 21: 1ff:

During the reign of David, there was a famine for three successive years [people die]; so David sought the face of the LORD. The LORD said, “It is on account of Saul and his blood-stained house; it is because he put the Gibeonites to death.” The king summoned the Gibeonites and spoke to them. (Now the Gibeonites were not a part of Israel but were survivors of the Amorites [Canaanites]; the Israelites had sworn to spare

them, but Saul in his zeal for Israel and Judah had tried to annihilate them.) David asked the Gibeonites,

“What shall I do for you? How shall I make amends so that you will bless the LORD's inheritance?”

The Gibeonites answered him, “We have no right to demand silver or gold from Saul or his family, nor do we have the right to put anyone in Israel to death.”

“What do you want me to do for you?” David asked.

They answered the king, “As for the man who destroyed us and plotted against us so that we have been decimated and have no place anywhere in Israel, let seven of his male descendants be given to us to be killed and exposed before the LORD at Gibeah of Saul—the Lord's chosen one.”

So the king said, “I will give them to you.”

Verses 13-15:

David brought the bones of Saul and his son Jonathan from there, and the bones of those who had been killed and exposed were gathered up. They buried the bones of Saul and his son Jonathan in the tomb of Saul's father Kish, at Zela in Benjamin, and did everything the king commanded. After that, God answered prayer in behalf of the land.

Even though the Israelites disobeyed God by entering into this covenant with the Gibeonites - and suffered their due consequences for disobeying the terms of the covenant with God- when they transgressed this new covenant that they made with the Gibeonites - even though it was against the expressed will of God - God did not even answer their prayers until they made it right.

### **Conclusion.**

I would like to re-emphasise a couple of things: One, God does not sever the covenantal ties that bind us to (or before) Him. He is faithful to His promises, even if we are faithless (Romans 3:3,4). This is important for us to remember. We should not enter into our covenants lightly. I don't believe that God says we can simply declare (through the courts or otherwise) that our partner did not live up to the marriage covenant and so we are no longer married (cf. Romans 7:2; 1 Corinthians 7:10-14; Luke 16:16-16; Mark 10:1-12; Matthew 5:32, 19:9). I don't think that God says that simply because we had a drink we can throw out our Soldiership agreement. I don't think the shackle is cut. I don't think that God says that just because we decide not to be Officers anymore that we are released from our vow to 'make soul-saving a primary purpose of our lives.' I think that this covenant referred to in Genesis 15, Joshua 9, Judges 2, and 1 Samuel 21 points to

the fact that God doesn't break His covenants with us and as a natural result, there are consequences for us if we try to break that chain that binds.[18]

This brings me to my second point of emphasis: covenants are not punishments; the consequences for rebelling against covenants are not punishments; the consequences of rebellion are the natural and logical results of our own actions. As I have already pointed out, the origin of the Hebrew word for 'covenant' comes from a root word meaning, 'to be shackled together.' The image of a covenant then is one of being shackled to God through a promise. One can compare a covenant with God (be it through marriage, Soldiership, Officership ...) to being shackled to a locomotive, with God being the locomotive. When we are chained to the train and ride comfortably on it – following the Lord's leading - we wind up where He is going a lot faster and a lot easier than if we travel the tracks on our own strength (under our own steam). This is the benefit of a strong covenant with the Lord.

If, however, once we are bound to the Locomotive of the Lord by a covenant, if we try to go our own way or try to shackle ourselves to something going in a different direction, it is not going to be a pleasant experience. The tie doesn't break. Disobedience to our covenants is like jumping off the train and trying to run in the opposite direction while we are still chained to it. It is going to hurt but this is not God's fault. He doesn't throw us from the train and because God is faithful (cf. Rom 3:3,4) this covenantal chain is so strong that it won't break - therefore what we suffer are the natural results of our own actions. This is what happened in the stories of the Judges (cf. Judges 2). God, wanting the Israelites to experience the full rest of the promise land entered into a covenant with Abraham and then with Israel. They willingly shackled themselves to His train but later, however, the Israelites also shackled themselves to the Gibeonite train that was going in a different direction and suffered the natural and logical consequences of their actions. This is exactly what happens to us when we don't respect our covenants.

There is good news in all this though and this good news is a great strength for covenanted people: no matter how many times we are faithless and jump off that train; no matter how many times we try to break the covenant; no matter how many times we throw ourselves on the tracks, under the wheels of the 'God Train', the Lord is faithful. While we are still alive (cf. Romans 7:1,2), there is opportunity to return to the Lord, the covenantal chain will not be broken.

God is faithful, and Jesus himself is standing here as the new chain that binds all of us in our relationship to God. Jesus is the new covenant through whom whosoever may will indeed be pulled back up onto the train as we turn to and rely on the Lord; so then instead of rebelling against God, instead of pulling against the tie that binds, let us all give our lives over fully to the Lord, buckle up, lean back and enjoy the fully sanctified ride on His train because His train is bound for glory.

-----

[1] The 'Judges', with the notable exception of Deborah, were actually more like military rulers and 'strong men' than judges as we would think of them today.

[2] Exactly how many hundreds of years has been debated. If one adds up the total time of enslavement as if they were served consecutively, one would arrive at a total of 480 years. There is a distinct possibility that some of these times of enslavement could be served concurrently. It is also likely that no one tribe suffered the entire length of subjugation. Cf. Denis T. Olsen, *NIB II: Judges*, (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1998) 724. Cf. also Robert G. Boiling, *Judges*, AB 6A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975) 9-29.

[3] The extent of the periods of peace generally decline as the story progresses.

[4] Divorce Magazine.com has world statistics for divorce: Aus 46%, USA 45.8%, UK 42.6%, Can 37%; more statistics are available on-line at: <http://www.divorcemag.com/statistics/statsWorld.shtml>

[5] Michael Ramsay. *Covenant: When God is Bound...a look at Genesis 15:7-21*. *Journal of Aggressive Christianity*, Issue 52, December 2007 – January 2008, pp 5-10. Available on-line at [http://www.armybarmy.com/pdf/JAC\\_Issue\\_052.pdf](http://www.armybarmy.com/pdf/JAC_Issue_052.pdf)

[6] G.E. Mendenhall. "Covenant." In *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by George Arthur Buttrick. (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1962), 715.

[7] Ibid. Cf. also M. Weinfeld. "berith." In *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. Johannes Botterweck. (Stuttgart, W.Germany: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975), 253.

[8] Michael Ramsay, "Berit[h]" *Journal of Aggressive Christianity*, Issue 40, December 2005 – January 2006 pp 16-17.

[9] Read online: <http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Joshua%209&version=31>

[10] Cf. David H. Madvig. *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, Pradis CD-ROM:Joshua/Exposition of Joshua. The ruse discovered (9:16-27), Book Version: 4.0.2.

[11] Also known as 'Amorites,' Cf. Gen 15:16.

[12] Child and Family Canada: *Divorce, Facts, Figures, and Consequences*. Available on-line: [http://www.cfc-efc.ca/docs/vanif/00005\\_en.htm](http://www.cfc-efc.ca/docs/vanif/00005_en.htm): Overall, about one third of all marriages in Canada end in divorce and the rate is somewhat higher for remarriages. Dissolution rates are even higher among cohabiting couples. Currently, there are no solid predictions of either a sharp decline or a sharp rise in divorce rates in the near future.

[13] Statistics Canada: *The Daily: Wednesday March 9, 2005: Divorce*. Available on-line at: <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/050309/d050309b.htm>: In 1973, only 5.4% of divorces involved husbands who had previously been divorced. Some 30 years later, this proportion has tripled to 16.2% of all divorces. Similarly, the proportion of divorces involving wives who had previously been divorced rose from 5.4% to 15.7% during this three-decade period.

[14] *Divorce and Children: An Interview with Robert Hughes, Jr, PhD*. Available on-line at: <http://www.athealth.com/consumer/disorders/childrendivorce.html> Cf. also from the Associated Press: *Divorce Gap Narrows over time*. Available on-line at: <http://www.divorcereform.org/mel/rchildrenofdivor.html>

[15] Notice that in a rare NT command attributed directly to God himself (1 Cor 7:10,12) – rather than human origin - even if a divorce is permitted, remarriage is not. Just because the original covenant is disobeyed does not mean it is rendered broken. It does not mean that one is released from it,

[16] God is faithful even when we are unfaithful (Romans 3:3,4). Cf. Cf. N.T. Wright, "Romans and the Theology of Paul," p. 37. See also N.T. Wright, "The Law in Romans 2."

[17] There were natural and logical consequences for the Gibeonites after their deception as well. They were saved but, as per the earlier instructions of Moses (Deut 20:10-15; cf. Josh 16:10; 17:13; Judg 1:28, 30, 33, 35), they became forced labour for Israel (Joshua 9:21).

[18] For a discussion on this as it relates to Genesis 15 and Abraham's covenant with God, see Michael Ramsay. Covenant: When God is Bound...a look at Genesis 15:7-21. *Journal of Aggressive Christianity*, Issue 52, December 2007 – January 2008, p 5. On-line at [http://www.armybarmy.com/pdf/JAC\\_Issue\\_052.pdf](http://www.armybarmy.com/pdf/JAC_Issue_052.pdf)

## Are we a Metaphor?

by Anthony Castle

### A dangerous assumption

In recent discussion and debate a vital question, or common assumption, about The Salvation Army's identity has arisen. Basically, is TSA's militant metaphor contradictory and irrelevant to the gospel and the culture in which we minister.<sup>1</sup> In my view, the crux of this issue is not the relevance or alleged irrelevance of a militaristic identity, but the assumption that it's metaphorical. I concede that the term 'metaphor' has been employed in the past to explain TSA's militant modus operandi, though I suspect for lack a better word. You see when one assumes that TSA is a metaphor, one perceives its identity, cause and methods as figurative, immaterial, and like any trope of language, open to alteration. If we are a metaphorical army in a metaphorical war, then we are not really an army and this is not a war.

This assumption naturally arises because militancy is but one of many images presented in scripture to give simple description to our faith and practice. After all, it is not as if militancy is the only descriptive image offered in scripture. What of 'reaping the harvest' or 'running the race'? Scripture utilizes agricultural and athletic metaphors frequently, often alongside the militaristic image, and you don't see any other denominations getting carried away and transforming into the Harvesters of Deliverance with uniform overalls and farming equipment. No Athletes of Redemption either, equipped with vestment shorts and ecumenical relay baton. So why does the militant image apply beyond mere literary function. Why do we take the militant perspective, the notion of the great salvation war, so seriously?

### The sword of the Word - Eph 6:17, Heb 4:12

We take it seriously because scripture does. The militant image appears often in the epistles, frequently terming Christians as "soldiers" (Php 2:25, 2 Tim 2:3-4, Phm 1:2) engaged in a "struggle" (Heb 12:4, Eph 6:12), a "fight" (1 Tim 1:18, 2 Tim 4:7) or a "war" (2 Cor 10:4, 1 Pe 2:11). We are given divine armor (Eph 6) and weaponry (2 Cor 6:7, 10:4) to combat the strongholds of satan, whose title translates to "adversary" or "enemy". Outside the epistles there are a number of linguistic references in scripture regarding militancy, for example 'paganus', a term for those who aren't Christian, was originally used when describing one unengaged in military service.<sup>2</sup> The designation of Jesus as 'kurios' was actually an authoritarian title for a military commander.<sup>3</sup> Scripture employs a detailed militant rhetoric that easily supercedes any alternative image in frequency, depth and spiritual application.

Now, I admit that some of these passages are discoursing in various tropes, both metaphor and simile, but ultimately the militant image in scripture is more than words in its relation to the unseen reality of spiritual warfare and its apocalyptic conclusion. The spiritual realms are plagued with unseen, but actual, battles that define our faith and steer the fate of creation (Dan 10:13, Eph 6:12, Rev 12:7), until Jesus returns victoriously to "make war" against satan and his nations (Rev 19).

### **Literary vs Literal**

So the militant imagery applies literally to the metaphysical, but what about our physical action? Isn't the militant view of our ministry still just a metaphor? Maybe not. When we feed a hungry person, the experience of hunger is actually overcome and defeated. When we lead someone to Jesus, they have actually switched sides in a violent, cosmic struggle. We are literal protagonists involved in a literal conflict. We can express ourselves in metaphor through language, but not in behavior. We cannot be or do a metaphor.

If, for argument's sake, TSA must function as a trope, it may be better suited to metonymy. A metonymy is a figure of speech where the name of something is substituted with one of its attributes or associations, for example, referring to a Christian and their faith as a soldier in a war.

However, metonymy is just another rhetorical device, and though it may be useful in theological theory, it will fail when applied to our identity and its day to day practice. This is more than a case of semantics. Ultimately, this splitting linguistic headache has to do with our culture's preoccupation with categorisation and definition. It is a reaction symptomatic of the postmodern world's fatal cynicism. If something appears anachronistic or idealistic, we feel compelled to employ our most effective tool of subversion to devalue it... a definition.

### **Manifest Mystery/Sacramental life**

When the mirage of acceptance and respectability beckons, definitions are tempting. However, no figure of speech can accurately capture what we are as a movement. So could it be that we actually transcend rhetorical categorisation? When something eludes definition and understanding, it is either meaningless, or alternatively, a mystery. To avoid becoming yet another meaningless institution, we might need to advance into the 3rd millennium claiming the transcendent nature of our identity, not rejecting it. Letting our sweat, tears, prayers and epaulets do the talking. Avoiding all attempts to fit into uncomfortable categories and just function as a living, breathing, manifestation of mystery.

This works on the most basic level. Tell your neighbor that you're an official member of a conservative, protestant Church denomination/charity and they'll have turned their back and walked off before you've even finished the sentence. Tell them you're a covenanted warrior fighting to banish social and spiritual evils from the world and they'll at least pay attention.

This is the crux and the calling of the Salvationist. To fulfill the great commission in lives sacred and consecrated to the Kingdom of God. In other words, to live a sacramental life. Despite its ecclesiastical application, the term 'sacrament' derives from the Latin sacramentum, or mysterion in the Greek, a word that lends itself to two definitions: First, something set apart for sacred purposes, and second, a soldier's vow of self-consecration in regards to their army and kingdom.<sup>4</sup>

Our oath as soldiers, our identity as an army is rooted in mystery and the sacred and in consequence does not easily fall into definitions or submit to figures of speech. As sworn soldiers, was our promise to Jesus, our covenant to His cause, a metaphor? If it is, then is the Kingdom of God a metaphor? What about our salvation?

### **Context of culture or a context of compassion**

The question of metaphor never entered into the Salvationist ecclesiology of our spiritual ancestors as they vowed to evangelise the world. As early as 1879 Catherine Booth stated,

“We are an army. We grew into one, and then we found it out, and called ourselves one. Every soldier of this Army is pledged to carry the standard of the Cross into every part of the world, as far as he has opportunity. Our motto is “The World for Jesus”.<sup>5</sup>

William Booth put it in a similar fashion,

“Gradually, the Movement took more of the military form, and finding as we looked upon it... that God in His good providence had led us unwittingly, so to speak, to make an army, we called it an army, and seeing it was an army organised for deliverance of mankind from sin, and the power of the devil, we called it an army of deliverance, an army of salvation- The Salvation Army.”<sup>6</sup>

As far as William Booth was concerned, there were “killing armies”, and in sharp juxtaposition there was The Salvation Army. We weren’t the fake army, the others were.

Then again, maybe the question never arose. After all, the original Salvationists were probably too busy leading tens of thousands to Jesus, changing legislation to free women and children from prostitution and industrial slavery, as well as leading a branch of the Kingdom that spread dynamic spiritual and social reform across the planet. Why would they bother questioning what they were?

The weary suspicion that would have us mistake the sacramental reality of spiritual warfare for an anachronistic image will pass, especially in the context of mission. What does the homeless junkie overdosing in an alley have to say about our detailed and conflicting ecclesiastical rhetoric? What about the prostituted women on my street who’ll be beaten by their pimps tonight? The 44 children that have starved to death in the third-world in the time that it took for you to read this article? We are not a metaphor to them. We would do well to discard the literary categories and claim the literal reality. Make no mistake. This is war.

### Footnotes

1- In various writings, articles and debates the militant identity of The Salvation Army and its articulation in our form have been questioned. In almost all of these instances our militant identity has been labeled a ‘metaphor’. It is understandable that in light of the Church’s abhorrent contribution to such historical episodes as the crusades and colonialism, militancy in our faith has understandably become unpopular and intellectually taboo. Historically, The Salvation Army has often tailored the articulation of its militaristic

identity to suit the sensitivity of new mission fields, for instance, Booth-Tucker in India etc. Those entrenched in the frontlines of sensitive mission fields should be the ones to further discern the appropriate articulation of militancy in our form, and partner with Holy Spirit in advancing the Kingdom.

2- Major Phil Needham, *Community in Mission: A Salvationist Ecclesiology*, (The Campfield Press, Atlanta, 1987), p.126.

3- Needham, *Community in Mission*, p.126.

4- James Hastings Ed., *Dictionary of The Bible* (Morrison and Gibb Limited, London,1936), under entry 'Sacrament', p. 806.

5- Trevor Yaxley and Carolyn Vanderwal, *William and Catherine: The Life and Legacy of the Booths Founders of the Salvation Army*, (Bethany House Publishers, Minnesota, 2003), p.153.

6 Yaxley, Vanderwal, *William and Catherine*, p.148.

#### Bibliography

- Burrows, General Eva, (Rtd), notes from the lecture *The Identification Marks of The Salvation Army as part of the Christian Church*.

- Hastings, James, Ed., *Dictionary of The Bible*, Morrison and Gibb Limited, London,1936.

- Needham, Major Phil, *Community in Mission: A Salvationist Ecclesiology*, The Campfield Press, Atlanta, 1987.

- Yaxley, Trevor, Vanderwal, Carolyn, *William and Catherine: The Life and Legacy of the Booths Founders of the Salvation Army*, Bethany House Publishers, Minnesota, 2003.