

# **JOURNAL OF AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY**

# **JAC Online**

**Issue 102, April - May 2016**

Copyright © 2016 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

**In This Issue**  
**JOURNAL OF AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY**  
Issue 102, April - May 2016

Editorial Introduction *page 3*  
Major Stephen Court

Building Up The Temple *page 5*  
Heather Dolby (nee Wright)

A Prophecy For the Western Territories of The Salvation Army  
and for Individual soldiers *page 7*  
Andrew Bale

Friends Don't Let Friends Go To Hell *page 10*  
Michael Ramsay

Being Faithful With Dishonest Wealth:  
Stewardship in the Face of Global Poverty *page 13*  
James Pedlar

A Word To Dry Bones *page 17*  
Andrew Bale

The Lover and the Hidden Treasure *page 19*  
Ian Gillingham

Criminal Jesus *page 25*  
Aaron White

Fasting: The First Works of Jesus *page 26*  
Janet Munn

The Justice Decree *page 30*  
Danielle Strickland

Leadership in The Salvation Army:  
A Case Study in Clericalisation *page 31*  
Harold Hill

Companions Of The Cross *page 58*  
General William Booth

## **Editorial Introduction**

By Major Stephen Court, Editor

Greetings in Jesus' name. Mercy and peace to you from God our Father. I trust the battle progresses well on your front. Welcome to JAC102 - the third installment of the three-edition Centenary Celebration of Journal of Aggressive Christianity.

In JAC100 - part of the Centenary Celebration Series - we lifted every JAC Exclusive Interview over the first 99 issues and we all had opportunity for inspiration from all sorts of soldiers from all over the world.

JAC101 built on JAC100. Whereas JAC100 was the Interview Issue, JAC101 was the ISSUE Issue. We lifted a representative smattering of popular articles on important issues over the life of JAC.

JAC102 is the Challenge Issue. Included in this issue are prophetic words, summons to repent, edifying provocation, inspiring dream, and resolute decree.

Lieutenant Heather (Wright, at the time of JAC35) Dolby (now) in USA Southern Territory applied, back in JAC35, Old Testament physical lessons on priority to 21st century spirituality in Building Up The Temple.

Captain Andrew Bale (UKI) delivered, in JAC47, a prophecy for the western territories of The Salvation Army and for individual soldiers.

Captain Michael Ramsay (JAC41) explained that Friends Don't Let Friends Go To Hell (yes, he did address the bullhorn folk).

James Pedlar, in Canada, considered Being Faithful with Dishonest Wealth: Stewardship in the Face of Global Poverty (JAC67).

In JAC48, Bale followed up his previous entry (above) with A Word To Dry Bones, based on Ezekiel 36 and 37.

Canada's Captain Ian Gillingham (JAC67) offered an intriguing look into The Lover And The Hidden Treasure.

Aaron White challenged us with a depiction of Criminal Jesus, in JAC35.

In JAC40, Colonel Janet Munn (USE) explained how Fasting: (is) The first works of Jesus.

The Justice Decree (JAC59) was built on a collection of Bible verses, by Major Danielle Strickland (USW).

From New Zealand, Major Harold Hill (JAC37) gave us a glimpse at some of the research for his seminal book, *Leadership in The Salvation Army: A Case Study in Clericalisation*.

And in JAC83 General William Booth's *Companions of the Cross of Christ* offers a different future from the past that Hill explains.

And that's it. As God directs and permits, and tarries, you can expect us to build on the first 'century' in coming issues of JAC. Meanwhile, absorb and respond prayerfully to JAC102, and share widely. May God use it to help us position ourselves downstream in the River of His grace and in so doing position ourselves to complete the great salvation war.

## **Building Up The Temple** by Heather Dolby (*nee Wright*)

Did you ever read the book of Haggai? It's good stuff. The Lord sends his prophet Haggai to the Governor of Judah (Zerubbabel) and also to the High Priest (Joshua) with a message. It's not a pleasant message, in fact, it's rather convicting. This is what the Lord thought of the plans they had been making:

"Why is everyone saying it is not the right time for rebuilding my Temple? Is it then the right time for you to live in luxurious homes, when the Temple lies in ruins?" Haggai 1: 2-3 TLB

Hmm... strong words! I can imagine how it all went down. Haggai arriving at the meeting place to be ushered into the sumptuously decorated chambers and seated in a plush reclining chair around a highly polished mahogany table (worth a fortune) and offered the finest refreshments. Only to hear the discussion 'Yeahhh...we just don't feel the timing is right financially on this whole Temple-rebuild project. Let's reschedule a meeting for next quarter to re-visit the proposal.' Then everyone goes home to their mansions with the four car garages and tennis courts and room for a pony...in other words, we have the resources, but we'd rather spend them on ourselves and live it up selfishly with our pony than to give our tithe to the Lord for His holy Temple to be rebuilt.

This is a BIG DEAL. The Temple that they were putting off building was where our Jesus spent a whole lot of time when He arrived on the scene. He performed healings in this Temple, the blind were given sight, and the crippled were restored. He taught the people in a way that they could understand, which must have been refreshing, because in that day, only those born into certain roles were taught to read, understand and think for themselves, so when the people came to the Temple for worship, the guy giving the 'message' was like a Harvard professor preaching to a class of Grade 6 students. The Temple is where Jesus had verbal skirmishes with the 'self-important' – the Pharisees, Sadducees and teachers of the law. It's where Judas Iscariot felt the burn of conviction and cried out to the chief priests that he had betrayed an innocent man and then thrown down the thirty pieces of silver. It is the Temple that was destroyed upon Jesus' death; the curtain separating the Holy of Holies, torn in two.

THIS is the Temple that Zerubbabel the governor and Joshua the priest were hemming and hawing about building.

They were dragging their feet because up until that point they were using the resources that God gave them to live enjoyable, comfortable lives. So, the Lord does what He always does when He wants to bring a message to His people. He sends a prophet to give the Word, and an apostle to lead them into carrying it out. The Lord sends Haggai to the people and begins to prepare Nehemiah to come and spur them on. He was raising up people in the community not only to go and speak out the plans that He wanted to come about, but also equipping and sending out those who would implement the vision and work to make it possible.

First the prophet and then the apostle.

What does that speak to us today? Consider this: that the Temple WE are building is not one of dead rock, but out of believers:

“and now you have become living building-stones for God’s use in building His house.”  
1 Peter 2:5

We hold back, not solely in our money, old clothes we could be giving away or the extra room that we could invite someone to stay in but when we don’t live simply. We don’t give the Word of God our full attention, rushing through a skimpy devotional just to be able to say ‘well, at least that’s done’.

We don’t spend the time in prayer – just doing all the talking and not pausing to listen because we don’t expect God to even say anything to us anyway and besides, we’d rather go watch TV...we are holding back.

We are building up our own household of sinful flesh rather than denying ourselves and giving our all to be a living building-stone in the eternal Temple of the King of Kings. We drag our feet because we too are using the resources God gave us to live out comfortable lives.

We can look back at Joshua and Zerubbabel and at their reluctance to change, but we can also look ahead to all that God would do through the Temple that He wanted built. Our position in history affords us the knowledge that the Temple simply HAD to be built, and WOULD be built, even if that meant a little self-denial on the part of the people.

The same message holds true for us today. We have a reluctance to be self-sacrificial and to deny ourselves, but we can’t even begin to imagine all that God will do through His living Temple, the Church – and through each individual building-stone.

*“Building up the Temple, building up the Temple,  
building up the Temple of the Lord  
Boys won’t you help us? Girls won’t you help us?  
Building up the Temple of the Lord.”*

## **A prophecy for the western territories of the Salvation Army and for individual soldiers within The Salvation Army**

by Andrew Bale

*Editor's Remarks: in January 2007, Major Janet Munn prophesied that "The Salvation Army is coming into its finest hour." It is in this context that we offer the prophecy from Andrew Bale (also in January). Please consider Bale's offering as a potential means of positioning ourselves so that God can fulfill Munn's word.*

The following came to me today in prayer and I share it in humility – may God bless, redeem, sanctify and use the Salvation Army – Hallelujah!

“The Salvation Army is one of my favoured children. In your youth I gave you a multicoloured coat woven with a weft of marvellous signs and wonders, but over the years you have rebelled against me until you are no longer able to recognise the sound of my voice. It is bad enough when a parent and child refuse to speak but when one fails to recognise the voice of the other the situation has become tragic. I am speaking to you as much as I ever have done but you do not recognise my voice.

- I am still calling you in the direction of the disenfranchised and friendless but you cannot hear me.
- I will am still calling you to purity of living and holiness but you cannot hear me.
- I am still calling you to stand between the oppressed and the oppressor but you cannot hear me.
- I am still calling you to the mighty work of soul winning but you cannot hear me.
- I am still calling you to poverty, persecution and victory but you cannot hear me.

The once covenanted warriors of my Salvation Army have become desensitised to my voice.

Like the early church you were born with a rush of Pentecostal fire and your early years were accompanied by salvation war and revival. You were persecuted because you made serious inroads into the devil's territory and the narrow way that led to heaven was crowded with your converts. You found again the pearl of holiness and sold all that you had to possess it.

Now you have become a “Sinful nation, a people loaded with guilt, a brood of evildoers, children given to corruption! You have forsaken the LORD; you have spurned the Holy One of Israel and turned your backs on him.” (Verse 4)

I have seen your suffering and I beg you to stop your wilful self-harm.

“Why should you be beaten anymore? Why do you persist in rebellion? Your whole head is injured, your whole heart afflicted...” (Verses 5-7)

Your Corps are closing, your seats are empty, your halls are falling into disrepair and you have no money to rebuild them. Other denominations are trying to use the weapons I crafted for you – they are trying – but they are not you and their armour is ill-fitting and clumsy, they have not read the manual, they have not been properly drilled, your methods – the tactics designed for you are alien to them.

“Your country is desolate, your cities burned with fire; your fields are being stripped by foreigners right before you, laid waste as when overthrown by strangers.” (Verse 7)

Yet in spite of this breakdown in our relationship, in spite of your rebellion and your self-harm and poverty you continue with your religious ordinances. You march to deserted streets and preach to nobody. You feed the slave and clothe him but fail to break his chains. You polish your holiness tables but deny the possibility of purity. You hold music festivals that are nothing but concerts with an ‘amen’ at the end. You parade your good works like phylacteries ensuring that the world - along with your right hand - knows exactly what your left hand is doing. This offends me, I find it detestable, it is worse than the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah - I never asked for this.

“Stop bringing meaningless offerings! Your incense is detestable to me. New Moons, Sabbaths and convocations— I cannot bear your evil assemblies.” (Verse 13)

You are praying and even fasting but I have blocked my ears – Salvation Army I am not listening to you.

“When you spread out your hands in prayer, I will hide my eyes from you; even if you offer many prayers, I will not listen.”

Go and wash yourself, your hands are stained with blood for the road to hell is now crowded with the shuffling hopelessness of those I raised you up to save and their blood is on your hands – you think it is enough to feed them and clothe them and wash them but it is not enough. There is no greater contradiction than yours for your arrogant self obsession slaps a man on the back with a hearty ‘God bless you’ and then turns away as he falls into the fiery fissures of hell.

“Your hands are full of blood; wash and make yourselves clean. Take your evil deeds out of my sight! Stop doing wrong, learn to do right! Seek justice, encourage the oppressed.” (Verse 16-18)

Once you depended on me, you bought where you had no money, you attacked where you had no chance of victory and you opened fire on a wing and a prayer. Once heaven rang with the sound of your volleys and the angels wept at the audaciousness of your evangelism but now you have prostituted yourself. Now you have taken what is Caesar’s and failed to give me what is mine. You have taken Babylon’s money and bedded the heathen philanthropist. You have sacrificed your right to pray and preach for the chance to buy a building. Once you shouted ‘no compromise’ but now you are all compromise.



“See how the faithful city has become a harlot! She once was full of justice; righteousness used to dwell in her— but now murderers!” (Verse 21)

What is my judgement to be? How will I treat you? What is my response to your individual and corporate sin?

“Come let us reason together...”

I am looking and waiting for you. Like the prodigal I can see you now feeding on the scraps of this unclean world. It is in this mess, that you have created, that you must come to your senses. Dear Salvation Army come back to me for I have a robe and a ring and a fattened calf all waiting for you. It is time to come home!

“Though your sins are like scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they are red as crimson, they shall be like wool. If you are willing and obedient, you will eat the best from the land; but if you resist and rebel, you will be devoured by the sword.” For the mouth of the LORD has spoken.” (Verses 18-20)

I have left for myself a remnant and if they will humble themselves and identify themselves in repentance and sorrow then I will unblock my ears and clear my eyes and let the ‘revolution now begin’.

- The cost is repentance.
- The cost is a full renunciation of the values and standards of this world.
- The cost is a new and brave exposure to total dependence upon me.
- The cost is a full consecration of all you have and are to me (all I have ever asked is that you love me with all your heart, soul, body and mind – I am a jealous God and will not share your love with another!)

“I will turn my hand against you; I will thoroughly purge away your dross and remove all your impurities. I will restore your judges as in days of old, your counsellors as at the beginning. Afterward you will be called the City of Righteousness, the Faithful City.” Zion will be redeemed with justice, her penitent ones with righteousness.”

The future of the Salvation Army will be settled in the next 10 years – it is a clear choice – repent and live or rebel and die.”

Yours set apart by Christ for the lost, in the Army.

Andrew Bale

## **Friends don't let Friends go to Hell**

by Michael Ramsay

### **Part 1: Aggressive Christianity vs. Friendship Evangelism**

*"Most of the people that I have heard extol the virtues of Friendship evangelism practice no evangelism at all".*

I was speaking with Peter Unya today, a good friend of mine that I haven't heard from in awhile. He was telling me that "a friendship evangelist is neither [a friend nor an evangelist]" and that they "may be Christians but they certainly aren't Salvationists". Pete is a smart guy. I think he made some good points in our discussion. Let me try to communicate what he was saying in Mike language.

His argument was that the people he had come across in his life who were opposed to open evangelism often claimed that they preferred 'friendship evangelism'. I believe that he was in a discussion with a 'friendship evangelist' before we talked today and that set him off with the wonderfully passionate quotes that opened this article.

The argument in favour of friendship evangelism goes like this: you make a friend. They see that you are happy being a Christian. They ask you how to be a Christian and you take them to Church. The problem is that the friendship evangelist is not out there intentionally seeking to serve God by extending the Kingdom. She hopes to fulfil the great commission by having the world come to her.

Don't misunderstand me, or my friend Pete for that matter, no Christian can be opposed to someone who wants to lead all of their friends to Christ. The problem is that the term 'friendship evangelist' seems to be a euphemism for someone who doesn't care if anyone other than their friends go to hell or not - and their friends are usually already 'Christian'.

Hell is real. I believe in it just like I believe in Jesus. Hell is the most horrible thing there is. It is more than separation from God; It is more than your worst fears; It is worse than Guantanamo or Abu Garib; It is Hell! Jesus can save you from hell. Jesus can save your friends from hell. Jesus can save everyone from hell. All an evangelist has to do is introduce people to Jesus! We should all be evangelists.

If you believe in Hell and you believe in Jesus, then you will want to save everyone from Hell - not just your friends! If you saw a shipwreck and everyone was dying, would you only save your friends! If all you had to do was point them to the life raft (Jesus) and everyone could be saved if they swam there, would you only tell your friends? Would you let everyone else drown? What kind of a person would that make you? "In the best case scenario, that is what a friendship evangelist is... someone who, seeing that everyone is dying, only even tries to save his friends... and then only if he is sure that he won't risk his personal feelings and friendships in the process...what kind of a friend is

that?" (Pete Unya). What kind of a Christian is that? What kind of a person is that? People are dying and Jesus can save them.

Can you imagine if William Booth was a mere 'friendship evangelist'? Can you imagine Wesley was only a 'friendship evangelist'? Or Paul? Or Jesus? ...Would any of us be here now?

I spend my Sunday evenings walking around the streets here in 20 below weather offering prayer, food, shelter, help and the love of God in the name of Jesus to any who need it. I don't hide my light under a bushel and you know what? There are people in the Kingdom of Heaven tonight because of it. I am not ashamed of the gospel.

There is a parable of the sheep and the goats - both claim God - only the sheep make it into heaven. If Christ's great commission to us was to tell everyone that he is the life raft out there and we don't do it, are we sheep?

So that is what I was thinking after my discussion with my good friend Peter. If I am wrong, or have been led astray by Pete, and 'friendship evangelism' is alive, well, and effectively winning the world for Jesus, please let me know.

But as for me I will continue to be the best friend possible, by being an evangelist, to everyone the Lord sends in my path.

Praise God! Hallelujah!

### **Friends don't let Friends go to Hell Part 2: Bullhorn Man**

We watched a short film here a while ago whose central character was a seemingly friendless, middle-aged, pudgy, balding fellow with a bullhorn. He would print out tracts and yell to people through his bullhorn to accept Jesus. A slightly younger narrator was sitting on a bench telling the Christian audience what was wrong with this. This was a powerful anti-evangelism film. The implicit statement was that it is not worth it to be a fool for the Kingdom of God. Of course, this is wrong but was there another point?

Bullhorn Man was a Lone Ranger; one other point might be that evangelism works best within the context of authentic Christian community. When we are used by God to snatch people from the flames of hell, it is good to be able to have a safe place to send them so they don't fall right back in as soon as we turn our heads. Christian support and teaching is very important. That being said, the lone evangelist can form that discipling relationship, himself, with the people he meets.

Bullhorn Man was annoying. One point could be that we have to be smart when we are evangelising. This is true. I am not saying that there is never a time for the bullhorn but maybe there are better methods. I ask God to lead people to me who He would like to meet when I walk the streets. I pay close attention to the prompting of the Holy Spirit with regards to who to approach. Much of the time I can let others open the

conversation. There are a lot of drug dealers, panhandlers, prostitutes and other members of the underground economy here and they have no problem approaching people with their product. When they do, I respectfully decline and offer them God.

At one point here when I declined the drugs and offered prayer instead, I was invited into a hot-boxed bus-shelter full of teenagers and was asked if I would 'rap' a prayer. They took off their hats at the prompting of one of their number and I rapped out the only rap prayer I think that I have ever offered. When I left, we had all had a positive encounter with God. I have been honoured by praying with people on the street, been blessed when they prayed for me, and privileged to be there when the tears of repentance flowed and they accepted Jesus. Many times they opened the conversation by asking for money or trying to sell me something. We don't need a bullhorn, we just need to listen to Jesus and take the opportunities He gives us. If that was the point of the movie it is a good one.

Bullhorn man didn't seem to have any friends. We need to be friendly. We need to be friends. We need to all be friendship evangelists. Maybe there is a level of gifting involved in following Jesus out into the streets. We do all come in contact with people though and as we meet people we can tell them about Jesus. I compare it to being married. I don't need to talk to someone very long before my wife and kids come into the conversation because they are such an important part of my life. Jesus is the same. He has been my closest companion forever so, reflexively, He comes into a conversation early on and often in a friendship.

So to all of you who, in His gifting, step out of your comfort zone and, following God, march the streets to win the world for Jesus, praise the Lord! And for all of you who just have your eyes and ears open in your daily life ready to tell your friends, new and old, about Jesus, praise the Lord!

I just caution us all however not to let an opportunity go to waste. A friend of mine told me once of how, at work, he felt the prompting to tell a friend about Jesus. He didn't. That night his friend died...be a friend, tell someone about Jesus.

Friends don't let friends go to Hell.

*Michael Ramsay*

## **Being Faithful with Dishonest Wealth: Stewardship in the Face of Global Poverty**

by James Pedlar

It is easy to become overwhelmed when we consider the immense nature of global economic inequality. The disparities are so great that one cannot help but be repulsed, and, as with anything which is repulsing, we are tempted to simply turn away and focus on more “pleasant” considerations. It is certain that the global capitalist economic system is the source of much of this inequality, or at least seems to amplify and perpetuate existing inequalities. What is more, Christians who live in the West are implicated in this process, simply by virtue of participating in the economic life of their own societal setting. Even those of us who make efforts to buy ethically and use fair trade products as much as possible cannot completely remove ourselves from the system which produces great excess for some and great suffering for others. If you were born in the West, you were born into privilege at the expense of others. How should the church respond to this situation? What are we to do in the face of an economic system which is built on exploitation? Should we focus our efforts on *systemic and revolutionary change*, or work “*within the system*”?

There is a notoriously difficult parable in Luke’s gospel that may have something to contribute to this issue. It is usually known as the parable of the “shrewd manager” (Luke 16:1-13). The manager in the parable is commended by his master for using tactics that many of us would consider shady. Space does not permit a detailed treatment of all the problems that arise in attempting to interpret this parable, however, Jesus own’ words at the end of the parable give us some direction as to the message he is trying to get across:

“Whoever is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much; and whoever is dishonest in a very little is dishonest also in much. If then you have not been faithful with the dishonest wealth, who will entrust to you the true riches? And if you have not been faithful with what belongs to another, who will give you what is your own?” (Luke 16:10-12)

The force of the passage seems to be that we should use even wealth, though it is corrupt and “dishonest,” in a way that is faithful to the call of Jesus Christ upon our lives. The parable is not urging us to use corrupt means to attain wealth, of course. Rather, it is saying that we need to be faithful with the corrupt wealth we’ve been given.

It is notable that it is in this context that Luke includes Jesus’ saying about the impossibility of serving God and wealth (16:13). We are not to become slaves to wealth. Such a thing as money, which is corrupt, must be handled in a way that is faithful to our call as Christ’s disciples. In serving him in a context where we cannot help but participate on some level in the exploitative structures of global capitalism, we need to incorporate our dealings with such “dishonest wealth” into this life of service and discipleship. We have been given an abundance of wealth. If we are not faithful with something which is so corrupt, how can we deal with truly valuable things such as the preaching of the gospel? Our dealings with money are part of our stewardship of the

things with which we have been entrusted.

In a sermon based on this passage, John Wesley came up with his famous three point plan for stewardship among the early Methodists: *Gain* all you can, *save* all you can, and *give* all you can (see [Sermon 50, "The Use of Money."](#)). Methodists proved very proficient at points 1 and 2, but their efforts at *giving* were a disappointment to Wesley. Gaining and saving all you can is simply the way of the world – it is in the giving that Christian stewardship emerges.

But let not any man imagine that he has done anything, barely by going thus far, by "gaining and saving all he can," if he were to stop here. All this is nothing, if a man go not forward, if he does not point all this at a farther end. Nor, indeed, can a man properly be said to save anything, if he only lays it up. You may as well throw your money into the sea, as bury it in the earth. And you may as well bury it in the earth, as in your chest, or in the Bank of England. Not to use, is effectually to throw it away. If, therefore, you would indeed "make yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," add the Third rule to the two preceding. Having, First, gained all you can, and, Secondly saved all you can, Then "give all you can." ([Sermon 50, "The Use of Money."](#) §III.1)

Giving "all you can" meant that whatever is left once you've provided for the basic needs of yourself and your household - that is, "food to eat, raiment to put on, whatever nature moderately requires for preserving the body in health and strength," §III.3 - the rest is to be made available for helping others, beginning with the church and moving outward to the whole world. Wesley wanted to do away with all surplus accumulation, which he viewed as tantamount to robbing the poor of their basic needs.

In spite of the failings of early Methodists to enact Wesley's vision (and putting aside the debatable details of what "provision" for one's family today might require), I would suggest that the best course of action for Christians in the West is to *mobilize the resources we are able to gain through the capitalist system in order to do what we can to alleviate poverty*. While it is important for Christians to lobby governments for systemic reform, this goal should not take precedence over the *immediate demand* of alleviating the needs of others through the means at our disposal under the current system.

There is great potential for relieving poverty through the current system. The individual Western Christian has a relatively large amount of disposable income. Ron Sider, in a 1998 article in *Christianity Today*, noted that Christians at that time had a total income of \$10 trillion dollars. This figure would be even greater today. Given this fact, it is simply the most obvious course of action to use these resources for the alleviation of global poverty. Though this great wealth is obtained, partly at least, through the exploitation of labour in the developing world, the fact that so much of this excess makes its way into the hands of Christians means that we are obligated to use it to relieve what needs we can. Western Christians, whether we realize it or not, are stewards of this multi-trillion dollar fortune. This places an immediate ethical demand

upon us as Christians.

By using the wealth that we have, we can subvert the exploitation of the developing world by means of turning those exploitative profits back to the ones who are themselves being exploited. The tendency of capitalism to generate incredible amounts of excess can be, in a sense, “exploited” by Christians for the immediate relief of those who are disadvantaged by it. While the exploitation of labour itself is to be condemned, and the church can by no means endorse this kind of mistreatment of other human beings, we are bound, given the wealth we do possess, to use it for good.

Of course this leaves whole host of theological problems unanswered. Why is it that Western Christians have been born into such affluence and excess, while others have been born in deplorable conditions? This is indeed a difficult question, to which we are not likely to find an answer, apart from the conviction that the world in which we live is profoundly broken by the corruption of sin. What we *can* know is that it is *not* God’s intention that human beings should be so devalued as to die of hunger while many of us have more food than we can stuff down our throats. Our inability to answer the questions about how this is allowed to occur under God’s providence should not prevent us from making use of the “dishonest wealth” with which we have been entrusted, in order to better the lives of others.

Does this leave no room for Christians to work towards systemic change which will counteract the exploitative nature of consumer capitalism? Of course, we must also speak out and lobby governments to enact regulations which will protect the livelihood of all people. To exclude such action would implicitly condone the systems which create this problem in the first place. It would be to only treat the symptom without attacking the disease. To ignore systemic problems would be foolish, and it is not what I am proposing. Rather, I am proposing that, as the disease itself is not likely to be cured in the near future, our current obligation is primarily to use what we have and seek to relieve the plight of the poor.

It is true that Christians have been on the forefront of some of the most important social reforms in the past few centuries. However, we should guard against utopian visions of a world in which total equality is brought about by human social reforms. The profound brokenness of sin affects all of creation, including all social structures and relationships. While we can work for systemic improvements, we will not see complete equality in this current age. We will not see an end to suffering, strife, and exploitation. Human effort, which is always hampered by the effects of sin, is not sufficient to totally rid the world of so great a problem, and surely we are all aware that state regulation and provision cannot solve these issues. It is only when God intervenes in a decisive way at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ that we will see God’s vision for justice and peace realized in its fullness. The complete eradication of poverty is a part of God’s plan, for he has “made known to us the mystery of his will according to his good pleasure, which he purposed in Christ, to be put into effect when the times will have reached their fulfillment—to bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ” (Ephesians 1:9-10). Surely economic disparity is one of those things “on earth”

which, when gathered under the headship of Christ, will be made right. While we await this coming reign expectantly, we can participate in God's transforming action by living in obedience to his call to care for the poor. Our grace-enabled response to these challenges can be a sign, instrument, and foretaste of the coming Kingdom.



**A Word to the Dry Bones**  
*A Prophecy to The Salvation Army in the West*  
by Andrew Bale

Ezekiel 36 & 37 - A word to the dry bones:

The following came to me during prayer a few months ago and has been simmering away until tonight when I made the decision to commit it to paper and publish it on the internet.

The Salvation Army in the western territories has through its conduct and actions soiled its own commission, the commission I gave it when I raised it up to save the world. This turning away from my mission has angered me and caused me to scatter their evangelical efforts and withhold revival. (36:17-18)

Once, the lost and marginalised were yours by right and winning converts was like shooting fish in a barrel. In spite of persecution, hardship and great personal cost my Army went out to those furthest from the reach of my kingdom. The lost have scorned my name and belittled me because of your double standards, compromise and hypocrisy.

So for the sake of my name – not yours – I am going to restore you. Once again the name Salvation Army and holiness will be synonymous. I will do this for my sake, for the sake of my holy name which you have belittled. Once again those on the very edge of society, the unloved and friendless will know that I am God – I will prove myself through you (even though you are not worthy of your calling). I have chosen you and once again your name will be associated with mine. (36:22-23)

I am going to set you apart once more, I will make you stand out from the crowd and lead you back to your original mission. I will baptise you with fire, I will thoroughly wash you until every stain is gone. I will destroy your idols. The things you believe make you respectable and worthy I will smash. I will restore your passion for the lost; I will give you a new heart. I will take away your cold unbelieving heart and give you a heart that desires to obey me. You will go back to your original calling, once more street evangelism, slum and gutter brigades, pub raids and prayer mats will be used to attack the kingdom of my enemies and you will win souls like the Christian Mission. You will be filled with pioneer enthusiasm for militant evangelism. You will be my soldiers and I will be your general. (36:24-29)

It is time to reap, open the doors of your citadels and come rejoicing bringing in the sheaves. No longer will you be despised and rejected, no longer will you be dismissed as an historic curio, you will win the lost and everyday I will add more to your ranks. You will go out into the streets and revival will rain down upon you, you will splash in puddles of revival like children playing in the rain. Yet the more I bless you the more you will repent. The more I use you the more ashamed you will become. If withholding my blessing forced you to your knees in repentance then my new Pentecost will provide the

light required to see your sin in all its grotesque glory. You will be victorious but this new humility will allow all praise to pass to me. (36:30-32)

Once again your Corps will be so numerous you will run out of names for them! You will simply add numbers to the end of a city name as you did when you began. The urban areas will be your field and the wasteland and backstreet will be your vineyard. These dark corners will become like a new Eden. My kingdom will come to the cities, and the addicted and oppressed that I set free through you, will do my will! I have spoken and I will do it! Wash the streets, remove the burnt out vehicle, and prepare the way of the Lord. (36:33-36)

I will listen to the prayers of Salvationists once more; I will unblock my ears and focus my attention on them. I will swell their ranks and they will know that I am God. (36:37-38)

Salvation Army can you live, can I trust you once more with such a calling as this? You are so dry, look, walk up and down the aisles of your halls, and mingle midst your musicians and soldiers, look how dry you are – can you live again? Preach, prophesy, command yourselves in my name to stand up and fight again. I will make breath enter you, and you will come to life. I will attach tendons to you and make flesh come upon you and cover you with skin; I will put breath in you, and you will come to life. Then you will know that I am the LORD. (37:1-6)

Then when you are ready I will send that other Pentecost of which you are always singing – I will breathe on you and you will feel my life in your bodies and you will stand once more – a vast Army! (37:7-10)

NO more pessimism, no more hopelessness, no more negative reflections, there is work to be done, there are battles to be fought, there is injustice to rectify, there are souls to be won. I will open up the graves of long dead pioneers and new Railtons, Tuckers, Cadmans, Evas and Kates will take up their crosses. Preach and prophesy and say to your soldiers: 'This is what the Sovereign LORD says: O my Salvation Army I am going to restore you and then you, my people, will know that I am the LORD. I will put my Spirit in you and you will live, and I will take you back to the place where we first met and then you will know that I the LORD have spoken, and I have done it, declares the LORD.(37:1-14)

God redeem, bless, set apart and use the Army!

## The Lover and The Hidden Treasure

by Ian Gillingham

God is a lover. And He's looking for a lover to enthrall and draw close to Himself. The opening chapters of Genesis commence the unfolding the heart of the lover and the love story but it is purposeful for this Decree chapter to look much later in the Scriptures and see how the story ends.

You may be like some, who, in wanting to find whether the story is worth reading, jump to the last pages to know the conclusion before they dive into the novel. The Bible doesn't disappoint such readers for the windup in Revelation 19-21 offers glimpses of the grand conclusion and peeks into eternity. But along the way God yields clues and secrets of treasure, much of it hidden from the masses but disclosed to the wise and understanding seeker by revelation.

### The First and the Last

When Jesus performed his first miraculous sign at the wedding banquet (John 2) it exposed a gripping clue into the great mystery between God the Lover and His beloved. That the Father chose to manifest this clue at a wedding is astounding. For what better place than a wedding to foreshadow an aspect of the dramatic conclusion of history which will climax in eternity? What better place than a wedding banquet for a Host to extend to all the guests an invitation to an eternal marriage?

Read John 2: 1-11 aloud. Pay close attention to what the master of the banquet says in vs. 10 ("you have saved the best till now.") It could be said that Jesus saved the best wine till *last*. Now recall that this is the *first* of his many miracles. Do you see the clue? (Hint - It's found in the opposites or extremes.) Jesus decreed of Himself, "I am the First and the Last." (Revelation 1: 17)

Is it accidental that God reveals "The First" performing his first miracle at a wedding in order to foreshadow that His last and greatest miracle could also be at a wedding? Could it be that God might be saving His best wine for last? For as history closes, God, the Host of the banquet, will usher in the great wedding banquet in heaven for His Son and His beloved.

And who are his beloved, His precious redeemed? Rev. 5:9 answers that question. (Read the entire chapter aloud. Decree it with the authority God has given you as a believer.)

Some have concluded that the redeemed refers only to the Church. A wise and understanding saint looking at the whole counsel of Scripture would find holes in that theology. Standing on the premise that the redeemed is the Church alone would require cutting out hundreds, if not thousands, of verses concerning another beloved - Israel; His hidden treasure. You'll find out more on this descriptor later.

### **The beloved**

The scriptures teem with overtures of love between God the lover and his people. They begin flowing between God and our ancient fathers, Adam, Abel, Enoch and Noah, etc.

Each man dedicated to following God but largely following on his own or within a small community of believers.

Then the love story takes a dramatic turn when God sovereignly chooses to set apart an entire people for Himself beginning with Abram and his seed. When Jacob arrives on the scene and ultimately struggles and overcomes, the love story heightens all the more for Jacob ultimately represents the whole house of Israel for ages to come - struggling with God.

The saga ebbs and flows through the rest of the Old Testament. Following and rebelling. And being divorced. Yes, divorced. Read Jeremiah 3:8 And therein, lies the trap. Israel rejects God in the O.T. and then, in part, rejects Christ in the N.T. and the early church fathers jump on the divorce bandwagon, ignoring the remnant God kept for himself and the rest is ugly history. Yet, if God could remain opposed to His ancient people forever, then where does that leave us, the Church? What if we rebel and turn our backs on God as the house of Israel did?

Those who conclude that the beloved of God only includes the Church forget that immersed within the Genesis account is an irrevocable covenant that remains forever. It is not conditional on man's obedience. It was initiated by God their Father and it will be fulfilled by the finisher of our faith.

### **The Abramic covenant**

God initiates covenant by declaring the terms in Gen. 12:2-3; 6-7 & 15:5. He then confirms the terms by cutting covenant with Abram in 15:18-21. In the midst of the darkness the smoking firepot passed between the pieces symbolizing that God, who is a consuming fire, authored this covenant.

As promised on oath, descendants miraculously came forth from Abram. They settled in various places, including Egypt, due to famine in the land of Canaan. But again as promised, God delivered Israel from oppression and drew them out of bondage by his mighty hand. The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob led his chosen people back to the land of their inheritance promised on oath in Genesis 15:18-21. He demonstrated his mighty power by showing Israel that he is a covenant keeping God.

Then periods of history unfolded wherein Israel swung back and forth in her obedience. From our reading of scripture we know that Israel regularly rejected the prophets who called her to repent of her wicked ways and turn back to God. Interspersed throughout the call to repent, God repeatedly "held out his hands to an obstinate people." (Isaiah 65:2) He lavished hope (Jeremiah 29:10-14) but Israel would have none of it. And when her sin reached its full measure she was exiled, she lost her means of worship, ie

connection with God and her land was turned over to foreigners and destroyed. Thus marked a dark chapter in God's love story with Israel.

### **A new covenant with the house of Israel**

Can God be forever frustrated? Would God be angry with Israel forever? Would He prolong His anger through all generations? Read Psalm 85:5, then read the entire chapter. You will pray into it later.)

Never outdone by their sin and steadfast in love that overwhelms, God renewed His love by announcing another covenant with the house of Israel (Jeremiah 31:31-34) prior to their exile to Babylon. Decree this passage. It has been fulfilled in Christ Jesus, the King of the Jews.

### **The second dispersion**

In 586 B.C. the house of Israel was exiled to Babylon signaling the first dispersion. They were gathered back by their lover 70 years later and restored as God's beloved. Centuries past. The Messiah came as foretold by the prophets and when Israel again repeatedly rejected their Lord and their God, He set into motion another exile. In fulfillment of the words of their lover they were dispersed a second time in 70 A.D. But this one was different from the first in that they were dispersed en mass to the nations. The exile would reach its culmination in seeing them go to the ends of the earth because of their sin.

Read through and decree Ezekiel 36: 16-20 with the emphasis that these verses *have* taken place. It is vital to know that what you have decreed is past tense. It is done. They will not be exiled a third time. It is time for them to come home!

### **The second & final return for the sake of His Name**

The house of Israel has **never** returned a second time to the land of Israel after being dispersed to the ends of the earth. They have not yet been regathered entirely since Jesus uttered those sobering words just prior to his death, "Look, your house is left to you desolate. I tell you, you will not see me again until you say, 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.'" (Luke 13:35)

Nevertheless, behold saints of God, for the Lord God is the First and the Last. He shall have the final word for He knows what is coming. He foretold centuries beforehand through the prophet Isaiah that Israel, though dispersed, would return a second time. Read through and decree Isaiah 11:10-12.

It has commenced and you are a present part of fulfilling that very scripture. It is a "**now**" verse. Some prophetic verses wait for years, even centuries, for their fulfillment. Yet this is the hour in which the Almighty has chosen to restore his ancient people unto Himself. What a time in which we live!

Now decree Psalm 85 mentioned earlier and place yourself as an intercessor on behalf of the house of Israel. The first application the psalmist writes about, is them. Other

applications, whether personal or corporate can apply, but remember that the scriptures came **to the Jew first**. So from verse 4 on, substitute accordingly using “their” and “them” instead of “our” and “us.”

So significant is this move of God; He has reserved hundreds of scriptures concerning the restoration of the house of Israel. But is it for their sake that He is doing these things? Read on.

There is nothing made that is ever to be worshipped. God has set forth a decree. “I am the LORD your God who brought you out of Egypt, out of the land of slavery. You shall have no other gods before me.” (Exodus 20: 2-3). Here is the clincher. Read through and decree Ezekiel 36: 21-22. Nothing on earth shall be worshipped. No nation, no people, nothing - except the Sovereign LORD. And His name shall be the only name.

Read through and decree the following verses concerning their return.

Ezekiel 36:24-32

Jeremiah 31: 7-14

Jeremiah 16: 14-15

Isaiah 43: 1-7

Isaiah 49: 13-23

Jeremiah 32: 37-41 (Do you know of another verse where God is putting His whole heart and soul into the matter at hand?)

Ezekiel 39: 21-29 (Do you realize the earth shaking upheaval and significance of **every** Jewish person leaving their present home in exile and returning to the land of their inheritance?)

There are other reasons why the Lord does these things. Here are two more:

1. So that the nations would know that God rebuilds what he destroys and replants what was desolate. Read through and decree Ezekiel 36: 33-36

1) So that the nations would know that God is the LORD. Read through Ezekiel 36:23.

To “know” God signifies relationship. Concisely put, that verse is nothing less than global harvest. Holiness in Israel preceding massive end time harvesting of nations.

Now decree Ezekiel 36:23.

### **The hidden treasure**

Back to that descriptor of Israel, “the hidden treasure,” mentioned earlier. Let’s look at scripture to unearth more clues in God’s amazing love story.

Read Deuteronomy 7:6. “The LORD your God has chosen you out of all the peoples on the earth to be his people, his treasured possession.”

Deut. 14:2 “...For you are a people holy to the LORD your God. Out of all the people on the face of the earth, the LORD has chosen you to be his treasured possession.”

Deut. 26:18 “And the LORD has declared this day that you are his people, his treasured possession as he promised...” Psalm 135:4 “For the LORD has chosen Jacob to be his own, Israel to be his treasured possession.” Now decree each of them. Praise the

LORD for His wisdom. Praise Him. He is sovereign. He is their Father. What the LORD has foretold, He will do. Fullness for Israel! Glory to God.

You may ask, 'why are they treasured'?

Deuteronomy 7:7-9 yields the answer. God's love endures forever and He is a covenant keeping God. Bottom line.

"How great is the love the Father has lavished upon *them* (emphasis mine), that they should be called children of God! And that is what they are! (1 John 2:1) What a grand plan of redemption! It's the great exchange! Saved from wandering in exile and brought into citizenship in heaven. Every willing Jewish person drawn by the eternal love of God back into His embrace - a people belonging to God. How can we hold back praise from the Father? Stand in the gap and thank God on their behalf. You'll fulfill your role as an intercessor by thanking the Father for the Jewish people he has drawn and captivated with love already. But don't stop there. Ask Him to graciously draw many many more. Join your brother Paul in Acts 10:1 as he pleads, "Brothers, my heart's desire and prayer to God for the Israelites is that they may be saved."

Why can they be considered hidden?

Read Matthew 13:44. The field is often described as the world. That God would sovereignly choose to hide his treasure in the field is just one aspect of the eternal wisdom of God. Such insight is not my own.

We have an awesome privilege as Gentile believers to join the lover as He gathers His treasure unto Himself. Take in what the Holy Spirit reveals to us through Paul in Ephesians 3:1-9. Note the specific wording concerning Israel. We Gentiles are heirs *together with Israel, members together of one body....*

Concerning their being "hidden" note carefully the following phrases:

"...made known to me by revelation...", "not made known to men in other generations as it has now been revealed by the Spirit...", and "**this mystery**, which for ages past **was kept hidden** in God..." Though hidden for ages past, they remained under his banner of love. Call forth the eternal love of God to now be manifested, made abundantly clear to them and received in their hearts. This is the hour of their destiny! God's will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

### **The great wedding in heaven**

So here we are, looking forward to the great wedding in heaven. Yet how can there be a wedding when the bride is not complete? Since God divorced Israel in Jeremiah 3:8, how can she be considered "members together of one body" with the Gentiles, as Paul writes? For we know that God is bound by His own laws. Israel was guilty of harlotry and was

thus divorced. And He plainly records in Deuteronomy 24:1-4 that if a woman is divorced (note vs.4), "then her first husband, who divorced her, is not allowed to marry her again after she has been defiled. That would be detestable in the eyes of the LORD."

God is a husband to Israel. (see Isaiah 54:5) As we apply Israel to be the woman and her first husband to be God, then we discover that after the divorce, God is not allowed to remarry her because of her harlotry. How can God remarry Israel whom He has divorced? He is bound by His own word. The ramifications in answering this are crucial, yes even foundational, to our entire understanding that God is the truth and that He is love. If God can make exceptions and break His own word then it undermines what He has recorded in Scripture. Our trust in Him erodes. But...if the Holy Spirit would grant revelation with another look in the Scriptures, then we should pursue it.

As an intercessor, I trust you are continually looking for answers to biblical questions beyond your understanding, with more Scripture! "Blessed are you who hunger now, for you will be satisfied." (Luke 6:21) Look at Romans 7:1 "The law has authority over a man only as long as he lives." Read on. "For example, by law a married woman is bound to her husband as long as he is alive, but if her husband dies, she is released from the law of marriage." Is there a stirring in your spirit? God grant it! God is bound to his law on marriage as long as the man lives. The incarnate God, Jesus Christ, was Israel's husband in the flesh, making the implications of this verse nothing short of stellar. Because by his death it means that Israel (the woman) could be released from the law of marriage! That's freedom. And now Christ lives and is eagerly getting his beloved ready to be remarried at a later date!

This is love! This is redemption incarnate. Rejoice! Give thanks! This is God's master plan of redemption for the whole world. May your spirit burst forth right now with longing, yes, even yearning for the bride to be complete. May deep things in your spirit call to the deep regions of God's heart concerning the restoration of Israel. May God grant you the spirit of prayer for this matter. Ask for it! May you have tears, groans with understanding, and intercession for the bride to come forth in fullness. Jew and Gentile together. May the Lord dismantle any wrong theological beliefs you have held concerning the church and Israel and put you back together with right understanding. But above all may God grant you a heart of love. Yes, for the house of Israel, but especially for the whosoever. If you want it - it's yours!

### **You have saved the best till last**

God is a lover. He loves to party. Weddings are parties. Joyous occasions. They are celebrations between a husband and wife. These earthly gatherings foreshadow the greatest wedding of all time that is about to take place. The Host has seen fit to prepare a beautiful bride, the beloved, for His One and Only Son, the Bridegroom. Since creation those who have followed God wholeheartedly and kept His commands, comprise this great company of people called the beloved. Commencing with Abram, the Jewish people were chosen as a people to convey God's love to the nations. Then God sovereignly chose to graft Gentiles who believed, along with the Jews. As history draws to it's grand climax we will see this beautiful bride arise as a glorious gift to the lover.

Jew and Gentile. One beloved. One bride. For one lover.



## **Criminal Jesus**

by Aaron White

Jesus was a criminal. He was arrested, tried by the legal system of the day, deemed guilty by a selection of the public, and was tortured and executed by the state authority. That he was innocent, the victim of an unjust legal system, does not change the fact that he was, in his time, a convicted and punished criminal. He suffered a criminal's death between two thieves whom he spoke to and with whom he identified. One of the criminals was promised a place with him in paradise that very day.

I have met more than a few prisoners in my time. My job allows me to go down into the cells to visit prisoners awaiting trial, to take them messages from family and friends, to see what I can do to help them. Now, for those who have not been fortunate enough to visit a jail, let me tell you what you are missing. It stinks. Literally. It smells terribly of unwashed feet, bad gas, sweat, metal, antiseptic and fear. There are usually a lot of people in a very small amount of room and everyone is nervous, even when they are pretending to be cool and calm. It is not a place I would choose to spend any amount of quality time.

There are certain prisoners who have been through the system before and know what to expect. Then there are those who are seeing life from behind the bars for the first time, and they are in a state of near panic. It's dangerous, scary, smelly and awful. The person behind bars feels very vulnerable, and very alone.

I'm not sure how deeply it has hit home that Jesus actually chose to identify fully with the criminal, with the prisoner. We talk of Jesus' incarnation - his putting on of human flesh - and we are all generally familiar with the story of his death, but I wonder if repeated hearings have dulled the brutal shock of it. The King of Kings did not just descend to earth to live a human life. He descended and became a criminal, rejected, humiliated, beaten, imprisoned, killed. He chose that way, so that no one could ever scream out, "God doesn't understand!"

Jesus went through the worst, and identified with those the rest of the world thought were just good enough to spit on. Even more than this, Jesus said that whenever we see a prisoner, we see him. Whenever we visit someone in prison, we are in fact visiting the Son of God (See Matthew 25: 31-46). Through those bars, behind that Plexiglas window, in the face of the frightened, the convicted, we are somehow meant to see the face of our Lord. This is powerful grace.

Jesus' love did not stop at the edge of the prison cell. Where are the boundaries of our love?

## **Fasting – the First works of Jesus**

by Major Janet Munn

### **Greater Works – Who Me?**

Jesus said to his followers, “As the Father has sent me, I also send you” (John 20:21) and “whoever believes in me, the works that I do they will do also; and greater works than these will they do” (John 14:12). How can this be? What does it mean that we are sent by Jesus? How are we to do the greater works to which Jesus referred?

### **Jesus Our Model**

Mahesh Chavda is a pastor and author of *The Hidden Power of Prayer and Fasting*. He points out that just as a gymnast must first master elementary moves like a forward roll and a cartwheel, prior to mastering more advanced moves, so must the disciple of Jesus Christ develop the “first works” of Jesus prior to demonstrating the greater works promised by Him.

Before Jesus began his public ministry, first, he went into the wilderness, led by the Spirit, to fast for forty days (Luke 4: 1-2). However, Jesus returned from the wilderness in the power of the Spirit (Luke 4:14). At Jesus’ baptism the Holy Spirit came upon Him. Following the fasting Jesus went forth in the power of the Holy Spirit. If fasting was key for Jesus to operate on this earth in spiritual power, so it is for His disciples. Times of fasting and prayer are the first works we are called to do if we want to do the greater works of Jesus Christ.

### **Authority vs. Power**

Jesus clearly told the disciples that He had given them tremendous spiritual authority (Matthew 10:8), yet when faced with a boy suffering demonic torment, they found themselves unable to set him free. Upon Jesus’ arrival on the scene, the demon was readily driven out, the disciples rebuked for their spiritual impotence. Jesus explained that His effectiveness results from a lifestyle of prayer and fasting (Matthew 17: 14-21).

There are challenges we will face, confrontations with evil we will encounter, that will only result in victory through prayer and fasting. We neglect such a lifestyle to our own detriment.

### **Fasting – What it is and what it isn’t**

In our overeating western culture, it could readily be said of us, “our god is our stomach”, as Paul referred to in Philippians 3:19. Fasting is abstaining from food for spiritual purposes. Through fasting we put our flesh in its place and give the Spirit first place; we tell our bodies, our appetites to wait; we declare that we do not live by bread alone but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. In fasting we proclaim

that our hunger and thirst after God and His righteousness is greater than our hunger for our next meal.

God does not change. He will not be manipulated. Our fasting does not persuade Him to do something against His will, nor do we impress God with our piety through fasting. Rather we are changed through fasting. The psalmist David said that he humbled himself with fasting (Psalm 35:13). John wrote, "This is how we know what love is: Jesus Christ laid down his life for us. We ought to lay down our lives for our brothers" (1 John 3:16). Fasting is a way to lay down our lives for one another. When we become aware of someone in need, we can enter into a period of fasting and prayer, laying down our appetites, our physical comfort, for the sake of another as we focus our energies instead on the Lord, on the Scriptures and on intercession. Jesus amplifies this when he spoke of the necessity of those who follow him, to deny themselves, take up their cross and follow him (Matthew 16:24).

### **The Lord's Expectations**

In the Old Testament, fasting appears to be a pre-requisite for revival. In Joel chapter 2 prior to the prophecy of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on all flesh, later quoted by Peter at Pentecost, the people of God are challenged to "declare a holy fast, call a sacred assembly" (Joel 2:15). Then God promised, "And afterward, I will pour out my Spirit on all people" (Joel 2:28). Is it possible that greater revival, an increase in the manifest presence of the Holy Spirit on all people is delayed in our day, at least in part as a result of our lack of fasting, our self-indulgence rather than our self-denial? How often do we really say "no" to ourselves, to our own appetites and cravings for the sake of seeking the face of God through fasting and prayer?

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus taught the disciples how they were to pray and how they were to fast, with an underlying assumption that they would do both (Matthew 6: 5, 16-17). When his disciples were criticized for their lack of dietary restraint relative to John the Baptist's disciples, Jesus assured the critics that when he, the bridegroom, was taken from them, then they would fast (Luke 5: 35).

### **Benefits of Fasting**

As mentioned earlier, in fasting we humble ourselves and we know from the book of James that God gives grace, favor, to the humble (James 4:10). Jesus' example reminds us of the power over temptation connected with fasting (Luke 4). Throughout the book of Acts the early Church gathered corporately for periods of prayer and fasting in order to gain clarity and guidance regarding the will of God. This He made known to His people when they were together seeking Him in prayer and denying themselves of food as they sought Him. Imagine if we as Salvation Army leaders began to make major decisions only as we met together in fasting in prayer, rather than by committee meetings planned around meals!

## **Pioneers of Prayer and Fasting**

Queen Esther called her people, the Jews, to join her in a corporate fast for their deliverance as a people. Anna served in the Temple in Jerusalem around the time of the birth of Jesus Christ, with prayer and fasting. She lived a fasted lifestyle (Luke 2:37) as did John the Baptist. It was during a period of fasting and prayer that God spoke to the gentile Cornelius, the Roman Centurion about contacting Peter which then led to a major shift in understanding regarding the gospel and the Spirit offered also to the gentiles (Acts 10:30-31). The Apostle Paul fasted for safety and deliverance during a fierce storm (Acts 27) and Daniel fasted individually as a gesture of repentance on behalf of the sin of the people (Daniel 9). Jesus began his public ministry immediately following a forty-day fast.

The early church fathers, Polycarp and Tertulian fasted, as did Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Knox and John Wesley. Wesley was so committed to fasting that he would not approve a candidate for ministry if he did not fast twice a week! How would that policy change our Candidates' Councils and us?

Whenever he became aware that his spiritual power or anointing was weakening, Charles Finney would immediately commence a three-day fast. Following the fast, the presence of God would radiate so powerfully through Finney that people would fall under overwhelming conviction upon his entrance into a room, a building, or even the city limits.

Jonathan Edwards and Charles Haddon Spurgeon would fast and pray in order that they would be able to preach well! A fruitful endeavor indeed.

## **Types of Fasts**

Elmer Towns outlines various types of biblical fasts and their purposes, in his book, *Fasting for Spiritual Breakthrough*. These include the Samuel fast, in which people join together to seek God's guidance for them corporately (1 Samuel 7) as well as the Ezra fast, a corporate fast for protection (Ezra 8:22). The Elijah fast is an individual fast to cry out for God's help in time of trouble and discouragement. The Disciples' fast is for spiritual power to exercise authority over the demonic (Matthew 17:21) and the Saint Paul fast is an individual fast for increased light – for an opening of the eyes of the heart (Acts 9: 17-19). God's covenant people agreed together to fast for deliverance from danger and evil in the Esther fast (Esther 4:16) and the Daniel fast is one in which the individual fasts for physical health and strength.

## **When You Fast...**

What is the Lord calling you to by way of fasting? Are you to enter into a short-term fast, like Finney's three-day recharging of the spiritual battery? Or disciplined observance of the 40 period of Lent, a season of fasting?

Is God calling you to a fasted lifestyle, like the prophetess Anna or John the Baptist, in which you live in a such a way that you are continually fasting from something or some things? Perhaps you are to give or significantly reduce your intake of certain unhealthy foods. Perhaps you have some hobbies or recreational activities that are not in themselves evil, but that can sometimes take too high a priority in your life and you need to fast from them for a period of time. This will help to re-establish in your heart, your affections and in your calendar, that loving the Lord your God is the number one passion of your life. This could involve fasting from the computer, the Internet, the television, the telephone or sports or movies – anything that can work its way too high up on our list of priorities.

May God help us to enter into the “first works” of Jesus, and from that may we see a great unleashing of the “greater works” in our midst.

### **Questions**

How would a lifestyle of fasting and prayer change the way we currently do business?

What would integration of fasting into our ways of doing and being mean for each of us individually and for The Salvation Army corporately?

Do you desire to be like Jesus? What are you doing by way of intentional discipline to move toward that goal? Could fasting help?

How much are we willing to deny ourselves, to sacrifice, in terms of our bodily appetites, that the Kingdom of God would be more strongly established in these days?

Do you desire to be about the “greater works” of the Lord Jesus? Are you seeing them to the degree that you desire? If not, why not? Could ongoing fasting and prayer, individual and corporate, be part of the answer?

### **Resources**

Chavda, Mahesh. *The Hidden Power of Prayer and Fasting*, (Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image, 1998).

Foster, Richard. *Celebration of Discipline* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978).

Towns, Elmer L. *Fasting For Spiritual Breakthrough* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1996).

Willard, Dallas. *The Spirit of the Disciplines: Understanding How God Changes Lives* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988);

## Justice Decree

by Captain Danielle Strickland

The LORD loves righteousness and justice; the earth is full of his unfailing love. His righteousness is like the mighty mountains, his justice like the great deep. He will make our righteousness shine like the dawn, the justice of our cause like the noonday sun. He will judge the world in righteousness; he will govern his peoples with justice.

Righteousness and justice are the foundation of his throne; love and faithfulness go before him. The LORD works righteousness and justice for all the oppressed and with righteousness he will judge the needy, and with justice he will give decisions for the poor of the earth. See, a king will reign in righteousness – Jesus you are our righteous King. And because of you rulers will rule with justice. Your righteousness draws near speedily, your salvation is on the way, and your arm will bring justice to the nations. The distant lands look to you and wait in hope for their salvation. A bruised reed you will not break, and a smoldering wick you will not snuff out, till you lead justice to victory. You will proclaim justice to the nations. You will search for the lost and bring back the strays. You will bind up the injured and strengthen the weak. You will shepherd the flock with justice. Morning by morning you dispense your justice, and every new day you do not fail.

Jesus is the one who rides on a white horse called Faithful and True and with justice he judges and makes war. I cry out with the Lord, 'Let Justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never-failing stream!'

You tell us, 'maintain justice and do what is right, for my salvation is close at hand and my righteousness will soon be revealed.' So I put on righteousness as my clothing, justice as my robe and my turban. I clothe myself in Christ. Christ covers me with justice and righteousness. Jesus demonstrated justice on the cross as a sacrifice of atonement. I receive his justice through faith in his blood. I join with other believers and through faith conquer kingdoms, administer justice and gain what is promised; even shut the mouths of lions.

I cover my heart with the breastplate of righteousness. I boast about this: that I understand and know Christ, the Lord, who exercises kindness, justice and righteousness on the earth. I am covenanted to Christ in righteousness and justice, in love and compassion. I will not neglect the weightier matters of the law: I will practice justice, mercy and faithfulness. I will administer true justice; show mercy and compassion to others. I hate what is evil and love good. I will maintain love and justice, and wait for my God always. The spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners, and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed, to proclaim the year of the Lord's favour.

(Job 29:14, Psalm 9:8, 33:5, 36:6, 37:6, 89:14, 103:6, Isaiah 11:4, 32:1, 51:5, 56:1, Jeremiah 9:24, Hosea 2:19, 12:6, Amos 5:15, 5:24, Zech. 7:9, Zeph. 3:5, Ezekiel 35:16, Micah 6:8, Matt. 12:18-20, 23:23, Luke 4:18&19, Romans 3:25&26, 2 Corinthians 7:11, Hebrews 11:33, Rev. 19:11)

## Leadership in The Salvation Army: A Case Study in Clericalisation

by Major Harold Hill

Officers of my vintage were simply commissioned but after 1978 officers were ordained as well. What does that mean? And does it matter? My endeavour to answer these questions led to a four-year research project and some conclusions which I shall attempt to summarise in this article. The answers lie at least in part in the process of institutionalisation which affects all enterprises, including movements of the Spirit, in the course of which roles which begin as simply functional gradually assume significance as status. In this The Salvation Army has recapitulated in microcosm the history of the church as a whole.

While the charismatic founder may be kept honest by a closeness to the *mysterium tremens et fascinans* and a single-minded commitment to a vision, the second and subsequent generations tend to keep a closer eye on the political implications. A Moses could exclaim, "Would that all the Lord's people might prophesy!" A Joshua's instinct is to complain, "Eldad and Medad are also prophesying," and to urge, "Make them stop – they're not authorised."<sup>1</sup> Against that trend, there has also been, especially in the Judeo-Christian tradition, a counter-cultural, prophetic tradition of protest against the institutions of power. Jesus of Nazareth stood in this prophetic tradition. Jesus and the community which grew up after his death appear to have valued equality in contrast to the priestly hierarchies of received religion.<sup>2</sup> There were evidently varieties of function within the early Christian community, but not of formal status.

### Division into Clerical and Lay States

Over the first few centuries, however, as the Church institutionalised and developed structures to order its polity and conserve its message, and as it accommodated to Roman society and to traditional religious expectations, it developed such distinctions, between clerics in orders and laity.<sup>3</sup> By early in the second century the early charismatic offices had been superseded and a three-fold structure of one bishop, presiding over a council of presbyters and supported by deacons was becoming common. A second factor in the clericalisation of ministry was the adoption of the "priestly" language, a second-century development which became entrenched with the progressive development of the idea of the Eucharist as sacrifice which only a priest had power to perform. With Augustine (died 430) an "indelible character" was attributed to priesthood. A third factor was the incorporation of church and priesthood

---

<sup>1</sup> Numbers 11:26-27.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew 20:25-28, Matthew 23:8-10.

<sup>3</sup> Walter Brueggemann, *The Prophetic Imagination*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. 2001, p.22) says "it is clear that the militancy and radicalism of the earliest churches was soon compromised" and cites John Gager, (*Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity*, Englewood Cliffs NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1975) for the argument that "if they had not changed to embrace culture to some extent, they would have disappeared as a sectarian oddity."

into Roman society and the state. From the “Christianising” of the Empire under Theodosius in the fourth century, it eventually came to be assumed that all people in the state were “Christian”; by the end of the first millennium the boundary between the world and the church was seen as lying at ordination rather than baptism. Even from the third century on it was apparent that all these developments had reduced the “laity” to a passive role. We can call the cumulative process “clericalisation”.

## Reaction and Counter-reaction

Many times in the history of the Church when there has been a renewal of mission, some reaction against clericalism has been involved. Usually the movements involved have either been suppressed or have in their turn become clericalised. Monasticism was amongst the earliest such movements, from the mid-second century on. Originally a lay movement, it became clericised with a caste system whereby manual labour was performed by lay monks but clerical roles by priests.

The later middle ages in Europe were a period of huge social and economic change, affecting the church along with everything else. The laity became less willing to accept a passive role and there were many religious revivalist movements, some of which became officially accepted while others were denounced as heretical. Both in officially endorsed orders like the Franciscans and in others eventually excluded like the Waldensians, an initial all-lay ethos was eventually clericalised, with priests or clergy coming to dominate them.

The Reformation movements all involved a degree of rejection of clerical superiority. Luther dismissed “*characters indelebiles* ...” as “mere talk and man-made law.”<sup>4</sup> However most the reformers remained wedded to the concept of “Christendom”, in which the State and the Church were essentially the same thing and “the clerical office – whether under the name of *ministerium* (the ministry) or *sacerdotium* (the priesthood) – continued in being as something constitutive for the existence of the Church.”<sup>5</sup> In E. L. Mascall’s words, “what Protestantism did to the religion of Western Europe was simply to substitute a clericalism of the Word for a clericalism of the Sacrament.”<sup>6</sup> It was the “radical reformation”, the Anabaptists and their sectarian successors, who tried to make a fresh start and return to the polity of the primitive church. “It was not that the Anabaptists had no clergy; it is more accurate to say that they had no laity.”<sup>7</sup> As marginalised and persecuted, their situation more closely resembled that of the early Christians.

The immediate precursor of The Salvation Army was the Methodist movement of the eighteenth century. John Wesley unwittingly created what was virtually a parallel

<sup>4</sup> Martin Luther, “An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation”, 1520. *Works of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia, A.J. Holman Coy., 1915.

<sup>5</sup> Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of the Church, Faith and the Consummation: Dogmatics*, Vol III. London, Lutterworth, 1962, p.98-99.

<sup>6</sup> E.L. Mascall, *The Recovery of Unity: A Theological Approach*. London, Longmans, 1958 p.5.

<sup>7</sup> Larry Martens, “Anabaptist Theology and Congregational Care”. *Direction Journal*, Spring 1992, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp.3-14.



church though he was a priest of the Church of England, and refused to allow his lay preachers to administer the sacraments or call themselves “Reverend”. After his death the preachers claimed both rights and Methodism clericalised. However, both traditions, the “lay” and the “clerical”, persist in Methodism to the present day. Most of the subsequent schisms in the movement – and most of the reunions also – have been concerned with this polarisation.

In retrospect it may be seen that Bryan Wilson’s analysis of the process of clericalisation in Protestant sects applies to the broad history of the church as a whole:

What does appear is that the dissenting movements of Protestantism, which were lay movements, or movements which gave greater place to laymen than the traditional churches had ever conceded, pass, over the course of time, under the control of full-time religious specialists.. Over time, movements which rebel against religious specialization, against clerical privilege and control, gradually come again under the control of a clerical class... Professionalism is a part of the wider social process of secular society, and so even in anti-clerical movements professionals re-emerge. Their real power, when they do re-emerge, however, is in their administrative control and the fact of their full-time involvement, and not in their liturgical functions, although these will be regarded as the activity for which their authority is legitimated.<sup>8</sup>

The history of The Salvation Army is open to analysis in these terms.

### **Beginning with the Booths**

William Booth inherited the ambiguities of Methodism. He left a Church, the Methodist New Connection, but retained his clerical rank. He denied any intention of founding a “sect” or denomination (“I constantly put from me the thought of attempting the formation of such a people”<sup>9</sup>), but ended up doing so. As Ronald Knox remarks of Zinzendorf, “it is an old dream of the enthusiast that he can start a new religion without starting a new denomination.”<sup>10</sup>

The chief formative influences on William and Catherine Booth were Methodism and American Revivalism. Wesleyan influence on Booth can be seen in his emulation of Wesley himself and in parallels between the situation, ethos and doctrines of Methodism and Salvationism. It can also be traced in a degree of ambiguity about the nature or importance of ordination, in his conviction of the importance of lay-participation, and paradoxically, in his equally strong conviction of the value of authoritarian rule. Herein lay the tension, still in evidence, between the Army’s commitment to the “priesthood of all believers” and its hierarchical structure. From the American revivalists, such as Charles Finney, James Caughey and Phoebe Palmer, the Booths not only learned about evangelical methods and concluded that there was more freedom in their use outside the control of denominational structures, but also

<sup>8</sup> Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*. London, C.A. Watts, 1966, p.136.

<sup>9</sup> G.S. Railton, *Heathen England*. London, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. 1878, p.22.

<sup>10</sup> Ronald Knox, *Enthusiasm*. OUP, Oxford, 1950, p.403.

had confirmed their convictions both about the importance of lay-participation and about the value of strong government.

Booth's engagement with a tent mission in Mile End Waste in July 1865 is reminiscent of the Arab inviting the camel to put his nose into the tent on a cold night – soon the camel wholly occupied the tent. By 1867 a revivalist group drawn from a variety of evangelical backgrounds had been transformed into a proto-sect with its own headquarters, a number of preaching stations, systems for processing converts and for poor relief, a membership document, a first annual financial statement, and paid staff as well as volunteer workers. By 1878, this mission had evolved into a highly centralised organisation, a people with a distinct and common identity, and its own full-time, employed leaders, analogous to clergy (although like Wesley's lay-preachers, Booth's evangelists were forbidden to style themselves "Reverend"<sup>11</sup>). Under its new name of Salvation Army, the mission was poised to embark on a decade or more of exponential growth. With Divisional and Territorial Commands from 1880 it was possessed of an episcopal hierarchy.

### **Clerical Roles**

The clerical class in the church has come to be associated with specific functions – the administration of the sacraments, pastoring of the flock, the preaching and teaching of the Word and the government of the church. What can we say then about the roles of Booth's Missioners, the Evangelists, later Officers, under these headings?

### **Sacraments**

The monopoly of the sacramental function became the distinctive mark of the emergence of priesthood in Christianity. The Christian Mission and, until 1883, the Salvation Army, practised infant baptism and celebrated the Lord's Supper, and it is apparent that officials of the mission led these rites. The discontinuance of the practice could also have implications for the "clerical" role of officers. Booth's explanation in *The War Cry* simply said that (1) sacraments were not essential for salvation; (2) that if he insisted on having them there would be "grave dissensions" within the Army; (3) that the Army was not a church; and (4) that the question could be left until we shall have more light on the subject. (5) In the meanwhile Salvationists were free to take the sacrament at other churches, and (6) should feed on Jesus continually and ensure they had been baptised with the Holy Ghost. (7) Finally, having warned against dependence upon mere forms, he announced a form of service for the dedication of children.<sup>12</sup> Additional reasons subsequently offered, in addition to the dangers of formalism and contentious Biblical hermeneutic, have included the danger of strong drink to people converted from drunkenness, avoidance of controversial subjects, resistance to women administering the sacraments, the avoidance of anything smacking of a separate priesthood and the value of a distinctive non-sacramental witness.

<sup>11</sup> Christian Mission Conference Minutes, 1870.

<sup>12</sup> *The War Cry*, 17 January 1883, p.4, col. 2.

David Rightmire's study goes behind these presenting arguments and places the Army's early theology in the context of Victorian society, the Wesleyan revival and the nineteenth century holiness movement. He makes the point that by the mid-19th century Wesleyanism had lost touch with its founder's sacramental theology, maintaining the forms but subordinating other means of grace to the Word. The American holiness revival teaching of Caughey, Finney and Phoebe Palmer, already mentioned, also "emphasised a pneumatological ecclesiology that needed little continuity with historical institutions." Rightmire's argument is that once the Booths' "Holiness" or "Second Blessing" theology was fully developed, it provided a spiritualised substitute for sacramental theology.<sup>13</sup>

It is interesting to compare the course of The Salvation Army's relationship with the Church of England with that of its Wesleyan original. Methodism grew out of the established Church and the question was whether it could be contained. Salvationism was an independent entity and would have had to be grafted on to the Anglican stock – a more difficult exercise. With Methodism, the preachers, who had not hitherto been permitted to officiate at the sacraments, assumed this role. Salvation Army evangelists and officers, who had enjoyed this privilege, relinquished it.

The history of the Salvation Army also illustrates the maxim that if the sacraments did not exist it would be necessary to invent them, to adapt Voltaire. Forms and ceremonies have been substituted. The Directory or catechism for children in 1900 set out "The Army's Five Ordinances" as (1) The Dedication of Children, (2) The Mercy Seat,<sup>14</sup> (3) Enrolment under the Army Flag, (4) Commissioning of Officers and (5) Marriage according to Army rules.<sup>15</sup> To these might be added the uniform (surely "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace", as well as the nearest the Army comes to a medium for excommunication), and the recent practice of "installing" officers in certain commands.

All of this also indicates that although sacramental observances are usually taken as the initial catalyst for the process of clericalisation in the Church, the Army's clericalisation gathered momentum after their abandonment (apart from the substitute sacraments described above), suggesting that clericalisation is a sociological process independent of a theological base.

## Pastoring

<sup>13</sup> R. David Rightmire, *Sacraments and the Salvation Army: Pneumatological Foundations*. Metuchen, NJ, The Scarecrow Press, 1990.

<sup>14</sup> Booth took over from his American revivalist exemplars the practice of the "altar call" when penitents were invited to kneel at the front of the hall. At first a simple form or row of chairs sufficed to kneel at, but despite protestations that the place itself was of no merit, the "Mercy Seat" became sacred furniture. A 1908 article on "The Proper Use and Care of the Penitent Form", described the new style introduced at the recently opened West Green Citadel in London. "The floor surrounding the Mercy Seat is slightly raised and enclosed by heavy red cords, which are easily removed when the form is in use." (*The Field Officer*, September 1908, pp.327-8.)

<sup>15</sup> The Salvation Army Directory, No II, London, 1900, p.62.

Pastoring of the flock was not the original function of the Christian Missioners – they were above all itinerant evangelists. The gradual assimilation of evangelist into pastor in the role of the individual Salvation Army officer has paralleled the gradual metamorphosis of the “para-church” sect into denominational church. That trend has been accompanied by the gradual loss of the individual and corporate sense of responsibility of the ordinary members or soldiers to exercise the pastoral role. Within the early Salvation Army there was strong emphasis on the “lay”-pastorate, with the appointment of Visitation Sergeants with pastoral responsibility. With pastoral care undertaken by those with a more settled existence, the Evangelists or Missioners, and subsequently the officers, were itinerant. Itinerancy was a tradition inherited from Methodism, with frequent changes of pastorate for clergy, combined with the more limited role of the evangelist. Appointments tended to be for a matter of weeks only or months. Railton wrote that, “we refuse to allow our officers to stay long in one place lest they or the people should sink into the relationship of pastor and flock, and look to their mutual enjoyment and advantage rather than to the salvation of others...”<sup>16</sup>

In time, officers became under increasing pressure to exercise a pastoral role in addition to the evangelical one. Bramwell Booth’s 1899 book on officership included a section on “Shepherds and their Flocks”.<sup>17</sup> Whatever Railton’s fear of a pastor-flock relationship developing, it was inevitable; nurturing of new converts would establish expectations for continuing care.

### Preaching and Teaching

Clergy have usually assumed the magisterial role, the responsibility for teaching, in the Church. Although the *Orders and Regulations for Officers* prescribed instructing and drilling the troops as a significant officer-role, Booth saw preaching as the definitive clerical task (“one who had nothing else to do but preach”<sup>18</sup>) and we have seen that in his movement there was no thought of reserving this task to any special group. The reverse was his intention.

It should be noted however that whatever the theory, the Evangelists and then the Officers became the main speakers and preachers as time went on. A rearguard action against this practice has been fought ever since. In 1928 Bramwell Booth wrote to an officer in charge of a corps he had visited, advising him to, “Rope in your own people in so far as it is at all possible to take part in platform [i.e. preaching] work if the soldiers and locals felt the responsibility of speaking to the people the words of life and truth they would fit themselves for this work. This would relieve you of some of your platform responsibilities, and thus enable you to tackle other work.”<sup>19</sup> But many officers still jealously guard their prerogative in this respect, to the neglect of the gifts of their soldiers.

<sup>16</sup> G.S. Railton, *Heathen England*, p.144.

<sup>17</sup> W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants of All*. London, 1900, pp.93-9.

<sup>18</sup> George Scott Railton, *General Booth*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1912, p.17.

<sup>19</sup> Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*. London, Rich & Cowan, 1932, p.492.

## Government and Leadership

On the fourth point, government, only the full-time, employed evangelists or missionaries attended the Council of War in 1878, whereas lay-delegates had attended earlier Conferences. Murdoch avers that this action disenfranchised the laymen of The Salvation Army and “stripped them of the right to participate” in the organisation’s government.<sup>20</sup> At the same time as the Mission metamorphosed into The Salvation Army, it constitutionally reverted to Wesley’s original Methodist model of benevolent dictatorship. The government of the movement was clearly concentrated in the hands of a leading group, though always as a delegated authority derived in the end from the General himself. This remains the case today. The role of an officer is to command, to direct the government of the organisation at a particular level. The post-1877 polity certainly left the way open for the elevation of an “officer class” in the all-lay Army.

In sum, then, of the four clerical roles of officiating at rites, pastoring, preaching and government, it would seem that Christian Missioners became Salvation Army officers with only the fourth of these fields unambiguously as their largely exclusive prerogative. Their other roles were in the process of development – though also in the direction of a clerical monopoly. However, Officers were not yet clergy in any generally recognised sense at this time, any more than the Army itself was regarded as a church.

## What the Founders Said

Here we find an essential ambivalence as far as clericalism is concerned – and as far as being a church is concerned. The pragmatic origins of ministry and polity have meant that the Army has championed the concept of the priesthood of all believers and rejected the clerical role, while at the same time it has claimed ministerial status for its officers whenever that has seemed advantageous. Thus it has inherited and carried forward the ecclesiological contradictions of Methodism referred to earlier.

## All Lay, All Priests

Like Wesley before him, Booth did not see his Evangelists as clergy. He complained in 1877 that some had resigned because “they rub up against some Baptist or Primitive preachers and get ministerial notions.”<sup>21</sup> Railton quotes Booth, addressing young officers, as saying,

I have lived, thank God, to witness the separation between layman and cleric become more and more obscured, and to see Jesus Christ’s idea of changing in a moment ignorant fishermen into fishers of men nearer and nearer realization.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> Norman Murdoch, *Origins of The Salvation Army*. Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1994, p.91.

<sup>21</sup> Christian Mission Magazine, July 1877, p.172.

<sup>22</sup> George Scott Railton, *op.cit.*, p.17.

William Booth wanted to disabuse his officers of the notion that there is any “exclusive order of preachers” or that ministry was:

*confined to a particular class of individuals who constitute a sacred order specially raised up and qualified... on the ground of their ancestors having been specially set apart for it, and authorised to communicate the same power to their successors, who are, they again contend, empowered to pass on some special virtues to those who listen to their teaching... I deny the existence of any order exclusively possessing the right to publish the salvation of God... I honour the Order of Preachers; I belong to it myself... but as to his possessing any particular grace because of his having gone through any form of Ordination, or any other ceremonial whatever, I think that idea is a great mistake.*

*And I want to say here, once and for all, that no such notion is taught in any authorised statement of Salvation Army doctrine or affirmed by any responsible officer in the organisation... the duty in which I glory is no more sacred, and only a few degrees removed in importance, from that of the brother who opens the doors of the Hall in which the preacher holds forth... As Soldiers of Christ, the same duty places us all on one level.<sup>23</sup>*

Booth clearly rejected any apostolic succession or clerical character as needed to authenticate his officers' functions. Not only were officers not “clergy” but soldiers in effect were. In an 1898 address he hoped that soldiers would not shirk their duty “by any talk of not being an officer.”

*You cannot say you are not ordained. You were ordained when you signed Articles of War, under the blessed Flag. If not, I ordain every man, woman and child here present that has received the new life. I ordain you now. I cannot get at you to lay my hands upon you. I ordain you with the breath of my mouth. I tell you what your true business in the world is, and in the name of the living God I authorise you to go and do it. Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature!<sup>24</sup>*

### **Ministers Who were Not Ordained”<sup>25</sup>**

At the same time as we have these, and many other, very clear statements that The Salvation Army is an essentially lay movement, we find the growing assumption that officers do enjoy a distinctive and special role – or status. The specialness of the officer role was emphasised on two counts; firstly because of the need to foster and encourage the *esprit de corps* of officers in order to promote the effectiveness of the Army's leadership, and secondly from the desire to secure recognition of the officers within the wider community. Both would inevitably contribute to the process by which function would assume status.

<sup>23</sup> William Booth in *The Officer*, June 1899, pp.202-3.

<sup>24</sup> *The War Cry*, 22 January 1898, p.9, col.3.

<sup>25</sup> The phrase is Catherine Bramwell Booth's: *Bramwell Booth*, p.221.

Although not claiming any ordination for their officers, the Booths regarded them as in every way equal to the clergy of other denominations. Sandall reports a statement by William Booth, made in 1894: "The Salvation Army is not inferior in spiritual character to any organization in existence... We are, I consider, equal everyway and everywhere to any other Christian organization on the face of the earth (i) in spiritual authority, (ii) in spiritual intelligence, (iii) in spiritual functions. We hold 'the keys' as truly as any church in existence."<sup>26</sup> While these claims were made of the Army as a whole, the exercise of "authority" and the holding of the "keys" could be taken as peculiarly clerical or leadership roles. Booth was in no doubt that the Army would rise or fall on the quality of its leadership. His first *Orders and Regulations*, written particularly for officers leading a growing movement, noted that "The work must, of course, depend mainly upon the officers..."<sup>27</sup> Bramwell agreed with this, writing, "Officers ... they are the spinal column of the affair and their tone and spirit is its spinal marrow."<sup>28</sup>

In a circular to senior commanders, William Booth spoke of the role of officers as akin to a priesthood: "Indeed, the fact is ever before us – like Priest, like People; like Captain, like Corps."<sup>29</sup> "More and more as I have wrestled with the [new] regulations this week," he wrote to Bramwell in 1903, "it has been borne in upon me that it is the Officer upon whom all depends. It has always been so. If Moses had not made a priesthood, there would have been no Jewish nation. It was the priesthood of the Levites which kept them *alive*, saved them from their inherent rottenness... and perpetuated the law which made them."<sup>30</sup>

Such a statement suggests that Booth's own views were changing. Ervine comments that "This was a far different note from any that he had hitherto sounded. Priests had never previously been much esteemed by him who was more ready to admire prophets than priests... The Soldier-Prophet was about to leave his command to a Lawyer-Priest. A younger William Booth would have known that this was dangerous, but Booth was old and solitary and tired, and old men want priests more than they want warriors."<sup>31</sup> Robertson attributes this change to Booth's anticipation of a possible leadership crisis during the "period of routinisation" by his Supplementary Deed of 1904 (which provided for the deposition of a General adjudged unfit for office and the election of a replacement by a High Council). "Further, he came to the conclusion that the priesthood of all believers, although already effectively dropped in practice, had to be attenuated as an ideal."<sup>32</sup>

In an address to Staff Officers, reprinted after his death, William Booth said

<sup>26</sup> Robert Sandall, *History of The Salvation Army*. London, Nelson 1950. 2, p.126.

<sup>27</sup> *Orders and Regulations for The Salvation Army*, London, 1878, p.8.

<sup>28</sup> Letter of 24 February 1899, in Catherine Bramwell Booth, *op.cit.*, p.218.

<sup>29</sup> William Booth, Letter to Commissioners and Territorial Commanders. 1900, p.15.

<sup>30</sup> Harold Begbie, *Booth*. II, p.306.

<sup>31</sup> St. John Ervine, *God's Soldier, General William Booth*. London, Heinemann, 1934. II, pp.777-8.

<sup>32</sup> Roland Robertson, "The Salvation Army", in Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*. London, Heinemann, 1967, p.80.

*The Salvation Army also claims possession of certain authority – authority received from God and man adequate for the work required from it, and equal to that of any other Christian organisation in existence, if not superior to that of many which pass under that name. I claim such authority for myself as an ambassador of Christ, and I claim it also on your behalf. I claim for the Army all the authority necessary for the ruling of its people, their admission to its ranks or their exclusion from it... When I am asked to state the grounds on which the Army claims authority over the consciences and conduct of men, I reply that we do these things not on the authority of man, or of any outside organisation of men, but by the authority of God Himself.<sup>33</sup>*

In his memoirs Bramwell Booth echoes similar sentiments.

In this, we humbly but firmly claim that we are in no way inferior, either to the saints who have gone before, or – though remaining separate from them, even as one branch in the vine is separate from another – to the saints of the present. We, no less than they, are called and chosen to sanctification of the Spirit and to the inheritance of eternal life. And our officers are, equally with them, ministers in the church of God, having received diversities of gifts, but the one Spirit – endowed by His grace, assured of His guidance, confirmed by His word, and commissioned by the Holy Ghost to represent Him to the whole world.<sup>34</sup>

In the First World War Bramwell Booth forbade officers to volunteer for military duty, saying

*It seems to me that the consecration of their lives to the things of Christ, which all our officers have made, is inconsistent with their voluntarily drawing the sword in earthly warfare. There can be no doubt that they are as truly ministers of Christ's gospel as were the apostles themselves, and as ministers of God they are covenanted to approve themselves in patience, in affliction... And so I say I cannot approve their taking the sword, or any other carnal weapon.<sup>35</sup>*

These examples, and many like them, would support the view that the Army and its leaders progressively tended to claim a clerical role and status for officers. So, we have seen that The Salvation Army, in attempting to maintain a sectarian equality of believers, resisted the idea that its officers were clergy like other clergy. At the same time, partly because of the autocratic temperament of its founder, it adopted a military, hierarchical structure which served to expedite the process of clericalisation.

The conditions of officers' service would constitute their professional milieu in a way that could not be true of non-officer, volunteer Salvationists. The mystique of the Call to officership, the spiritually intensive nature of officer-formation in training and the sessional group bonding with peers, the extent of personal commitment involved in the

<sup>33</sup> *The Officer*, September 1915, p.579.

<sup>34</sup> W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes and Memories*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, [1925] 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. 1977, p.82.

<sup>35</sup> *The War Cry*, 19 September 1914, p.7. (Cited by Shaw Clifton, PhD thesis, *The Salvation Army's Actions and Attitudes in War Time 1889-1945*, Kings College, London 1989, p.215.)



Covenant and Undertakings, the ranking system, the distinctive functions and roles of officers and the intensity of the all-absorbing work, together with the sense of corporate identity and *esprit de corps*, gave officership a character which could be described as clerical compared with that of the rank and file.

This ambiguity over the status of officers arose in part from the Methodist theological roots, as we have noted, and in part from the fact that traditional ecclesiastical and canonical distinctions were of little interest or relevance. Salvationists were, as far as they were concerned, *sui generis*, needing no external ecclesiastical validation or referencing. Pragmatic decisions beget principles. The Founders set out to do just whatever appeared the most practical thing to do next. Rather than intentionally taking the historic pattern of the church as a model they fought against it as repugnant to their view of the ministerial role of Christians in general. For all that, they could not avoid bringing with them from their church background ways of thinking about how the church should be organised. The irony is that they ended up with a similar model of clergy and laity and an episcopal system of government under different names. It is difficult *in practice*, leaving aside ecclesiastical distinctions of legitimacy and apostolic provenance, to distinguish officership from the clerical status in any other church.

## Transitions

Sociologists refer to the period of “routinisation”, during which initially radical sectarian movements gradually accommodate to the world around them, and “denominationalise”. While Robertson considered that The Salvation Army had resisted this process and therefore dubbed it an “established sect”,<sup>36</sup> in the longer view it may be seen that the Army in the western world has conformed to type in this respect.

Although it was Donald McGavran’s twentieth century phrase,<sup>37</sup> the phenomenon of “redemption and lift”, was remarked upon by John Wesley nearly two hundred years earlier.

The Methodists in every place grow diligent and frugal; consequently they increase in goods. Hence they proportionately increase in pride, in the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, and the pride of life. So although the form of religion remains, the spirit is swiftly vanishing away...<sup>38</sup>

Salvationists, originally archetypal “working class”, have participated in the general rise in standards of living in western countries, with increased opportunity for education and diversified occupations. The children and grandchildren of those who had experienced the miracle of changing beer into furniture did not necessarily enjoy a vital conversion experience of their own or inherit the same evangelical imperative.

<sup>36</sup> Roland Robertson, *op.cit.*, pp.49-105.

<sup>37</sup> Donald McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1970, pp.262-275.

<sup>38</sup> Quoted by J.H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1950, p.97.

A concomitant of this development was a change in mindset from “mission to maintenance”; from a crusade to change the world to a preoccupation with the interests and needs of existing members. It is not without significance that the international statistics for numbers of corps and officers in 2004 were little different from those at the death of Bramwell Booth in 1929.<sup>39</sup> (The recent growth in soldiery statistics derives from a new, third world, growth spurt, offset by steep decline in the European homelands.) A diminution of evangelical fervour was also matched by a decline in commitment to sectarian “perfectionism” of the kind represented by the Army’s Wesleyan holiness theology, and the beginnings of a more conscious pluralism of theological outlook.

These changes have also been reflected in a moderation of the Army’s opposition to “the world”: only an embargo on alcohol, tobacco and gambling survives where once wearing a feathers on ladies’ hats, make-up and jewellery, and attending dances, organised sports events or the cinema were equally reprehensible. The Army no longer provides an all-embracing social milieu for many Salvationists, and the movement no longer maintains what Bryan Wilson called “a totalitarian rather than a segmental hold” over its members.<sup>40</sup> Higher education is no longer regarded with suspicion.

At least in much of the “western world”, this process of routinisation occupied perhaps the first sixty years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. As far as the theme of this essay is concerned, the end result of this was that the Army became another “mainline” denomination, in which the officers were regarded, and regarded themselves, as clergy, and the soldiers thought of themselves as laity. Despite a strong and continuing tradition of soldier involvement in “the work”, the officers became the professional religious class. Thomas O’Dea summarised the tendency thus:

*there comes into existence a body of men for whom the clerical life offers not simply the “religious” satisfactions of the earlier charismatic period, but also prestige and respectability, power and influence... and satisfactions derived from the use of personal talents in teaching, leadership, etc. Moreover, the maintenance of the situation in which these rewards are forthcoming tends to become an element in the motivation of the group.*<sup>41</sup>

### **Into the Second Century**

Although we have observed a denominationalising tendency in the period reviewed above, the Army’s official rhetoric remained sectarian. The inevitable tectonic tension between these two continental plates moving in opposite directions began to surface as the movement entered its second century in the 1960’s. This again conformed to the usual pattern of such movements in their life-cycle, as indeed had happened with the early Church itself. A period of consolidation and reflection begins. The movement becomes more self-conscious, and begins to clarify and rationalise what it had been

<sup>39</sup> 1929: 15,163 corps and 25,427 officers. 2004: 15,339 officers and 25,716.

<sup>40</sup> Bryan Wilson (Ed.), *op.cit.*, p.24.

<sup>41</sup> T.F. O’Dea, *The Sociology of Religion*. Englewood Cliffs NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1966, p.91.

doing, as well as adjusting to the fact that it is now operating in a world strangely different from that in which it had taken shape. Roger Green, referring to various late 20th and early 21st century initiatives in Salvationist theological discussion, comments that “these are still tenuous efforts for a denomination yet in its primacy. The Army is only now coming into an understanding of what it means to have a corporate theological life.”<sup>42</sup>

## The Debate

As far as our theme is concerned the Army entered upon a period of internal debate, expressed for the first time in its history in articles and correspondence, at first in *The Officer* and later in such territorial publications as *The Salvationist* in the UK and *Word and Deed* in USA. We can trace the coming out into the open of the polarities, “lay”, and “clerical”, between the view that office is simply functional and the belief that office confers a status or character, inherited a century before from Church history through Methodism and inherent in the Army as a sociological and ecclesiastical phenomenon.

The debate took place in two phases. For the first twenty-five years – roughly from 1960 to 1985 – it concerned function and status. In the following twenty years, following the introduction of the “ordination” of officers, this terminology naturally shaped the arguments offered. At the risk of caricaturing the variety of views, we can sample here only a few of the contributions made to the debate.

As representative of the “functional” school we can take the unambiguous statement by Australian Commissioner Hubert Scotney:

*The distinction made today between clergy and laity does not exist in the New Testament... The terms layman and laity (in the current usage of those words) are completely out of character in a Salvation Army context... It is foreign to the entire concept of Salvationism to imagine two levels of involvement. Any distinction between officers and soldiers is one of function rather than status.*<sup>43</sup>

Against that we can cite Colonel William Clark (IHQ), who claimed that by:

*a direct call from God into the ranks of Salvation Army officership, we have been given particular spiritual authority... Whatever our role ...happens to be for the time being... we are primarily spiritual leaders...Our spiritual authority lies not only or chiefly in what we do, but in what we are... Our calling is to be a certain kind of person and not ... to do a certain kind of job... The “ordained” ministry of the Church – to which body we belong by virtue of our calling, response, training and commissioning – is a distinctive ministry within the body of the whole people of God, different from that “general” ministry of the Church which is defined in the New Testament as “the priesthood of all believers”.*<sup>44</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Roger L. Green, “The Salvation Army and the Evangelical Tradition”, *Word and Deed*, May, 2003, p.61.

<sup>43</sup> *The Officer*, July 1969, p.452.

<sup>44</sup> *ibid.*, July 1976, pp.289-90.

In 1978 General Arnold Brown announced that the commissioning of officers would in future include use of the word “ordain”. This innovation evidently passed largely unremarked until Captain Chick Yuill of Scotland drew attention to it in 1985.

May I suggest that we need to re-emphasise the truth that there is no real distinction between officers and soldiers, that the difference is simply of function... If that little word ‘ordain’ has crept in because of a subconscious desire that other Christians should realise that we are as ‘important’ as the clergy of other denominations, ... in the end it matters not a jot where we stand in the estimation of any who would compile a league table of ecclesiastical importance.<sup>45</sup>

Cadet Stephen Court of Canada took the same line:

There is no difference between the two functions [officer and soldier], there is no distinctive, and so there are no grounds to justify ordination by this argument. The emphasis on ordination and the professional nature of officership only serves to widen the artificial gap existing between officers and soldiers. Note I use the term “soldier” rather than the insidious term “laity”.

He concluded by warning against “the gradual abdication of our characteristic birthright in ‘favour’ of a mainstream church identity.”<sup>46</sup>

Against those, we can quote for example the following vigorous support for ordination from a retired officer, Brigadier Bramwell Darbyshire:

In spite of all the stuff about the priesthood of all believers, ordained and commissioned officers are different from non-officer Salvationists. They are not cleverer, wiser, more loved of God than their fellows, but they are special, set apart for Jesus in a way that involves sacrifice and often great inconvenience to their families... No one is more grateful for the Army’s dedicated lay staff than this old warrior; but let’s get it right. They may be as much involved as officers, but there is for an officer a sacramental dimension and if we lose sight of this the Army is finished.<sup>47</sup>

Others again used the term “ordained”, but on their own terms, as implying only a “functional” role. Major Raymond Caddy of IHQ defended it in these terms: ...one of its meanings is closely tied to the idea of organisation which underlies all military structures... means to categorise, to place in a particular ranking... the specific ranking, then, has something to tell us about function. ...this is the classification of people as ministers of religion... to carry out certain roles. These duties are restricted to people of that rank, otherwise there is no point in separating them from the rest.

He went on to distinguish two kinds of ordination in the Church, one of all Christians, and the other to the exercise of certain spiritual gifts (see Romans 12, 1st Corinthians

---

<sup>45</sup> *ibid.*, October 1985, pp.438-40.

<sup>46</sup> *ibid.*, May 1993, pp.214-5.

<sup>47</sup> *The Salvationist*, 18 April 1998.

12), vocations given so that the Church may be governed and served... Particular ministries are recognised and encouraged when the Army commissions or warrants its officers and local officers. However, every Salvationist is ordained to the greater vocation of Christian. There is no higher calling than this.<sup>48</sup>

The debate widened to a general discussion of what roles and functions were appropriate to an officer. These tended to follow the culturally conditioned expectation of clergy in general. Officers were to lead, pastor, preach, teach and disciple, and equip the saints for ministry. Some saw the officer as being assisted in ministry by non-officers; others saw that the officer's role was to assist non-officers in *their* ministry. Some writers addressed officer conditions of service, such as appointability, as the distinctive mark of officership. A few called attention to officers' representative role, as head and focus of their community of faith. Some people, while rejecting any spurious status equivalent to priestly character for officership, felt that an entirely functional description could not justify a separate officer role. They therefore looked for an internal, Salvation Army validation, a combination of the officer's own personal sense of calling and the objective fact that Salvation Army officer ministry was an existing reality to be taken into account. Major Cecil Waters urged a return to an unabashedly Salvationist argument from simple pragmatism.

*We will go on looking for a definition of officership unless and until we recognise that officership exists firstly as a convenience by which we organise the Army and secondly as one function, among many, to which we feel "called of God. [It was] impossible to define a concept of officership which is plainly and clearly distinct from that of soldiership. [He concluded] (a) That it would seem that the Army needs full time workers... Most, but by no means all, these workers are officers. (b) That we believe we may be called to be such workers – and this call may refer to officership (rather than employee or envoy status). (c) That to be so called and so engaged is sufficient to sustain our work, our spirit and our identity. I believe we need look for nothing more special than this."*<sup>49</sup>

## Official words

### Ordination

Of official statements on this matter the first was General Brown's introduction of "ordination" in commissioning. The Chief of Staff's 1978 letter to Territorial Commanders stated:

*It is the General's wish that a slight modification should be made to the wording of the Dedication Service during the Commissioning of cadets, in order to emphasise the fact that Salvation Army officers are ordained ministers of Christ and of His Gospel.*

*After the cadets have made their Affirmation of Faith, the officer conducting the Commissioning should then say: "In accepting these pledges which you each have made, I commission you as officers of The Salvation Army and ordain you as ministers of His Gospel." In countries other than English-speaking, and where the word*

<sup>48</sup> *ibid.*, 20 May 1989, p.5.

<sup>49</sup> *The Officer*, July 1992, p.317.

*“ordained” has no exact equivalent, a translation should be used which will give the nearest possible meaning to the English-language expression.*<sup>50</sup>

That the decision did not command universal support might be suggested by the fact that it was reviewed in 1988 and 1892, and the rubric was eventually amended by General John Gowans. A 2002 Memo from Chief of Staff John Larsson instructed:

*The commissioning officer will say to each cadet in turn: “Cadet (name): Accepting your promises and recognising that God has called, ordained and empowered you to be a minister of Christ and of his gospel, I commission you an officer of The Salvation Army.”*<sup>51</sup>

The significant changes here would appear to be that (1) the cadets were to be commissioned individually rather than collectively, and (2) “ordination” was now seen as something already done by God rather than in this ceremony by a representative of the organisation.

### **Response to the Lima Document**

In 1982 the World Council of Churches *Faith and Order Paper 111 on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Lima<sup>52</sup>), was circulated amongst churches for comment. The Salvation Army’s response was included in *Faith and Order Paper 137* of 1987, and also published by the Army itself as *One Faith, One Church*, in 1990. While the intention had been that churches would look for areas of agreement, the majority ended up by drawing lines around their own particular distinctives and the result pleased no-one. Catholics felt the document was Protestant in emphasis; Protestants felt “left out”.

The Army identified with Lima where it could. Its main concern seems to have been to defend its non-sacramental stance, and even in its response on Ministry, it appeared somewhat preoccupied with the sacramental issue.

About the question of how Salvation Army ministry is perceived in relation to traditional Church belief about ordination, it appeared to be less sensitive and therefore, missed significant areas of difference. It was vague about the meaning of the language of ordination, which it had recently adopted, and confused the concept of indelible character of orders with the Army’s own expectation that officers would commit to life-long ministry. The Army identified with the theology of the “radical reformation” but that it also sought to be included in the fold of “mainstream” ecclesiology by claiming that it was just like everyone else but with different terminology. Or in the case of “ordination”, the same terminology.

It concluded that rather than “the highlighting of differences,” the Army would prefer to see the churches demonstrating their existing unity in mission and evangelism. It

---

<sup>50</sup> Letter of 30 May 1978 in IHQ Archives.

<sup>51</sup> IHQ Archives.

<sup>52</sup> Named for the city in which took place the final conference producing the document.

believed that differences in faith and order in the church are issues only to theologians, of lesser concern to lay Christians and of no interest whatever to those outside the church.<sup>53</sup>

### Community in Mission

Their work on the Lima document evidently alerted the Salvation Army's leadership to its lack of a coherent ecclesiology and the difficulties inherent in maintaining a merely reactive mode. The book *Community in Mission, A Salvationist Ecclesiology* was commissioned from an American officer, Major Philip Needham, and published in 1987. Needham's basic premise is that "a Salvationist ecclesiology stands as a reminder to the Church that its mission in the world is primary, and that the life of the Church ought largely to be shaped by a basic commitment to mission."<sup>54</sup> His ecclesiology deals pre-eminently with the ministry of the Army as a whole, and only *inter alia* with that of the officer corps in particular.

*Within the elaboration of this theme, Needham clearly confined the concept of "ordination" to a "functional" role within the movement – and claimed that its significance was best expressed in the word "commissioning", used of both officers and soldiers taking up specific tasks, while "ordination" was commonly used in connection with "ministries that require theological training, specialised skills, pastoral leadership and a full-time vocation..."<sup>55</sup>*

### The work of the International Doctrine Council

The Doctrine Council, inaugurated in 1931, has been responsible for producing successive editions of the *Handbook of Doctrine*. None of the pre-1969 editions mentioned the doctrine of the Church, a concept without interest to the early Salvation Army, and even from 1969 this was discussed only under Trinitarian doctrine, as a Ministry of the Holy Spirit. No reference was made to a "separated ministry". The 1998 edition, *Salvation Story*, explains that "One very important change since the Eleven Articles were formulated and adopted is the evolution of the Movement from an agency for evangelism to a church, an evangelistic body of believers who worship, fellowship, minister and are in mission together."<sup>56</sup>

With reference to Ministry, a paragraph explains that all Christians are "ministers or servants of the gospel... share in the priestly ministry... In that sense there is no separated ministry." However the section goes on to say:

*Within that common calling, some are called by Christ to be full-time office-holders within the Church. Their calling is affirmed by the gift of the Holy Spirit, the recognition of the Christian community and their commissioning – ordination – for service. Their function is to focus the mission and ministry of the whole Church so that its members are held faithful to their calling. They serve their fellow ministers as visionaries who*

<sup>53</sup> Faith and Order Paper 137, p.256.

<sup>54</sup> Philip Needham, *Community in Mission*, London, 1987, pp.4-5.

<sup>55</sup> Philip Needham, *ibid.*, p.65.

<sup>56</sup> *Salvation Story*, London, 1998, p.100.

*point the way to mission, as pastors who minister to the priests when they are hurt or overcome, as enablers who equip others for mission, as spiritual leaders.*<sup>57</sup>

Like *Community in Mission*, this does establish clearly the principle that the ministry of particular persons arises out of the ministry of the whole Christian community, and attempts to explain and justify how this happens in practice.

The Council's most recent work is ***Servants Together***, arising from the 1995 International Council of Leaders' recommendation that

The roles of officers and soldiers be defined and a theology of "the priesthood of all believers" be developed to encourage greater involvement in ministry (for example, spiritual leadership, leadership in general), worship, service and evangelism.<sup>58</sup>

The book for the first time puts the Army's ecclesiology in its historical context. It clearly establishes the principle that there is no distinction in status between soldiers and officers, although it then struggles to establish what is unique about the role of the officer. Significantly, and indicative of the Army's growing pluralism, it does allow that a variety of opinion is held on the subject. As an official response to the debate of the previous forty years, *Servants Together* entrenches the Army's traditional ambiguity about the nature of its "separated ministry".

If we were to attempt to sum up the progression to be found through the sequence beginning with the introduction of ordination in 1978 and culminating in the publication of *Servants Together* in 2000, at the risk of over-simplification we might suggest that in the 1970's the pendulum had swung as far as it could in the direction of a status for officers, and that the subsequent works show a move to correct an imbalance and restore a functional point of view – while retaining the movement's traditional ambiguity about the question.

### **Officers who may not be officers**

The ambiguity about the status of officers – whether they are clerical or lay – has further implications for Salvationists who have performed "officer" functions without being accorded full officer status. These include not only non-commissioned and warranted ranks and soldiers, but more surprisingly the women officers, particularly the married women, of the Army.

### **An officer by any other name...**

In every army in the world, it is the non-commissioned officers, the NCOs, who see themselves as the real leaders of the army. The Salvation Army's unpaid, volunteer "local officers", originally the "elders" of the Christian Mission, evolved to become a paid, full-time parallel structure to officership. From 1893, some were appointed as

---

<sup>57</sup> *ibid.*, p.108.

<sup>58</sup> *Servants Together*, London, 2002, p.127.



“Envoys”, equivalent to Methodist local preachers on a circuit, and from the 1930’s these sometimes acted as Corps commanding officers. By the 1940’s these voluntary workers were supplemented by full-time paid Envoys who held officer appointments in both corps and social work but without officer training or commission. Finally, by the 1960’s some were warranted as “Auxiliary Captains”, working under officer conditions but still without officer status, though some later went on to hold substantive rank. The phenomenon of people doing identical work but accorded differing status is fraught with inequities and runs counter to the principle that officership is simply functional.

Although we have referred to the trend for officers to become clergy and soldiers to think of themselves as laity, there has always been a counter-movement, a consistent tradition of soldier initiative and participation in the Army’s work. There has always been some tension between the view that soldiers are “cannon-fodder”, with lives co-extensive with Army programmes, and the belief that soldiers are the front line of evangelism in the world, engaged in *real* “full-time service”, and to be resourced by officers rather than used. The former approach is always a danger in a clericalising context.

In the “Western world” Army, the second half of the twentieth century saw some attempt to accommodate to the more democratic temper of the times with some consultative machinery on both the local level, with Corps Councils, and territorial level, with a variety of “laymen’s advisory” groups. It is interesting that General Clarence Wiseman, an initiator of the latter, had second thoughts on theological grounds – “to have segregated groupings is really in violation of the concept of the priesthood of all believers... thereafter Officers came officially on to the [Canadian] ACSAL.”<sup>59</sup>

Two weaknesses have dogged all such attempts at spreading the ownership of policy. Firstly, as Peter Price has observed of the Catholic Church: “The consultative structures of the Church are still only ‘recommended’ and ‘advisory’. They do not necessarily facilitate Lay participation in real decision-making. Such participation as well as its authority are dependent on the individual Bishop or Parish Priest, and may be dismantled at will.”<sup>60</sup> Secondly, the default, officer-centred position into which the organisation so readily lapses, attributing omnicompetence to commissioned rank, means that too often business decisions are made by commercial amateurs, with a commensurate loss of credibility in the eyes of Salvation Army soldiers.

A growing late twentieth century trend has been the employment of soldiers in ministry roles – as youth workers, pastoral workers and corps leaders, as well as in social work and administrative roles. This has been particularly the case in western countries with declining officer strength and has provoked further debate about the respective roles and status of officers and soldiers. This has paralleled a similar controversy in the

<sup>59</sup> Minutes of the 1971 International Council of Leaders, p.54.

<sup>60</sup> ‘Vatican II: End of a Clerical Church?(1)’ in *Australian Ejournal of Theology*, [http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet\\_1Price.htm](http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_1Price.htm)

Roman Catholic and some other churches.<sup>61</sup> The difference between the Church and The Salvation Army lies in the fact that the Army does not in theory reserve spiritual ministry and leadership roles for a sacerdotal class. The similarity lies in the fact that in practice, because of its hierarchical structure, the Army has tended to behave in the same way as the Church, and change in this area therefore occasions similar tensions.

### **A Monstrous Regiment of Women<sup>62</sup>**

If a question is whether Salvation Army officers are, or are not, clergy, the question may have even more point in the case of women officers, given that ordination of women was not generally accepted in the 19th century. Equality of the sexes has always been one of the Army's boasts. "In the Army," wrote Florence Booth, "we know no distinction, because of sex, which is calculated to limit either a woman's influence or her authority, or her opportunity to serve, by sacrifice, the Kingdom of God."<sup>63</sup>

Over many years, Salvationists regarded the struggles of other denominations over this question with a certain smugness, not always justified, and on two grounds. The first was theological, in that Salvation Army commentators did not always understand the difference between involvement, even leadership, in ministry and a claim to Christian "priesthood". The second reason for some modesty on the question is that the Army's practice has not always matched its precepts. In fact, over much of its history the Army appeared to retreat from its early promise of gender equality. Single women officers were disadvantaged in comparison to their male peers; married women found their officership merged with and subordinated to that of their husbands.

The reason for this was probably simply male chauvinism and the increasing conservatism of a movement institutionalising and tending to be on the defensive. It might be suggested that this touches on our clericalising theme as well. Whatever the Army's rhetoric, the men thought of themselves as clergy, and in the world to which the Army was accommodating it was not yet trendy to think of the women as clergy as well. While the stand taken by the Booths was ground-breaking in the nineteenth century, they found it difficult to apply the principle of gender equality across the board, quite naturally because they were prisoners of their own times and assumptions. Theological principles are not easily imposed on resistant cultural norms. Andrew Mark Eason's *Women in God's Army* explores and analyses

the cultural and theological foundations upon which the organisation was established. Reflecting views that were similar to those of their male counterparts, most Army women espoused beliefs and accepted roles that were incompatible with a principle of sexual equality. A female officer's moral and spiritual functions in the home, combined

<sup>61</sup> See for example, Mary Ann Glendon, "The Hour of the Laity". *First Things*, 127, November 2002, pp.23-29, or John T. Pless, "Vocation: Where Liturgy and Ethics Meet". *Journal of Lutheran Ethics*, Vol.2 No.5, May 13<sup>th</sup> 2002.

<sup>62</sup> I cannot claim this seriously inappropriate pun on John Knox as my own; Lt. Colonel Bernard Watson has anticipated me, for a chapter heading in his centenary history of the Army. (*A Hundred Years War*, London, Hodder & Stoughton 1964, p.28.)

<sup>63</sup> *The Officer*, August 1914, pp.509-10. (Florence was wife of Bramwell Booth.)

with her other domestic tasks, either called into question or placed constraints upon her public ministry... Within the public realm, a married or single female officer was usually confined to responsibilities consistent with the notion of sexual difference. She was encouraged to possess a femininity defined in terms of self-sacrifice, weakness, dependency and emotion. This construction of womanhood allowed women to challenge sinners publicly from the platform or engage in social work, but their overall ministry remained a modest one... Her ideal role was one of service and submission rather than leadership and authority.<sup>64</sup>

The Salvation Army, having in some senses pioneered equality, evidently lost its momentum fairly early in its history, while continuing to believe its own rhetoric. It has only recently begun to address the issues again, firstly as a result of the work of a commission established by General Eva Burrows and its recommendations as implemented by General Paul Rader in the 1990's, and secondly as an outcome of the International Commission on Officership, under General John Gowans.

### **The International Commission on Officership**

General Paul Rader set up an International Commission on Officership, on the recommendation of the 1998 International Conference of Leaders held in Melbourne. Its purpose was "to review all aspects of the concept of officership in the light of the contemporary situation and its challenges, with a view to introducing a greater measure of flexibility" into officer service.<sup>65</sup>

Most of the recommendations deal with "officer conditions". To that extent the commission was a response to the ways in which the original expectations of both the officers and the Army as a whole have drifted out of synch with the changing times and world-view of newer generations. However, the findings of this commission and ensuing changes also bear upon the matters at the heart of this paper – the character of officership, and the question of whether officership is perceived as a functional role or a clerical status.

Of the matters traced in this paper, some recommendations had to do with the role of women and the equality of their status with that of men officers in the matter of allowances, women's appointments and the need for gender balance on Boards and Councils. These largely affirmed, furthered and encouraged reforms already in train. Only with local, territorial exploration, and will to progress, will changes be made.

Secondly, some recommendations bore directly on the status-function dichotomy we have observed through the Army's (and the Church's) history. Under this heading we could place those referring to Covenant and Undertakings, open-ended or short-term commissions, diverse models of spiritual leadership and tent-making ministry.

---

<sup>64</sup> Andrew Mark Eason, *Women in God's Army*. Waterloo, Ontario, Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2003, p.152.

<sup>65</sup> Norman Howe, "The International Commission on Officership, A Report", *The Officer*, August 1999, p.19.

Concerning the status of officership there was an inherent tension between two of the Commission's terms of Reference: to strengthen the ideal of life-time service and to explore the possibilities of short-term service. The first would shore up the "clerical" assumptions behind officership; the second would permit a greater degree of flexibility based on an "all-lay" ethos. General Gowans opted for the former, perpetuating the two-tier model, both tiers performing the same ministry roles but only one with the status of officership, with Lieutenant becoming a warranted rank to replace those of Envoy and Auxiliary Captain. Gowans was unable to commit the Army to a solely "functional" model, and the movement continues to try to have it both ways.

The Commission was not set up to address the issue of clericalisation, so it is not surprising that it did not resolve the tensions between The Salvation Army's theology and its ecclesiology apparent throughout its history. It was intended to suggest solutions to practical, organisational problems arising from the tensions between an institutional structure, its evolving constituents and its ever changing milieu. In particular, it sought to modify those service conditions which were bringing pressure to bear on officers and making it harder to recruit and retain officers in some territories. However, those conditions and tensions are to some extent the result of and inseparable from the process we have described as clericalisation. Pragmatic rejigging of regulations without recognising and adequately taking into account the underlying sociological and ecclesiological processes involved, is dealing with symptoms without addressing causes. Such measures may meet the need of the hour, or of a decade or two, but do not go far enough to help regroup the Army for the battles of the coming century.

## Conclusions

The Salvation Army had three options regarding clerical status:

1. There *are* priests/clerics/people in orders in the Church, with a status distinct from that of the laity, but we *do not* have them in The Salvation Army.

This would mean The Salvation Army's acceptance of an "all lay" status for its soldiers and officers and a second class clergy status for its officers, acknowledging itself to be something like an order or an *ecclesiola in ecclesia* rather than a "church" or "denomination". For Booth it was not enough that his officers should be regarded as Deacons and Deaconesses, members of an inferior order.

2. There *are* priests/clerics/people in orders in the Church, and we *do* have them as officers in The Salvation Army.

The adoption of "ordination" by Arnold Brown, and the claim that the Army's commissioning had always been equivalent to ordination, amounted to this position. This seemed to be an attempt to endorse officially what Salvationists had come to accept in practice over many years, without being very clear about what was meant by it. The confusion that has grown up on this issue within The Salvation Army is, as has

been suggested, partly a result of ambiguity about church order inherited from Methodism, and partly from a desire to be accepted by other Christian denominations as one of them.

3. There are *no* priests/clerics/orders in the Church, and The Salvation Army does *not* aspire to any. All Christians are “lay”, in the sense that all belong to the people of God, without distinction of status.

Booth in fact made it clear on more than one occasion that this was his theoretical position; his theology required it. However, the Army’s ecclesiology was shaped instead by Booth’s autocratic temperament, the need for organisation, the twin demons of militarism and bureaucracy, the susceptibility of human nature to pride and ambition, along with historically conditioned expectations. All these meant that the leadership function, as always, appropriated to itself a dominant role and assumed a regular status. The difficulty lies in the tension between the Salvation Army’s hierarchical institutional structure and the “Priesthood of all Believers” ethos inherited from its radical Protestant antecedents. In a word, The Salvation Army has “clericalised”.

I suggest that the tendency to clericalisation has had two related adverse effects on the Church, and, on The Salvation Army.

Firstly, clericalism fosters a spirit incompatible with the “servanthood” Jesus taught and modelled; it is inimical to the kind of community Jesus appeared to call together.

Secondly, clericalisation by concentrating power and influence in the hands of a minority, disempowers the great majority of members of the Church. It can therefore diminish the Church’s effectiveness in its mission of evangelising and serving the world. It might be possible in fact to argue that the effectiveness of function is in inverse proportion to status claimed.<sup>66</sup>

How might the effect of clericalisation be moderated? We might consider this question under three headings, concerning firstly the vocation of the officer as an individual, secondly the role of the officer, and thirdly the relationship of the officer to the organisation.

### 1. The Officer’s Vocation

Over the years the Reformation concept of all believers having a calling has been narrowed to a clerical focus, into which the Army has bought. A newer generation is less willing to accept this. To maintain officer recruitment the Army therefore has a choice of what in the Catholic Church is called the “restorationist agenda”, attempting to set the clock back, and emphasising the status of officership, or the alternative is to

---

<sup>66</sup> This analysis refers particularly to the Army in the post-Christendom, post-modern, western world. The present growth spurt in the developing world may relate to the fact that less individualistic societies, with a generally stronger culture of belonging and a traditional respect for authority, still relate more easily to the hierarchical, military structure of the Army.

give full value to the vocation of officership as one ministry option without, by implication, devaluing other callings.

## 2. The Officer's Roles in the Organisation

The debate referred to already and the book, *Servants Together* show that a variety of attempts to define the officer role over against that of soldiers all came to grief over the basic presupposition, derived from our rejection of any hint of sacerdotalism, that there was nothing done by an officer that could not be done by a soldier. It is necessary to fall back on Cecil Waters' dictum that officership is simply the way in which we choose to organise the Army; it has no sacred dimension in itself. It is about leadership.

Given the military metaphor on which the Army is structured, and the necessity of leadership in any human endeavour, it is necessary to ask how we can ensure leadership without the abuse of power to which a hierarchical system is especially vulnerable. Without structural safeguards, all talk of "servant leadership" too easily becomes an instrument of spiritual abuse; systemic privilege and power must be circumscribed. It is true, however, that servant-leader behaviour flows only from servant-leader attitudes, and attitudes are notoriously unamenable to legislation. They have to be caught as well as taught, by the example of what Paul called "working together", by way of contrast with "ruling over".<sup>67</sup> Both structural and attitudinal change is required for this to happen.

## 3. The Officer's Covenant and Undertakings

The Undertakings signed by the officer commit the individual to a number of conditions intended to ensure his or her full availability to the service, equivalent for example to celibacy for the Catholic priesthood. I would argue that the conditions of officer service have helped create status, in so far as they have set officers apart from other Salvationists. We have seen that this was deliberately fostered, along with all the other devices used to create morale and *esprit de corps*. In my view this has now become counterproductive, in that these conditions no longer serve that purpose for people who are already officers and make more difficult the recruitment of their replacements.

The other significance of the Undertakings is that with the officer's explicit renunciation of any legal claim to remuneration or other benefits of employed status, they are the cornerstone of the Army's sharing the "employed by God" status enjoyed by the clergy of most churches. We have seen that this has until now served to safeguard the Army against legal action by its officers. However, it is an anachronism left over from the Theodosian polity of Christendom, and coming under increasing pressure in secular societies.

Rather than trying to hang on to a *soi disant* clerical status which is irrelevant to the needs of the modern world, we could accept that officers are employees, their covenant no different from that of soldiers in the Army's service. At the same time, we could accord officer rank to anyone in a leadership roles normally exercised by an officer. This rationalisation would end the two-tier structure whereby some officers are

---

<sup>67</sup> 2 Corinthians 1:24

more equal than others and the anomaly whereby a “mere” soldier can be the leader and focal representative of the Army in a whole community. Rank and status would lose their pseudo-theological rationale.

Leadership is indispensable to the effectiveness of a movement. It is not suggested that structure be abolished; the nature of human affairs is that structures will happen anyway, and their having some continuity, accountability and legitimacy may be necessary to help mitigate the effect of unrestrained personal power. As O’Dea says, “charismatic authority is inherently unstable and... its transformation into institutionalised leadership is necessary for the survival of the group.”<sup>68</sup> But if institutionalisation is inevitable, the prophetic critique, the Reformation’s *ecclesia semper reformanda*, is equally necessary. This section of the Conclusion has attempted to propose some small changes in how the vocation of officership is viewed, in how the role of officership is expressed and in the conditions of officer-service, all with a view to moderating the clericalist tendency. Such comparatively minor modifications to Salvationist culture, some structural, some attitudinal, might at least contribute to the process of re-founding, necessary to the future of The Salvation Army.

However, these suggested changes do not amount to any more than “tinkering”, while it may be that the challenges facing the Church today are of the same order as the implications of global warming for the environment.

## Postlogue

The range of ways in which The Salvation Army in the West is attempting to come to terms with post-modern society could be compared with various contemporary trends in motor car design. At one end of the spectrum there are those manufacturers fashionably “retro” in style, deliberately evoking the design cues of long-past glory days as a market ploy for the present but technologically thoroughly advanced – the recent S-type Jaguar, harking back to the classic Mark II of the 1960’s would be a prime example. At the other end of the spectrum is the handful of curious “green” hybrid petrol-electric or hydrogen-powered vehicles, showing that manufacturers are trying to plan ahead for the day the oil runs out. And in between, the majority of the industry continues to make incremental model changes from year to year as fashion dictates in the hope of improving their market share.

Likewise, in the Salvation Army, there are the “retros” who seek to reawaken the radical passion of the 1880’s – witness an “Army-barmy” website, a “War College” in Vancouver, an on-line *Journal of Aggressive Christianity*, a fashion for “Roots” conventions, a growing network of “614” communities. Such activists have been described as “neo-primitive salvationists”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Thomas O’Dea, *The Sociology of Religion*. p.49

<sup>69</sup> Shaw Clifton, “What on Earth is Neo-Primitive Salvationism?” The Coutts Memorial Lecture given at the Salvation Army College of Further Education, Sydney NSW, July 2003.

At the other end of the spectrum there is the secret army of those who have gone AWOL, of those who would prefer to disavow the whole military metaphor as inimical to the spirit of the age, for whom every convention is up for grabs and every received truth open to re-negotiation; who believe that the “oil is running out” for the institutional church. They are of that great company from every denomination who have taken their faith with them when they have left the church.<sup>70</sup> Many are “church-burnt” and are unlikely to return to the ranks under existing conditions. They nevertheless represent enormous potential for some future form of the Church, because they are attempting to work out in practice what it means to be Christian in a secular society without any of the traditional supports or conventions, or are in some cases involved in new, experimental forms of Christian community or ‘emergent church’. Behind the lines is always a dangerous place to do the fighting, and casualties are likely to be high.

And in between, the majority of Salvation Army units try to maintain market share, sometimes by soldiering on and trying to hold the line against change, and sometimes by borrowing whatever seems to be working somewhere else – usually from some fashionable US megachurch, or trying to implement the current gospel of “church growth” or “natural church growth” – or attempting to become a generic “community church”.<sup>71</sup> Despite huge effort and some outstanding successes, they tend in the main to be either just holding their ground or are retreating. The casualties are high here too.

The kind of leadership or officership required by each of these models is likely to differ markedly. For the third of these models the present conception of officership could continue to do duty, still with its tension and ambiguity on the question of status and function. However, retaining such a theological hybrid may continue to give rise to the same kinds of inconsistency and inequity we have observed in the past, and limit the ability of the Army to harness fully the resources of its non-officer personnel. The neo-primitive Salvationists, on the other hand, might just possibly stake out the original conception of a “lay” Salvation Army and, for the time being at least, resist the process of clericalisation. Status is of less significance in the trenches than on the parade ground. The “Underground Army” is unlikely to have officers of any kind, and be less interested in questions of accountability or apostolicity.

In these days of exponential change, when a cultural generation in the West is reckoned at less than seven years, it would be foolish to assume that the present fragmentation and individualism experienced in western life, including religious life, will not swing back towards a desperate search for certainty and authority, for which a restorationist theology, or perhaps neo-primitive Salvationism, might be tailor-made.

---

<sup>70</sup> See Alan Jamieson, *A Churchless Faith*. Wellington, Garside, 2000; Alan Jamieson, *Called Again: In and Beyond the Deserts of Faith*, Wellington, Garside, 2004; or such websites as <http://www.dechurched.com/>.

<sup>71</sup> See for example, John Larsson, *How Your Corps Can Grow*, London 1988, or Tim Beadle and Joel Matthews, *Let the Son Shine Out: Let God's Church Find its Place in Your Community*. Toronto ONT, 2000.



But there is also the possibility that only the underground church will survive the coming storm.

If we recall that almost every revival of Christian religion in the past has involved a reaction against priestly presumption and a renewal of lay power and activity, it may be that the Salvation Army's best hope is to rediscover this aspect of its original genius. This is the age of irregulars, not of parade grounds or set piece battles. Like William Booth, one hundred and forty years ago, it would be necessary for The Salvation Army to admit that it did not know where it was going, but that would not matter. The institutional Church always seems to be bound by the answers to the previous age's questions. It might be better, David Pawson's words, to "find out what the Holy Spirit is doing and join in."<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup> David Pawson, freelance British house-church leader, speaking in Queenstown, NZ, 9 January 1986.

## **Companions of the Cross of Christ**

by General William Booth

*(International Staff Council Addresses 1904, General William Booth, p144-147)*

THE FUTURE - Do not limit the possibilities of the future. God has many ways of fulfilling His purposes towards the sons and daughters of men. Here is one, of which I dreamed a dream. The one I am going to mention came to me when thoughtfully wondering, as I so often do, what The Salvation Army of the coming years was likely to be.

In this vision I beheld many things that were novel and fascinating, but nothing that took greater hold of me at the moment than the one I am about to describe. Perhaps the superior interest it excited in my feelings arose out of its intense practicality. It seemed all so natural, so possible, so fruitful, and the results so desirable, that I came almost to feel that the thing was not a dream, but an actual occurrence, literally happening before my eyes.

I thought I was looking at The Salvation Army in its varied future operations, and while I looked I thought I saw a new body of Officers suddenly start into existence. In many respects they strongly resembled the comrades with whom I am familiar to day. In other respects they appeared strangely dissimilar.

I will try to describe them, and while I do so you will be able to judge of the probable usefulness or otherwise of such a class, the possibility of creating it, and whether you would or would not like to belong to it, if it were created.

As I looked at this new people, they appeared to manifest extraordinary signs of earnestness, self-denial, and singleness of purpose; indeed, they had every appearance of being a reckless, daredevil set. On inquiry, I found that they described themselves as "Brothers of Salvation" or "Companions of the Cross of Christ." They went forth, two and two, strengthening each other's hands, and comforting each other's hearts in all the work they had to do, and all the trials they had to bear. They seemed to welcome privations, and to revel in hardships, counting it all joy when they fell into diverse persecutions, and facing opposition and difficulties with meekness, patience, and love.

As I looked, and looked, I wondered more and more, for I observed that they had voluntarily embraced the old-fashioned vows of celibacy, poverty, and obedience. These vows I observed, further, were regarded as only binding upon them for a term of years, with the option of renewal for a further term at the expiration of that period, or of being able at that time to honourably return to the ordinary ranks of Officership.

As I looked at these new comrades, who had as it were suddenly sprung out of the ground, I saw that they wore a novel kind of uniform of simple shape, but very

pronounced, and displaying very prominently the insignia of The Salvation Army. They were evidently proud of their colours.

And then I saw another thing that was peculiar about this new Order – I do not know how else to speak of it. I saw that they refused to accept any money or gifts for themselves, or for their friends, or, at most, not more than was necessary to meet the very humble wants of that particular day; while I saw that they were pledged not to own any goods of any kind, save and except the clothes they wore.

And then I saw that they were great wanderers, continually travelling from place to place, and that very much on foot, as this gave them the opportunity of visiting the hamlets, cottages, farmhouses, and mansions on the way, and speaking to the people in the streets, market squares, or other open spaces on week-days as well as on Sundays, as they passed along.

I saw that they assisted at the services in The Salvation Halls wherever they came, always working in friendly co-operation with the Officers in Command; visiting the Soldiers, sick or well; hunting up backsliders, and striving to promote the interests of every Corps they visited, to the utmost of their ability.

I saw that they visited and prayed with the people from door to door, in the great cities as well as in the villages; talked to them in the streets, trains, or wherever they had opportunity, about death, judgment, eternity, repentance, Christ, and salvation.

I saw them in my dream addressing the workmen at the dock gates, at the entrances to public works, in the factories at meal hours; indeed, they were talking, praying, and singing with whomsoever they could get to listen to them, singly, or in company wherever they came.

And as I looked, I saw their number, which was very, very small at first, gradually increase until they reached quite a multitude. And the educated and well-to-do, charmed with this simple Christ like life, swelled its numbers, coming from the universities and the moneymaking institutions and other high places.

Do you ask me about their support? Oh! I answer, so far as I could find out in my dream, they never lacked any really necessary thing, having all the time what was above all and beyond all in worth and desirability – the abundant smile of God, and a great harvest of precious souls.