OFFICERSHIP IN THE SALVATION ARMY

A Case Study in Clericalisation

by

Harold Ivor Winston Hill

**A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Religious Studies**

Victoria University of Wellington

2004

In memory of
A.J. Gilliard.
1899-1973

I would love to know
what he would have
said about it all.

Commissioning then...

Illustration deleted

Commissioning now.

Illustration deleted

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	viii
PREFACE	x
1 Introduction: Of clerics, clericalism and clericalisation	2
PART ONE: THE FIRST CENTURY	46
2 Booth Led Boldly	47
3 Clerical Roles	73
4 What Manner of Men...?	109
Entr'acte: From Era of the Booths to the 1960's	146
PART TWO: THE SECOND CENTURY	161
5 Putney Debates	167
6 Official Words	208
PART THREE: OFFICERS WHO MAY NOT BE OFFICERS	254
7 An officer by any other name...	255
8 A Monstrous Regiment of Women	304
PART FOUR: THINGS THAT ARE SHAKEN; THINGS THAT REMAIN	354
9 The International Commission on Officership	355
10 Conclusions	371
Appendices	i
Bibliography	xl

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts an historical review and analysis of Salvation Army ministry in terms of the tension between function and status, between the view that members of the church differ only in that they have distinct roles, and the tradition that some enjoy a particular status, some ontological character, by virtue of their ordination to one of those roles in particular. This dichotomy developed early in the life of the Church and can be traced throughout its history. Jesus and his community appear to have valued equality in contrast to the priestly hierarchies of received religion. There were varieties of function within the early Christian community, but perhaps not at first of status. Over the first two or three centuries the Church developed such distinctions, between those “ordained” to “orders” and the “laity”, as it accommodated to Roman society and to traditional religious expectations, and developed structures to defend its doctrinal integrity. While most renewal movements in the Church from Montanism onwards have involved a degree of lay reaction against this institutionalisation, clericalism has always regained the ascendancy.

The Christian Mission, originating in 1865 and becoming The Salvation Army in 1878, began as a “lay” movement and was not intended to become a “Church”. By the death of its Founder in 1912 however it had in practice become a denominational church in all but name and its officers had in effect become clergy. At the same time it continued to maintain the theory that it was not a church. The first three chapters explore this development, and the ambiguity that this uncertainty built into its understanding of ministry.

In the Army's second century it began to become more theologically aware and the tension between the incompatible poles of its self-understanding led to prolonged debate. This debate is followed firstly through published articles and correspondence mainly from the period 1960-2000, and then in the official statements produced by the organisation. Separate chapters attend to the way in

which this polarity was expressed in discussion of the roles of women and of auxiliary officers and soldiers of the Army.

The culmination of this period of exploration came with the setting up of an International Commission on Officership and subsequent adjustments to the Army's regulations. The conclusion argues however that these changes have not addressed the underlying tensions in the movement's ecclesiology, between the "radical reformation" roots of its theology and the hierarchical shape of its ecclesiology, and attempts to explore future possibilities for the Army's theology of ministry.

In retrospect it may be seen that The Salvation Army recapitulates in microcosm the historical processes of the Church as a whole, its history illustrating the way in which pragmatic measures become entrenched dogma, while charismatic revivals and alternative communities are reabsorbed into the structures of power and control.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgements often conclude with a nod in the direction of the long-suffering spouse. In order to underline the priority of this debt, I begin by thanking my wife, Pat, for her constant forbearance and encouragement, and for making this work possible.

The Salvation Army has allowed me to spend a good deal of its time on this project. Lieut.-Colonel Wilfred Arnold and the Appointments Board made it possible for me to spend much of 2002 on part-time study leave for this purpose. My colleague Major Graeme McMurdo also shouldered a heavier burden that year in consequence. Commissioner Shaw Clifton proposed and the Council of the Booth College of Mission provided a travel grant that enabled me to carry out research in Washington and London towards the end of that year.

I have been most fortunate in the hospitality and assistance of those who care for The Salvation Army's Archives. Lieut.-Colonels Moira Wright and Lyn Buttar, Major Alan Robb and Mr Cyril Bradwell in Wellington; Envoy George Hazell and Mr Lindsay Cox in Sydney and Melbourne respectively; Mrs Susan Mitchem and Mr Scott Bedio in Washington DC; and Mr Gordon Taylor and Commissioner Karen Thompson in London, have all been of great help. Gordon has generously continued to support my subsequent research from the far side of the world with useful material. In London, General John Larsson kindly gave me access to relevant records of the General's Advisory Council and of International Leaders' Conferences, with my friend Colonel Laurence Hay acting as guide and gatekeeper therein. Margaret and Laurence Hay also provided gracious hospitality at that time.

I am grateful to Mrs Beverley McKenzie, Librarian at Booth College of Mission, Trentham, for her assistance at that library and for the interloan arrangements that have enabled me to explore the resources of other libraries belonging to the New Zealand Association of Theological Schools.

Friends and some who have become friends in the course of this exercise, scholars in various places, have been generous with support and ideas and information. Mr Tom Aitken (London) and Commissioner Shaw Clifton (then in Wellington) laboured through the whole of my first draft and made useful suggestions and corrections. Professor Ian Breward (Melbourne) also read the draft, making helpful suggestions and encouraging me to turn a prolix Master's thesis into a PhD. Professor Norman Murdoch (Cincinnati) has provided much useful material. Many other people, acknowledged in footnotes, have patiently responded to my correspondence. Mrs Mary Cresswell and Ms Sarah Corkill have saved my document from the consequences of my ignorance of computers.

Finally, I acknowledge also the guidance, assistance and light rein of Professor Jim Veitch, my supervisor in the Department of Religious Studies at Victoria.

PREFACE

In May 1972 I was “commissioned” as a Salvation Army officer; this military expression for the designation of officers having sufficed for The Salvation Army for more than ninety years. However, since 1978 Salvation Army officers have been not only “commissioned” but also “ordained”. Learning of this change eventually triggered my interest in seeing what discussion had taken place within The Salvation Army on this matter, initially as reflected in contributions to *The Officer*, a periodical for Salvation Army officers, over the past forty years.

I found some polarisation on the subject. The points of difference were between those who (a) identified officership in The Salvation Army with the historic clerical role in the church, involving some kind of “status”, and those who (b) maintained that any suggestion of ontological distinction between “clergy” and “lay” was inappropriate, and that roles in The Salvation Army differed only in their “function”.

This led me to undertake a comprehensive search of Salvation Army published sources to see if this polarisation had been evident throughout the lifetime of the movement. I found that an ambiguity on the subject was present from the earliest records up to the latest publications. From the beginning, it was clear that evangelists of the Christian Mission and then officers of The Salvation Army were regarded as “lay”, but their role increasingly approximated to that of clergy. In time they regarded themselves, and the organisation regarded them, as the equivalent to clergy in every respect. Function eventually gave rise to status. It also became clear that others had passed this way before us; the tension between these two poles could be traced far back in Church history. In a word, this is about the process of “clericalisation”.

This work is premised on the second of the two positions described above: that officership in The Salvation Army is simply functional. I have an instinctive sympathy with the argument that a separate order of ministry is not of the essence of the Christian faith, but is what Emil Brunner characterised as a “misunderstanding of the

Church”.¹ It is true that protagonists of either persuasion are equally able and willing to justify their respective stands on Biblical, historical and theological grounds. I do not plan to argue that point in this thesis, though as a student of history I believe the unfolding of a pattern can be observed.

The whole movement of clericalisation can be seen as part of a wider sociological process, and I concede that this work as a whole might, if that conclusion is not excessively cynical, simply illustrate Robert Michel's “iron law of oligarchy” – that large and complex organisations gravitate to rule by small elites, which come in time to place their own interests, identified with the institutional structure which they comprise, above those causes which the organisation ostensibly serves.²

I have benefited from the insights afforded by sociologists of religion, but have used their work to support rather than shape my methodology, which is largely descriptive and expository of the case study itself. *Rather than an offering an exposition of clericalisation with The Salvation Army used for illustrative material, it will be seen that my primary concern has been to document what I see as the gradual clericalisation of the role of The Salvation Army's officer corps.* The arrangement of this work is therefore based on Salvation Army history rather than on sociological categories. A sociological interpretation of the history of clericalisation would be significant but is not germane to this study. There appears in fact to have been little attention paid to the theory of clericalisation itself.

I have therefore attempted in the introductory overview to provide my own typology of clericalisation as background to the changes in attitude towards ordination in The Salvation Army. This

¹ Emil Brunner, *The Misunderstanding of the Church*, London, Lutterworth Press, 1953. That is, the Church has misunderstood how it ought to be ordered.

² See Robert Michels, *Political Parties*. London, Jarrod, 1915.

may provide some explanation as to why Salvation Army officers have become priests or ministers, with their role legitimated by ordination, along with what that means, what it might lead to – and how, or whether, we might get out of it!

My material has been derived mainly from a search of published sources – books, articles and letters to periodicals – with some supporting documentation for the later period from internal, unpublished Salvation Army minutes and memoranda. The sources are mostly secondary, for two reasons. The first is the paucity of accessible primary material, especially from the early period of The Salvation Army. This is partly because archiving was not a very high priority for the Movement until comparatively recently, and partly because of the destruction of the International Headquarters in London during the blitz in 1941. (I regret my lack of opportunity to explore the extant Booth family correspondence and records.) The second reason is that the published material, forming a relatively compact and accessible resource, does provide a fair indication of individual and organisational opinion. My thesis reviews and analyses these sources in terms of the status/function polarisation referred to above, and then draws some conclusions about the present situation and future options for The Salvation Army.

A further word needs to be said about the nature of the sources however. For much of its history few of the Army's teachers and writers have been interested in theology or ecclesiology. Sometimes, in the manner of sects, they gloried in their ignorance.

We do not propose to dive into any of the depths of theory and creed that are today absorbing the entire time and energy of so large a portion of the Christian Church. The theology of the Salvation Army is a plain and simple revival of the teachings of Christ and His apostles, and its vitality comes in great measure from the fact that of every principle and belief, we say, "Do not talk and argue over it, but live it out," which we hold is the best way of demonstrating its reality...³

³ Ballington Booth, *From Ocean to Ocean: Or, The Salvation Army's March from the Atlantic to the Pacific*. New York, J.S. Ogilvie, 1891, p.102. (Quotation

Salvationists' concern – even in the case of the comparatively small numbers of academically educated officers in earlier years – has been largely with pragmatic issues of evangelism and organisation, or with their professional speciality. For most of the Army's first hundred years theology was implicit rather than explicit, based on assumptions derived from the diluted Methodism of the founding generation. There has in consequence been little engagement with classical or contemporary ecclesiologies. Some able and erudite officers of earlier times tended to be self-taught and lacked the broader frame of reference which academic discipline may have afforded, so that they were unconscious of theological solecisms. Some apologetic for the Army's position *vis-à-vis* the sacraments has suffered in this respect for example.⁴

No-one has expected The Salvation Army to have competence in this field. I can remember the reaction of an Anglican vicar to the *Dominion's* reporting the visit of the then Commissioner Frederick Coutts in 1959. The newspaper had commented that he was reputed to be "The Salvation Army's leading theologian." "The Salvation Army doesn't have any theologians," retorted my friend. And in the sense he understood it, he was right of course. That arbiter of theological rectitude, Sir Paul Harvey, described William Booth as "a man of narrow prejudices, and entirely ignorant of theology."⁵ The same Frederick Coutts was able to quote a kindlier gloss on things by the redoubtable James Hastings, who wrote in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*:

For the militant mission on which it [the Army] set out... its doctrinal impedimenta had to go into the smallest of knapsacks... Common

courtesy of Prof. Ed. McKinley.)

⁴ The citing of Romans 14:17 at the beginning of *The Sacraments: The Salvationist's Viewpoint*, (London, 1960), for example, could be construed as somewhat forced.

⁵ Paul Harvey (Ed), *Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford, OUP, 3rd edn., 1960, p.99.

sense and immediate emotional power were the criteria of truth ... essential for the campaign against sin.⁶

Modern Evangelicalism has had a bad press for its weak theological base. Tom Sine describes asking

...Christian leaders to explain to me their assumptions underlying their programmes in church planting, youth ministries or missions... They can describe in detail the latest approaches in planting “user-friendly churches” but they are often at a total loss to define their ecclesiology.⁷

The Salvation Army could always have been open to such a charge. Some Salvationists have resented being put down. Duncan Park, writing in *The Salvationist* in 1999, responded to denigration over the Army’s lack of theology in terms identical with those of Ballington Booth over a hundred years earlier:

It was not the “gimmicks” but the Army’s theological radicalism that underlay its success. We put spirituality first, where it should be... The Bible, the Church, the Sacraments, liturgy, doctrine and all the traditions that had attached themselves to organised Christianity took their place behind the personal transformation of individuals and the social transformation of the world. Our Founders were not great intellectuals or great theologians but great hearts. Their theological radicalism was rooted in a passion for God and a love for souls...⁸

The theologians the Army has begun producing in recent years, however, happily acknowledge the ground to be made up. Major Nigel Mason agreed that

as a militant, evangelical body, the Army has carried but a light load of “doctrinal luggage”. We had all that advance required, but consolidation requires more.⁹

John Rhemick explained how

⁶ *The Officer*, November 1981, p.504.

⁷ Tom Sine, *Mustard Seed Versus McWorld*, Crowborough, Monarch Books, 1999, p.209.

⁸ *The Salvationist*, 23rd January 1999, p.16.

⁹ *The Officer*, November 1974, p.500.

Booth could lump Luther, Wesley and Whitfield together and do it comfortably because neither he nor his earlier mission nor his later Army was concerned with the fine points of doctrine.¹⁰

Roger Green described

the two problems which constantly surfaced when trying to define the theology of Booth and when attempting to discuss the changes in that theology. First there was often a lack of theological precision in his writings and his speaking... The second problem ... Booth was not always aware of how theology is formulated. He was not always clear about the sources which he was using for his doctrinal statements... not always cognizant of subtle changes which were taking place in his own thinking... not trained to take a critical and objective look at his own formulation of theology.¹¹

For the researcher into the historical theology of The Salvation Army, all the above means that in dealing with the major part of Salvation Army literature, connections with classical ecclesiology have to be inferred from the text. Historic ecclesiological categories were largely ignored by early Salvationists. Even when traditional language was used, as in the correspondence of the later 20th century, it was not always clear that some writers understood the implications of their statements. The researcher is therefore more than usually exposed to the danger of eisegesis in handling these sources. Anyone picking over the field of history is likely to find what they are looking for: history tends to be written to justify the present, and the writer's view of it. I hope therefore that I have not simply imposed my categories inappropriately upon the earlier material. Nevertheless, from where I stand, they make sense.

And, I believe, not just from where I stand. One of the confirmations from reading around this subject has been the observation that although The Salvation Army's ecclesiology has until recently developed almost in isolation from the mainstream of theological and ecumenical dialogue, its experience has many parallels and linkages with the stories and customs of other Christian

¹⁰ John Rhemick, *A New People of God: A Study in Salvationism*, Des Plaines, Ill., 1984, p.61.

¹¹ Roger Green, *War on Two Fronts: The Redemptive Theology of William Booth*, Atlanta Ga., 1989, p.99.

traditions. The connections made with Roman Catholicism may be most obvious to the reader. The two organisations are similar in structure and ethos, whatever their dissimilarity in size and doctrine. (More personally, four years attending Holy Cross Seminary in Mosgiel comprised a significant part of my own theological training.) On the larger scale has been the insight that the Army's history has recapitulated in so many respects the dynamics of the wider Church's story – which is my basic thesis. On the smaller scale, so many serendipities... such as Bishop Bertolotti's 1971 observation that, "given a revival of prayer, all could be well again," carrying with it "the connotation that no alterations to the status quo in the church were necessary."¹² How often have we all, in whatever tradition, heard the call to spiritualise our way out of reality.

Having been born into The Salvation Army and spent more than thirty years in its full-time employment in three countries, I think I can claim to know it from the inside. I have also attempted to stand outside and, as it were, look in through the window. While the theology of officership has been discussed in Salvation Army periodicals and some aspects have been the subject of particular studies,¹³ I have not been able to locate any other in-depth research and extended discussion of these issues along the lines I have undertaken. I think this account therefore may be of some ecumenical interest, and it would be encouraging if it were also able to make some contribution to ongoing discussion within The Salvation Army.

¹² Cited by Edward Schillebeekx, *The Church with the Human Face*. New York, Crossroads, 1985, p.212.

¹³ Most notably, Andrew Mark Eason's outstanding work, *Women in God's Army* which I obtained after completing my chapter on the situation of women in the Army. I have subsequently incorporated some of his insights with acknowledgement.

NOTE: The Salvation Army tends to be particular about, and style guides for its publications stipulate, the capitalisation of the initial 'T' in its legal name. I have attempted to comply with this idiosyncrasy throughout this thesis. Within the organisation's literature, references to the Founder tend to be similarly capitalised.

A revised and expanded version of this thesis has been published as

Leadership in the Salvation Army: a case study in clericalisation

By Harold Hill.

Bletchley, Milton Keynes, UK; Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006

ISBN 1842274295

9781842274293

Xvi, 341p.; ill.; 23cm

Series: Studies in Christian history and thought.

Includes Bibliographical references and index.

The

WAR

Official Organ of The Salvation Army
in New Zealand.

CRY

Registered at the G.P.O., Wellington, for transmission by post as a Newspaper.

WELLINGTON, FEBRUARY 7, 1953

Vol. 71

No. 6

For these two cadets — the most important moment of the commissioning . . .

Today the "point of greatest impact" upon the future for any saved young person of ability is full-time service for Christ

Picture shows Lieut.-Commissioner Robert Hoggard commissioning Cadet and Mrs. Kenneth Saunders in Wellington Citadel. Mrs. Saunders is the daughter of General Albert Orsborn.

**PERHAPS YOU SHOULD OFFER
YOURSELF AS A CANDIDATE**

Salvationist

INSIDE THIS WEEK

Joy Webb
ad lib
page 7

Ireland DC
quizzed
page 9

South Pacific and
East Asia update
pages 11 to 14

Trevial Pursuit
page 20

25 July 1998
No 640
Price 40p

Ordained to serve

GENERAL Paul Rader commissions Lieutenant Freddy Coronado Jimenez at commissioning meetings in Mexico City during his visit, accompanied by Commissioner Kay Rader, to the Latin America North Territory. The lieutenant, who entered training from Limon, Costa Rica, was appointed to work in Colombia. A full report of the General's visit will appear next week

CHAPTER ONE

OF CLERICS, CLERICALISM AND CLERICALISATION

*Because you have thrown off your Prelat Lord,
And with stiff Vows renounc't his Liturgie
To seize the widow'd whore Pluralitie
From them whose sin ye envi'd, not abhorrd,
Dare ye for this adjure the Civil Sword
To force our Consciences that Christ set free,
And ride us with a classic Hierarchy
Taught ye by mere A.S. and Rotherford?
Men whose Life, Learning, Faith and pure intent
Would have been held in high esteem with Paul
Must now be nam'd and printed Hereticks
By shallow Edwards and Scotch what d'ye call:
But we do hope to find out all your tricks,
Your plots and packings worse than those of Trent,
So that the Parlament
May with their wholsom and preventive Shears
Clip your Phylacteries, though bauk your Ears,
And succour our just Fears,
When they shall read this clearly in your charge
New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large.*

John Milton

*On the new forcers of Conscience
under the Long PARLAMENT*

Every field throws up its specialists. The ordinary person cannot be expected to master the expanding body of knowledge and range of skills required and naturally defers to and depends upon those who have made a special study of the subject. Religion was long pre-eminent amongst such fields. From pre-history, the medicine-men and shamans, spirit mediums and priests, have stood between the unknown, magical and dangerous spiritual realm and the people, speaking for the people to the gods, and speaking for the gods to the people.

The one speaking for the gods enjoys a position of some influence. 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 generation and those following 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."¹ Spiritual hierarchs came to exercise both spiritual and temporal power. In the course of history, the bond between rulers and priests became so indissoluble that even when there was no longer any God to represent or transcendent dimension recognised, political commissars were needed to ensure the purity of the military commanders' ideology in defence of the Socialist state (and to ensure the ideologues' continued power and control).

Against that trend, there has also been, not only but notably in the Judeo-Christian tradition, a counter-cultural, prophetic tradition of protest against the institutions of power. Walter Brueggemann's hypothesis is: "The task of prophetic ministry is to nurture, nourish and evoke a consciousness and perception alternative to the consciousness and perception of the dominant culture around us."² At times the prophets, like Nathan, have constituted an official and loyal opposition within the power

¹ Numbers 11:26-27.

² Walter Brueggemann, *The Prophetic Imagination*. Minneapolis MN, Fortress Press, 2nd edit. 2001, p.3.

structure.³ At other times they have stood outside, like Amos, and denounced the abuse of power in the name of the God assumed to legitimate the cult.⁴

Jesus of Nazareth stood in this prophetic tradition. He may not have begun by attacking the institutions of received religion – he attended the synagogue, went up to Jerusalem for the Great Feasts, and sent his cleansed lepers to priests to be formally declared healed, as required by the Law. However, by the time he had challenged those who locked the doors of the Kingdom against others without entering themselves, poured scorn on the blind leaders of the blind and evicted the profiteers from the Court of the Gentiles, he had caused such an uproar that the whole system was in danger. It was inevitable that temporal and spiritual powers should combine to eliminate him before it was too late. And as his followers eventually came to understand it, his teaching made the whole apparatus of the cult irrelevant and unnecessary.⁵

Although his disciples argued about their order of precedence, Jesus and the community which grew up after his death appear to have valued equality in contrast to the priestly hierarchies of received religion.⁶ Jesus is reported as saying,

You know that foreign rulers like to order their people around. And their leaders have full power over everyone they rule. But don't act like them.

³ 2 Samuel 12.

⁴ Amos 6:21-24.

⁵ N.T. Wright draws attention to the fact that whereas "in Judaism, repentance and forgiveness were focussed... on the temple... Jesus was offering forgiveness to all and sundry, out there on the street, without requiring that they go through the normal channels. That was his real offence." (N.T. Wright and Marcus Borg, *The Meaning of Jesus, Two Visions*. San Francisco, Harper, 1999, p.39.)

⁶ Egalitarianism is not confined to "spiritual" matters. Wright claims that Jesus was creating a restored community on the principle of inclusiveness, creating an open-ended "fictive kinship group", exemplified in what John Dominic Crossan calls the "open commensality" of his eschatological banquet metaphor. Borg says that "Remarkably inclusive and egalitarian, his movement undermined the sharp social boundaries of his day... His movement did not move towards institutionalism until quite some time after his death." (*ibid.*, p.p.46, 74.) Crossan posits that the Jerusalem Christian community in Acts 4:32-5:11 was a "share community", noting that "communal sharing is a far more radical criticism of commercialised sharing than patronal sharing, because the more individual almsgiving is increased, the more systemic injustice is ignored. Patronal sharing (alms) is an act of power. Communal sharing is an act of resistance." (John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity*, San Francisco, Harper, 1999, p.472.)

If you want to be great, you must be the servant of all the others. And if you want to be first, you must be the slave of the rest. The Son of Man did not come to be a slave master, but a slave who will give his life to ransom many people.⁷

But you are not to be called “Rabbi”, for you have only one Master and you are all brothers. And do not call anyone on earth “father”, for you have only one Father, and he is in heaven. Nor are you to be called “teacher”, for you have only one Teacher, the Christ.⁸

There were varieties of function within the early Christian community, but not of formal status. Over the first few centuries, however, as it institutionalised and developed structures to order its polity and conserve its message, and as it accommodated to Roman society and to traditional religious expectations, the Church developed such distinctions, between clerics in orders and laity.⁹ This introductory chapter sets out to trace briefly that process, and then the various reactions against it.

Clericalism

In most Christian traditions the question is not about whether there should be office, in the sense that some members will have particular roles within the organisation. That, in some form, is assumed across almost the whole spectrum. The very calling of twelve disciples could suggest and the exercise of leadership by a variety of people in New Testament times illustrate that special roles were not incompatible with an underlying equality.¹⁰

A watershed lies between those traditions which ascribe some ontological character to office-holders and those which do not, even although they agree that a separated ministry is still in some way

⁷ Matthew 20:25-28.

⁸ Matthew 23:8-10.

⁹ Brueggemann (*Prophetic Imagination*, 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.”

¹⁰ Paul in Galatians 2:2, 6-10 recognises “those who seemed to be leaders” and refers to “James, Peter and John” as “those reputed to be pillars,” but of “those who seemed to be important” he remarked that “whatever they were makes no difference to me.”

constitutive of Church. The divide seems to be between those who believe that Jesus chose certain people to initiate a caste intended to remain separate from others, and those who believe that the special task of the chosen was to raise all others to the same station. A similar tension may be traced in the First Testament between the concept of Israel as a Chosen People and Israel as a pilot scheme intended to bring light to the Gentiles. Beyond that, the divide extends to that between a view of the Church as primarily an objective institution and those who find it consists in subjective relationships. For the former, ministry is firstly *ex officio*; for the latter, *ex spiritu*. For the former, the Church is essentially hierarchical; for the latter, democratic. While these categories need not, even should not, be mutually exclusive, in practice people seem to polarise instinctively along these lines .

Those arguing for a special character would claim that,

By divine institution, among Christ's faithful there are in the Church sacred ministers, who in law are also called clerics; the others are called lay people.¹¹

The Second Vatican Council in *Lumen Gentium* affirmed of

the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial priesthood..., [that they] differ essentially and not only in degree...¹²

Those denying the existence of a separate ministerial caste are content that

all minister, and that nowhere is to be perceived a separation or even merely a distinction between those who do and those who do not minister... There exists in the Ecclesia a universal duty and right of service, a universal readiness to serve and at the same time the greatest possible differentiation of functions.¹³

Or as Volf, summarising a "free church" position, puts it,

The distinction between the general and particular priesthood does not divide the church into two groups, one of which has merely the general while the other has also the particular priesthood, but rather refers to two

¹¹ New Code of Canon Law, 1983, Canon 207 #1, of the Roman Catholic Church.
http://www.justiceforpriests.org/part_1_christs_faithful.htm.

¹² Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, Article 10, in Austin Flannery (Ed.) *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Collegeville Min., Liturgical Press, 1975, p.361.

¹³ Emil Brunner, *The Misunderstanding of the Church*. London, Lutterworth, 1958, p.50.

dimensions in the service of every member of the church. On the basis of common baptism, all have become priests, and all realize their priesthood in their own way on the basis of their respective charismata. Hence all members of the church, both office-holders and “laypersons”, are fundamentally equal.¹⁴

But even that line of demarcation does not tell the whole story. The difficulty lies in the fact that office itself inevitably involves the assumption of some degree of power and power offers at least the possibility of those who exercise it “tyrannising over those allotted to [their] care.”¹⁵ Power, like steroids taken by an athlete, may enhance performance but exact a long-term cost. This can happen whether or not office and officer have been sacralised. Office-bearers whose roles are theoretically simply functional may come to share the same assumptions of status and behave in the same way as some who are conceived to belong to a different order or class of Christian. “New presbyter is but old priest writ large”, as John Milton complained in the 1640’s.

Yves Congar, in his seminal work on the laity, pointed out that “Protestant communions, starting from strict congregationalist premises and an associational and community basis, are in practice as clericalised as the Catholic Church... No doubt there are sociological laws in virtue of which the most ‘charismatic’ religious communities, those most made ‘from below’, quite soon become organisations with authority, traditions, a ‘church’ sociological structure.”¹⁶ Even in the contemporary unstructured house-church movement, as Volf notes, “...a strongly hierarchical, informal system of paternal relations often develops between the congregation and charismatic delegates from the ascended Christ.”¹⁷ So, whatever the theory, whether special character is postulated or not, or even when no separate ministry is established, assumptions of superiority

¹⁴ Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church in the Image of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1998, p.246.

¹⁵ 1 Peter 5:3.

¹⁶ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*. London, Bloomsbury, 1957, p.45.

¹⁷ Volf, *After Our Likeness*, p.237. Even in a structured denomination, this kind of spiritual one-upmanship can create informal castes of spiritual superiority.

pose a special danger to those holding church office. As Lord Acton put it, “all power tends to corrupt...”¹⁸

One word for this tendency, where church is concerned, is “clericalism”. Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary defines it as, “A policy of maintaining or increasing the power of a religious hierarchy.” Cross’s Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church elaborates with, “A term, often used in an opprobrious sense, for an excessively professional attitude or outlook, conversation or conduct on the part of clergymen, or for the imitation of a supposedly clerical manner by lay persons. It is also used to describe undue clerical influence in secular affairs.”¹⁹ It is with the first of these definitions that we are chiefly concerned in this thesis. Loren Mead claims that “Clericalism, for us in the churches, is like the water in which the fish swims. To the fish, the water is invisible, its existence unacknowledged, but it constitutes the world in which the fish lives...”²⁰ The process by which this assumption of status and a widening gap between leaders and led take place might be described as “clericalisation”.

Having clerics does not necessarily involve clericalism. Not having clerics does not necessarily mean clericalism can be avoided. We cannot simply identify the institutionalising of a uniform structure with clericalisation in a pejorative sense, or claim that the church necessarily lost its way as it became organised. The church operates within the culture of its times, however counter-cultural its beliefs and ideals may be. The Church adapted itself to changing circumstances. Looking back from the mid-fourth century, “Ambrosiaster” approved the change, saying that whereas “in the early church, anyone could teach and baptise...,

¹⁸ Letter to Bishop Creighton, 3rd April 1887.
<http://www.theihs.org/libertyguide/people.php/75834.html>.

¹⁹ F.L. Cross, *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford, OUP, 1957.

²⁰ Loren Mead, *Five Challenges for the Once and Future Church*. Herndon VA, Alban Institute, 1996, p.16.

when all do everything, that is irrational, vulgar and abhorrent.”²¹ Some, like Emil Brunner or Eduard Schweizer, have indeed seen in this change an erosion of the influence of the Holy Spirit²². Others, like James Monroe Barnett, say that, “it is surely limiting the freedom of the Spirit to argue that he does not act here in a constitutive way.”²³ Barnett argues that

The two ideas, an office created for humble service but possessing rights and powers, are not mutually exclusive...The radically different thing is the attitude towards office and not the failure of an office to possess rights and authority. These ... are necessary for order in any social organisation.²⁴

Perhaps the most we can say then is that the danger of clerical attitudes is heightened when clerical caste is claimed. Having said that, we need to trace the steps by which the instrument was created which could serve attitudes far removed from the ideal of humble service.

Institutionalisation and Clericalisation

The widening gap between leaders and led can be traced firstly in connection with the development of ecclesial structures for leadership; secondly in the role of the ministers, and thirdly in the situation of the church in society as a whole.

²¹ ‘Ambrosiaster’, *Litt.ad.Eph.* 4,11-12, cited in Edward Schillebeeckx, *The Church with a Human Face*. New York, Crossroads, 1985, p.73.

²² Eduard Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament*. London, SCM, 1961, following Rudolf Sohm (“Kirchenrecht”) and Vernon Bartlett (“Church-Life and Church-Order during the First Four Centuries”) who argued that “not only are the structures and orders of the post-apostolic church of no dogmatic significance, but they actually represent a departure from the original purity of the apostolic message and spiritual fellowship of the earliest believers, who had no need of any outward structures.” (Richard N. Longenecker (Ed), *Community Formation in the Early Church and in the Church Today*. Peabody Mass., Hendrickson, 2002, p.xv.)

²³ James Monroe Barnett, *The Diaconate: A Full and Equal Order*. Valley Forge, Penn, Trinity Press International, Revised edn. 1995, p.16.

²⁴ Barnett, *ibid.* p.24. Or to quote Adolf Harnack’s “Constitution and Law of the Church”, “Freedom of the Spirit and ecclesiastical structures cannot be so summarily contrasted as being contradictory or mutually exclusive.” (Cited in Longenecker, *op.cit.* p.xv.) Or, “Institutions themselves are meant to be the organs through which the Spirit-animated community expresses its life”. (Bernard Cook, *Ministry in Word and Sacrament*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1976, p.198.

The Structure of Leadership

The earliest Christian texts, the letters of Paul, can give the impression that despite the ascription of some titles there were at first no officials filling regular offices, in the sense that ministry is understood by the churches today. There were “Apostles, prophets and teachers”²⁵, “elders” were appointed (and sometimes described as having the role of “overseeing”)²⁶, and Paul describes ministries of *charismata*²⁷, which were functional roles within the community. There is little agreement on the exact shape of these arrangements; it is said to be “almost impossible to reconcile all the facts in a single coherent and convincing account.”²⁸ Probably the New Testament texts reveal a variety of responses to local situations in a variety of Mediterranean and Asian cultural contexts and a consequent diversity of organisation in the churches of the Apostolic and immediate post-apostolic period. It is often suggested however that the names adopted for offices in the church were deliberately functional and chosen to avoid any comparison with existing status-laden titles, such as “priest” or “ruler”.

At first all believers, including any holders of office, simply comprised the *laos*, the people of God; there was no sense in which anyone exercising a particular *charism* or role was set over against the *laos* in some other category. Any authority deemed to have been conferred by Jesus was owned by the whole body rather than by particular individuals in it, and any offices that developed were seen as performing a representative function on behalf of the whole body. While there is no trace of any ascription of priestly status to any individual (apart from to Jesus himself in the extended analogy in the letter to the

²⁵ 1 Corinthians 12:28. “Apostles” appeared to comprise not only “the Eleven” surviving disciples but later additions like Matthias (Acts 1:26), Paul (1 Cor. 15:9) as well as “the Lord’s brothers” and Barnabas (by implication in 1 Cor. 9:6).

²⁶ Acts 14:23, Acts 20:17, 28.

²⁷ 1 Corinthians 10:7-10.

²⁸ R.P.C. Hanson, “Office and the Concept of Office in the Early Church,” in *Studies in Christian Antiquity*. (Edinburgh 1985) p.120. Cited by John N. Collins in *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*. London, Oxford University Press, 1990, p.253.

Hebrews), the whole body of believers enjoys a collective priesthood, since described as the “priesthood of all believers”.²⁹ The connection between this common priesthood and the ministry roles of particular individuals can be described as one of delegation. At the same time, it was also claimed that all offices were the result of delegation by the Holy Spirit.³⁰

The development and standardisation of a hierarchy of offices took place as the Church institutionalised, a process which began within the New Testament period. By the time the “Pastoral Epistles” were written, towards the end of the first century, the original apostolic leadership had passed on and the earlier variety of charisms were in the process of being superseded by two (subsequently differentiated into three) roles which were becoming regular offices. The roles of overseer (*episkopos*), and elder (*presbyteros*), are referred to, sometimes interchangeably,³¹ and some people are also described as servants (*diakono*)³². In time the most senior elder, acting as chairman or president amongst the council of *presbyteroi*, particularly as presiding over the eucharist, became identified as the *episkopos*.³³ He was responsible for admission to baptism and also acquired the prerogative of ordination.³⁴ Deacons probably had a liturgical function assisting in the eucharistic context. (Later use of these terms should not be read back into the earliest period; a “bishop”, for example, was not the later “diocesan” but the head of a local Christian community. The identification of the diaconate with the “seven” of Acts 6 and with charitable work was first made by Irenaeus only late in the second century.)

²⁹ 1 Peter 2:4-5,9; Revelation 1:5,6; 5:9, 10; 20:6. Paul’s *hierourgounta* in Romans 15:16 is simply metaphorical.

³⁰ 1 Corinthians 12:11.

³¹ E.g. Titus 1:6-7.

³² 1 Timothy 3:10, 13.

³³ Edward Schillebeeckx argues that the emergence of the *presbyteros-episkopos* as leader did not derive from his liturgical role, but the other way round; the liturgical role arising from that of leadership. *Church with a Human Face*, pp.145-6.

³⁴ Henry Chadwick, *The Early Church*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1967 p.49.

The late first century *Didache* also suggests that the charismatic offices like that of the prophet were in the process of being superseded by the election, by the *laos*, of presbyter-bishops and deacons. A form of ministry developed “in which permanent office-bearers succeeded each other in office and were appointed by some formal act of ordination.”³⁵ Clement of Rome (c.96) and Ignatius of Antioch (c.110), whose letters have survived, were such officers and were concerned for the proper ordering of such offices. Their authority was still delegated to them by the church, to represent the church; they did not claim to derive it from any independent historical succession from Christ or the apostles. Clement still uses the terms bishop and presbyter interchangeably. Responding to a Corinthian crisis in which impatient younger men have displaced the older officials, he urges the orderly succession of apostolic authority with the assent of the whole church. Ignatius is the first to describe the three-fold hierarchy with a definite moniscopate, writing to the Magnesians that their “Bishop presides in the place of God”.³⁶ Presbyters were in the place of Apostles, but as the Deacons represented Christ, Ignatius’ hierarchy evidently did not yet consist of *graded* categories.

As Hans Küng puts it,

The fellowship of believers, the collegiality of all believers, of all those who had charisms and fulfilled their own ministries... gave place to the collegiality of a special ministry within the community: the collegiality of the leaders of the community, the *episkopoi* or elders, who increasingly began to see themselves as distinct from the community, from the ‘people’; this is where the division between ‘clergy’ and ‘laity’ begins.³⁷

By early in the second century the three-fold structure of one bishop, presiding over a council of presbyters and supported by deacons was becoming common. In the words of Jürgen Moltman,

The doctrine of the monarchical episcopate certainly brought unity into the Christian churches, but it did so at the cost of eliminating the

³⁵ Richard Hanson, *Christian Priesthood Examined*. London, Lutterworth, 1979, p.33.

³⁶ Ignatius, Magnesians IV. www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-01/anf01-17.htm#P1486_261369.

³⁷ Hans Küng, *The Church*. London, Search Press, 1968, p.410.

charismatic prophets. The Spirit was now bound to the office. God's grace became the grace of office.³⁸

The role of the bishop was further reinforced as a focus of unity in the face of the Gnostic threat³⁹, and the fact that correspondence between churches took place through their [leading presbyters or](#) bishops also tended to emphasise the leadership and marginalise the laity.⁴⁰

Within the increase in numbers of Christians in urban centres and the spread of Christianity into the countryside, a further development took place in the second century. The presbyters, rather than remaining simply the council of elders around the bishop in a congregation, began to take pastoral and liturgical responsibility for outlying congregations. They became "little bishops" themselves, while representing the one bishop. This process, prefiguring the later diocese, further distanced many of the ordinary laity from the bishop.

By the third century the various offices of the church were beginning to be seen as a *graded* hierarchy, a ladder up which clerics could climb rather than being ordained to an office for life. Cyprian applauds the elevation to the episcopate of Cornelius, who "did not suddenly attain to the dignity of bishop," but reached that office through all the stages of the church's ministries (*officia*).⁴¹ In this way the diaconate eventually became reduced to being a transitional order on the way to the presbyterate. While this progression did not become an invariable rule until much later, the concept of *cursus honorum* (in which each order was seen as contained within its superior, rather like a series of Russian *maruska* dolls) was taken over from the model of Imperial organisation by the fourth century.⁴²

³⁸ Jürgen Moltman, *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*. London, SCM, 1981, p.200.

³⁹ Maurice Wiles, *The Christian Fathers*. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1966, p.141.

⁴⁰ Henry Chadwick, *Early Church*, p.49.

⁴¹ Cyprian Letter 55.8.
<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/pc/england/jwords/saltum.html>.

⁴² Barnett, *Diaconate*, p.104.

It was early recognised that one of the effects of these developments was to reduce the laity to a more passive role. In the third-century Pseudo-Clementines, “the Church is likened to a boat whose helmsman is Christ. The Bishop is the lookout in the bows, the presbyters the sailors, the deacons the boatswains, the catechists the pursers. The ‘multitude of the brethren’ (i.e. the faithful) are the passengers.”⁴³

The Ministers as Priests

A significant factor in the clericalisation of ministry was the adoption of priestly terminology, at first not even thought of and later avoided as the Church sought to distance itself from Judaism. Several factors helped bring about a change. In the mid-second century Marcion’s rejection of the Old Testament led to its favourable reappraisal by the Church and its priestly institutions began to be seen as models. Justin Martyr (died c.165) and later writers saw the Eucharist in terms of a sacrificial meal, which contributed to the development of the idea that the one presenting it had a priestly role. This possibly might have been encouraged as an accommodation to Roman ideas about *religio licita* being characterised by sacrificial rites. In the words of Andrew McGowan, “Cyprian’s sacrificial Christianity (mid-3rd century) begins to look like an official religion-in-waiting.”⁴⁴ Additionally, the church no longer felt a need to assert its difference from the now obsolete Jewish system of priestly sacrifice.

Irenaeus of Lyons (c.177) speaks of the principle of apostolic succession as a defence against Gnosticism; the emphasis is shifting from the minister as exercising a role within the community, to the minister being authenticated in his own right, almost distinct from the community. But Irenaeus still holds that “*all* the righteous possess the

⁴³ Herbert Haag, *Clergy and Laity: Did Jesus Want a Two-Tier Church?* London, Burns & Oates, 1998, p.106.

⁴⁴ Andrew McGowan, “Water in the Desert:: Wine, Water and the Eucharist in Tertullian and Cyprian”.
<http://divinity.library.vanderbilt.edu/burns/chroma/eucharist/euchMcGowan.html>.

sacerdotal rank.”⁴⁵ No separate Christian ministry is clearly identified as a “priesthood” until about the year 200 AD, when Tertullian refers to the bishop as *summus sacerdos* (high priest) and holds that the bishops, presbyters and deacons together comprise a clerical order as distinct from the laity.⁴⁶ But the bishop was *high* priest because *all* Christians were priests. Tertullian allows that even a layman could baptise in the absence of clerics.⁴⁷ Hippolytus of Rome, within twenty years, is found defending his episcopal office in sacerdotal language and claiming succession from the apostles. The mid-second century *Didascalia Apostolorum*, addressing the “laity”, calls the bishops “your high priests, as the presbyters are your priests, and your present deacons instead of your Levites; as are also your readers, your singers, your porters, your deaconesses, your widows, your virgins, and your orphans.”⁴⁸

The priestly role also became more entrenched with the progressive theological development of the idea of the Eucharist as sacrifice. In the sixth and seventh centuries, rather than merely “making present” the sacrifice on the cross, the Eucharist came to be seen as a means of “renewing” that event.⁴⁹ The priest’s ordination was seen as giving the power to make that happen, further separating him from lay Christians. After the fifth century the advent of private masses also emphasised the priest’s power in isolation from what had always been a community event. By the tenth century the laity usually communicated only on great festivals; generally they were reduced to a spectator role in

⁴⁵ Irenaeus, “Adv. Haer.,” iv.8.3. www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-01/anf01-62.htm#P8629_2440260.

⁴⁶ Tertullian, “On Monogamy”, 11,12, “De Exhortatione Castitatis” 7, in Herbert Bettenson (Ed.) *Documents of the Christian Church*, London, OUP, 1956, pp.100-1.

⁴⁷ Tertullian, “Bap.” 17. www.piney.com/Tertullian-Baptism.html#P11686-3287159. Bettenson, *ibid.*, cautions that by this time he was a Montanist and had earlier reproached heretics because “they endure even the laity with the functions of the priesthood.” It is not clear however how far Tertullian’s Montanism involved any “anticlericalist” tendency. (see p.21.)

⁴⁸ *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Bk 2,xxv.<http://www.piney.com/DocAposConstitu.html#have>.

⁴⁹ Schillebeeckx, *Church with a Human Face*, pp.158-9.

the liturgy.⁵⁰ In the later middle ages the Scholastic philosophy of Thomas Aquinas provided further basis for the elaboration of Eucharistic theory in the doctrine of transubstantiation, all of which served to emphasise the elevation of the priesthood above all others.

Originally the line between the world and the church was drawn at baptism. Baptismal character (though that expression is not found until much later) was the decisive mark of all believers. Gradually ordination came to be seen as conferring a further distinct personal mark on the cleric. Augustine of Hippo (d.430) is credited with “distinguishing between the grace of the Holy Spirit, which can be lost, and the unlosable grace of the sacrament of order.”⁵¹ The Donatists, rigorists on the matter of those who buckled under persecution, claimed that a lapsed cleric automatically lost his priesthood. Augustine not only denied this but also held the Donatists to be clergy in true succession, validly ordained, and not requiring re-ordination should they rejoin the Catholic church. This ascribed a *character indelebilis* to ordination and isolated the ministerial order as something that could exist in isolation from the church as a whole.⁵² This was not the intention of course, and a long rearguard action was fought against such an understanding. The Council of Chalcedon (451) for example decreed “absolute consecrations” (to priestly or episcopal status not derived from an official connection with an actual church community) to be null and void.⁵³ By the Lateran Councils

⁵⁰ Schillebeeckx, *ibid.*, p.162.

⁵¹ Ludwig Ott, *Das Weihe-Sakrament. Handbuch de Dogmengeschichte*, vol.4 fasc.5, Freiburg-im-Breisgau 1969, p.29. (Cited in Haarg, *Clergy and Laity*, p.107.)

⁵² Maurice Wiles, *Christian Fathers*, pp.143-144. St. Bonaventure, 13th century Franciscan Minister-General, defined “character” as “a sign distinguishing the faithful in the spiritual people of the New Covenant ... Baptism distinguished the faithful from the non-faithful; among the faithful, confirmation denotes the strong; by holy order ‘homo ut sanctus ad ministerium templi a laicis separatur.’” (Quoted by Yves Congar, *op.cit.*, p.13.) The *character indelebilis* or “indelible mark” was described authoritatively by Pope Eugene IV in the Bull “Exultate Domino”, 1439, as applying to the sacraments of baptism, confirmation and orders. (J.Neuner and J. Dupuis, *The Christian Faith: The Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*. Bangalore, Theolog. Pub. in India, 3rd edn. 1978, p.350.)

⁵³ Hans von Campenhausen, *Tradition and Life in the Early Church*. London, Collins, 1968, p.222.

of the twelfth century, however, absolute ordinations had become more acceptable, provided that the ordaining bishop accepted financial responsibility for the future maintenance of the ordinand, as a feudal overlord for his vassal.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries the renaissance of Roman law also had a decisive influence on ecclesiology and the Church's view of ministry in relation to community. This legal development involved the detachment of the power of leadership from the concept of territoriality, and therefore, in the religious sphere, from the local church. A priest might have no *potestas iurisdictionis* but still have *sacra potestis* in respect of the Eucharist. In Canon Law as collated by Gratian of Bologna, sacramental ordination became finally restricted to priests and deacons, while all other vocations and ministries in the Church were jobs done by the laity. The fourth Lateran Council of 1215 finally insisted that only an ordained priest had the power to confect the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, using the term *transubstantiat* for the first time in an official church document. It has been claimed that this "constitutes a crucial turning point in the relationship of clergy and laity," not merely the culmination of the long process but a decisive, magisterial intervention, closing off of further debate on the subject.⁵⁴

The change in location of the boundary between the world and the church from baptism to ordination was entrenched towards the end of the first millennium because of lay reaction to the general decline of spirituality in the Church, leading to a revival of monasticism. This led to the taking of monastic vows being seen as a new kind of baptism at a time when nearly everyone in society was already baptised. With the subsequent clericalisation of monasticism and the pressure on secular clergy to adopt monastic spirituality, priesthood became identified with a more spiritual way of life. The laity for example put pressure on the clergy to adopt celibacy – resisted at first but eventually made mandatory with the 11th century Gregorian reforms as the centralising Papacy came under monastic influence. All of this strengthened the medieval concept

⁵⁴ Gary Macy, 'Who and How: Debates about Consecration in the Twelfth Century'.

of the church as divided between the *ordo laicorum* and the *ordo clericorum*. The boundary between world and church was confirmed as lying at ordination.

Under this heading we can also refer to the gradual restriction of the preaching and teaching role in the Church. While the gifts of evangelism and teaching were apparently subsumed by the clerical role at an early stage along with the other *charismata*, notable lay Christians continued to exercise great influence. Many of the early Fathers, like Origen, were laymen. However the church progressively restricted this possibility, so that only bishops could exercise a magisterial, teaching role, and presbyters by delegation, and deacons if licensed. In the ferment in the Church of the eleventh century, this was one of the major issues in contention as the laity sought opportunity to teach and preach. Gregory IX (1227-1241) prohibited lay preaching.⁵⁵ The Barbarian invasions (which left the clergy as the only educated people) and the Protestant Reformation (which left the Church unwilling to trust lay enthusiasts) were other influences.

The Church in Society

Another factor in institutionalisation was the concept of “order”, taken over from Roman society. Cicero in his *De Officiis*, had spoken of “the order of things” as the just and proper arrangement of the universe. In society the senatorial and equestrian orders were the elite ruling classes, as by Imperial appointment or *ordinatio*, and unpositioned people were by contrast relegated to the role of *pleb*. Tertullian applied the same structure to the church: clergy were *ordo*, laity were *plebs*. His division between the *ordo* and the *plebs* was for the organization and administration of the church; it did not yet reflect special powers that belonged only to the clergy.⁵⁶ Ordination was still *ad officium*, and not yet

http://naal-liturgy.org/Members/papers/Gary_macy.htm.

⁵⁵ Schillebeeckx, *Church with a Human Face*, p.188.

⁵⁶ <http://divinity.library.vanderbilt.edu/burns/Church/tertsum.htm>.

ad personam.⁵⁷ However, with the growth of the Church in the third century, its leaders' authority was augmented as they gained in wealth and distinction within the community, gaining some power of patronage, and so came to be regarded as belonging to a superior social order, above other Christians. The structure of the Church also increasingly mirrored the administration of Empire, with metropolitan and provincial officials, and regional synods of bishops analogous to Imperial diets.

Within the third century it became more customary for clergy to be supported by church offerings rather than working at secular occupations.⁵⁸ Cyprian pronounced that "Everyone honoured by the divine priesthood and ordained to the clerical service, ought to serve only at the altar and sacrifices, and to have leisure for prayers and supplications."⁵⁹ With the advent of toleration under Constantine Christianity gained equal rights with other religions and clergy gained special prerogatives. Even more significant change came with Theodosius I (379-395) when Christianity became *the* official religion of the Empire. The late pagan conception of religion was adapted to Christianity and the *clerici* became equated with the former pagan priesthood, charged with maintaining religion as a civic duty, exempt from all other civic responsibilities and salaried by the state. The higher clergy however increasingly served in government roles, as imperial delegates and counsellors.⁶⁰ Over the next few centuries, as the fabric of Empire unravelled under the impact of barbarian invasions, the civic magistracies melted away and the prelates of the church often inherited their functions.

⁵⁷ Herbert Haag, *Clergy and Laity*, p.100.

⁵⁸ Bearing in mind that even in the primitive church Peter and others had been supported, and Paul claimed to have forgone that right. (See 1 Cor:9.3-14, 2 Thess. 3:7-10; 2 Cor.11:7-9; Gal. 6:6; 1 Tim. 5:17-18.) However it was probably as the local bishops' responsibilities grew too large to manage as a spare-time activity that their support by the church became customary.

⁵⁹ Cyprian of Carthage, Epistle 65.1.
<http://www.auburn.edu/~allenkc/openhse/money.html>.

⁶⁰ The process has begun even earlier – witness the role of Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, under Constantine. Henry Chadwick, *Early Church*, p.66.

Under social order we could include the comparatively minor line of demarcation between clergy and laity involved in the evolution of clerical dress. At first there was no such thing, and Pope Celestine rebuked some Gallic Bishops in a letter of 428 for wearing distinctive attire. "We should be distinguished from the common people (*plebe*) by our learning, not by our clothes; by our conduct, not by our dress..."⁶¹ It was not until the fifth and sixth centuries that distinctive clerical garb became more common, and then because Roman clergy adhered to the older style of long tunic and cloak while the laity increasingly adopted the short tunic, trousers and mantle of the new barbarian rulers. Conservatism was already the mark of the clergy. The Council of Braga (572) required clerical dress; Pope John VIII in 875 told the English Archbishops to insist on it.

Architecture also reflected ecclesiology. As Schillebeeckx notes, it is probably no coincidence that the high middle ages saw the erection of ornate screens closing off the choir and sanctuary from the nave in churches.⁶² Even today the eucharistic liturgy of the Orthodox Church takes place hidden from profane eyes.

Thus structural, doctrinal and social developments over the first millennium of Church history all served to distance the clergy from the laity and separate them from an organic relationship with the ecclesial community.

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. I have attempted to summarise some of these reactions. Usually the movements involved have either been suppressed or have in their turn become clericalised.

Montanism

⁶¹ On-line Catholic Encyclopaedia. <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04419b.htm>.

⁶² Schillebeeckx, *Church with a Human Face*, p.166.

As a first example of such reaction, Montanism in the mid to late second century is perhaps debatable. It has been seen as a reaction to the increasing institutionalisation of the church and the squeezing out of earlier charismatic freedoms.⁶³ This is unproven; little of the Montanists' own writing survives and much we do have from their opponents is later hearsay. Originating with Montanus and the female prophetesses Prisca and Maximilla in Phrygia, Montanism could have been what today might be described as a charismatic revival, stressing in particular the prophetic gift and apocalypticism. Rigorist in discipline, it won the allegiance of Tertullian in 206. According to Christine Trevett, "there was little to distinguish the Prophets from their catholic co-religionists. Differences were mostly differences of degree. Catholic leaders may have perceived a dangerous laicisation and democratisation but not even Tertullian denounced clericalism *per se* or sought to divorce charismatic empowerment from Christian office."⁶⁴

It seems to have been a matter of *authority* and where it should lie. Trevett suggests that "a hierarchically controlled church opted for maintaining order and continuity at the expense of spontaneity and the effervescence of the Spirit." However she does believe the evidence is in favour of the Montanists having had female clergy and suggests that rather than their being anti-clerical their leadership was "clericalised by default" as they were forced to separate from the Church.⁶⁵ We have seen how Tertullian as a Montanist was open to a greater role for laity though he did not move on the role of women. As an opening example of reaction to clericalism we are not on sufficiently firm ground for dogmatism. We do know however that it was condemned and its

⁶³ View of Adolf Harnack for example. See F.L. Cross (Ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford, OUP, 1980, p.919.

⁶⁴ Christine Trevett, *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p.146.

⁶⁵ Trevett, *ibid.*, pp.190-197.

remnants suppressed when eventually the Church was able to marshal the secular arm.⁶⁶

Monasticism

Although Coptic monasticism goes back to people like Frontonius in the mid-second century,⁶⁷ Monasticism is usually seen as a reaction against the worldly success of the Church in the fourth century. With Christianity's official Imperial recognition and role as a state religion, and the mass conversions of convenience which eventuated, some feared that true spirituality had to be sought in withdrawal from the world and the adoption of an eremitic life-style. St Antony (251?-356) in Egypt attracted some fellow hermits and eventually provided them with a Rule, while his countryman Pachomius (ca. 287-346) based a community Rule on obedience to a superior. He specifically forbade monks to become priests on the ground that "it is not good to covet power and glory."⁶⁸ (In itself a reflection of the growing status of clergy.) St Basil (330-379) in Asia Minor provided for coenobitic monasticism a Rule still followed in Eastern Orthodoxy. St Benedict of Monte Cassino (480-543), still a layman, broke new ground for western community monasticism and his Benedictine Rule prevailed in Europe from the eighth to the twelfth centuries. Periods of decline and decadence led to periodic new and sterner foundations such as those of Cluny (910) and Citeaux (1098).

For the purposes of our study the point is that Monasticism was originally a lay movement, but became clericised. The original hermit monks lived largely without sacraments, independently of clergy. Benedictine foundations tended to depend upon the nearest parish

⁶⁶ A Salvationist evocation of Montanism was made by Bernard Watson in a 1960's article. He quoted Rupert Davies as claiming that the Montanists' "religion which prefers personal converse with God to institutional forms; a concern to bring the truth to simple people; a stress on holiness; a reaffirmation of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit; a semi-lay Church order..." displayed the "very marks of Methodism." Watson added, "These are also the fundamentals of Salvationism."⁶⁶ Bernard Watson, in *The Officer*, January 1965, p.22.

⁶⁷ <http://copticchurch.tripod.com/copticchurch/id8.html>.

⁶⁸ Christianity Encyclopaedia Britannica. Encyclopaedia Britannica Premium Service.<http://britannica.com/eb/article?tocId=67516>.

church unless they were too isolated in which case they had to either take in a priest or have some brothers ordained. Pope Gregory the Great, in the sixth century, drew on monasteries for ordinands, but even he believed that monastic and clerical vocations were incompatible. "No one can perform both ecclesiastical (clerical) duties, and remain by due order under monastic rule," he said.⁶⁹ This remained the general picture up until late in the first millennium when, paradoxically, monastic spirituality came to dominate clerical life at the same time as monastic life became increasingly clericalised. By the tenth century in some monasteries more than half the monks were ordained.⁷⁰

The development of Eucharistic practice in the Western church in the Middle Ages contributed to this gradual clericalisation. Nussbaum emphasises the growing commitment to the Eucharist at the centre of monastic spiritual life. Haussling focuses on social and cultural factors contributing to the increasing importance of Eucharist, including the attempt, general within the church in the West, to replicate the Roman liturgy, requiring many priests.⁷¹

The Lateran Council of 1059 created the Augustinian Canons, the first hybrid monks/priests to be employed as secular clergy. The canon was an ordained clerk (living in community) and according to Deanesly, "a monk essentially was not, though it had become usual by the twelfth century to give him priest's orders."⁷² The Cistercian economic system came to depend upon the manual labour of unlettered lay brethren. Monasticism came to reflect the feudal social order, with noble clerical monks and lay brother serfs. In the words of Pope John Paul II, "Gradually a division was established between clerical members and lay

⁶⁹ Margaret Deanesly, *The History of the Medieval Church 590-1500*. London, Methuen (1925) 1979, p.40.

⁷⁰ Otto Nussbaum, *Kloster, Priestmönch und Privatmesse*. Bonn, Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1961, p.102. Cited in R. Kevin Seasoltz, "A Western Monastic Perspective on ordained Ministry", in Paul. K. Hennessey (ed.) *A Concert of Charisms: Ordained Ministry in the Religious Life*. New York, Paulist Press, 1997, p.41.

⁷¹ Angelus Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier*. Munster, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1973, pp.298-347. Cited in Seasoltz, *ibid.* p.41.

⁷² Deanesly, *op.cit.*, p.126.

'brothers' or *conversi*."⁷³ The change is summarised by a modern Cistercian nun:

The monks in Egypt may have shunned priests and avoided ordination, affirming the independence of their lay, charismatic state. But little by little, more and more monks became priests. By the 17th century it had become a general rule that all choir monks were priests. The caste system existed in the monastic world, and the priests were obviously the higher ups – spiritually and intellectually as well as materially. Before Vatican II, the priesthood was considered the fullness of monkhood. All pastoral offices in the community had to be filled by priests. The monastic life had been completely clericalised.⁷⁴

New Movements

The late Middle Ages were a time of great ferment and change in Europe, not least in religion and spirituality. While the movement of the official Church following the Gregorian reforms was towards centralisation, institutional conformity and a widening gap between clergy and laity, there was a counter mood amongst the laity, who became less willing to accept a passive role. This was characterised by a desire to return to evangelical living, partly in reaction to clerical decadence. Scripture reading, the imitation of Christ and the example of the apostolic church were frequently appealed to, indicative of the emergence of a better-educated and more self-confident urban middle-class. R.W. Southern refers to "a permanent and widespread desire to invest the ordinary secular life with some of the values of a religious Order."⁷⁵ Of the great variety of new religious expressions, some were passing occasions of mass excitement like crowds of flagellants rushing from town to town, leaving no organised association. Others coalesced about charismatic figures, like Arnold of Brescia, Lambert le Begue, Tanchelm of Utrecht or Peter of Bruys. Some were taken under the wing of the Church and became official "Orders" while others were fringe movements, drifting into heresy and schism.

⁷³ General Audience Feb. 22nd 1995.
<http://www.ewtn.com/library/papaldoc/jp2f2295.htm>.

⁷⁴ Sister Martha Driscoll, July 1999. (<http://www.ocso.org/martha-conf.html>).

⁷⁵ R.W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1972, p.304.

Movements retained in the fold

Friars. Just as the Monastic Orders met and provided a means of expression for popular religious feeling at the various times of their foundations, the Dominican and Franciscan Mendicant Orders of Friars fitted the social pattern of the thirteenth century. They were an urban phenomenon and responded to and channelled religious aspirations of burgeoning urban life. The Dominicans followed the Augustinian rule and were clerical from their inception so are outside our thesis. Francis of Assisi (1181-1229) reluctantly accepted deacon's orders from Innocent III but was not concerned about hierarchical status. In Paolo Ricca's words,

Francis welcomed both laymen like himself and clergy, uniting all together in the single fundamental bond of brotherhood. The original Franciscan community was a *fraternitas sui generis*, alien to the clerical models and juridical spirit, wholly concerned with the following of the 'lowly' ('minor') Christ, the servant. It was governed by the great evangelical principle of the turning upside down of hierarchies as in Matt.20:20-27. Slowly but inexorably, this community which was anomalous in the religious scene of its time, was regimented into the conventual and clerical tradition and made uniform. The primitive *forma evangelii* became the *forma ecclesiae*.⁷⁶

The fourth Minister-General in succession, Haymo of Faversham (1240-43) "excluded all lay brothers from holding posts of government in the Order. The process of clericalisation of the Order was under way."⁷⁷ Southern suggests two reasons for this change: firstly that "it was in every way easier to organise and support a religious community if all its members were in holy orders" and secondly that the tasks of "preaching, evangelizing and spiritual direction could only be served by the clergy."⁷⁸

Third Orders. Francis however recruited a further kind of follower in his last few years; some lay people who professed a rule and made a commitment to an evangelical lifestyle but remained in their secular

⁷⁶ Paolo Ricca, "Sect or Order? (Waldensians – Franciscans)". *Concilium 158: The Right to Dissent*. Edinburg/New York, T&T Clark/Seabury, 1982, p.44-5.

⁷⁷ History of the Franciscan Movement. <http://198.62.75.1/www1/ofm/fra/FRAht01.html>.

⁷⁸ R.W Southern, *Western Society*, p.351.

occupations, and could be married. These were known as a “Third Order”. (The Friars Minor were the First, and women Franciscans comprised the Second.) The Dominicans and Carmelites also enrolled such Tertiaries. These associate orders have survived today in their ‘lay’ condition.

The Brethren of the Common Life is the name usually given to the followers of Gerhard Groote (1340-84), a Dutch mystic who opted out of the ecclesiastical rat-race after becoming a deacon and gathered a following almost by default as an itinerant preacher. In his last years, silenced by the Church, he established small communities, including one for women. They had no rule or binding vow, worked at secular occupations for a living, and “laymen mixed with clerks in these communities and lived ‘like clergy’.” Despite their irregularity the Brethren somehow managed to escape juridical condemnation. Sadly they were no more successful than the “real orders” in maintaining their freedom from status. Opposition from the trade guilds restricted their occupation largely to book copying. “In the early days clerks and laymen worked together building houses... But when the communities settled down to their steady routine of study, prayer and copying books, there was little left for the layman to do but cook, in the long-run the old established inferiority remained and the laity faded out.”⁷⁹

Fringe Orders and Anti-Orders, as Southern described them, failed to make the transition to respectability. In the words of Richard K. Weber,

Some of the lay groups, angry and critical, had begun to develop ‘anti-hierarchical’ beliefs. They began to develop an ecclesiology that identified authority or function within the church with personal goodness of life. Instead of an order based on *officium*, they insisted on an order based upon merit. They began to disregard the sacramental within the

⁷⁹ R.W. Southern, *ibid.*, pp.339, 352.

life of the church and exalt the emotive and personal. They rejected the church as an institution and saw it only as association.⁸⁰

Of the many such groups, we sample the **Waldensians**. They were the followers of Peter Waldo (d.1217) a merchant of Lyons who gave away his property and attracted followers as a mendicant missionary. These Poor Men of Lyons translated the Bible into vernacular Provençal and preached in their own words but were initially orthodox in doctrine until their exclusion from the Church caused them to develop their beliefs further. They encouraged both laity and women to preach and teach. An opponent claimed that “their one conspicuous fault is, that they blaspheme against the Church and the clergy.”⁸¹ They “felt called by God himself to exercise a fundamental Christian function – preaching – without being incorporated in the Church’s clerical and monastic structure... The Waldensians wanted to preach without abandoning their lay status.”⁸²

The Waldensians sent a delegation to the Third Lateran Council in 1179 to ask for Papal approval but were denied and later condemned. Subsequent centuries of persecution failed to destroy them and a remnant has survived, particularly in Northern Italy. They became associated with the Hussites and later with the Reformed movement. (The 20th century Biblical scholar Alberto Soggin taught at both the Waldensian Theological Academy and the Pontifical Biblical Institute.)

Despite their being, in McCallum’s words, “an early test case in the area of lay ministry”, and their view that “any true believer could administer the Lord’s Supper,”⁸³ they did evolve their own clergy in time.

⁸⁰ Richard K. Weber, “A History and Theology of Sharing Responsibility for the Church.” *Spirituality Today*, Summer 1985, Vol. 37 No.2, pp.100-107. (<http://www.spiritualitytoday.org/spir2day/853721weber.html>).

⁸¹ Gretser, “Contra Valdensus IV”. Trans. in Emilio Comba, *History of the Waldenses of Italy*, pp.3-4, cited by Dennis McCallum in “The Waldensian Movement From Waldo to Reformation”. (<http://www.xenos.org/essays/waldo1f.htm>).

⁸² Paolo Ricca, *Concilium* 158, p.42.

⁸³ Giorgio Tourn, “The Waldensians”, pp.50-1. Cited by McCallum, *ibid.* According to Paola Ricca, *op.cit.*, p.42, there is evidence that they permitted women also to preside over the Eucharist.

Their preachers were known as “Barba” (uncles), but by the fifteenth century further distinct orders of “brothers” and “sisters”, also called “Perfects” after Matt.19.21, came to profess the three monastic vows.⁸⁴ Eventually the Perfect were divided into classes of Bishop, Priest and Deacon.⁸⁵ Here was another case of an initially anti-clerical movement becoming clericalised.

The Reformation Movements

The precursors to the Reformation, Wycliff and Huss, reacted against clergy abuses and denounced the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy. While claiming that Christian people following the Bible and living in simplicity needed no priestly mediation, they did not appear to posit a clergy-less church. They wanted to reform the ministry, not abandon it, and the residual reform movements deriving from Huss in middle-Europe retained clerical roles.

The same is true of the main streams of the Reformation deriving from Luther and Calvin. In Luther’s reaffirmation of the priesthood of all believers or the priesthood of the baptised, “he is insisting that every Christian fulfills a mediating role between God and neighbour... ‘Through baptism,’ Luther declared, ‘*all* of us are consecrated to the priesthood.’”⁸⁶ He denied the traditional demarcation between a spiritual estate (pope, bishops, priests, monks) and a temporal estate (princes, lords, artisans, farmers). This did not mean that Luther believed that anyone in the Church could do anything. He made it clear that it was appropriate for ministerial functions to be performed by designated people in the Church, just as people could follow any other vocation in the world. He said that clergy acted on behalf of other believers when “commissioned in orderly

⁸⁴ Peter Biller, “Multum leiunantes et se Castigantes: Medieval Waldensian Asceticism”, in *Monks, Hermits and the Ascetic Tradition*, London, Basil Blackwell, 1985, pp.218-219. Cited by McCallum *op.cit.*

⁸⁵ Claimed in <http://www.turrisfortis.com/trail.html>.

⁸⁶ Herman G. Stuempfle, “Theological and Biblical Perspectives on the Laity”. Division of Ministry, Augsburg Fortress Press, 1987.
http://www.elca.org/dm/midl/theol_biblical_persp_laity.pdf.

fashion for preaching the Word, for administering the sacraments and for other pastoral ministrations.”⁸⁷ A group of pious laymen in a wilderness could choose one of themselves for the task. “A priest is no longer a priest when he is deposed... *characters indelebilis* ... is “mere talk and man-made law.”⁸⁸

Calvin, though himself a layman, stressed the magisterial teaching role of the clergy. He viewed all ministry as that of Christ, who chose to make men his substitutes⁸⁹ (*quasi vicarium operam*), delegating tasks to them but certainly not making them ontologically different. Examining Ephesians 4:4-16, Calvin described the ministries of Apostle, Prophet and Evangelist as “extraordinary” and not to be expected in day to day Church life, but said that those of Pastor and Teacher were regular and “ordinary”. Of the offices of Bishop, Priest and Deacon, he claimed that the first two expressed the gift of government in the Church and that both were to be found in the office of Pastor (who also served as Teacher). Deacons expressed the gift for the care of the poor and sick. Ordination was the Church’s recognition and endorsement of God’s call on the life of the Pastor; it did not create a different class of Christian.

Summarising the Reformers’ position from a Catholic viewpoint, Yves Congar states, “The universal priesthood of all believers came to exclude all ministerial or hierarchical priesthood and, at any rate in principle, a purely synodal and presbyterian ecclesiastical system was set up.”⁹⁰ From the “left wing”, however, Emil Brunner, in a free church critique of the Reformers, claimed that “Although it was precisely at this point that Luther attacked the structure of the medieval Church by

⁸⁷ Martin Luther, “On Councils and the Church” (1539). Quoted by Christoph Schwobel, “The Creature of the Word: Recovering the Ecclesiology of the Reformers”, in Colin E. Gunton and Daniel W. Hardy (Ed.), *On Being the Church: Essays on the Christian Community*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1989, p.135.

⁸⁸ Martin Luther, “An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation”, 1520. *Works of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia, A.J. Holman Coy., 1915. <http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/web/nblty-04.html>.

⁸⁹ John Calvin, “Institutes of Religion”, Book 4, Ch. 3, Sect. 1. <http://www.smartlink.net/~douglas/calvin/bk4ch03.html#one.htm>.

⁹⁰ Yves Congar, *Lay People*, p.36.

preaching the priesthood of all believers and therefore not recognising an official priesthood, neither he nor any other of the reformers took this universal priesthood seriously in practice. Even in the Protestant Church, 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.”⁹¹

E.L. Mascall succinctly compared Reformation with pre-Reformation ministry by saying that “what Protestantism did to the religion of Western Europe was simply to substitute a clericalism of the Word for a clericalism of the Sacrament.”⁹² And, according to John Roxborough, the Presbyterian system still has unanswered questions about hierarchy. “The use of the word ordination, and the requirements which go with it, and views of equivalence of status support a view that elders should be considered clergy rather than laity.”⁹³

The Radical Reformation

The Reformation, overturning so many previous certainties and placing the Scriptures in the hands of common people at a time when the invention of printing had made possible wide literacy, created the “religion of the mechanics.”⁹⁴ All over Europe little groups of lay-people, from the 1520’s on, met to study the Bible and determine for themselves the shape of the Church. Hugely diverse, and ranging from the mildly reformist to the certifiably revolutionary, they known are collectively as Anabaptists because most shared a belief in the need for adult baptism, whether or not they had, as everyone had, been baptised as infants. Beyond that, they tended to reject human authority, clericalism and hierarchy, resisting

⁹¹ Emil Brunner, *The Christian Doctrine of the Church, Faith and the Consummation: Dogmatics*, Vol III. London, Lutterworth, 1962, p.98-99.

⁹² E.L. Mascall, *The Recovery of Unity: A Theological Approach*. London, Longmans, 1958 p.5.

⁹³ John Roxborough, “Persistent Presbyterianism? Lay Leadership and the Future of a Reformed Christian tradition in the West”. <http://www.roxborough.com/missiology.htm>, p.6. Roxborough cites Ian Breward, “The Presbyterian Eldership Yesterday and Today”, *Colloquium. The Australian and New Zealand Theological Review*. 2, No. 2 (1967).

⁹⁴ Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1964, p.188.

any connection between church and state. Their radical congregationalism provided the prototype for free churches of all descriptions since then, and they emphasised servant leadership, the responsibility of the individual believer to participate in ministry and the local congregation as the appropriate context for biblical interpretation. In Chris Marshall's words, "These understandings are particularly relevant for the contemporary western church, as it comes to terms with the demise of 'Christendom'."⁹⁵

The contemporary American Mennonite Larry Martens comments that, "Anabaptists... rejected distinctions between clergy and laity. It was not that the Anabaptists had no clergy; it is more accurate to say that they had no laity. Unfortunately, one's theology and practice are not always congruent. The universal priesthood even today remains a declaration of principle rather than a realization even for congregations which find their theological roots in Anabaptist theology. More often than not the congregation is the object rather than the subject in its own calling and responsibility. While Anabaptists have an excellent theology of pastoral care, congregations have adopted current patterns by emphasizing the need for the caring expertise of pastors, pastoral counsellors, and psychiatrists to the neglect of the caring ministry a community of faith can have."⁹⁶ Such a comment shows that even when a church polity attempts to exclude the possibility of clericalism, professionalism makes inevitable inroads.

Most of the free churches descended from Anabaptism and the generally radical fringe of the reformation have maintained a clerical role even while making it clear that no clerical character is involved. The constitution of the Baptist Union of New Zealand for example insists of the pastoral role that "When the function ceases, the person is no longer a minister." The Baptist website admits that "Often other Christian

⁹⁵ Chris Marshall, "Following Christ in Life: The Anabaptist-Mennonite Tradition". *Reality*, Issue 37, February/March 2000, p.22.

⁹⁶ Larry Martens, "Anabaptist Theology and Congregational Care". *Direction Journal*, Spring 1992, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp.3-14. <http://www.directionjournal.org/article/?744>.

traditions, their forms and thus implicitly their theology, can all too easily flow over to us. Here we need the courage of our biblical radicalism.”⁹⁷ But for all practical purposes such clerics are indistinguishable from any of their colleagues at the local Ministers’ Fraternal

The post-Reformation Catholic Church

It would be appropriate to note that in the Catholic Counter-Reformation, both in the Council of Trent and in the whole ensuing direction of Catholic ecclesiology until the mid-twentieth century, the need to counter Protestant theology of ministry led to an unbalanced reaction, an increased emphasis in the juridical and hierarchical aspects of the Church. In Congar’s words, Catholic writers “[did] not point out that it is the whole Church quickened by the Holy Spirit, the faithful people, that co-operates in the work of sanctification and praise of God; they talk only about the priest and the hierarchy, and the believing, praying people appears to be passive in a church that it does not affect and is not expected to affect.”⁹⁸ The pendulum has swung back the other way following the second Vatican Council of the early 1960’s, with the hierarchy trying with mixed success to keep a lid on lay activity, as noted in the conclusion of Chapter Seven, below.

Methodism

Methodism was part of the 18th century revivalist movement which grew and flourished independently of any established church or effective parish system. R. W. Ward says that the

new context of Christianization released new resources. The most surprising of these was the children, who for much of the eighteenth century played a leading role in revival movements from Silesia to New England. All this despite the insistence of churches everywhere that for children to convert their parents was unnatural, improper, and to be subjected to clerical control at the earliest opportunity. In short, before revival got to the churches it sprang from religious communities...⁹⁹

⁹⁷ http://www.baptist.org.nz/registration_systemwork.php3.

⁹⁸ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp.40-1.

⁹⁹ R.W. Ward, “Established Churches, Free Churches, Religious Communities: Their Contemporary Social setting”. *Expository Times*, Vol.106 No.4. January 1995, p.113.

Wesley was an ordained Anglican priest. "I live and die a member of the Church of England," he wrote in 1790,¹⁰⁰ but by appointing lay preachers from 1740 on, he created what became in effect a parallel church. From the 1750's on he had at every Conference to fight against secessionist tendencies in his societies. In particular the local preachers wanted to give the sacrament to their societies, so that they did not have to depend on the willingness – not always forthcoming – of the Anglican parson to welcome Methodists to parish communion. In Wesley's eyes, his preachers were lay – although on the principle of when in Scotland, do as the Presbyterians do, he performed what Ronald Knox calls "Gretna Green ordinations", not intended to be valid south of the Tweed.¹⁰¹ However, despite even Wesley's usurping episcopal prerogative in 1775 by ordaining clergy for the American mission when the Bishop of London declined to do so, the final break with the established church did not come until 1795, four years after his death.

Rack says that "Since [Wesley] did not admit to himself that he was founding a church, he felt free to experiment in ways that might otherwise have been more inhibited than they were by his High Church inheritance... 'Order', in canonical terms, could then be subjected to the expediency of promoting his mission... One of the tragedies of 19th century Wesleyanism was that it fossilised his pragmatism into a new ecclesiastical orthodoxy as dogmatic as the old ones."¹⁰²

Concerned to ensure that his Methodists maintained his somewhat inconsistent status quo after his death, Wesley executed a "Deed of Declaration and Establishment of the People called Methodists" and enrolled it in Chancery in 1784. Methodism was to be ruled by a

¹⁰⁰ John Henry Overton, *John Wesley*, 1891, London, p.102.

¹⁰¹ Ronald Knox, *Enthusiasm*, Oxford, OUP 1950 p.511. Ironically, the Methodist Conference in Scotland decided in 1793 to cease ordaining preachers and to stop wearing clerical garb. (Henry D. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast, John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism*, Nashville, Abingdon Press, 2nd edn. 1992, p.231.)

¹⁰² Henry D. Rack: *Reasonable Enthusiast*, p.250. There are parallels here with development of The Salvation Army.

Conference of one hundred preachers, carefully chosen by Wesley from those who agreed with his policies. No laymen (that is, non-full time preachers) or women were included (although he had appointed his first woman preacher in 1761). Strictly speaking of course, almost all his preachers were lay; Wesley did not regard them as Ministers and did not permit them to use the title Reverend. Knox observes that “inevitably the lay preachers, who had less of ecclesiastical status than the Nonconformist ministers around them, longed for some new arrangement which would give them the recognition their arduous labours deserved.”¹⁰³

With Wesley gone, the preachers soon began to style themselves “Ministers”. Conference in 1795 permitted each Methodist society to have the Lord’s Supper administered by an authorised person and to hold services at the same times as the established Church held its service – always forbidden by Wesley. Conference also “declared that the admission of a preacher to ‘full connexion with the Conference’ conferred ministerial rights without any form of ordination. Ordination by the imposition of the hands of ministers was again adopted by the Conference in 1836.”¹⁰⁴ By then, the movement had suffered schism upon schism – the New Connexion emerged in 1797 from disputes over ‘lay’ representation at Conference and sacramental autonomy; the Wesleyan rump shed the Primitive Methodists in 1811 and the Bible Christians in 1815. The proposed erection of a pipe organ sparked an 1827 split and in 1835 the issue was methods of ministerial training. Further agitation for lay-representation in government produced both the Wesleyan Reformers and the Wesleyan Reform Union between 1847 and 1852.

If tension between clerical and lay activism was at the heart of the process of schism in Methodism, clericalisation underlay the process which eventually brought together many of the splinter groups again. Wilson notes that reunion “was largely a matter for the clerics in the

¹⁰³ Ronald Knox, *Enthusiasm*, p.507.

¹⁰⁴ F.L. Cross, *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, p.893.

movement rather than the laity... amalgamation was generally towards a greater recognition of ministerial authority and away from the priesthood of all believers.”¹⁰⁵ The residual strength of the latter view, however, along with Anglican commitment to the historic episcopacy, was sufficient to abort Anglican-Methodist union negotiations from the 1960's to the end of the century.¹⁰⁶

John Stacey enumerates the consequent variety of contemporary Methodist answers to the question, “What then is a minister?”

One will tell him that he is simply a layman working full time; another that he is what he is because he has received a call from God, ratified by the Church, to exercise his particular gifts within a full-time ministry; another that what distinguishes him from a layman are the functions which he has to perform within the fellowship of the people of God; another that ordination means creation of an *ordo* and that he is therefore different in *being* from a layman.¹⁰⁷

The struggle over clericalisation has continued within the Methodist Church and the familiar polarisation can still be found within the modern Methodist Church in New Zealand. One of the goals of the Te Taha Māori o Te Hāhi Weteriana has referred to “every member a minister’... Writing in 1980 the Tuamuaki amplified on its meaning.

Its essential and theological stress is in relation to the ministry that stems, not so much from an act of ordination, but from the administration of baptism and confirmation...

However, an ordained presbyter complained in 1995 to the Faith and Order Committee of the Conference,

[every member a minister] is garbage and a red herring that blurs and confuses the roles of lay people and presbyters and deacons. “Everyone a mission” yes. “Everyone a minister” no.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, London, Heinemann, 1967, p.155.

¹⁰⁶ *Anglican Communion News Service* (ACNS) - 4 March 1996, <http://www.anglicancommunion.org/acns/acnsarchive/acns0800/acns835.html>. Also *A Theological Workbook on An Anglican Methodist Covenant* (2002). <http://www.cofe.anglican.org/ccu/england/amworkbook.doc>.

¹⁰⁷ John Stacey, *About Ministry*. London, Epworth, 1967, p.34.

¹⁰⁸ John H. Roberts, *Thinking Theologically in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Paihia, ColCom Press, 2000, pp.79-80.

John Salmon, speaking at a Wesley Dinner in Auckland in 1999, examined the same polarisation in Methodist roots and suggested, "Our post-modern setting calls for different ministry patterns... I'm not convinced that ordination is a category that will help us in this."¹⁰⁹

Other sectarian movements

Some other sects/denominations have determined to have no clerical roles. As examples we might take the Society of Friends, the Plymouth Brethren and the Christadelphians.

Quakers.

Although the Friends have almost invariably described themselves as without clergy, people who preached regularly, often as itinerants, were often described as "Ministers". Elizabeth Isichei notes that

"By the early eighteenth century... when the practice of 'recording' ministers was established, they had adopted one of the principles of a professional ministry – that of permanent differential status – without its concomitant principle of remuneration. But the ministers in Quakerism were laymen, and they received no formal training in ministry... In theory, all present at a Quaker meeting were equally free to speak. In practice, the unrecorded had to pass a difficult psychological barrier..."¹¹⁰

Rebecca Larson claims that "an estimated thirteen hundred to fifteen hundred women ministers were active in the transatlantic Quaker community during the first three quarters of the eighteenth century."¹¹¹ In the United States popular revivalism led to accommodation to the style of mainstream Protestant denominations, and an American Quaker group adopted a professional pastorate by 1880. Although "some Friends still consider the notion of a Quaker pastor to be an oxymoron,"¹¹² at least in

¹⁰⁹ John Salmon, "Is it Ordained?" Address at Wesley Dinner, Trinity College, Auckland, 24 May 1999. Copy in possession of the writer. Dr Salmon was Principal of Trinity College.

¹¹⁰ Elizabeth Isichei, "English Quakers", in Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.167.

¹¹¹ Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700-1775*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1998, p.63. Cited by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell in a book review in *The Review of Communication*, 1, 2001, 194-198, <http://www.natcom.org/pubs/ROC/one-two/campbell.htm>.

¹¹² Frances Kinsey, "Getting a Clue about the Fine Art of Pastoring." *Quaker Life*, September, 1998. <http://www.furm.org/QL/issues/9809/kinsey.htm>.

the United States it is now common. Isichei notes however that in England, because of a growth of historical studies, “this trend to a professional ministry was reversed, and the practice of recording ministers was abolished in 1924.”¹¹³ However she also describes how a strong informal concentration of power evolved within the conduct of the Friends’ business, saying that “Because such an elite is informal, it tends to be self-appointed and self-perpetuating.”¹¹⁴

Plymouth Brethren.

The same phenomenon obtained among the Plymouth Brethren. Although a large number of their early adherents in the 1830’s were Anglican clergymen, these were strongly anti-Erastian and anticlerical. Despite, or perhaps because of, their principle of minimal organisation, a relatively small number of leading Brethren, who were “formally and nominally ‘one brother amongst others’, were in fact the real and effective leaders of their communities.”¹¹⁵ Their personal, ecclesiastical and doctrinal disputes and mutual excommunications of the 1840’s led to the division between Exclusive Brethren, led by John Darby, and the Open Brethren, led by A.N. Groves and others. Schisms remained a way of life, especially of the exclusives, long afterwards. Darby’s early dominance, and in the twentieth century the ascendancy of James Taylor Snr., and later of his son, over the Exclusives presented a curious paradox for a movement asserting local autonomy and without formally legitimated leadership – like having an infallible Pope without having a priesthood. However, there exists an informally institutionalised, unprofessional, speaking ministry or leadership – rewarded by monetary gifts rather than set stipends, though expected to maintain themselves by some other occupation.

¹¹³ Elizabeth Isichei, *op.cit.*, p.169.

¹¹⁴ Elizabeth Isichei, “Organisation and Power in the Society of Friends, 1852-59”, in Bryan Wilson, *op.cit.*, p.209.

¹¹⁵ Peter L. Embley, “The Early Development of the Plymouth Brethren”, in Bryan Wilson, *op.cit.*, p.217.

Amongst the Open Brethren, ministry has developed differently. According to Piepkorn “a growing number of Open Assemblies have invited full-time workers to associate themselves with a given assembly particularly, and these persons can become very much like conventional pastors. But even these men rarely do all the preaching or wholly give up itineranting, and they have no sacramental role.”¹¹⁶ The new development was the subject of an issue of the Journal of the Christian Brethren Research Fellowship in 1986.¹¹⁷

Christadelphians

The Christadelphians, originating in the 1830's with Dr John Thomas, were like the Brethren notable for their factiousness. They were also a lay movement. In Bryan Wilson's words,

“trained ministry was, from the very outset, an institution of the apostasy, as were the rituals and procedures of the church. Christadelphianism stands in the meeting-house tradition of all sectarians – with lay leadership and exhortation, lay presidency and offices, and decisions taken congregationally... In practice, of course, leadership was indispensable. [Robert] Roberts in particular became the arbiter of a great deal of the development of the movement, and at the local level there were often prominent brethren whose actual influence far exceeded their nominal functions”¹¹⁸

Roberts wrote, “‘The appointment of brethren is not the appointment of men to exercise authority, but of men to serve.’ There were to be no committees, no offices with distinctive titles such as secretaries and presidents... There were to be brethren for distinct tasks – to preside at meetings; to speak; to examine candidates for admission; to arrange the business of the ecclesias...”¹¹⁹ We see the same phenomenon of informal but significant leadership roles emerging as in other similar sects. An odd development was the way in which Roberts and his

¹¹⁶ Arthur Carl Piepkorn, “Plymouth Brethren”. *Concordia Theological Monthly* 41, 1970, pp.165-71. <http://www.breuderbewegung.de/pdf/piepkorn.pdf>.

¹¹⁷ Harold H. Rowdon (ed.) *Servants of God: Papers on the use of full-time workers in Brethren churches*. *Journal of the Christian Brethren Research Fellowship* No. 37: April 1986. This development can be observed e.g. in “E-Street Church”, Wellington, NZ.

¹¹⁸ Bryan Wilson, *Sects and Society: A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain*. London, Heinemann, 1961, pp.267,8.

successors, editing *The Christadelphian*, an entirely private undertaking unconnected with any kind of central authority, assumed a de facto leadership role in the sect. Ecclesia which were “disfellowshipped” ceased to be reported. Another curiosity was the way in which In order to secure exemption from military service for its pacifist members, this movement was obliged to present letters from its “leadership” for all conscientious objectors. An ad hoc, nominal leadership group was therefore called into being. In Wilson’s words, “thus external pressure induced the sect to depart from one of its entrenched positions.”¹²⁰

The Pentecostal Movement

The twentieth century Pentecostal Movement has left in its wake a whole new division of Protestantism, quite apart from seeding charismatic revival in existing Protestant denominations and within the Catholic Church. The Pentecostal churches are clear that “all Christians are Ministers” and that “the clergy/laity distinction is quite artificial and unbiblical.”¹²¹ Nevertheless they have a place for “separated ministry” as the recognition of charismata and answering ordination by elders of a local congregation. In John Roxborough’s words,

Pentecostalism may run with demonstrated gifting more than formal qualification and have freedom from traditional structures, but power lies with personality and systems of leadership that can exclude the voice of the people at the same time as it affirms their ability to exercise spiritual power in the name of Christ.¹²²

Pentecostalism in fact offers yet another example of the sectarian emphasis on the priesthood of all believers gradually accommodating to clerical control. In his 1967 essay on “The Pentecostalist Minister”, Bryan Wilson illustrates the process in the development of the Elim Church. He

¹¹⁹ Bryan Wilson, *op.cit.*, p.269.

¹²⁰ Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, p.210.

¹²¹ J. Rodman Williams, *Renewal Theology: The Church, the Kingdom and Last Things. Systematic Theology from a Charismatic Perspective*. Grand Rapids, Zondervan, 1992, pp.159ff.

¹²² John Roxborough, *op.cit.*, “Persistent Presbyterianism”, p.9.

draws attention to the tension between the Minister's "need to assert leadership with Pentecostalism's insistence on the spontaneous operation of the Spirit."¹²³

Tracing the history of the "indigenous" churches of New Zealand as they evolved into the New Life denomination, Brett Knowles identifies the development whereby the

...charismatic authority of the Spirit was increasingly channelled and moderated by the pastor and the right to speak became specialised and restricted to those who were "recognised" by the leadership as "having a ministry". While spontaneous spiritual gifts continued to feature in the worship of the Indigenous Churches, the effect of this regulatory function was to replace the charismatic freedom of the Spirit with an "official" mode of leadership.

The shift from a "charismatic" to a more "official" form of authority was reinforced by an upward social mobility and by the acquisition of institutional authority as the pastors acted as "spokespersons" for the movement.¹²⁴

Knowles refers again to this tendency in outlining abortive negotiations for union amongst Pentecostal Churches in New Zealand in 1979.

...discussion was initially conducted at a senior leadership level, and only later involved the rest of the pastors in the movement... At no stage were the movement's congregations brought into the discussion. This demonstrated the penchant of the movement for discussing matters *in camera* and its perception of the role of the pastor as the institutional authority over the congregation.¹²⁵

The "Indigenous" or New Life Churches had job descriptions for regional leaders and apostolic ministries, and annually renewable accreditation for pastors by 1989 and a Handbook for Pastors by 1992.¹²⁶ From being an informal, spirit-called ministry, the leadership was clearly professionalising and growing apart from the laity.

¹²³ Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, pp.145-6.

¹²⁴ Brett Knowles, *New Life: A History of the New Life Churches of New Zealand 1942-1979*. Dunedin, Third Millennium Publishing, 1999, p.162, 164.

¹²⁵ Brett Knowles, *The History of a New Zealand Pentecostal Movement*. Lewiston, Edwin Mellen Press, 2000, p.274.

¹²⁶ Brett Knowles, *op.cit.* p.289.

The Ecumenical Movement

The Ecumenism of the twentieth century is a different kind of phenomenon from the revival movements discussed above.¹²⁷ However it is worth noting that some of the great founding leaders, people like John R. Mott, J.H. Oldham, and William Paton were lay, not clerics¹²⁸. With the setting up of the Department of the Laity in 1947 and the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey under Hendrik Kraemer (also a layman) great new impetus was given to the development of a theology of the laity. Over the years however this emphasis was diluted and the Department of the Laity dissolved. One document has confessed, "When we gather in ecumenical meetings the preponderance of laity no longer is evident. Clergy are often the representatives in ecumenical gatherings, regardless of the ecclesiological self-understandings of particular churches. In fact, in these contexts we sometimes talk about laity as objects to be trained, rather than people in partnership."¹²⁹ The focus of interest in ecumenical discussions drifted back to clerical concerns – especially about who could do what, and be recognised by whom. Discussing earlier church union negotiations, Bryan Wilson commented that, "Those concerned with ecumenism are especially preoccupied with priestly functions, ecclesiastical hierarchy and validity of ordinations."¹³⁰

The Pattern and the Problem

What has been suggested in this introduction is that early Christianity and every succeeding attempt to renew its vision and mission could be described as "movements" as distinct from "institutions". Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch observe that such

¹²⁷ As Wilson says, "Ecumenism... is not in itself a revival of religion... It is the turning in on itself of institutionalised religion, as its hold on the wider social order has diminished." (Bryan R. Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, London, C.A. Watts, 1966, pp.175-6.)

¹²⁸ Stephen Neill, *Men of Unity*. London, SCM, 1960.

¹²⁹ World Council of Churches, "Towards a Common Understanding of the Theological Concepts of Laity/Laos: The People of God." Consultation Statement, May 7-10, 1997. <http://www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/education/statemnt.html>.

¹³⁰ Bryan Wilson, *op.cit.*, p.167.

movements generally have a non-traditional or non-ordained leadership. Renewal movements are often lead by people with no recognized leadership status in pre-existing structures. Charismatic and not institutional power is the key... They are nonelitist...¹³¹

However, any human society needs some form of order to avoid falling into either anarchy or tyranny. A society called into being around some founding vision requires some means of maintaining what in the church is described as “apostolicity” – an authenticity derived from faithfulness to that founding vision. This brief overview of the history of the Church in terms of clericalisation suggests that some degree of institutionalisation of that order and leadership will always take place. It does not necessarily show that having a designated leadership or pastoral role inevitably leads to clericalism of an undesirable or abusive character but it does suggest that there is an almost inevitable sociological tendency for a clerical class to form even when the ecclesial body wants to avoid that development.

Beneath the presenting issues of function and status, of roles and ontological character, therefore, other realities may be discerned. One of these is sociological, as Yves Congar suggested. In Wilson’s words,

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.¹³²

Twentieth century sociologists of religion have been especially interested in the description and analysis of sectarian groups descended

¹³¹ Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch, *The Shaping of Things to Come*. Peabody MASS, Hendrikson, 2003, p.205.

¹³² Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, p.136.

from the Protestant “Radical Reformation”¹³³. Despite their diversity, some common distinguishing characteristics of such sects have been noted, such as voluntary membership, entrance qualifications, exclusiveness, a self-conception of being an “elect”, the ideals of personal perfection and of the priesthood of all believers, a high level of lay participation, opportunity for members to spontaneously express their commitment, and a hostility or indifference to secular society and/or the state.¹³⁴ “Sects” have been distinguished from “the Church” where some vestigial form of the Theodosian polity remains, and from the “churches” as denominations where there is religious plurality. Some sects have “denominationalised” as they have institutionalised and others have maintained an enduring sectarian character. We have seen that most sectarian and denominational groups in the end have evolved some clerical group or leadership, whether formally or informally, even though this development is in tension with the sectarian emphasis on equality and undifferentiated ministry.

However, we have traced these clericalising developments throughout Church history, not merely since the Reformation, or within the era of “secularisation” when these sociological processes, if not “laws”, have been discerned. And although non-Christian religions lie outside the scope of this work, it is obvious that spiritual hierarchies have emerged there too, even when they are not of the essence of the particular faith. While Islam for example knows no clerical class,¹³⁵ it is commonplace to refer to Muslim clerics, Mullahs, Imams, Ayatollahs, Grand Muftis and other dignitaries, and not merely in the Western press. However it is beyond my purpose to explore the nature of movements

¹³³ For example: Ernest Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (Translated O. Wyon), 1931; J.M. Yinger, *Religion, Society and the Individual*, 1957; H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*, 1929; Benton Johnson, “On Church and Sect”, *American Sociological Review*, 28, (August 1963); T.F. O’Dea, *The Sociology of Religion*, 1966; Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, 1967; Roland Robertson, *The Sociological Interpretation of Religion*, 1969.

¹³⁴ Bryan Wilson, *ibid.*, p.23.

¹³⁵ “There are no clergy in Islam.” (Ahmed Zaoui, “Clash of Civilisations: Myth or Reality?” Paper read at the University of Auckland, 19th October, 2004, p.5.)

and sects in non-Christian religions. Suffice to say that the tendency towards clericalisation appears to be universal.

It may be argued, as David Martin does, that “theological discussion... must generally take on a high-flown and self-deluding linguistic camouflage...” and that therefore “sociological perspectives are not a marginal luxury but an essential.”¹³⁶ Nevertheless, it may not be necessary, in dealing with the general area of religious studies, to dispense entirely with theological categories. In Breuggemann’s schema, the alternative, prophetic community of Moses is set against the “royal consciousness” of the Egyptian Empire. The establishment of the Solomonic Empire, within 250 years of the Exodus from Egypt, represented a rejection of the free association of Israelites and a return to the structures of Empire.¹³⁷ In the same way, the process of institutionalisation and clericalisation in the church can be seen as a successful reconquest of the new community by the old structures of domination and power.

Faced with the reality of this context, the really central questions, to be faced afresh in every generation of the ecclesia, are those posed by Ken Booth in a 1999 paper.

The first question is:

How is apostolic leadership to be given structural form in the church?

And the second question is:

How can we overcome the tendency to clericalisation in the church?.¹³⁸

The first of those questions occupies the major part of this thesis. In particular, I attempt to show how the development of The Salvation Army illustrates the process of the development of apostolic leadership, and how it corresponds to the pattern suggested in this introductory essay. In many respects, though not in all, The Salvation Army

¹³⁶ David Martin, *A Sociology of English Religion*. London, SCM, 1967, p.12.

¹³⁷ Walter Breuggemann, *Prophetic Imagination*, p.23.

¹³⁸ Ken Booth, “Something about Ordination”. Paper read at a seminar arranged by the Ministry and Training Division of the Christchurch Diocese, held at Bishop Julius Hall, 31st July, 1999. Paper in possession of the writer. (Rev. Dr. Ken Booth is Principal of College House, Christchurch.)

exemplifies sectarian development. The polarities present in the early church and throughout its subsequent history, such as those between the charismatic and the institutional, the prophetic and the priestly, the functional and the sacerdotal, informal and formal, dispersed and centralised authority, even non-stipendiary and stipendiary, are all present and played out in the pages which follow.

Ken Booth's second question is touched on in the conclusion.

PART ONE

THE FIRST CENTURY

CHAPTER TWO

BOOTH LED BOLDLY

Booth led boldly with his big bass drum.

(Are you washed in the Blood of the Lamb?)

The saints smiled gravely, and they said, 'He's come!'

(Are you washed in the Blood of the Lamb?)

Walking lepers followed, rank on rank,

Lurching bravos from the ditches dank;

Drabs from the alleyways, and drug fiends pale –

Minds still passion-ridden, soul powers frail!

Vermin eaten saints with mouldy breath,

Unwashed legions with the ways of death –

(Are you washed in the Blood of the Lamb?)

*from General William Booth Enters into Heaven,
Vachel Lindsay, 1913*

Of Sects and Sectarrians

Booth did lead boldly, as Vachel Lindsay's poem declaims. Without him, Rider Haggard wrote in 1910, "the Salvation Army would not exist today, for it sprang from his brain like Minerva from the head of Jove, and has been driven to success by his single, forceful will."¹³⁹ In fact, like Abraham, the bold leader was not always sure where he was going, and like Columbus, sometimes not sure where he had arrived when he got there. In a letter to *The Revival* dated 17th August 1865, reporting on his East End activities, Booth informed readers that, "We have no very definite plans. We shall be guided by the Holy Spirit..."¹⁴⁰

So, whence were they guided? What did they become? A question germane to the theme of this thesis is whether the Salvation Army is, or was intended to be, a Church in the denominational sense. Traditionally the leadership of the church has been in the hands of an ordained clerical class. However, if the Army was not to be a church, its leaders could hardly be clergy. Such categories were not so much even repudiated by most early Salvationists – rather, unsuspected or ignored as irrelevant.

It was not the Booths' intention that the Salvation Army should become a church. In fact, Booth said, "From the first, I was strongly opposed to forming any separate organisation..."¹⁴¹ Once he had, however unwillingly, an organisation on his hands, Booth still denied that it was a church or sect. "We are not and will not be made a Church. There are plenty for anyone who wishes to join them, to vote and to rest."¹⁴² Thus he dismissed churches as characterised by democracy and a passive laity, neither of which he intended would have a place in his Army. (Hindsight might suggest that, contrary to Booth's vision, a

¹³⁹ H. Rider Haggard, *Regeneration*, London, Longmans Green, 1910, p.212. Interestingly, this classical allusion had been expressly repudiated by Maud Booth, Booth's daughter-in-law, as attributing a misleading intentionality to the Army's development. (*Beneath Two Flags*, New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1889, p.23.)

¹⁴⁰ Robert Sandall, *The History of The Salvation Army*, London, Nelson, 1947, 1, p.42.

¹⁴¹ Introduction to George Scott Railton's *Twenty-one Years Salvation Army*, London, 1886, p.22.

¹⁴² *Orders and Regulations for The Salvation Army*, London, 1878, p.4.

passive laity would be more likely to evolve in the absence of democracy?) In an article in *The Contemporary Review* in August 1882, Booth expressed his hope that the Army would never grow into a sect. He felt that Wesley had been wrong to permit Methodism to become another denomination.¹⁴³ This was unfair to Wesley, who unlike Booth had permitted no such thing. Booth's armour-bearer, George Scott Railton, inveighed against sectarianism in *Heathen England*.

Shall we ever sink into a sectarian spirit of selfish care about our own, and cease to spend all our strength for the good of others?" Answering the hypothetical objection, "But this is making a new denomination – a new sect," he responded, "Well, and supposing that it is. Is there any harm in doing so? Is there not a need for just such a 'sect' in many cities?... But we deny that we are in any proper sense a sect... We are a corps of volunteers for Christ, organised as perfectly as we have been able to accomplish, seeking no Church status, avoiding as we would the plague every denominational rut, in order perpetually to reach more and more of those who lie outside every Church boundary."¹⁴⁴

When interviewed by Sir Henry Lunn in 1895 on the Salvation Army position on the sacraments, Booth claimed, perhaps a little disingenuously, that "we came into this position originally by determining not to be a church. We did not wish to undertake the administration of the sacraments and thereby bring ourselves into collision with existing

¹⁴³ Quoted by Norman Murdoch, *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, March 1986, p.40.

¹⁴⁴ George Scott Railton, *Heathen England*, London, 2nd edn., 1878, pp.143-144. Railton, the brilliant eccentric and cosmopolitan who in 1872 became the Mission's Secretary and Booth's "lieutenant-general" for a few years, was probably the most radical and intellectual of Booth's early confederates. Supplanted in the key role of second in command within a few years by Bramwell Booth, Railton remained a lifetime loyal follower. Booth's first "Commissioner", he was a vigorous apologist and pamphleteer, itinerant evangelist, trouble-shooter and pioneer leader of the Army's work in many countries. Embracing Franciscan poverty, he was a purist as far as the mission was concerned and constituted a one-man loyal opposition to the Army's growing involvement in social work, business and fund-raising enterprises. His most notorious intervention was to appear in sackcloth and ashes on the platform of a great meeting to launch the Army's life-assurance business in 1894, denouncing the whole operation. (Bernard Watson, *Soldier Saint*, London, Hodder, 1970, p.128.) Loved and despaired of in turn by the Booths, he died in harness in 1913 still campaigning, alone on a Cologne railway station.

churches.”¹⁴⁵ Begbie also quotes Randall Davidson, later Archbishop of Canterbury, as saying of Booth (*a propos* negotiations between The Salvation Army and the Anglican Church in the early 1880’s), “He certainly gave me to understand, and very emphatically, that he did not seek to establish a new sect.”¹⁴⁶

These examples suggest that by “sect”, Booth meant what we would describe as a denomination – the sociologists had not yet taken responsibility for the term. However, his use of the word suggests a pejorative sense, implying more than the mere nonconformity that was its conventional application. The fissiparous history of Methodism in the century following Wesley’s death and the disputatiousness of the sectaries offended the Booths, not primarily because of the loss of unity and charity but because they meant distraction from the work of saving the lost. “The chief sorrow to me in connection with the sects of the past, had ever been their divisions on the subject of practical Godliness and immediate results... I constantly put from me the thought of attempting the formation of such a people.”¹⁴⁷

In 1907, distance no doubt lending some roseate hue to the memory of attendance at “Sunday School at the formal and unfriendly St Stephen’s church”,¹⁴⁸ he explained that “my early association with the Church of England prevented my entire acceptance of some of the Nonconformist views of denominationalism, and gave me, perhaps, a more liberal feeling towards the work of all good men.”¹⁴⁹

That the Army was not a church was the official position throughout the early years and well beyond. In a catechism-like pamphlet explaining the Army in the United States, one question asked, “Will not

¹⁴⁵ Harold Begbie, *Life of William Booth*, London, Macmillan, 1920, I, pp.468-9. This glossed over the fact that The Christian Mission, and the Salvation Army until 1883, had in fact practised the sacraments.

¹⁴⁶ Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.29.

¹⁴⁷ G.S. Railton, *Heathens England*, p.22.

¹⁴⁸ Roy Hattersley, *Blood and Fire*, London, Little, Brown and Co., 1999, p.16.

¹⁴⁹ William Booth, Forward to Hulda Friederichs, *The Romance of The Salvation Army*, London, Cassell, 1907, pp.2-3.

this movement result in the making of a new sect?" The answer: "Not in the sense in which a new sect is usually understood. It is not a Church, after the fashion of Churches, but an Army, that is aimed at – this is a force as real, as self-sacrificing, and as much under control for soul-saving purposes as the ordinary military armies are for slaughter and destruction. There is at present nothing after this model in existence; and if it be desirable and Scriptural, it does not matter much what it is called."¹⁵⁰ Maud Booth wrote, "There are sects and denominations enough. This is an Army, a band of aggressive men and women, whose work of saving and reclaiming the world must be done on entirely new lines..."¹⁵¹

The recollections of the Rev. F.S. Webster suggest that some recruits may still have had the impression at a comparatively late date that The Salvation Army was intended to be only a kind of para-church organisation. Webster describes how in about 1877 or 1878, Wilson Carlile showed him his "soldier's certificate", "explaining that it was an Army and not a Church, that people could be banded together for the purposes of evangelization and soul-winning, as they were in connection with the Moody and Sankey missions, and yet remain, for the purposes of worship and edification, in connection with their own churches." Carlile's understanding of the situation would seem to have been anachronistic for as late as 1878. However, it is possible that he had received this impression from Booth's claims that the Army was not a "church". Webster also expressed his regret that, "Unfortunately – and, I think, most unwisely – General Booth deemed it necessary to make his Army into an independent Church."¹⁵² (Webster and Carlile went on to found the Church Army.)

¹⁵⁰ Frank Smith, *All About the Salvation Army*, New York, 1885, p.20.

¹⁵¹ Maud B. Booth, *Two Flags*, p.271.

¹⁵² F.S. Webster in *The Life of General Booth* (a collection of tributes, no editor or compiler named), London, Nelson, (undated but after Booth's death in 1912), pp.153-4, 168.

However, another even later witness to the Army's ambiguous ecclesiastical status was Brigadier Susan Swift, notable early American officer and close associate of the Booth family. Swift resigned in 1897 to become a Dominican nun as Sister Teresa M. Imelda. Writing in that year about her second conversion, Swift looked back to her introduction to the Army in Glasgow in 1884. "The Army taught in those days that it was 'not a church but a mission' and placed no obstacle in the way of my receiving the 'sacraments' of my own or any other denomination."¹⁵³ An editorial in *The Field Officer* for July 1901 (p.282) stated that "A Corps is neither a Church nor a Mission" – a negative version of having it both ways. As late as the 1950's, General Albert Orsborn still denied emphatically that the Salvation Army was a "church", preferring to describe it as "a permanent mission to the unconverted".¹⁵⁴

In some European countries, where membership of the State Church was a corollary of citizenship, the fiction that the Army was not a church was also maintained. Swiss Salvationist Victor Kunz, writing in 1947, stated that "the S.A. itself does not desire to be a church" and described himself as "a local officer of the Salvation Army and a convinced member of the Evangelical Swiss Church. All members of The Salvation Army, including Officers, without exception pay the Church tax..."¹⁵⁵

One of the ironies of Booth's history is that although he was determined that the Army would never become a sect, it did of course become just that. Cardinal Manning, noting Booth's protests on this point and giving Booth credit for his intention, commented that the Army did not

¹⁵³ Susan Swift, *The Conversion of Susan Swift*, 1897 p.5, quoted by Norman Murdoch in his unpublished draft monograph, "Suzie Forest Swift (1862-1916), From Sisterhood to Sisterhood, Vassar to Salvation Army to Roman Catholic Dominican", 2003, p.17.

¹⁵⁴ *The Officer*, March-April 1954, p74. Orsborn was General 1946-54.

¹⁵⁵ Victor Kunz, "The Salvation Army – Its Origin, Spirit, Work", Switzerland, 1947. Translated typescript in Heritage Centre, London. Some individuals have always managed to maintain a dual allegiance. Lois Bishop, an Envoy in the Salvation Army, married a Presbyterian minister, John Hyslop, and served many years with him as a missionary. In retirement, in Levin, he became a Salvation Army soldier. Her funeral notice in the *Dominion Post* of 2nd February 2004 described her as "Faithful and loyal soldier of The Salvation Army and committed Servant of the Presbyterian Church."

have much choice – “Nevertheless we have a conviction that the Salvation Army will either become a sect or it will melt away. This world is not the abode of disembodied spirits.”¹⁵⁶ 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.”¹⁵⁷

In fact the Army founders were willing to think in terms of denomination when it suited their practical needs. Even in 1870 the Christian Mission had a rule that “Persons belonging to *other Churches* (my italics) seeking membership with us shall be admitted on presentation of their note of transfer if such can be obtained,”¹⁵⁸ which implies that the Mission already saw itself in a sectarian light. The Salvation Army soon began to claim denominational status when legal considerations suggested advantages. For example, “The Salvation Army in Australia, presumably with the Founder’s blessing, claimed legal status as a church as early as 1884.”¹⁵⁹ Gordon Moyles notes that from 1892 Canadian Salvation Army officers could officiate at marriages, prior to which year the vows were administered by a clergyman of another denomination.¹⁶⁰

And subsequently the Army’s writings often betrayed the unconscious assumption or made explicit claim that it was to be regarded as a “church”. For example, Lieut.-Colonel Thornsten Kjall of Sweden, contrary to Victor Kunz’s opinion quoted above, though living in a country where such state religious taxes were also payable, rejected the notion that the Army was simply an order within the Swedish State Church. He quoted the “law of religious freedom” in that country to the effect that “With denomination of faith is understood, in addition to the Swedish

¹⁵⁶ Cardinal Manning in *The Contemporary Review*, quoted Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.31-32.

¹⁵⁷ Ronald Knox, *Enthusiasm*, p.403.

¹⁵⁸ Minutes of the Christian Mission Conference, 1870, V:17., Heritage Centre, London.

¹⁵⁹ Captain Thomas Hubbard, *The Officer*, November, 1978, pp.516-7. Hubbard cites, “*Regina v Darling* (1884) 5 NSW 405. Martin, CJ, found in favour of the Army’s position, Fawcett and Innes, JJ, concurring.”

¹⁶⁰ R. Gordon Moyles, *Blood and Fire in Canada: The History of the Salvation Army in the Dominion 1882-1976*, Toronto, Peter Martin Associates, 1977, p.289.

State Church, fellowship for religious work which includes the custom to arrange divine services.”¹⁶¹

Since Booth's day, the term sect has received attention from sociologists as well as theologians, with less derogatory overtones, and some Salvationist writers have taken note. In *The Officer* Tor Wahlstrom summarised the work of Ernst Troeltsch in his 1931 *The Social Teaching of Christian Churches*, the Swede E.H. Thornberg in his 1937 monograph on *Frlsningarmen*, Joachim Wach in his *Sociology of Religion*, and H. Richard Niebuhr in *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*. All treat a sect, including the Army, wrote Wahlstrom, as “a religious body which stresses the need for personal decision, conscious faith, voluntary adhesion to the community of believers, the acceptance of the high ethical standards and several other kindred requirements. All this stands in contrast to what sociology means by the term *church* – an organisation into which you are born and of which you are accepted as a full member in infant baptism; an organisation which is thus inclusive and tolerant rather than one which makes certain standards of living, faith and moral conduct conditions of membership.”¹⁶²

Roland Robertson, struck by the persistence of what he perceived as the Salvation Army's sectarian characteristics long after it might have been expected to evolve into a denomination or church in the sense used above, dubbed the Army an “established sect”.¹⁶³ Major Bruce Power

¹⁶¹ Thornsten Kjall, *The Officer*, January 1977, pp.3-5, 11.

¹⁶² *The Officer*, November 1974, pp.490-491.

¹⁶³ Roland Robertson, “The Salvation Army: The Persistence of Sectarianism”, in Bryan R. Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, London, Heinemann, 1967, pp.49-105. Also in Robertson, *The Sociological Interpretation of Religion*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1970 p.127. Michael Hill, following Bryan Wilson's analysis, describes the Salvation Army as a “conversionist sect” on the grounds of its “fundamentalism”. (“The Sectarian Contribution”, in *Religion in New Zealand Society*, Ed. Brian Colless and Peter Donovan, Palmerston North, The Dunmore Press, 2nd ed. 1985, pp.121-122.) In fact, The Salvation Army predates Fundamentalism as a late 19th and 20th century phenomenon of American origin. Though it is true that the Army's doctrines and early teaching on the Bible were conservative, Booth was not a fundamentalist or literalist. (See articles by William Booth in *The War Cry*, May 30th 1885 on the Revised Version of the Bible, and others reprinted in *The Founder Speaks Again*, London 1960, and in A.G. Cunningham, *The Bible: Its Divine Revelation, Inspiration and Authority*, London, 1961, pp.9-16. Booth was open to the possibility of errors in translation and copying, and to “treating parables

noted that the Army had “made a sharp distinction between theological and sociological usage of the term church. “While we have been comfortable applying the term to ourselves theologically, we have avoided such a sociological designation.” Power proposes a model enabling the Army to comprise both church and sect by linking the two types of response together under the umbrella of “authority”, the “power structures” of the Army. Essentially he is proposing a “broad church” Army, and seeks sanction for this approach in Booth’s claim that the movement could find many expressions of the same Salvationist principles.¹⁶⁴

This view is supported by a recent study by Andrew Mark Eason who discusses the Army in terms of the 1960’s model by Benton Johnson: “A church is a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists [whereas a] sect is a religious group that rejects the environment in which it exists. ”He shows that the Army does in fact illustrate a “mixed type”, exhibiting characteristics of both church and sect. Eason argues that categorising the Army solely as a sect is the result of allowing sociological theory to take precedence over a close historical examination of all the evidence, ruling out in advance “the possibility that the early Salvation Army may have been both sectarian *and* churchly.”¹⁶⁵ The adoption of military terminology and structure was not only indicative of “accommodation to the world”, given that militarism was fashionable at the time, but had implications for the role of the officer class which assumed a clerical status.

as facts and facts as parables,” holding that “the value of its teaching is not affected either way.” While the Bible “stands alone, not one among other such scriptures... it contains the fullest and clearest but not the only light [God] has given to men.” Such views would not pass muster with fundamentalists.) A rare acknowledgement of the Army’s internal tension on this subject is found in Christine Parkin, “A Wesleyan Theological Legacy in the Homeland of Wesleyan Revival”, (*Word and Deed*, May 2004, pp.44-5.) Parkin quotes research suggesting that “Salvationists in the United Kingdom take a more literalist interpretation of the Bible than many of those in other Christian denominations. This is interesting, not least because a number of distinctive Salvation Army attitudes rely on a more contextual approach to Scripture, such as our attitude to the ministry of women and to the sacraments.”

¹⁶⁴ Bruce Power, in *Word and Deed*, November 1999, pp.17-33.

¹⁶⁵ Andrew Mark Eason, in *Word and Deed*, May 2003, pp.3-27.

As we shall illustrate, the “mixed type” identity is the result of tension between the Army’s sectarian theology and its hierarchical ecclesiology. Bryan Wilson categorises sects as, amongst other things, “normally lay movements, which practice their religion without an established professional ministry...committed to a concept of the priesthood of all believers” and which tend “to deny any sort of division of religious labour.” He goes on to say that “leadership roles are frequently important features of sect organisation, at the informal level, if not at the level of formal sect structure.”¹⁶⁶ In the Salvation Army however leadership roles were the essence of its formal structure.

In Shaw Clifton’s words, “In most countries where it worked, the Army carried the uncertainty and ambivalence of being seen sometimes as a religious organisation, sometimes as a charitable body, sometimes as a mission and sometimes as all or a combination of various of these things. The Army’s perceptions of its own status were not always exact. It could refer to itself as a church, as part of the body of Christ, or merely as a movement or an organisation, terms vague enough to incorporate any other more precise concepts as need dictated.”¹⁶⁷

Whatever its ambiguity about terminology, the Army did become a church, or denomination, in the sense that its local congregations bore a resemblance to those of other non-conformist denominations, and its members did come to think of their leaders as the equivalent of clergy. The remainder of this chapter traces why and how this began to happen.

Formative influences

We start with the influences that chiefly shaped the Booths,¹⁶⁸ religious outlook, considering particularly their view of the roles of clergy and laity. These influences were firstly Wesleyan and secondly

¹⁶⁶ Bryan R. Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*. pp.180, 183.

¹⁶⁷ Shaw Clifton, “The Salvation Army’s Actions and Attitudes in War Time 1899-1945”, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, King’s College, London, 1989, p.548.

¹⁶⁸ Plural, William and Catherine, since Salvation Army letterhead finally, at the end of the 20th century, acknowledged Catherine’s role as “co-founder”.

“revivalist”. Murdoch’s summary is that Booth “worked American revivalism and Methodist polity and discipline into an ideology which became The Salvation Army a marriage of freedom and conformity.”¹⁶⁹

Wesley and Methodism

Converted in the Methodist church at the age of 15, Booth claimed in a speech on his 60th birthday that he “literally worshipped Methodism. To me there was one God and John Wesley was his prophet.”¹⁷⁰ Wesley’s example inspired Booth’s evangelical zeal. Like Wesley, Booth took to the fields and the streets (and circuses, skating rinks and theatres) when the churches were closed to him. Like Wesley’s, Booth’s followers tended to be of the lower classes and they suffered similar persecution from mobs and vested interests. Wesley’s Arminian faith and his teaching on “Christian perfection” or “holiness” were Booth’s creed as well. As John Rhemick’s careful study shows, the doctrines and conference polity of the Christian Mission were entirely Methodist.¹⁷¹ The Salvation Army retained most of the doctrines but not the Conference.

Methodism carried forward into its church phase the ecclesiological ambiguities of its para-church ethos. Colonel Earl Robinson notes that “Our lack of precision in responding (to the question of to what extent is The Salvation Army an ecclesia) may be considered to be part of our Wesleyan heritage.” He quotes David Smith’s suggestion in *A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology* that Wesley did not think of his followers as being incorporated into a separate church, but rather forming a group of societies within the Anglican church, an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*. Robinson writes that the “same ambiguity existed

¹⁶⁹ Norman H. Murdoch, “Wesleyan Influence on William and Catherine Booth”, *Wesleyan Theological Journal*, Vol. 20 No. 2, Fall 1985, pp.97-103.

¹⁷⁰ St. John Ervine, *God’s Soldier, General William Booth*. London, Heinemann 1936, II, p.735.

¹⁷¹ John R. Rhemick, *A New People of God: A Study in Salvationism*, Des Plaines, Illinois, 1993.

in the early days of The Salvation Army, and to some extent exists still.”¹⁷²

As the quintessential pragmatist, Booth inherited Methodism’s ambiguities. The “off again, on again” Methodist approach to ordination suggests that he may not have derived from Methodism any really strong convictions on the subject. His account of his own ordination, in a letter, was fairly perfunctory. “The service was an interesting one,” he noted. He was particular, however, to ensure that, faced by a bevy of ex-Presidents of Conference about to lay hands upon him, he was nearest “some of those in whose piety and devotion he thoroughly believed”, to “reap whatever advantage might accrue from their faith and prayers, while there were others whom he studiously avoided...”¹⁷³ Whatever significance the service held for Booth, he clearly did not accept the view that the character of the ordainer was immaterial to the validity of the sacrament.

Whatever uncertainties Booth entertained on the ordination of clergy, he shared Wesley’s conviction that the laity were called to an active role in ministry. They were not merely pew fodder or spectators at religious ceremonies. The great strength of Methodism lay in the “classes” which were lay-led, and in the training and appointment of lay preachers. The Christian Mission, and in its turn The Salvation Army, also pressed every available man (and woman) into service.

William Booth wrote that one of the “principles with which I believe my heart was inspired in the earliest days of my spiritual life”, was “our employment of the people – out of which has grown our varied classes of officers, opportunities for testimony, and the open door and continued encouragement to every man, and every woman, and every child, to use and exercise whatever gifts they may have received from God for assisting Him in subduing and winning this rebellious world to Himself.”¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² Earl Robinson, “The Salvation Army – *Ecclesia?*”, in *Word and Deed*, Vol. 2 No. 1, November 1999.

¹⁷³ Frederick Booth-Tucker, *The Life of Mrs Booth*, London, 1992, 1, pp.221-2.

¹⁷⁴ G.S. Railton, *Heathen England*, p.23.

Catherine Booth's vigorous claim was, "Yes, thank God, we are teaching the Churches that others besides clergymen, ministers, deacons and elders can be used for the salvation of men. The multitudes have too long been left to these. As a clergyman said to me the other day, 'There are 35,000 souls in my parish, what can one do?' What indeed! Set the carpenters and the washerwomen on to them, saved and filled with the Spirit!"¹⁷⁵

The Booths, then, wholeheartedly adopted the Wesleyan model of lay ministry. That was however only half the story. Wesley, for all his fostering of lay ministry, was less willing to share the government of the church with the laity. Booth, like Wesley, was an autocrat by temperament and conviction. Ervine puts the similarity strongly: "When Wesley, in his old age, surveyed his society and appraised his preachers, he realized that the whole organization was his, as the whole Salvation Army, more than a century after Wesley's death, was to be William Booth's: a foundation largely, if not entirely, the personal possession of its founder."¹⁷⁶

As we have seen, continuing power struggles between Methodist clergy and laity led to further schisms. William and Catherine had some brief involvement with the [Methodist Reform Movement](#). In that case, the pendulum had swung too far towards anti-clericalism for the Booths' taste, as Catherine explained in a letter. "The discipline of the Reform Society was very unsatisfactory to us both, in denying the minister his proper authority they went over to regard him as nothing, denying him every shadow of authority, and only allowing him to preside at their meetings when elected for the purpose, and speaking of him in public and in private as their 'hired' preacher..."¹⁷⁷ Ervine summed up Booth's attitude on the question of authority: "... his instincts were conservative, but he also had a natural hatred of committees and interfering laymen

¹⁷⁵ Catherine Booth, *The Salvation Army in Relation to Church & State*. London, 1889, p.75.

¹⁷⁶ St. John Ervine, *God's Soldier*, I, p.178.

¹⁷⁷ Harold Begbie, *Booth*, I, p.138.

and a deep belief in the authority of the minister.”¹⁷⁸ The shadow of the coming Army may be discerned in which the foot soldiers would certainly share the fighting but the officers would issue the orders.

In sum, then, the 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. As far as the theme of this thesis is concerned, 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.

American Revivalism

The other main influence on the Booths was the American Revivalist movement itself the child of Methodism. This tended to be non-sectarian (what we would today call non-denominational) and lay led and controlled. One of the best known 19th century evangelists, Dwight L. Moody, chose not to be ordained, even although he had in the course of his ministry, established and led more than one church congregation.¹⁷⁹ The influence of Charles Finney, James Caughey and Phoebe Palmer in particular, the latter two themselves children of Wesleyanism, helped shape the Booths' style of evangelism. All three visited Britain and Finney's books in due course became textbooks for Salvation Army officer-trainees.

Caughey's British campaign from 1841 to 1846, organised largely without reference to the official structures of the church, led to a vigorous controversy within Methodism about revivalism and lay authority.¹⁸⁰ As a fledgling teenage preacher, Booth was impressed by Caughey's "straightforward conversational way of putting the truth, and the common-sense method of pushing people up to decision, and the corresponding

¹⁷⁸ St. John Ervine, *God's Soldier*, I, p.80.

¹⁷⁹ J.C. Pollock, *Moody Without Sankey*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1963, pp.58-59.

¹⁸⁰ Norman Murdoch, *The Origins of The Salvation Army*, Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1994. p.11.

results that followed”¹⁸¹ Caughey later gave the Booths counsel on a visit in 1858 when they stood at a crossroads in their career - and also baptised their son Ballington. It is interesting that Caughey, while sympathising with Booth’s frustration at the reluctance of the New Connexion to give him liberty to work as an itinerant evangelist under their aegis, nevertheless urged caution. William should wait until he was ordained before leaving so as to resign “from a position of strength” as a fully accredited and recognised minister.¹⁸² There were mixed messages there about the clerical-lay relationship and the significance of ordination. Phoebe Palmer and her husband, both lay, evangelised together, but Mrs Palmer was the preacher and Dr Palmer’s was a support role. Catherine Booth took up cudgels in 1859 in defence of Phoebe Palmer’s right, as a woman, to preach. This led towards Catherine’s own destiny as an advocate and exemplar of female ministry and so to The Salvation Army’s precept of the equality of the sexes in ministry.¹⁸³

The non-sectarian character of the revivalists’ missions was important for the Booths. It must have seemed to them that most really effective evangelical work was happening outside the official church structures, while churches tended to be self-absorbed and complacent. Certainly the official bodies strongly rejected the revivalist movement of the late 1850’s.¹⁸⁴ Describing their freelance work in the early 1860’s, when the various Methodist Conferences had closed chapels against them on the ground that evangelistic movements were “unfavourable to church order”, Booth recalled that, “undenominational work was just then coming into fashion. The theory was, save the people outside the

¹⁸¹ G.S. Railton, *Twenty-one Years*, p.8.

¹⁸² Roy Hattersley, *Blood & Fire*, London, Little, Brown, 1999, pp.95-6.

¹⁸³ See Chapter 8.

¹⁸⁴ Robert Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.13-17. It should be remembered however that some Anglican and non-conformist clergy supported the revivalist movement. Bishop Handley Moule later paid tribute to its influence on his life. (J. Edwin Orr, *The Second Evangelical Awakening*. London, Marshall Morgan and Scott, 1955, pp.70-71).

churches and then send them to the churches to be trained and cared for.”¹⁸⁵

The “Hallelujah Band”, a kind of prototype Salvation Army exercise in the Midlands, was a short-lived English lay-movement in 1862-3. Through Booth’s influence perhaps it could also be described as a child of American revivalism. Converts, especially those with colourful reputation as formerly notorious sinners or people of note amongst the working class – pugilists, former poachers and jailbirds who could draw a crowd to a salvation “freak show” – were set up as the preachers and open-air rallies were held. They attracted thousands of people “Many of the most notorious characters in the district were converted”.¹⁸⁶ The exact relationship of the Booths to the Bands has been questioned. Booth’s recollection in *Twenty-One Years* gives the impression that he originated this movement – “I devised a special kind of meeting, out of which grew a remarkable movement which went afterwards by the name of ‘The Hallelujah Band’.”¹⁸⁷ Hattersley credits Booth with inventing the name.¹⁸⁸ Booth’s presidential address to the 1877 Christian Mission Conference claimed that “with the origin of this movement I had something to do. ”He described how he had got together a “collection of people” for a Camp Meeting at Walsall. “Directly after this much the same set of brothers held meetings all through the Black Country... I never had the opportunity of taking part in it...”¹⁸⁹ Their Garibaldi-like red shirts may have inspired the Salvationist red guernsey, however.

At any rate the Hallelujah Band’s example not only confirmed Booth’s views on the mobilisation of the laity. Their longer-term fate also confirmed his predilection for authority. “In course of time,” he noted, “the

¹⁸⁵ William Booth, in G.S. Railton, *Twenty-one Years*, p.15. Booth’s “just then” was rather broad-brush: the London Missionary Society dated from 1795, the British and Foreign Bible Society from 1804, the Evangelical Alliance from 1846. No doubt Booth meant evangelising, para-church groups like his own.

¹⁸⁶ G.S. Railton, *ibid.*, pp.16-17.

¹⁸⁷ G.S. Railton, *ibid.*, p.16.

¹⁸⁸ Roy Hattersley, *Blood and Fire*. p142

¹⁸⁹ *The Christian Mission Magazine*, July 1877, p.182.

leaders disagreed. Divisions crept in. There being no acknowledged authority, all did pretty much what was right in their own eyes. The work gradually died out, or, at best, left only the monument of a few half-and-half Methodist societies behind.”¹⁹⁰

From the American revivalists, then, we see that Booth not only learned about evangelical methods and concluded that there was more freedom in their use outside the control of denominational structures, but also had confirmed his convictions both about the importance of lay-participation and about the need for strong government.

We conclude from our sampling of these influences and experiences that ecclesiastical tradition and authority were not of great significance to Booth. He took what he inherited, used what worked for him and discarded what did not. The key was the engagement of the laity – of all Christians. This, along with his own disinclination to accept anyone else’s authority, led him to work outside the existing denominational framework, and that led to his having to create an alternative framework, simply in order to organise what was happening and to secure its effectiveness and survival. We now come to trace the steps by which that was done.

Becoming a Sect

The period from 1865, when Booth began working in the East End of London, to 1878 when the Christian Mission became known as The Salvation Army, could be seen to encompass the transition from non-sectarian work to sect; in modern terms, from a parachurch agency to a church.

In a modern parachurch agency, working alongside the churches, the workers conventionally retain their membership of their original community of faith. Where the agency has some limited aim such as relief work, as with World Vision, that relationship can be maintained without difficulty. This is still the case, even where the agency’s sole or

¹⁹⁰ G.S. Railton, *Twenty-one Years*, p.16.

predominant purpose is evangelical, if it works with groups of churches and denominations rather than with individuals, as does for example the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association. Where the agency recruits individuals, however, and its main concern involves the holding of religious missions and services, the agency itself tends to become in practice a new and autonomous community of faith for its workers and their converts. It is not merely the vehicle for their work; it becomes the source of their own support and training, the locus of their fellowship and absorbing interest.¹⁹¹ This certainly happened with Methodism. This is also what happened with Booth's mission, whatever Booth's intention at first.

My first idea was simply to get people saved, and send them to the churches. This proved at the outset impracticable. 1st. They would not go when sent. 2nd. They were not wanted. And 3rd. We wanted some of them at least ourselves, to help us in the business of saving others. We were thus driven to providing for the converts ourselves.¹⁹²

Such provision marked the birth of a new faith community. The 1868 Report of the East London Christian Mission informed its readers "that this is an unsectarian mission. Our creed is the Bible, our work is to publish the gospel, and we welcome as co-workers all who hold the Word of God as the standard of faith and practice, and whose hearts are in sympathy with revival work."¹⁹³

We have seen that Booth's theology was Methodist. Murdoch also notes that the Mission's Articles of Faith followed point by point (with the notable omission of references to sacraments or ministry) those of the Evangelical Alliance, formed in 1846.¹⁹⁴ Their purpose was identical with

¹⁹¹ James Packer, a modern evangelical guru, makes the same point: "...these agencies of God's kingdom draw interest, prayer, enthusiasm, and money away from the wider-ranging, slower-moving, less glamorous realities of congregational life, so that the parachurch body comes to have pride of place in supporters' affections and in effect to be their church." (J.I. Packer: "A Stunted Ecclesiology? The Theory and Practice of Evangelical Churchliness." *Touchstone*, December, 2003. Posted on www.latimer.org.nz/morecomment.asp?ColD=13.) I remember forty years ago Salvation Army Commissioner A.J. Gilliard less charitably and more pungently described Youth for Christ as "religious parasites".

¹⁹² William Booth, in G.S. Railton, *Twenty-one Years*, p.22.

¹⁹³ Robert Sandall, *History*, 1, p.93.

¹⁹⁴ Norman Murdoch, *Origins*, p.66.

that of the Alliance – to provide a common platform on which people drawn from various denominational traditions could work together. Booth's articles, after 1873-76, were framed to exclude those of Calvinist persuasion (not to mention Roman Catholics or others in any case unlikely to throw in their lot with such a mission) but anyone of broadly Arminian provenance would feel comfortable in such an association.¹⁹⁵

History is usually a seamless garment and the transition from one stage to another with such an organisation is difficult to pin down. The Salvation Army has always regarded 1865 as its founding date – Railton published *Twenty-One Years Salvation Army* in 1886, even although the name was unheard of before 1877; the international Centenary Congress was held in 1965. (Not to miss any good opportunity for what early Salvationists called a “big go”, a second such event was held in 1978.) However the point at which the Mission became the de facto community of faith for its adherents probably came earlier rather than later, probably 1867, despite the “unsectarian” claim of the following year, as quoted above.

The steps on the way are well documented by Sandall. The Home Mission revival movement of the late 1850's spawned many small agencies and missions. One Reginald Radcliffe called a meeting in 1861 to try to co-ordinate their activities in London and the result was the formation of the East London Special Services Committee. Booth talked with representatives of this group in 1861 but it was not until 1865, after the Booths had moved to London for the sake of Catherine's speaking engagements (usually in West End establishments rather than the slums of the East End), that William became actively involved. This was initially

¹⁹⁵ See Norman Murdoch, “Evangelical Sources of Salvation Army Doctrine”, *The Evangelical Quarterly*, LIX: 3, July, 1987, pp.235ff. Amongst such early associates of Booth were, for example, at least twenty members of “The Christian Community”, which dated back to the late 17th century, originating from a group Huguenot refugees. Associated with Methodism in the late 18th century, the Community was expelled again en masse in 1849 for taking sides with the Methodist Reform movement. Some of these people became missionaries and Salvation Army officers in later years. (Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.24-5). “Arminianism” from Jacobus Arminius (1560-1609), who proposed more scope for self-determination of the “elect” than in classical Calvinist predestinationism. William Booth's brief flirtation with training for the Congregational ministry ended when he rejected Calvinism. (Begbie, *Booth*, I, p.142.)

quite fortuitous – he stopped to listen at an open-air meeting in Whitechapel and took the opportunity to say a few words. (Booth could seldom resist such an opportunity.) His first regular engagement with the Committee began in July 1865, with meetings held in a tent in a disused Quaker burial ground.

Pressed to continue his successful leadership of the “tent group”, Booth informed the *Revival* (in the same number in which he denied having any definite plans), that, “In order to carry on this work we propose to establish a Christian Revival Association in which we think a hundred persons will enrol themselves at once. We shall also require some central building in which to hold our more private meetings, and in which to preach the gospel when not engaged in special work elsewhere.” Nothing is plain sailing but after a year, there were 60 members.¹⁹⁶ It is not clear whether this meant 60 financial supporters or 60 active participants.

1867 seems to have been the *annus mirabilis* as far as establishment of a distinct body is concerned. Sandall describes it as “the turning point”. In that year The East London Christian Mission

- was named,
- acquired its first headquarters,
- hired a theatre for Sunday meetings and increased its number of “preaching stations” to six in the course of the year,
- began to hire workers (nine by the end of the year),
- established a system for processing converts (1st ensure a definite decision, 2nd give them instruction, 3rd train them and set them to work),
- printed its first document (combined Articles of Faith and Bond of Agreement, direct forbear of the “Soldier’s Covenant” or “Articles of War”¹⁹⁷ signed by Salvationists today),

¹⁹⁶ R. Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.42, 46-7.

¹⁹⁷ The term “Articles of War” was officially discontinued in 2004 on the grounds that in some countries it might be misunderstood.

- embarked on social relief for the hungry poor,
- organised its funds, issued its first financial statement and received a grant from the Evangelisation Society.

In October of the following year, its first publication, the *East London Evangelist*, appeared.

Sandall points to another significant development, a substantial change in membership. People left for various reasons, some because they didn't like the way things were going or the Booths' methods, and others because once the new mission was established they returned to their home churches which had loaned them. Booth set about building those who remained, and their converts, into a fighting force.¹⁹⁸ At the end of 1868 the Evangelisation Society made its last grant: the Mission was seen to have become a permanent, organised institution and therefore no longer within the scope of the Society's aid.¹⁹⁹ The East London Christian Mission, like Methodism before it, was on its way to becoming a sect.

Clergy in the Making

For the purposes of our study, out of the innovations of 1867, the hiring of staff probably marks the beginnings of the development of a full-time, paid ministry. Sandall again provides the information. The first paid helper, Mrs Eliza Collingridge, herself a convert, was described as a "Biblewoman", "who is most useful in visiting the distressed by day and assisting in religious meetings in the evening". She later became Superintendent of the Shoreditch circuit when expansion required such organisation and was therefore the first woman to hold office in the Christian Mission. Eliza Collingridge worked with Booth until her death in 1872. In tribute he wrote that she "understood and enjoyed real religion; understood soul-winning work; had skill in leading anxious souls by the nearest road to Christ; was an acceptable and useful preacher; in the

¹⁹⁸ R. Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.46-7.

¹⁹⁹ R. Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.115-6.

open-air would hold a crowd of the roughest East End men breathless; everywhere had souls for her hire and had only to go anywhere once to be wanted again.”²⁰⁰

In March 1867 the Evangelisation Society granted four pounds a week to the Mission for an evangelist's salary at Poplar. By 1868 the Revival recorded that “Twenty persons are wholly employed, assisted by a large band of devoted helpers. (In the *East London Evangelist* of February, William Booth stated “not a single official salary is paid,” evidently meaning “office staff” as distinct from the Mission field force.) One hundred and twenty services outdoors and in are held weekly, at which the gospel is preached on an average to 14,000 people.” (Booth himself was never paid by the Mission, nor later by The Salvation Army; some personal supporters saw to his maintenance.) Most of the “twenty persons” were presumably evangelists, though some were doubtless involved in relief work and one appears to have been responsible for a sewing class.²⁰¹ At first the various preaching posts or “stations” (Salvation Army officers are still described as “stationed” at their appointments today) were controlled centrally and evangelists rostered. James Dowdle was the first to be appointed to the charge of a particular centre, though in a voluntary capacity; he became a full-time, employed evangelist in 1873.²⁰² Fixed (though still very brief) appointments soon replaced itinerancy; by 1874 there were eight district superintendents.²⁰³ The same rules given for “Itinerant Preachers” as distinct from “Evangelists” in the 1870 Conference Minutes are applied to “Evangelists” in the Rules and Doctrines of the Christian Mission from the Minutes of the 1875 Conference.

²⁰⁰ R. Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.73, 86-7, 108.

²⁰¹ R. Sandall, *ibid.*, 1, pp.74, 99-100.

²⁰² R. Sandall, *ibid.*, 1, p.164.

²⁰³ Archivist Gordon Taylor notes that the early statistics are quite difficult to reconcile because of the lack of consistency in terminology. “At various times the available statistics refer to Districts, Stations and Circuits, Preachers and Exhorters, Evangelists and Workers, District Superintendents and helpers, with little explanation of the terminology.” (Gordon Taylor, Correspondence with writer, 2 March 2002.)

After some stagnation the Mission was entering a period of rapid expansion and thereafter was always “growing out of its clothes”, in Bramwell Booth’s phrase.²⁰⁴ In 1874 there were 10 “Districts”²⁰⁵ The 1875 Report lists 23 stations and their District Superintendents.²⁰⁶ The first issue of *The Salvationist* gives 30 stations and 36 evangelists for 1877²⁰⁷ and 81 stations and 127 evangelists for 1878. By the beginning of 1883 there were 442 Corps and 1067 officers operating in 13 countries. Three years later, there were 1,749 Corps and 4,192 officers.²⁰⁸

With such growth the Mission inevitably entered also a period of reorganisation and constitution-making. The first Christian Mission Constitution, 1870, is described as a “self-denying ordinance” by Sandall – Booth made Conference the final authority in the Mission’s affairs. Modelled on that of the Methodist New Connexion, it was largely composed of the evangelists in charge of districts and, according to Sandall, “two elected lay delegates from each district”.²⁰⁹ The 1876 Minutes do not use the word “lay” in connection with delegates.²¹⁰ Possibly the word “lay” is Sandall’s anachronism, reading back a later clerical-lay distinction between officers and soldiers, in which case the reference illustrates perfectly the argument of this thesis, or perhaps he intended it simply in the sense of not being professionally engaged. After all, the evangelists were also “lay” in the sense of not ever having been ordained. Never the less they were on the way to becoming the de facto clergy of a de facto church. A major break from Methodist tradition was

²⁰⁴ Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, London, Rich & Cowen, 1932, p.90.

²⁰⁵ *Christian Mission Magazine*, August, 1874, p.226.

²⁰⁶ *ibid.*, July 1875, p.191.

²⁰⁷ *The Salvationist*, January 1879, p.4.

²⁰⁸ R. Sandall, *History.*, 1, pp.170ff, 2, p.338.

²⁰⁹ R. Sandall, *ibid.*, 1, pp.178-9.

²¹⁰ *Christian Mission Magazine* July, 1876, p.171, stated “That each district having a membership of 100 or upwards on 7th November next send their evangelist with one delegate if thought desirable to a meeting of the Conference Committee.”

that women were admitted to full participation – in government as well as in ministry.²¹¹

Conference rule proved too inhibiting for Booth, and for his band of enthusiasts, a delegation of whom asked him to assume more direct control. A deed-poll enrolled in Chancery in 1875 provided that the Mission should be “under the oversight direction and control of some one person”, gave Booth a veto over any proceedings of Conference, the power of appointment, office for the term of his natural life and also the power to nominate his successor. He was also sole trustee for financial purposes. Endless talkfest, the unreality of trying to organise a rapidly expanding organisation by annual decision-making and government by committees were still seen as inhibiting progress. A meeting of ‘Conference Committee’ in January 1877 abolished Conference rule, this being ratified by the last Conference, styled a “Council of War”, in July. Thus by something like a palace *coup d’etat*, Booth resumed full control of the Mission. A new deed poll in 1880 gave legal sanction to these arrangements, along with the new style of Salvation Army.

Wilson’s comment on the tendency of sects to clericalise is apt here:

The emergence of a paid ministry, and then of a central council which effectively ceases to maintain lay control, just as it ceases to permit local control, is a danger which all persisting sects have to face.²¹²

Not surprisingly, Booth was popularly supposed to be claiming greater powers than the Pope, an accusation that dogged him all his life despite denials, such as Catherine’s in an address on “The Probable Future of The Salvation Army” in 1883²¹³. Booth himself had no illusions on this score. Announcing his position on the sacraments, he commented that any order he might give for the general administration of the

²¹¹ Wesley appointed women as local preachers, though the practice declined amongst the Wesleyans after his death and Conference prohibited it in 1803. The Primitive Methodists retained women preachers. The Countess of Huntingdon’s controlling role in her own Connexion surely constitutes a special case of female church government.

²¹² Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, p.209.

²¹³ Catherine Booth, *Church and State*, p.66.

sacraments would probably be ignored – hardly consistent with the absolute obedience to his orders generally thought to be exacted.²¹⁴ There is however an endearing vignette from the drawing up of the 1880 deed poll. The lawyer, Cozens-Hardy, later Master of the Rolls, protested, “Mr Booth, you want me to make you into a Pope, and I do not think it can be done!” To which Booth retorted, “Well, Mr Cozens-Hardy, I am sure that you will get as near to it as you suitably can!”²¹⁵

An anonymous pamphlet attacking the Army in 1889 was entitled, *The New Papacy: Behind the Scenes in the Salvation Army*. Booth made the accusation into a joke. Ex-Commissioner Alex Nicol records his regaling a crowd with, “They say the Salvation Army is a despotism and a religious hierarchy, and that I am a despot, who dwells in a lordly mansion, eating his food out of golden vessels and riding about in an expensive motor car. (Laughter and applause) And they call me a Pope. (Laughter) And so I am! The word Pope means papa (laughter) – and I am your Papa! (Cheers).”²¹⁶ Ervine acidly comments that Booth resolved “to have no priests in his stations; he was equally resolved that he himself should be the High Priest!”²¹⁷ Not that he suffered delusions of grandeur; he put the military title after his name because he felt that “General William Booth” looked pretentious.²¹⁸ Booth had been “General Superintendent” of the Christian Mission and nicknamed “The General” in the family circle long before the advent of the Army.²¹⁹

Like Wesley’s Lay Preachers, Booth’s Evangelists were forbidden to use the title “Reverend”²²⁰. Quite apart from the missionaries’ lay status in conventional church terms, this was part of the whole avoidance of

²¹⁴ *The War Cry*, 17th January 1883, p.4, col.3.

²¹⁵ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes and Memories*, London, Hodder and Stoughton (1925) 2nd edit. 1977, p.184.

²¹⁶ A.M. Nicol, *General Booth and The Salvation Army*, London, Herbert and Daniel, 1910, p.112.

²¹⁷ St.John Ervine, *God’s Soldier*, 1, p.522.

²¹⁸ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, pp.60-1.

²¹⁹ Roy Hattersley, *Blood and Fire*, p.235.

conventional religiosity, which would be an obstacle to any effective approach to the unchurched masses. Ironically, Booth himself retained the clerical usage long after it was superseded by his quasi-military title. Publications as late as the 1910 Yearbook bore his name as “Rev. W. Booth, General”. The same courtesy was not extended to such senior officers as Samuel Logan Brengle or Elwin Oliphant (formerly ordained Methodist and Anglican clergymen respectively.)

Between 1868 and 1878, then, the process took place whereby an independent mission staffed by volunteers from a variety of church backgrounds evolved into a highly centralised, sect-like organisation, a people with a distinct and common identity, and its own full-time, employed leaders, analogous to clergy.

²²⁰ Christian Mission Conference Minutes, 1870 (no page numbers).

CHAPTER THREE

CLERICAL ROLES

*Cleric before, and Lay behind;
A lawless linsy-woolsy brother,
Half of one order, half another.*

Samuel Butler

Hudibras I iii 1226

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

Administration of the Sacraments

The monopoly of this 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. Their advent might possibly be taken as another indication that the Missioners viewed their Mission as their community of faith – although that would depend on whether they saw the sacrament as something about which a community formed, and it is not clear that they did. The discontinuance of the practice would also have implications for the “clerical” role of officers, and requires a substantial excursus at this point.

The earliest reference to sacramental practices in the Mission is in a printed report of the East London Christian Mission (c.Sept/Oct 1867). A list of meetings held at the Whitechapel Mission Hall, 188 Whitechapel Road included, “Sunday 3pm. Breaking of bread, or experience meeting, and service in the open air.”²²¹ Perhaps it is significant that this was the year in which, as we have seen by Sandall's account, the Mission developed many indications of an independent existence. At the same time there was a significant change in membership, in which it is suggested that many who had supported the Mission as a parachurch agency returned to their own denominations ([see p.67](#)). Perhaps those who remained therefore held “breaking of bread” together as part of their consciousness of belonging to a new entity.

Bramwell Booth's memoirs claim that when he “came on the scene as a responsible official of the Mission, in 1874, the Lord's Supper was administered monthly at all our stations to all members of the Mission and

²²¹ I am indebted to Mr Gordon Taylor for this information.

to such other Christian friends as were known to be in good standing and desired to join us."²²² And in fact Rule 39 of the Christian Mission in 1870 said that the Lord's Supper was to be observed once a month in each station unless two thirds of members desired it more often.²²³ On the other hand we have a reported explanation by William Booth to an Anglican clergyman "that some of his people on their own responsibility had had a very simple 'breaking of bread' together but that this was no part of the 'Army' – as an evangelistic agency."²²⁴ (We have the problem that this was second hand, as well as the possibility that Booth sometimes said what he thought people wanted to hear.)

The 1878 *Orders and Regulations* refer to the sacraments only in passing, in connection with the "Formation of Corps", a subsection of "How to Capture a Town", which suggests that their occurrence was taken for granted but not considered of central importance. "The Sacrament should be administered during the latter part of this meeting, and if it can be prolonged to midnight or an unusually late hour, it will make all the deeper impression upon all."²²⁵

The 1881 *Doctrines and Disciplines* catechism included a brief section on Baptism, indicating that by "adult, or Believers baptism", "the person baptised declares that he wishes it to be known that he is converted." However, it is "DECIDEDLY NOT... a duty that must be performed... The Army considers only one baptism essential to salvation, and that is, THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST." Likewise in response to the question, "What is the teaching of the Army on the subject of the Lord's Supper?" (all within the section on Baptism) the book says that "When such an ordinance is helpful to the faith of our Soldiers, we recommend its adoption." It is "certainly not... essential to

²²² W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.201. He also describes the practice of baptising infants: "I have in some cases 'sprinkled' as many as thirty in one service!"

²²³ Copy in The Salvation Army Heritage Centre Archives, London.

²²⁴ Letter addressed by an East End clergyman to the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1881, and quoted by Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.26.

²²⁵ *Orders and Regulations for the Salvation Army*, London 1878, p.72.

membership of the Army, or to Salvation.”²²⁶ Such a position naturally made the abandonment of the practices much easier in due course. No doubt through oversight, this section was retained in full for the 1883 reprinting, by which time official policy had moved on.²²⁷

Reports of observances appear in the Mission’s papers. At the conclusion of the “War Congress” of August 1878, “The usual unintoxicating wine having not been prepared for the sacrament, we managed uncommonly well with water... After the sacrament only a quarter of an hour remained for the love-feast, if we were to conclude, as intended, at six...”²²⁸ The Salvationist reports an officers-only celebration when “at the house of Captain Broadbent... we took the sacrament together” after an all-night meeting in the hall ended at 5.00am.²²⁹ Later, advertisements appeared in the *War Cry* for special meetings: “At Headquarters on the morning of Good Friday, at nine o’clock, there will be a workers’ breakfast; and, at ten, a consecration and sacrament service. Miss Booth will speak.”²³⁰

A similar service was advertised in the *War Cry* for Easter 1881. *War Cry* reports from various other parts of the world confirm the practice. An 1886 Wanganui, New Zealand, report on Christmas Day activities included, “11a.m., Sacrament service, when 50 or 60 partook of the emblems of the Saviour’s dying love. It was a heart-searching time.”²³¹ This was three years after the official cessation of such observances.

²²⁶ William Booth, *The Doctrines and Disciplines of The Salvation Army*, London, 1881, Section 26.

²²⁷ A reprint of *Doctrines and Disciplines* was rather hastily offered for sale to the general public in 1883 to counter accusations that Salvationists had a “secret book” containing their real beliefs. (See William Booth’s speech at Exeter Hall, London, reported in the New Zealand *War Cry*, 30 June, 1883, p.4, col.1.)

²²⁸ *Christian Mission Magazine*, September 1878, p.252.

²²⁹ *The Salvationist*, 1 December 1879, p.325.

²³⁰ *The War Cry*, 27 March, 1880, p.3.

²³¹ New Zealand *War Cry*, January 10th 1886, p.4, col.2. (I am grateful to Mr Trevor Brieseman for this reference.) The New Zealand Salvation Army Archives hold a shapely glass carafe for communion wine, engraved with a Salvation Army crest. Rescued by a Devonport scrap merchant in 1958, its history is unknown. George Hazell informs me

During this “observing” phase, was there any suggestion that only the Evangelists or Officers could preside at the sacrament? Bramwell Booth recalled that one of the arguments for the discontinuance of the sacraments in the 1880’s was the disagreement over who should administer them. “There arose the question whether the Evangelists alone should be the administrators. Great exception was taken in some quarters to the administration by others, even by the principal local officials; indeed in some places the people absented themselves from the service unless the ‘bread and wine’ were offered by ‘the regular preachers’”.²³² The very disagreement indicates that at least sometimes lay people, not Evangelists, presided. It also suggests that the polarisation of views in the ranks about the status of the ministry had already begun. That this relatively minor problem should have weighed against an apostolic practice at all could suggest both the relative unimportance attached to the sacrament, and also perhaps how unwilling the Founders were that any distinction between clergy and lay would be institutionalised within The Salvation Army.

William Booth announced the new policy, abandoning the sacraments, at a council of London officers on 2nd January 1883 and his statement was printed in the *War Cry* two weeks later.

The main points he made were that, (1) “The ‘Sacraments’ must not, nay, they cannot, rightly be regarded as conditions of Salvation”; (2) that any order he gave for their observance “would be likely to produce grave dissensions” on account of the wide variety of practices followed amongst the churches; (3) that “we are not professing to be a church, nor aiming at becoming one”; (4) that it is wise for us “to postpone any settlement of the question, to leave it over to some future day, when we shall have more light, and see more clearly the way before us.”

that contemporary Australian editions of the *War Cry* carry similar reports. He suggests that movement of people between denominations would have been a factor. Primitive Methodists, relocating to an Australian outback town with no Methodist congregation but a Salvation Army Corps in evidence, would have brought their sacramental practice with them without any sense of incongruity.

²³² W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.203.

In the meanwhile, (5) “we do not prohibit our own people... from taking the Sacraments... if this is a matter of conscience... the churches and chapels around will welcome for this.” (6) He also urged Salvationists to “remember His love every hour of our lives, and continually feed on Him – not on Sundays only...” and that they all agree on “one baptism – that is the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.” (7) Finally, having also announced the introduction of a new “formal service for the Dedication of Children”, he concluded, “Let us keep off all mere forms, and do nothing in which, as far as possible, the hearts of our Soldiers do not go with us.”²³³

Sandall quotes Booth as saying on this occasion, “I cannot accept any obligation as binding upon my conscience, neither will I seek to bind any upon yours, to do, or believe, or teach anything for which authority cannot be furnished from the Word of God, or which God Himself does not reveal to us by His Spirit, as our present duty.”²³⁴

Some disapproval must have been expressed, whether from within or without, because Booth responded in an Exeter Hall meeting on 16th April 1883. “The great charge against us is that we depreciate the sacraments because we say that baptism with water and the taking of bread and wine at the Lord’s Supper are not conditions of salvation. If it were proved that they were so, you would shut out from heaven some of the best and holiest that ever walked the face of the earth...”²³⁵

Was the fear of “grave dissensions” because of the variety of possible practice a present danger or a hypothetical one? There is no evidence that existing practices were causing strife within the Army. Did many desert the ranks in consequence of the change? “No statistics exist but they do not seem to have been many.”²³⁶ A few senior officers, resigning for various reasons, mentioned the sacraments as contributory factors – Major Thomas Moore, when setting up his short-lived secessionist Salvation Army in the USA in 1884, re-instituted sacraments;

²³³ *The War Cry*, 17 January 1883, p.4, col. 2.

²³⁴ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.130.

²³⁵ *The War Cry*, 25 April 1883, p.2, col.2.

²³⁶ John Coutts, *The Salvationists*, London, Mowbrays, 1977, p.74.

a Colonel Keppell, resigning in 1898, referred to the Army's sacramental theology as "shifty and unexplainable."²³⁷

This was in the period of the Army's very rapid expansion, particularly amongst people with little or no previous church experience. The sacraments had no meaning for them, and the majority of salvationists were, if not all illiterate, then certainly theologically illiterate; they were not going to argue with Booth about anything so apparently inconsequential. Schillebeeckx makes the point that throughout the history of the Church whenever there has been any significant change, "on each occasion official documents sanction a church practice which has grown up from the grass roots."²³⁸ Perhaps Booth's passing comment that any general order he might give enforcing sacramental observances would probably be ignored ²³⁹also indicated an instinctive reading of his times and people, and Schillebeeckx's rule may be observed here in Salvationist microcosm.

The fullest explanation Booth himself gave for his decision was in response to questioning by Henry Lunn, in the interview already referred to, published in *The Review of the Churches*, April 1895:

In the first place, we do not consider that the Sacraments are essentials of salvation...

Secondly. With reference to the question as to our Lord's intention to institute these as permanent ceremonies in the Church, we reply that there are other ordinances that are apparently commands of a similar character which the Church has universally agreed in not observing. The most striking example of that is the command to wash one another's feet.

Thirdly. We came into this position originally by determining not to be a Church. We did not wish to undertake the administration of the Sacraments and thereby bring ourselves into collision with the existing churches.²⁴⁰

²³⁷ Edward H. McKinley, *Marching to Glory: The History of the Salvation Army in the United States of America 1880-1980*. San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1980, pp.74, 78.

²³⁸ Edward Schillebeeckx, *Ministry: A Case for Change*, London, SCM, 1981, p.3.

²³⁹ *The War Cry*, 17 January 1883, p.4.

²⁴⁰ Bramwell Booth recalls that while Dean Farrar "made a great effort to persuade me to ask for the reintroduction amongst us of the supper", Dr Westcott had said "they

Fourthly. We were further driven to take up our present position by clergymen of the Church of England refusing to administer the rite to our soldiers because they had not gone through the form of confirmation. This created difficulties which seemed to me only to be solved by the declaration of my own conviction that these Sacraments were not essential to salvation.

Fifthly. We have found the existing notions with reference to these ordinances seriously interfering with the right views of penitence and holy living. Men and women are constantly in danger of putting their trust in ordinances, and thinking that baptised communicants must be in a secure position, no matter how inconsistently they are living...

Sixthly. Moreover I should like to emphasise the fact that this with us is not a settled question. We never declaim against the Sacraments. We are anxious not to destroy the confidence of Christian people in institutions which are helpful to them.²⁴¹

Lunn's final two questions about the sacraments concerned firstly whether anything was substituted for the Sacraments, and secondly whether Salvationists would still be free to be baptised and take communion if they so desired. To the first, Booth suggested that every meal was an occasion to remember Christ's sacrifice, and to the second, "the General gave an unqualified answer in the affirmative". Begbie, who copies out the whole exchange, prefaces his chapter with the cautionary experience of Lady Henry Somerset. Lady Henry wanted to become a soldier but asked the General if she might still "be allowed to go for Holy Communion to the Church of England. The answer was a negative."²⁴²

Other reasons were subsequently adduced – at various times – and repeated in various Salvation Army publications. For example Sandall claims that "a very practical consideration that its orthodox administration was a snare to the poor souls who had been slaves to drink". He also refers to William Booth's desire to avoid controversy, quoting Booth as writing in *The Contemporary Review* of August 1882 that controversial questions should be avoided as "the poison of hell".²⁴³

approved of the stand we took... as this meant a refusal to embark on what was, in their view, a 'schismatic procedure'." (W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.207.)

²⁴¹ Henry S. Lunn, *Review of the Churches*, April, 1895. Page number and other details unknown because copy of article in the Heritage Centre fire-damaged in blitz.

²⁴² Harold Begbie, *Booth*, I, p.459.

²⁴³ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.133.

This seems a bit rich, coming from so controversial a figure as Booth, but clearly he chose the hills he meant to die on.

Bramwell Booth noted that “the idea of women administering the sacraments at that time was almost unthinkable to many good people, in spite of our stand, from the beginning, on the perfect equality of men and women in the Kingdom of Christ.”²⁴⁴ Mrs Carpenter also suggests that one of the reasons for discontinuance was that “William Booth was not willing to surrender the principle of perfect equality of men and women in every activity of the Kingdom of Christ”.²⁴⁵ The evidence is not conclusive: a letter writer to the *Non-Conformist and Independent* of 9th February 1882 drew attention to the fact that in the Salvation Army for the first time in Christian history the sacrament had been administered by women.²⁴⁶ We do not know if that had occasioned dissension.

Not mentioned publicly at the time but later suggested as significant was the issue of whether sacraments required “priests”. George Scott Railton had attempted to persuade William Booth to acquiesce in the abandonment of the sacraments on these grounds. In a paper written for this purpose in 1881 (in Begbie’s uncharacteristically caustic words, “set forth with a speciousness and a plausibility which are more curious than persuasive”) Railton urged that “there must be no Lord’s Supper ‘administered’ by anybody in such a way as to show anything like a priestly superiority of one over another – every saved person being a ‘priest unto God’.”²⁴⁷ Harry Dean included this in a list of reasons for discontinuance in a 1960 *Yearbook* article: “The sacraments had been linked, in the main, with systems necessitating a separate priesthood for their administration; this suggested a double standard for Christians, and contradicted the New Testament emphasis on the

²⁴⁴ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.203.

²⁴⁵ Minnie Lindsay Carpenter, *William Booth*. London, 1942, p.78. Mrs Carpenter was the wife of George Lyndon Carpenter, General 1939-1946.

²⁴⁶ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.134.

²⁴⁷ Harold Begbie, *Booth*, 1, p.462.

'priesthood of all believers'."²⁴⁸ Clearly this argument does relate to the theme of this thesis.

The influence and example of the Quakers has sometimes been mentioned as a factor in the Army's decision. It was claimed that a member of the Fry family had been an influence on Booth in this respect,²⁴⁹ but I do not know of any contemporary evidence for this. While Railton and Catherine Booth may have been influenced by Robert Barclay's "inner light" theology, the truth is probably that, in Rightmire's words, "the influence of the Society of Friends on the Salvation Army was more implicit than explicit" and that "the Quaker position on the sacraments provided the early Army leaders with a theological precedent for justifying their non-sacramental practice."²⁵⁰

This is not the place to discuss the validity of Booth's arguments or explore the subsequent history of Salvation Army apologetics. However it will be obvious that none of the reasons alleged above, individually or taken together, amount to insuperable difficulties or provide irrefutable arguments for abandoning the nineteen hundred-year practice of Christianity. To understand why the Army ceased to baptise or celebrate communion we need to look behind the immediate explanations and the arguments of later Salvationist apologists, to the theological mind-set of the Booths and their associates.

The most comprehensive account of their approach to the sacraments is David Rightmire's 1990 work. He places the Army's early theology in the context of Victorian society, the Wesleyan revival and the

²⁴⁸ Harry Dean, "The Founders and the Sacraments", reprinted in *Another Harvest of the Years*, London 1975 p36. In *The Sacraments – a Salvationist Viewpoint*, London, 1960, pp.71-5) Dean argues that the Salvation Army's dispensing with the sacraments is an indication of its standing in the prophetic, over against the priestly, tradition.

²⁴⁹ "Henry William Fry, last surviving grandson of Elizabeth Fry, the Quaker Prison Reformer, who recently passed away at San Francisco at the age of ninety-one, was an intimate friend of the Army Founder. It is said that it was largely owing to H W Fry's influence that the Founder decided that The Army should be like the Quakers in not outwardly observing the Sacraments." *The War Cry*, 5 August 1939, p7, col.4.

²⁵⁰ R. David Rightmire, *Sacraments and the Salvation Army: Pneumatological Foundations*. Metuchen, NJ, The Scarecrow Press, 1990, pp.117-8.

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 subordinated other means of grace to the Word. William Booth had been taught William Cook's subjectivistic sacramental position while Catherine Booth especially was influenced by her reading of church history by people like John Lorenz Mosheim and Augustus Neander and a range of 17th and 18th century "radical restorationist" and "spiritualising" writers like Isaac Newton and Madame Guyon. 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." Phoebe Palmer claimed that "the full baptism of the Holy Ghost" is "the act of ordination on the part of God."²⁵¹ Rightmire's argument is that once the Booths' "Holiness" or "Second Blessing" theology was fully developed, it provided a spiritualised substitute for sacramental theology. What Mason summarises as their "docetic, pneumatologically-conditioned pragmatic hermeneutic" left them free to discard the material symbols.²⁵²

George Scott Railton's views have been mentioned. He and Catherine Booth were most influential in persuading William Booth to make the break with sacramental practice. Catherine's most public statement is found in a lecture reprinted in her *Popular Christianity*, where she attacks four "mock salvations" – theory, ceremony, "mere belief" and unbelief. "Another mock salvation is presented in the shape of ceremonies and sacraments. These were only intended as outward signs of an inward spiritual reality, whereas men are taught that by going through them or partaking of them, they are to be saved. Amongst these may be classed Baptism, the last Supper, and the ceremonials of ancient or modern Churches."²⁵³

²⁵¹ David Rightmire, *ibid.*, pp. 150,155,158.

²⁵² Robert Mason, New Zealand, in his unpublished monograph, *The Salvation Army and the Sacraments*, submitted to the International Spiritual Life Commission, July, 1997, p.8.

²⁵³ Catherine Booth, *Popular Christianity*, London, 1887, p.42.

William and Bramwell Booth were less willing to change. Bramwell described himself as possibly the last officer to officiate at the Lord's Supper, his father having given him "a freedom in this matter which, so far as I am aware, he gave to no one else, and which he gave me on no other subject of importance on which our views were for the time out of accord. But gradually I, too, realised how prone the human mind is to lean upon the outward."²⁵⁴

The issue possibly came to a head in 1882 at the same time as discussions with the Anglican Church and perhaps because of them. The Church was divided in its view of the Army. Some elements of the Church were interested in taking over the new religious movement that seemed to offer a means of rapprochement with the alienated working classes – while others regarded the Army with disgust because of its sensational and vulgar style. In May 1882 the Upper House of Convocation, Canterbury, appointed a committee consisting of Dr Benson (Bishop of Truro) as Chairman, Dr Lightfoot (Bishop of Durham), Canon Westcott, Canon Wilkinson and Dr Randall Davidson, Dean of Windsor and Chaplain to Archbishop Tait, to negotiate with General Booth.

According to Sandall, the negotiations foundered on four issues: the role and authority of General Booth, with the associated matter of the doubtful status of Salvation Army officers as clergy (and their likely subordination to each local vicar); the matter of female ministry (the most the Church would concede was training as Deaconesses); and the matter of the sacraments.²⁵⁵ Of these, Randall Davidson viewed the first as the most serious. "Booth was determined to keep control, and a very autocratic control, of the Army... We could not get anything in the nature of control over the organization, and so we had to let it go."²⁵⁶ Benson reported to the House in April 1883 that his impression was that the Army was in a state of transition and that they should continue to gather more

²⁵⁴ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.204.

²⁵⁵ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.148.

²⁵⁶ Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.29.

information. Over his objections, however, the committee was dissolved.²⁵⁷

For a brief period there were signs that the Army might assume the character of an *ecclesiola*, a church within a church, rather as Wesley had thought of Methodism, because there are recorded instances of Corps attending parish churches to take the sacrament. This was suggested by Canon Wilkinson as a way forward, and it was already happening in some places. For example, 400 Salvationists attended communion at St Paul's Hogate in March 1882 at the invitation of Archbishop Thompson of York.²⁵⁸ The War Cry of 20th April 1882 reported a combined service at St. Mary's, Halifax, where 315 Salvationists participated in Holy Communion. The House seriously debated Wilkinson's proposal, to the indignation of the Church Times, and Bramwell Booth admitted that it "afterwards for a time bore some fruit."²⁵⁹ Sandall records various instances of Salvation Army Corps and Anglican parish churches participating in each other's services in the early 80's.²⁶⁰

The practice was not without difficulties; in his interview with Lunn, as already noted, Booth recalled that some clergymen "refused to administer the rite to our soldiers because they had not gone through the form of confirmation."²⁶¹ He did not want his soldiers divided at the Church door, with those of non-conformist background or no church history at all, diverted to another table.²⁶² Wesley's Methodists had suffered similarly in their time. This path was certainly a cul-de-sac even though the related notion of The Salvation Army as an order within the

²⁵⁷ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.148.

²⁵⁸ Norman Murdoch, 'The Salvation Army and the Church of England 1882-83', in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, March, 1986, p.37.

²⁵⁹ Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.77, Robert Sandall *History*, 2, p.147.

²⁶⁰ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, pp.136-7.

²⁶¹ *The Review of the Churches*, April 1895 and quoted by Begbie, *Booth*, I, p.469.

²⁶² *The War Cry*, 17 January 1883, p.4.

church has persisted in debate long after the sacramental implications have been lost sight of.²⁶³

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. Could the Army's abandonment of the practices have been seen as an accommodation to the Church, preparatory to closer association, though this was not stated explicitly? It seems likely that there were several crosscurrents involved in this meeting and parting of streams.

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 included the question: "What are the FIVE ORDINANCES of the Army?

The Army's Five Ordinances are: -

1. The Dedication of Children to God and the Army.
2. The Mercy Seat.²⁶⁴

²⁶³ e.g. See Victor Kunz, already quoted above; Tor Wahlström (writing as "Ariston"), "Salvationism and the Sociologists" in *The Officer*, November 1974, pp.490-492; Clarence Wiseman, "Are we a Church" in *The Officer*, October 1976, pp.436-437; Thornsten Kjall, "The .Army is a Church!" in *The Officer*, January 1977, p.93-6; Shaw Clifton, *Who are these Salvationists?*, Alexandria VA, 1999, p.8: [David Taylor, "Army, Order or Church?" Paper read at Theology Symposium at William Booth College, London, July 2004. \(The Salvationist, 17 July 2004, pp1,8-9.\)](#) In his 1967 essay on the Army (in Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism* p.105) Roland Robertson offers the curious opinion that amongst the "Acceptors" group in the Army (those wishing to retain the outline of the tradition but "imbued with a pragmatic and neutral attitude to wider society," by way of contrast with the unambiguously sectarian "Old Guard" and the out-and-out "Modernists"), the Army was seen as "an order within Anglicanism". This notion would surely have been considered bizarre by most salvationists even in Britain and illustrates the pitfalls awaiting the researcher from "outside" in sampling opinion.

²⁶⁴ 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

3. Enrolment under the Army Flag.
4. Commissioning of Officers.
5. Marriage according to Army rules.”²⁶⁵

The very term “ordinances”, usually reserved in Church circles for ceremonies derived from dominical or scriptural injunction, is revealing here.

Murdoch notes that in so far as officers only rather than soldiers administer these ceremonies, they make of the officers a priesthood in the old sacerdotal sense. “As a member of a Soldiers’ Commission in the 1960’s I asked if a soldier could dedicate a baby, a ceremony similar to infant baptism. Major Robert Watson, the Commission’s officer-leader, told me he’d ask the Commissioners’ Conference. He did. They said that only an officer could do the ceremony. I told him that that meant that the Army had a sacrament and an exclusive priesthood.”²⁶⁶ This must however be a local custom; certainly no such rule obtains in New Zealand where it is infrequent but perfectly acceptable for soldiers to dedicate infants. For the period under review it may have been still an open question. Officers would always conduct the enrolment of soldiers however. For a while it seems that this function may have been reserved for Divisional Officers, rather like an episcopal confirmation rite. A contemporary witness claimed there was a rule that “All soldiers must be SWORN IN PUBLICLY by the Divisional Officer, the Officer in charge of the corps having previously, at the soldiers’ roll-call, read and explained

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.)

²⁶⁵ *The Salvation Army Directory, No II*, London, 1900, p.62.

²⁶⁶ Norman Murdoch, Letter to the writer, 1 March, 2001. The “Commissioners’ Conference” in this case meant the leaders of the four USA territories and their National Commander.

the doctrines and the articles of war.”²⁶⁷ The Commissioning of Officers likewise became, once the practice was established, the prerogative of the General, or in his stead, Commissioners or Territorial Commanders.

It is interesting that the list of “ordinances” did not include the wearing of uniform, which certainly serves as an “outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual meaning.” It also provides the medium for the nearest The Salvation Army comes to a form of excommunication. For such lapses as immorality (sex out of wedlock), smoking tobacco or drinking alcohol, incurring a criminal conviction or suffering a marriage break-up, a soldier might be “stood down” – relieved of duties and temporarily removed from the Soldiers Roll for a period of amendment of life, and so obliged to go out of uniform.²⁶⁸

For the purposes of this analysis however it would have to be said that although after 1883 the Officers did not have a sacramental role in the conventional sense, they were regarded as the focal figures of the faith community in matters of public worship, specifically for Salvation Army rituals which came to be regarded as substitute sacraments, such as those mentioned above, and for funerals. In the words of Lt.-Colonel Fred Hoyle, as a representative opinion, “I believe it is the prerogative of the officer to officiate on the occasion of dedications, weddings and funerals. The officer is also the unifying factor in corps life.”²⁶⁹

Well out of our period, but in linear development, is the comparatively recent (since the 1980’s) custom of “installing” officers in certain positions – particularly Corps Commanding Officers, Divisional Commanders and Territorial Commanders – in public gatherings. Whereas once the individual simply arrived, was extended words of welcome, and got on with the job, now a church-like liturgy of charge and acceptance marks the occasion. In the case of Territorial Commanders in New Zealand, someone with the rank of Commissioner from Australia or

²⁶⁷ An ex-staff officer, ‘A.S.’, *The New Papacy: Behind the Scenes in the Salvation Army*, Toronto, Albert Britnell, 1889, p.63.

²⁶⁸ The pastoral implications of this practice have been far-reaching.

²⁶⁹ Fred Hoyle, “Two Salvation Armies?”, in *The Officer*, May 1982, p.223.

further afield is flown in to perform the installation (and later, the service recognising their retirement). A more obvious example of clericalisation could hardly be imagined. Possibly a similar ritualisation of initially informal custom contributed to the original elevation of the presbyteral role in the early church; doctrine follows praxis. In due course, unchecked, such customs could affect the Salvation Army's nascent ecclesiology. At the same time, officers in less public roles continue to simply arrive and get on with it – an indication that some are more equal than others.

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

Pastoring of the flock was not the original *raison d'être* of the Christian Missioners – they were pre-eminently itinerant evangelists. If this was seen as a gift distinct from that of pastor (in Pauline terms), it could be suggested that evangelism was the gift of the Mission or the Army as a body. 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 of course 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. The area included in a Corps' boundaries was supposed to be divided geographically into "Wards", with a sergeant responsible for the nurture of all Salvationists (and the salvation of all the sinners) in each.²⁷⁰ The system was also

²⁷⁰ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, London, 1886, pp.179-182.

overlapped by the appointment of Brigade Sergeants, responsible for the welfare of members of their Brigades, such as the brass band, or the slum brigade specialising in relief work, or those who sold the War Cry in public houses. It is not clear how well or for how long the Ward System actually worked, although the Brigade system still operates to a limited extent.

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 in any case, with frequent changes of pastorate for clergy, but taken to another level, so to speak, when combined with the more limited role of the evangelist. Railton, already quoted as wanting no priests in the Army, 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...”²⁷¹

Appointments tended to be for a matter of weeks only or months at most in the early days.²⁷² This was facilitated by the youth of the overwhelming majority of officers. Many were still teenagers. Catherine Booth stated in 1883 that most were under 25.²⁷³ Single and almost without possessions, they were highly mobile. In 1883 two men aged 19 and 20 were sent to pioneer the Army in New Zealand. Captain Emma Westbrook, a comparative veteran of 35 with ten years' service was given only a few hours notice to join the pioneering party for the United States in 1880. Marriage, families and the accumulation of personal effects made such mobility more difficult to sustain – although with “quarters” still

²⁷¹ G.S. Railton, *Heathens England*, London, 1887, p.144.

²⁷² I remember even in the early 1970's a British officer who in thirty years had been stationed at thirty different Corps. Although such short terms are no longer the norm, and official policy now aims at five years, the average duration of a Corps appointment in New Zealand is still less than three years.

²⁷³ Catherine Booth, *Church and State*, p.77.

provided and fully furnished, whether or not to travel light remains a personal choice.

As time went on, officers became under increasing pressure to exercise a pastoral role in addition to the evangelical one. An article entitled “The Work of a Soul Nurse” in *The Field Officer*, for example, encouraged the following up of new converts, the practice of visitation and the need for care in arranging for the “transfers” of Salvationists moving from one district to another.²⁷⁴ Likewise, Bramwell Booth’s 1899 book on officership included a section on “Shepherds and their Flocks”.²⁷⁵ Whatever Railton’s fear of a pastor-flock relationship developing, it was inevitable; nurturing of new converts would establish expectations for continuing care.

Preaching

Concerning preaching, Booth’s statement quoted below on [page 95](#) suggests that he saw this as having been the definitive clerical task (“one who had nothing else to do but preach”) 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. Murdoch quotes the Minutes of the Seventh Mission Conference where one Corbridge wanted “all our people [to] be praying and preaching men and women”, while Bramwell Booth agreed; “Let us make all our people parsons!”²⁷⁶ The success of the movement in achieving this is illustrated by the exponential growth in the number of “voluntary speakers” Catherine Booth claimed, quoted in the previous chapter.

By the turn of the century, a debate was beginning to surface on the viability of longer appointments – a year or even two years at a time.

²⁷⁴ *The Field Officer*, January 1901, pp.21-2.

²⁷⁵ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants of All*, London, 1899, pp.93-9.

²⁷⁶ Norman Murdoch, *Origins*, p.93. (Bramwell’s intention was clearly not that Mission workers be clericalised but that all should enjoy the opportunity of preaching. It was his version of the modern slogan, ‘Every member a minister.’)

Writers in *The Field Officer*²⁷⁷ discussed how it was possible to sustain a preaching ministry for such a protracted period. It has to be remembered that a Field Officer of that day would probably have to preach half a dozen times on Sunday and every weeknight as well, both in-doors and in the open-air.²⁷⁸ For many decades *The Officer* provided “Outlines of Addresses” or “Subject Notes” and “The FO’s Armoury” and stocks of sermon illustrations as aids for this task. It is significant that preaching rather than pastoring, whatever Railton’s reservations about the latter, was felt to be the difficulty with longer terms. The limited educational background of most officers, the brevity and inevitable superficiality of their training and the relentless pressure of work to be done and money to be raised would exacerbate that difficulty.

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.”²⁷⁹

Government

On the fourth point, government, it is significant that 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

²⁷⁷ For example, *The Field Officer*, March 1904, pp.104-7.

²⁷⁸ Maud Booth, *Two Flags*, p.149.

²⁷⁹ Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.492.

government.²⁸⁰ At the same time as the Mission metamorphosed into The Salvation Army, it constitutionally reverted to Wesley's original Methodist model of benevolent dictatorship.

Booth made no bones about the fact that he insisted that things would be done his way. He wrote to his son in 1877, "...controversy is useless ... I am determined that evangelists in this Mission must hold my views and work on my lines." Thirty-four years later his beliefs on this subject had not altered: "I feel as if I had a call from Heaven to make my officers and soldiers understand what I want in The S.A. and make them feel that they have got to work to my plans and not to ___'s or their own conceits."²⁸¹

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. Only at the highest level in the Army is decision-making by majority vote. The High Council, by which the General is now elected, is the only council not simply advisory in function, and it may vote for that purpose only, after which it automatically dissolves. For ordinary purposes, however, it may be seen that 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.

Railton defended the Army's "military order and system".

The question is how men and women, hitherto averse to all religious control, and indeed, control of any kind, are induced to submit themselves without fee and reward to the orders of those who are often in every way their inferiors. Look at that young lad, not out of his teens, commanding a corps in some large city. His every sign is obeyed by men and women old enough to be his grandparents, by tradesmen who were accustomed to manage business affairs before he learned arithmetic (what little he knows of it), by sergeants and soldiers of the Army, who have served several years longer than himself in it, and some of whom know more of God and mankind, more of the work and literature of the Army, than he does... It is easy to explain all upon "the love of Christ

²⁸⁰ Norman Murdoch, *Origins*, p.91.

²⁸¹ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, pp.96, 217.

constraineth" us principle, "submitting yourselves to one another in love"; but take that away, and what becomes of the Army's discipline?²⁸²

In sum, then, of the four clerical roles of officiating at mediatory 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. 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. They were not ordained even in free-church terms, much less in any formally recognisable apostolic succession.

This chapter has so far looked at how the Army became, despite the intentions of its Founders, a sect, and how their helpers began to assume some kind of ministerial role. We move next to reviewing what the Founders thought they had done, as documented in their writing.

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. Pragmatism, under the banner of Catherine Booth's dictum of "adaptation of measures"²⁸³, became the Army's leading principle. The pragmatic origins of its ministry and polity have in effect meant that the Army has always wanted to have its cake and eat it too. It has championed the concept of the priesthood of all believers and rejected the clerical role. 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.

²⁸² G.S. Railton, in Catherine Booth, *Popular Christianity*, London, 1887, p.193.

²⁸³ Catherine Booth, *Aggressive Christianity*, London, 1880, pp.45ff.

All lay together

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...”²⁸⁴ Railton quotes Booth, addressing young officers, as saying,

...my conversion made me, in a moment, a preacher of the Gospel. The idea never dawned on me that any line was to be drawn between one who had nothing else to do but preach and a saved apprentice lad who only wanted ‘to spread through all the earth abroad,’ as we used to sing, the fame of our Saviour. 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.²⁸⁵

Catherine Booth, in a letter to an early associate, Mrs Billups, wrote, “You need no human ordination, no long and tedious preparation, no high-flown language, no towering eloquence: all you want is the full baptism of the Holy Spirit in your heart, the Bible in your hand, and humility and simplicity in your manner.”²⁸⁶

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... [*He was not referring to the Dominicans*] 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

²⁸⁴ *Christian Mission Magazine*, July 1877, p.172. Much later he complained that the Corps officer was being “left to imitate the Ministers of Religion around him; and does he not often fall into their lifeless style, without possession of their knowledge of the theory of religion, or their general intelligence and education?” (*Letter to Commissioners and Territorial Commanders*, London, 1900, p.16. Privately circulated.)

²⁸⁵ George Scott Railton, *General Booth*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1912, p.17.

²⁸⁶ Quoted in Norman H. Murdoch, *Origins*, p.57.

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.²⁸⁷

Note that for Booth the preaching role was the only one that sprang to mind – the sacramental role was perhaps too distant and the governmental role too close at hand to recognise. However, he clearly rejected any apostolic succession or clerical character as needed to authenticate his officers' functions.

Railton, leading the invasion of the United States in 1880, admitted that he was not ordained when told that only an ordained clergyman could apply for a licence to preach in the open air in New York.²⁸⁸ Railton's initial scepticism about uniform-wearing (though his invasion-force were in fact the first Salvationists to don a regulation uniform) was because of his fear that it would “‘create a hindering separateness,’ to put the soldiers apart from the people, as a priest, by his garb, is put apart from his congregation.”²⁸⁹

We have seen that negotiations for some kind of association with the Church of England, initiated by the Church in the early 1880's, foundered on ecclesiological questions. Commenting on the likely outcome in 1882 under the heading “Proposed Alliance Hopeless”, the *Nonconformist and Independent* pointed to the difference over clericalism as the main impediment. “The Church shuts up its pulpit against the layman and suffers not a woman to usurp the authority of teaching; insists in fact upon the necessity of ‘orders’, or at any rate, upon their supreme virtue. How here is a divergence which goes to the very root of the two systems.”²⁹⁰

A book published pseudonymously in 1882 commended the Army for its avoidance of clericalism. *The Question of Questions* by

²⁸⁷ William Booth in *The Officer*, June 1899, pp.202-3.

²⁸⁸ Diane Winston, *Red Hot and Righteous*, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press, 1999, p.27-8.

²⁸⁹ St. John Ervine, *God's Soldier*, I, p.449.

²⁹⁰ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, pp.149.

“Caractacus” is sub-titled “Church Communities of the Present and Past Contrasted with the Church Communities of the Apostolic Age.” It outlines the development of monarchical government in the Church in place of charismatic fellowship and universal Christian priesthood, denounces the idea of Apostolic Succession as a “profane fiction” and claims that “there is no warrant in Scripture for an exclusive caste.” The final chapter, “The Remedy”, offers The Salvation Army as the ideal model for a modern apostolic church. “I suppose there is not another people beside The Salvation Army that really and entirely seeks implicitly to follow the Apostolic practices and principles, in making the one thing needful the business of their lives, preaching and teaching a full Gospel.”²⁹¹

According to McKinley, Booth’s rejection of suggestions that officers should be ordained was one of the sources of tension with his son Ballington, commander of the Army in the United States before the latter’s resignation in 1896 and his forming of the rival Volunteers of America.²⁹² While this does not appear at issue in the Ballington Booth letters held in the Heritage Centre’s archives, it is a fact that six months after leaving the Salvation Army Ballington Booth was ordained a “Presbyter of the Church of God in General” in an unusual interdenominational ceremony at the hands of Bishop Samuel Fallows (Reformed Episcopal Church) assisted by Methodist, Presbyterian, and

²⁹¹ “Caractacus”, *The Question of Questions*, London, S.W. Partridge, 1882, pp.iv, 95-6, 104,106. Much of the book is a rambling attack on Roman Catholicism and Puseyism, which might explain reticence about Salvation Army ownership. However, while the book is not ostensibly published by the Army, it has, curiously, a Salvation Army crest embossed on its cover. This implies some kind of official support for the opinions expressed in it even though there is no evidence that the writer was a Salvationist. Possibly the Army helped market the book. It sometimes published Salvation Army editions of books of which it approved or wanted to use, such as Wesley’s New Testament Commentary and Finney’s lectures and autobiography, and adorned them with a crest, though in this case the Army was not the publisher. S.W. Partridge did publish some Army books, such as *All About The Salvation Army*, 1882. One can only speculate on whether the publication date intentionally coincided with the period of Anglican-Salvation Army discussions. The British Library catalogues two other works probably by the same author: *Divine Healing Part of the Gospel* (1887) and *Eternal Punishment in Another Light* (1899).

²⁹² Edward H. McKinley, *Marching to Glory: the History of the Salvation Army in the United States of America*, San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1980, p.74.

Congregational clergy.²⁹³ This was held at Dwight L. Moody's church in Chicago, or possibly in St James' Episcopal Church, Chicago.²⁹⁴

William Booth is also quoted as delivering to his officers "an exhortation to devote ourselves to the work of lay apostles... We all are 'a royal priesthood, an holy nation'. Even though we have not been anointed sacramentally by the laying on of hands by a bishop, we have all been consecrated *lay* [my italics] apostles by the sacrament of the Holy Ghost."²⁹⁵ Booth's son-in-law, Frederick Booth-Tucker, editorialised in *The Officer*, "There is a danger of the old clergy and laity idea creeping in amongst us. The common church idea is that of a minister doing all the fighting and feeding, while his congregation does all the looking on and swallowing. We are an Army. Every soldier is expected to fight. We teach this as a duty. It is for us, as officers, to create the opportunity."²⁹⁶

William Booth himself addressed the same theme in a "Farewell Charge in the Royal Albert Hall" before setting off on a trip overseas in 1898. 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!²⁹⁷

Booth was clear that if any were ordained, all were ordained. That sympathy for these views was not unknown in some other churches is evidenced by an editorial from *The Methodist*, as early as 20th May 1881.

²⁹³ *Outlook*, 3 October 1896, pp.618-9. (I am indebted to Prof. Ed. McKinlay for this reference.)

²⁹⁴ Conflicting accounts of this event are given by Francis Dingman in *New Frontier*, 31 May, 1996; and the *Volunteers' Gazette*, 3 October 1896, quoted by Herbert A. Wisbey Jr., in his *History of the Volunteers of America*, Chicago, 1954. Wisbey notes (p.40) that "qualified officers of the Volunteers might be ordained as Ministers."

²⁹⁵ Quoted by Carvosso Gauntlett in *The Staff Review*, February 1930, p.77.

²⁹⁶ *The Officer*, June 1893, p.176.

²⁹⁷ *The War Cry*, 22 January 1898, p.9, col.3.

It may only have been called into being yesterday; it may be without a history, without prestige, without worldly power; but if the fire be there which transfigures and cleanses, it stamps it as divine. On the other hand, if the fire be wanting, no ecclesiastical pretensions, or far-stretching history, or scriptural creed, or sanction, or state, or boasted majorities can constitute a "true church". It is with this canon in our hand that we turn to The Salvation Army. The Salvationists have reared their altar; best of all, the fire has fallen! The question of questions today is, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost?" Oh, the infinite littleness of silly squabbings on such subjects as "orders", "apostolic succession", "connexionalism", "congregationalism" – when placed by the side of a question like this! Show us the bright flame upon your altar, and that settles your claim to the apostolicity.²⁹⁸

Early publications of the Army did not appear to demarcate very strongly between commissioned and non-commissioned, "local" officers. For example, in the 1881 *Doctrines and Disciplines* section on 'Officers', the question, "How then is The Army governed?" is answered, "By a Commander-in-Chief, Chief of Staff, Lieutenant-Generals, Generals of Divisions, Captains, Lieutenants, Treasurer or Paymaster, Secretary or Paymaster Secretary, Sergeants, Colour-Sergeants, and other officers."²⁹⁹ The plethora of Generals (reminiscent of W.S. Gilbert's "Bishops in their shovel hats") did not stay the course.

In the Australian Eastern Territory's Archives interesting evidence is provided by an Officer's commission for the first officer commissioned for Australia and appointed to a Corps in Adelaide. (Appendix 5) The commission, dated 5th January 1881 and signed by William Booth, appears to be a standard form used for the commissioning of people to a variety of offices. Dotted lines provide spaces for the handwriting in of not only the name of the office-bearer and his appointment, but also his function, in this case "Captain". Examples of the identical form held at the Heritage Centre in London are made out for people with the local officer role of "Treasurer" or "Secretary". Such a scenario suggests a relative equality of status for full-time, commissioned officers and lay functionaries or local officers.

²⁹⁸ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.126.

²⁹⁹ William Booth, *Doctrines and Disciplines*, 1881, p.110.

Testimony of uncertain veracity to the equality of all ranks is offered by La Comtesse Agenor de Gasparin, who published a pamphlet against the Army in 1883. She quotes the *Orders and Regulations* as saying, "Our plan, moreover, makes every soldier in some degree an officer, charged with the responsibility of so many of his townsfolk, and expected to carry on the war against the streets, street or part of a street allotted to his case..."³⁰⁰ However, I cannot find these words in the 1878 Regulations.

Bramwell Booth, reflecting fifty years later on the negotiations with the Church of England, opined that, "the idea that Jesus Christ in some way instituted a society with set orders of worship, and appointed the times and manner of sacred things, such as sacraments and sacrifices, or settled an order of ministers who should be the exclusive channel of grace, has no particle of authority in the New Testament".³⁰¹

In his journal for 19th April 1920 Bramwell Booth noted, *a propos* reading the Report of a Free Church Ministers' Committee on the Lambeth Bishops' appeal for unity, that "the chief difficulty lies in the question of ordination." He replied to the Secretary of the National Free Church Council, "I am rather outside the deliberations referred to... I am not sure that I feel so enthusiastic with regard to the subject of Reunion... We of The Salvation Army look for important changes in the near future. If, for example, the Anglicans were to follow us all the way in giving full authority to women, that might have a very important result in modifying their whole position with regard to ordination and bring them again nearer to the practice of the Early Church, which seems to have made little of 'Ordination' and much of 'Appointment'".³⁰² He went on to write, "Just as Paul said in speaking of the old Jewish system: 'Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision but faith which worketh by love', so

³⁰⁰ Agenor de Gasparin, *Read and Judge The (So-Called) Salvation Army*, London, Griffiths and Farran, 1883, p.26.

³⁰¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.79.

³⁰² The Anglican Church debated the ordination of women from the 1920's on. Canon Raven, Chaplain to the King, published a book urging this course in 1928. http://www.womenpriests.org/classic2/meer_fd2.htm

I feel like saying to the Confirmed and the Unconfirmed – to the Ordained and to the Unordained – to the Baptised and the Unbaptised, “If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.”³⁰³

Florence Booth, wife of Bramwell, published a book entitled, *Wanted – an Elite*, being collected addresses she had made to British officers in the 1920's. However, her point was not that such an elite was provided by the officer corps – rather, the reverse. “The kingdom of Satan and sin will never be overthrown by a body of officers, as officers only. Our Founders raised the Salvation Army because they saw clearly there should be an army of fighting men and women. The churches have erred by shutting out the laity and making God's work depend on the leaders only; and the Army was raised up as a protest against this very mistake. Do not ape the parson. Do not imitate the Church. Let your great aim be to raise an Army that shall glorify God by fighting His battles.”³⁰⁴ Retired Commissioner John Carleton contrasted the “military system with its very strict line of demarcation between officers and soldiers” and the Salvation Army. “Such a distinction is contrary to the spirit of all our teaching.”³⁰⁵

Finally in this largely Booth family recital on the nature of Salvation Army officer-ministry, Catherine Bramwell-Booth, in summing up the distinctive marks of the organisation, “the militant church”, established by her grandfather and father, includes among them, “ministers who were not ordained”.³⁰⁶ All of the above quotations make it clear that the Founders did not see officers as ordained clergy.

Ministers who were not ordained

At the same time as we have these very clear statements that The Salvation Army is an essentially lay movement, we find the development

³⁰³ W. Bramwell Booth, *General Booth's Journal*, 1921-2, London, 1925, p.30.

³⁰⁴ Florence Booth, *Wanted – An Elite* London, 1928, p.8.

³⁰⁵ John A. Carleton, *The Staff Review*, July 1924, p.242.

³⁰⁶ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.221.

of an assumption that officers do enjoy a distinctive and special status, or role – clarifying just what that distinction meant would in due course occupy much attention. 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.

Perhaps a straw in the wind is suggested by a footnote to statistics provided in *The Salvation War* of 1885. On the "Field State of The Salvation Army" it is explained that "Our grand total of officers does not show so great a growth in proportion to those abroad, because we last year had included employees in our grand total, whereas this year we exclude them at home and abroad."³⁰⁷ The meaning of this sentence is not immediately obvious but it does suggest that a clearer line is being drawn between those commissioned and those not.

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."³⁰⁸ 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

³⁰⁷ *The Salvation War, 1885*, London 1886, p.170. New Zealand S.A. Archives hold 1882, 1883, 1884, 1885 and 1886 volumes of this publication.

³⁰⁸ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.126.

must, of course, depend mainly upon the officers..."³⁰⁹ Bramwell agreed with this, writing, "Officers ... they are the spinal column of the affair and their tone and spirit is its spinal marrow."³¹⁰

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."³¹¹ "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."³¹² Perhaps such a statement shows 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."³¹³ 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

³⁰⁹ *Orders and Regulations for The Salvation Army*, London, 1878, p.8.

³¹⁰ Letter of 24 February 1899, in Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.218.

³¹¹ William Booth, *Letter to Commissioners and Territorial Commanders*, London, 1900, p.15.

³¹² Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.306.

³¹³ St. John Ervine, *God's Soldier*, II, pp.777-8.

all believers, although already effectively dropped in practice, had to be attenuated as an ideal.”³¹⁴

In his Foreword to a book by Hulda Friederichs, Booth paid glowing tribute to “My Officers, as a whole one of the most remarkable and I think, important facts about The Army there has not been a single year without its increase, not only in quantity, but in quality...As a body the men and women who make up the sum total of our leadership are a signal evidence of the presence of Christ in our midst, proving themselves to be no mean successors of the Apostles...”³¹⁵

In one of his “Letters to Soldiers” from the *War Cry* and the *Social Gazette*, reprinted in book form, Booth promotes the enlistment of the children of Salvationists as officers, asking, “Ought not a soldier’s children be trained for officership? To this I reply, Most certainly they ought, if they make it manifest that they possess or are likely to possess, gifts that will qualify them for such an important position. Every Salvationist father ought to foster in the hearts and minds of his children – boys and girls alike – that to be Officers in The Salvation Army is the highest and most useful position to which they can hope to aspire in this world, and so create the ambition in their hearts to reach it. And every Salvationist mother ought to do the same, only more so...”³¹⁶

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

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

³¹⁴ Roland Robertson, “The Salvation Army”, in Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.80.

³¹⁵ William Booth, in Hulda Friederichs, *Romance*, pp.12-4.

³¹⁶ William Booth, *Religion for Every Day*, London, (1902) reprinted 1987, p.31.

these things not on the authority of man, or of any outside organisation of men, but by the authority of God Himself.³¹⁷

Even Railton, enemy of the concept of the priestly class, wrote, "The work of the ministry is another thing altogether. Let no one suppose that The Salvation Army at all underrates the 'separation' unto His work of those whom God has chosen for entire devotion to some task, whatever it may be."³¹⁸

Bramwell Booth echoes similar sentiments in his memoirs.

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.³¹⁹

Again, Bramwell stated that

Our officers are ministers in the Church of God, having received diversities of gifts, but the one Spirit – endowed by His grace, confirmed in His word, and commissioned by the Holy Ghost to represent Him to the whole world.³²⁰

In one of his "Talks with Officers" series of articles in *The Officer*, later reprinted in book form, Bramwell notes that

even now many religious authorities deny our claim to minister to the souls of men because of an alleged lack of human accomplishments in our people. Some Christian bodies, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic – deny the claim even of our Officers to be ministers of Christ, and with a narrow and hateful sectarianism refuse them the hand of fellowship. That they should do so all the more surprises me because I know quite well on what slender ground the authority of their own ministers rest... But whatever may be the views of others, for any sake, do not let us have any lack of faith in God inside our own borders. The days of the fishermen and gardener, who were also disciples and apostles and evangelists, are not passed!³²¹

³¹⁷ *The Officer*, September 1915, p.579.

³¹⁸ G.S. Railton, *General Booth*, pp.21-2.

³¹⁹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.82.

³²⁰ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.67.

³²¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Talks with Officers*, London, 1921, p.15.

The issue became of more practical importance in the First World War. In Britain, because of uncertainty as to whether the Salvation Army was a *bona fide* church, obstacles were placed in the way of soldiers attesting as members of the Army. Salvation Army officers were not at first exempt from conscription, because of the unwillingness of the War Office to recognise them as Ministers of Religion. Bramwell Booth battled hard and eventually successfully for this. He also joined with other churchmen in opposing a proposal to call up clergy – pointing out that breeding horses and brewing beer were also reserved occupations.³²² He 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.³²³

In the United States the Judge Advocate General determined in September 1917 that The Salvation Army was a religious denomination, and that its officers were clergy, regularly ordained within the meaning of the statutes – exempt from conscription but eligible as chaplains to the forces. (Appendix 7) Chaplains were also appointed from amongst Salvation Army officers from New Zealand (the earliest, in 1915), Australia and Canada. It was not until April 1918, however, after considerable political influence was brought to bear, that the War Office relented and four Salvationists were appointed chaplains with British troops. On the Continent, Salvation Army Officers were conscripted both by Allied countries and by the Central Powers – some of those conscripts then being assigned to chaplaincy duties with the German troops.³²⁴

³²² Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.361.

³²³ *The War Cry*, 19th September 1914, p.7. (Cited by Shaw Clifton, Thesis, *Salvation Army in War Time*, p.215.)

³²⁴ Shaw Clifton, *ibid.*, pp.148, 150, 197-204, 263, 271-3; Herbert A. Wisbey Jr., *Soldiers Without Swords: a History of The Salvation Army in the United States*, New York, Macmillan, 1955. Pp.167-8; F.L. Coutts, *The Better Fight*, London, Hodder, 1973, pp.22,27.

A curious reminiscence by Edward Joy, an officer who served under both the Founder and his son, serves to underline the essential ambiguity of the Army regarding ordination. In 1944 he wrote:

During the last war there was some argument among a certain section of religious folk in Britain on the right of Salvation Army officers to regard themselves as “ministers of the Gospel” within the meaning of the Act of Parliament. At a ministers’ fraternal I attended, a minister of one of the (then) minor Methodist Connexions contended that we had no such right, never having been ordained.

“Oh, but we have been ordained, as you call it, according to the practice of our denomination,” I exclaimed, “just as truly as you have in accordance with the custom of your church.”

He, however, vehemently asserted that ordination could only be by the laying on of hands by a duly ordained minister. Such is the practice of the British Free Churches; Anglicans and Roman Catholics adhere to the belief that only a duly consecrated bishop – in what is called “the Apostolic Succession” – can perform the ceremony of ordination.

After some argument with my friend I turned to the chairman, a Nonconformist minister of high standing in his denomination, and asked for his ruling. For a moment or two he seemed nonplussed, then he said whimsically, “Let us ask the bishop next week.”

“Good enough,” said I. If he agrees that _____ is properly ordained, I’m sure he will admit that I am.” I knew full well that the Bishop, a High Anglican, would never admit the validity of my friend’s ordination, and most certainly not of mine. No more than the Roman Catholics would allow his!

I told this incident to my dear old leader, Commissioner T. Henry Howard, during a shipboard conversation, and asked him if my argument was sound.

“I’ll answer it in this way,” he said. “Kneel down.” (We were in his cabin.) I knelt before him, a feeling of solemnity taking possession of me as I realised his intention. Placing his hands on my head, he said something after this manner (I do not remember his exact words): “Receive thou the Holy Ghost for the office of a minister of the Gospel. In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost I declare you to be ordained to the office of the Christian ministry.”

“But Commissioner,” I asked, “who gave you the authority to ordain me?” And then he told me this:

In one of the early-day Exeter Hall “Two Days with God” Meetings Commissioner Howard made a reference to his not being an ordained minister, but as truly called to the preaching of the Gospel as any such. Whereupon the General – the Founder – jumped to his feet and exclaimed: “Not ordained? It shall be done now!” And placing his hands on Howard’s head, he said: “Thomas Henry Howard, in the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, I ordain thee a minister of the Gospel.” Some time later the Founder said to the Commissioner, “Don’t you trouble about the validity of the matter; I am an ordained minister of the Gospel, and as such fully qualified to perform the rite in your case.”

Now, am I an ordained minister, or am I not?"³²⁵

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, because of the autocratic temperament of its founder, it adopted a military, hierarchical structure which served to expedite the process of clericalisation. In the process of coming to terms with the fact that it was becoming a church amongst other churches, even while denying the fact, it claimed for its officers a distinctive status difficult to distinguish in any practical sense from that of other clergy.

³²⁵ Edward H. Joy in *The Officer's Review*, April-June 1944, pp.103-4.

CHAPTER FOUR

WHAT MANNER OF MEN... AND WOMEN³²⁶

WANTED ALWAYS

TO BECOME OFFICERS IN THE SALVATION ARMY

MEN AND WOMEN OF GOD

Anxious to devote their lives to the work of saving souls, Whose characters will bear any amount of investigation; Who can talk to a crowd of people out of doors and in, so as to wound sinners' hearts; Who can lead a band of godly men and women to do anything likely to win souls; Who are perfectly ready to speak, pray, visit, sit still, travel a hundred miles; Who have given up drink, tobacco, and finery for Christ's sake, or are willing to give up anything and everything for Him; Who are willing to be led and taught, and to be sent home again if they do not succeed. Who are willing to be evil spoken of, hated and despised, and even to be misrepresented, misunderstood, and undervalued at headquarters.

THE FOLLOWING NEED NOT APPLY:

Persons who, "being out of employment, desire to give themselves entirely," &c., &c.; Who "do not think they can be expected" to exhaust all their strength in labouring day and night to save souls; Who, "if engaged, will endeavour to give satisfaction to their employers"; Who will take any notice of the fact that their "friends object" to their going or living anywhere or doing anything they are asked to do; Who desire "light employment," "find their work begin to tell on them," &c., &c.; Who would like to know "particulars as to salary, hours, home, &c., before engaging"; Who "are sometimes troubled with doubts" about the inspiration of the Bible, the Divinity of Christ, the Atonement, election, the possibility of falling from grace, eternal damnation, or the personality of the devil. Who "having had considerable experience" in our kind of work, think they know how to do it.

G.S. Railton, *Heathen England*, London, 5th edn. 1883, p.192.

³²⁶ 2 Peter 3:11

Early Salvation Army theology of officership was not couched in traditional ecclesiastical terms. Rather it is motivational, descriptive and prescriptive of function. This section looks at this kind of theology under the following headings: A Peculiar People, The Military Model, Orders and Regulations, Recruiting, Vocation, Training, Terms of Engagement, The Work, Poverty Suffering and Sacrifice, Obedience, and Enduring to the End. Again, the question is raised as to whether the people described under these headings enjoy a particular status separate from that of other Salvationists, or whether they merely exercise one function within the organisation. This list does not refer to that one thing that seemed to most distinguish Salvation Army Officership from almost every other contemporary clerical institution – the equality of sexes in ministry. This is treated separately in a later chapter.

A Peculiar People

If the Founders' attitude to the ecclesiastical status of Salvation Army officers was ambiguous, they entertained no doubts at all about the qualities that should characterize those officers' lives, or the functions that they should discharge, or the conditions under which they should work. Any theology of Salvation Army officership must attend to these elements.

The earliest kind of theology of Salvation Army officership was prescriptive and motivational. Any theoretical justification it took from (1) Biblical models, such as the claim that General Booth occupied in respect of the Salvation Army a position analogous to that of Paul in the early church³²⁷, and (2) practical necessity – the exigencies of the war. It was in no way interested in questions of authenticity and authority in relation to the historic ministry of the church. Salvation Army doctrine of ministry

³²⁷ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, p.162. This tradition is alive and well today. In an address to officers in New Zealand on 31st March, 2000, Commissioner Ross Kendrew spoke of "a Theology of Officership" based on "Mark 3:13 as the basis for a contention that the role of the modern officer is akin to the first century apostle." (Text in possession of the writer.)

did not seek to dignify itself by such an appellation as “theology”; it was not that self-conscious. Booth would have applauded Nike’s motto, “Just do it!”

Questions of this kind were raised from time to time, but they were not considered of ultimate importance. The issues could be lived with, with a degree of imprecision and uncertainty that would not have been acceptable concerning doctrines held to be more central to the Salvationists’ faith. The Eleven Points, a statement of Salvation Army belief, enshrined alike in the Deed Poll of 1878, The Salvation Army Acts of Parliament of 1931 and 1980, and in the soldier’s “Articles of War”, contain no doctrine of the Church. Salvationist doctrinal publications made few explicit references to the matter before *Salvation Story*, the 1998 version of the Handbook of Doctrine.

It was probably not until the 1960’s that some officers began to discuss such matters with more than casual interest; not until the mid 1970’s that the expression, “theology of officership” actually appeared in the pages of *The Officer*. At this point in our study, however, we are concerned with what the first two generations of Salvationists taught and were taught. The principles then established determined the nature of a tradition, of which some elements have been perpetuated as a cultural mythology even when the reality has drifted somewhat from that ideal. But that is to anticipate. Firstly, we look at “what manner of men”, and women, the officers of Booth’s day were required to be.

The Military Model

The most obvious thing about The Salvation Army is that it is an Army – an authoritarian religious organisation structured on quasi-military lines and employing military terminology. Any theology of officership has to look at the implications of the status and function of officers within such a hierarchy. As Booth’s small, London-based Mission expanded he first attempted to organise it on Methodist conference lines, which involved a measure of democratic participation. In his words, he “launched the

Conference on a sea of legislation and it all came to nothing.”³²⁸ Both Booth and his closest associates found this frustrating. Sandall quotes a delegation of close supporters telling Booth in 1876, “We gave up our lives to work under you and those you shall appoint, rather than under one another.”³²⁹ Close examination of the Mission’s structure through to 1877 suggest however that Booth’s control was never less than authoritarian and the eventual reorganisation along even more autocratic lines in 1877-79 “marshalled it in the way that it was going.” According to Glen Horridge, the new Deed Poll of 1878 simply did “away with any pretence of democracy.”³³⁰

A certain spontaneity nevertheless attended the adoption of military ranks and terms. Booth followed rather than led in this respect so it was in a way a manifestation of grass-roots democracy. Militarism and jingoism were in the air; Britain was fighting small colonial wars; the Volunteers were a contemporary British phenomenon – although a somewhat risible one. It was the age of “Onward Christian soldiers”; the church also employed the fashionable language of war. Railton wrote to Booth as “General” and signed himself as “Lieutenant” as early as 1873.³³¹ Elijah Cadman of Whitby first used the expression “salvation army” to describe the mission. Booth made it official when he corrected a printer’s proof of the title page of the 1878 Christian Mission Report, by crossing out “Volunteer” in “Volunteer Army” and substituting “Salvation”. Cadman styled himself a captain and Booth as “General of the Hallelujah Army” in posters in 1877³³² and first proposed uniform as “a suit of clothes that would let everybody know that I meant war to the teeth and

³²⁸ *The Christian Mission Magazine*, July 1877, p.147.

³²⁹ Robert Sandall, *History*, 1, p.198.

³³⁰ Glenn K. Horridge, *The Salvation Army, Origins and Early Days: 1865-1900*, Godalming, Ammonite Books, 1993, p.31.

³³¹ Bernard Watson, *Soldier Saint: George Scott Railton*, London, Hodder, 1970, p.26.

³³² Humphrey Wallis, *Commissioner Cadman*, London, 1928, pp.70-1.

Salvation for the world.”³³³ Booth became General; Evangelists became captains and members soldiers. Regulations, flags, bands and all the panoply of war followed.

With the organisation of the Army into Divisions under Divisional Officers in 1880 an episcopal structure came into being.³³⁴ International expansion soon brought about the three levels of Command that still exist – Territorial, Divisional and Corps.³³⁵ (Not quite the traditional three-fold order of the Church, but interesting to compare this with Hans Küng’s comment : “But even in non-episcopal missions in many cases an office corresponding to that of bishop, though bearing another name, has been established to meet the requirements of ecclesiastical life.”³³⁶)

Leadership, as the whole military metaphor would insist, would be the principal aspect of the officer’s role. A vigorous note from William Booth to Bramwell in March 1877 encapsulates his theology of officership: “You must have a leader, and you must have a band of men who are ‘alive’. Let us pour contempt on our ‘ministerial helpers’ and end them or mend them... Give me godly, go-ahead dare-devils and anybody may have the preachers!”³³⁷ His closest spirits shared his views. Railton lauded the “superiority of a personal directorate over a divided management...” “By this means above all,” he claimed, “can our members be preserved from the tendency to sectarianism and kept continually moving on to the fulfilment of the great evangelistic enterprise for which alone the Army exists. The supremacy of one who is pledged

³³³ Glenn K. Horridge, *Origins*, p.45.

³³⁴ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.50. Announced in *The War Cry*, 18 September 1880.

³³⁵ The Salvation Army was sometimes a bit hazy about the precise application of military terms and managed to make Corps a subset of Division rather than the reverse. The rank structure suffered from comparable anomalies, compounded by their international application. On the Continent, “Brigadier” suggested a lowly NCO rather than an officer of staff rank; in Britain it meant a General. Norman Bicknell, distinguished World War II chaplain, was promoted from Brigadier to Lt.-Colonel when Divisional Commander in Auckland. His confreres on the Chaplains’ Defence Advisory Council congratulated him, but one took him aside to ask, “Norm, whatever did you *do*?”

³³⁶ Hans Küng, *Structures of the Church*, London, Burns & Oates, 1965, p.134.

³³⁷ Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.90.

to an invariable and unalterable programme is guarantee for the perpetual prosecution at every station of the same system, which has proved so blessedly successful hitherto.”³³⁸ Hattersley characterises as “positively Nietzschean” Railton’s insistence that success depends upon the direction of one controlling will.³³⁹ “Is it any wonder?” asked Hulda Friederichs, “that the autocrat of the Salvation Army is so imbued with the power of autocracy that he makes every officer, down to the youngest lieutenant, an autocrat in his or her own sphere of work?”³⁴⁰

The Orders and Regulations spelled it out in Chapter VI, “The Government of the Army”. Section 1 was about “Strong Government”; “Where prompt, decided, forcible action is being continually required, there must be a form of government proportionately strong and determined.” Section 2, on “Leadership”, showed how such command, and corresponding obedience, was natural, Scriptural, universal and effective. Section 3, “Description of the Government”, claimed that “The Army has been modelled substantially after the fashion of the most powerful form of human government a military one.” Because, “to rise in the Army, a soldier has only to prove himself proportionately good and able... It is really the administration of government by the wisest and best... If the value and utility of a government be proved by its success in attaining the ends for which it is instituted, the unprecedented successes which have attended the career of The Army, taken alone, establish its claim to be considered not only wise and useful, but Divine.”³⁴¹ Such confidence was certainly not for the faint-hearted... and perhaps difficult to sustain with the benefit of hindsight. However, Commissioner Allister Smith, in opposing The Salvation Army Act of 1931, told a Parliamentary Select Committee that the General held office “by Divine Right”.³⁴²

³³⁸ George Scott Railton, *Heathen England*, p.180.

³³⁹ Roy Hattersley, *Blood and Fire*, p.220.

³⁴⁰ Hulda Friederichs, *Romance*, p.57.

³⁴¹ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, pp.159-163.

³⁴² St. John Ervine, *God’s Soldier*, 2, p.1007. (Smith had voted against the deposition of Bramwell Booth by the 1929 High Council.)

Discipline has to be seen in the nineteenth-century context when even ordinary conditions of employment would be judged harsh by twenty-first century expectations, and the Booths were leading a force many of whom were unused, as Railton noted, to discipline of any kind. An 1879 report announced that “Four officers were reduced to the ranks in December. 2 for light and frivolous conduct and conversation, 1 for contracting a matrimonial engagement immediately after appointment and without the consent of Headquarters. 1 for misbehaviour in the presence of the enemy.”³⁴³ Discipline could also be perceived as arbitrary or capricious. Colonel Henry Edmonds, once William Booth’s ADC and later a Territorial Commander, evidently fell from favour for exhibiting too great an independence of mind. In his unpublished memoirs he wrote of “...the extent to which, at a certain period, the General and Headquarters carried their spying and persecuting propaganda against those whom they suspect of seeking reforms in the Army system, or criticising any department of the Army, or any member of the Booth family, or their administration of their responsibilities, would be incredible but for the knowledge and experience of those who have suffered it.”³⁴⁴

Orders and Regulations

The earliest applied theology for Salvationists is found in the earliest *Orders and Regulations*. At first all evangelists, and later all officers, were engaged by the Founder in person. Through Conferences and Councils they heard from his own lips what character and duties he expected of them. As the organisation grew, William Booth, Bramwell and Railton all spent much of their time on peripatetic inspections, encouraging and correcting the workers and their work. This proved increasingly unmanageable. Booth recalled that for a time he resorted to issuing “these instructions in the form of correspondence; but this also I

³⁴³ *The War Cry*, 29 December 1879, p.4.

³⁴⁴ Henry Edmonds, unpublished memoirs, quoted in Glenn K. Horridge, *Origins*, p.88.

soon found to be a task beyond my ability... I was therefore compelled to print such special directions as I had formerly issued in other forms.”³⁴⁵

The Orders and Regulations of The Salvation Army, prepared by Railton under Booth’s supervision and first published in October 1878, were the result. This first edition majored on the practical issues to be addressed in seizing and holding posts for the Army and establishing Corps. The much larger and more detailed *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers* appeared in 1886.³⁴⁶ Additional volumes for the guidance of Soldiers, Secretaries and Treasurers, Staff Officers, Social Officers, Territorial Commanders and Chief Secretaries, and anybody else appointed to do anything at all, followed. Their multifarious revisions continue to order the life of The Army today, providing cohesiveness and a legal framework.³⁴⁷ Because they preceded any form of training – the most rudimentary form of which began in 1879 – and because in Booth’s words, “a very large proportion of my officers were uneducated and comparatively ill-trained”³⁴⁸, the “O’s and R’s” became very comprehensive. The more than 600 pages of the Regulations for Field Officers ranged over diverse matters from doctrine to book-keeping; “how to capture a town” and dealing with persecution; behaviour on board ship and the “construction of the Army”; how to talk with Mohammedans and how to march in formation; the need for fresh air in bedrooms at night and the application of hydropathy to such illnesses as scarlet fever and “difficulties of the bladder and urine”.

Most importantly for our theme, the Regulations prescribe the character and role of the officer. The expectations were high: “The F.O. [Field Officer], by virtue of his position, stands out before his Soldiers more prominently than any other man. To them he is the Ambassador and Representative of God. He is their Captain, their brother, and friend.

³⁴⁵ W. Booth, in Preface to Hulda Friederichs, *Romance*, pp.7-8.

³⁴⁶ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, pp.33, 35.

³⁴⁷ The “O’s and R’s” may have become more generic and diminished in volume in recent years but “Minutes” of local application have more than compensated for this.

³⁴⁸ Hulda Friederichs, *Romance*, p.11.

Their eyes are on him night and day. They regard him as the pattern expressly set for them to copy, the leader who at all times it is their bounden duty to follow.”³⁴⁹ It is difficult to imagine a description of function more redolent of status or more likely to contribute to perceptions of status.

Chapter One also explains that the Officer’s teaching must be accompanied by his personal example, that the Officer must be a “Divine Man” – must have been converted and possessed by God – and must be “Holy”, which holiness will be expressed in every aspect of his life. The groundwork having thus been laid, Chapter Two devotes 27 pages to the Officer’s “War Qualifications”, these being outlined under the headings of a Soldier’s Spirit, Compassion for the perishing, Intelligence, Improvement, Responsibility for Success, Humility in Prosperity, Perseverance in Adversity, Obedience, Manner, Loyalty and Business.

According to Bramwell, William Booth’s “anxiety was to compile in that book a set of regulations which would perpetuate the Salvation Army, and preserve it from the mistakes and confusions which have befallen so many other societies in the religious sphere.”³⁵⁰ Against that, the elder Booth confessed that “I have never placed too great a reliance upon either these laws or the methods of their application”, he wrote. “I have ever been deeply impressed by a vivid sense of the utter powerlessness of any mere system, however wisely it may have been framed, which has not in its application that Spirit of Life which alone can impart that vital force without which no extensive or lasting good can be accomplished. God forbid that any regulations which I have issued, no matter how effective for their immediate purpose, should go to swell the number of dead forms and powerless systems already in existence.”³⁵¹

³⁴⁹ *Orders and Regulations*, 1886, Part I, Chapter I, Section 1, No.4.

³⁵⁰ Quoted by Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.158.

³⁵¹ Hulda Friederichs, *Romance*, p.9.

Recruiting

Not discussed in the Regulations but another general principle to which attention has already been drawn was Booth's conviction "that the best way to reach ... [those] lying entirely outside the influence of the Churches was by means of those who had themselves belonged to those classes. Therein lay what may be called the germ of The Salvation Army. From that point everything else, or nearly everything else, in our peculiar propaganda, has proceeded."³⁵² He concurred with and quoted Lord Shaftesbury (who detested him, and his Army³⁵³) as saying that "The working classes will never be reached but by an agency provided among themselves."³⁵⁴

Some of the most notable of the first generation of Salvation Army officers were firstly taken prisoner from the ranks of the "Skeleton Army", the organised bands of roughs that persecuted Salvationists in the English tradition of "rough-musicing" during the 80's. Charles Jeffries was one such who became a Commissioner in later years.³⁵⁵ Popular attention was focussed on such recruits. "It should not be forgotten that many of the officers of the Army have been recruited from the lowest strata of society, and some from the ranks of the most dangerous and criminal classes."³⁵⁶

Horridge has shown however that "while the majority of officers continued to be recruited from a wide social range across the working

³⁵² W. Booth, in Friederichs, *Romance*, pp.4-5.

³⁵³ Shaftesbury wrote to La Comtesse de Gasparin (who published his letter) that the Army showed that "the devil, who, having long tried to make Christianity odious, has now changed his hand, and endeavours to make it ridiculous." (La Comtesse Agenor de Gasparin, *Read and Judge*, p.55.) His biographers suggest that "Shaftesbury's quarrel with the Salvation Army in 1881 was a matter of manners rather than of principle." (J.L. & Barbara Hammond: *Lord Shaftesbury*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 4th ed. 1939, p.228.)

³⁵⁴ Robert Sandall, *History*, 1, illustration opposite p.228. (Quote on title page of the Report of The Christian Mission for 1878.)

³⁵⁵ Robert Sandall, *ibid.*, 2, p.61.

³⁵⁶ Emma Booth and Herbert Booth in *Called Out! And what comes of it*, London, undated but from internal evidence 1887, p.11.

class (he gives the figure of 93% in the period 1878-1883) few actually came from the 'submerged tenth' – the class to which Booth felt especially called. A high proportion had had some previous religious affiliation – two thirds of them Wesleyan or Primitive Methodists. Some came from what Sandall described as "the Christian unemployed" – men and women already converted for whose service there was not provided any outlet in their own sphere." "Between the recruits who came from the 'dangerous classes' and the comparatively few 'preachers from the pub', ... were the ever-growing large number of ordinary men and women..." Horridge also notes that Anglican and Methodist women were attracted by the Army's policy of equality of opportunity for women.³⁵⁷

The "dangerous classes" was Booth's term for the middle and upper classes – he tried to discourage them from joining because he did not think they would fit in or accept his discipline. In fact they usually rose quickly to prominence and high rank. William Booth's "first gentleman", and subsequently his son-in-law, was Frederick St. George de Latour Tucker, late Indian Civil Service. Tucker's ancestors included a secretary to Elizabeth I and a grandfather who had been Chairman of the Court of Directors of the Honourable East India Company. He had a head start in the Army, by-passing training in 1881 and with the initial rank of major led the invasion of his native India in 1882. He was made a Commissioner the following year.³⁵⁸

Booth tried to dissuade the American Methodist clergyman Brengle when the latter applied to become an officer in 1887 but Brengle survived his initial assignment of cleaning fellow cadets' boots and went on to become a Commissioner.³⁵⁹ Elwin Oliphant, one of three curates to enter the work in 1884, likewise ended up a Commissioner.³⁶⁰ However, Bramwell Booth assured his readers that, "All, or practically all promotion

³⁵⁷ Glenn K. Horridge, *Origins.*, pp.76, 80-6, 225-7; Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.59, 64.

³⁵⁸ Harry Williams, *Booth-Tucker, William Booth's First Gentleman*, London, Hodder, 1980.

³⁵⁹ William Clark, *Samuel Logan Brengle*, London, Hodder, 1980, p.47.

³⁶⁰ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, pp.194-5.

is from the ranks. Less than ten in a thousand of our leaders have reached that position without having first served as followers.”³⁶¹

The Call

One identifiable strand in the Army’s officership ethos, a characteristic inherited from its non-conformist, sectarian forebears, is the “call”. William Booth spoke of his own call when interviewed in 1894: “I have heard a great deal about the ‘call to the ministry’ since those days, but my call to follow my Saviour and save as many sinners from the pains of Hell as I possibly could, came to me at the beginning of my career... I never needed either my Bible or my minister, or any special movement of the Holy Spirit on my heart to press this truth home upon me. It appeared to me self-evident that the religion of Jesus Christ could not be possessed without the Christ-like hunger for the Salvation of men.”³⁶² Booth here regards a call to evangelism as concomitant with being a Christian.

In Salvation Army usage however the call came to be associated particularly with officership. A frequently quoted saying by William Booth – “‘Not called, did you say?’ Not heard the call, I think you should say...”³⁶³ – was by its context evidently addressed to all Salvationists concerning their responsibility for evangelism, but became associated with the call to officership. Bramwell Booth refers to “that direct and definite impulse, born, I believe, of the Spirit of God, which is usually described by those who recognise it as ‘the call to the work.’” “There is sometimes, I admit, an illusion... element of selfish ambition... a mere impression. But in the majority of cases that call is a very real, a very beautiful, a very powerful occasionally a very terrible, visitation... The call disposes at one stroke of difficulties that no human influences could remove. It comes with the imperative definiteness of a command, with the

³⁶¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p.22.

³⁶² Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.196.

³⁶³ Reprinted in *The Officer*, August 1921, p.93.

directness of an overwhelming conviction of duty.” He goes on to say that, “Rarely is one asked to become an Officer. The proposal comes to us in the form of an ‘offer’ for service from the candidate, and is usually addressed to the Captain of the Corps of which the proposer is a soldier.”³⁶⁴

Whatever Bramwell's disclaimer, this is not to say that there was not aggressive recruiting and shoulder tapping. Apart from the constant need for money³⁶⁵, the ever-expanding war was hungry above all for officers. In 1878 Booth was already demanding “1,000 recruits, 1,000 evangelists, to join the salvation army,” initial letters not yet capitalised.³⁶⁶ In a letter to Bramwell while on tour overseas in 1909, William Booth exclaimed, “Oh, what an opportunity we have in these parts. Officers! Officers! Officers of the right stamp are our great necessity.”³⁶⁷ In 1919 Bramwell Booth launched “a great call for two thousand candidates... Will each officer secure at least one offer of a life in 1919? I want those two thousand almost immediately – a thousand men and women at once, and another thousand in six months or so.”³⁶⁸

Heart Training

Bryan Wilson notes that the concept of special training by a sect marks a significant step towards denominationalising. “Training implies a lack of parity between leaders and members, it compromises the radical democracy of the sect and the ideal of the priesthood of all believers. Spontaneity disappears, and the leaders employ the status symbols of

³⁶⁴ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p.27, 32.

³⁶⁵ William Booth wrote to Bramwell in 1884 that “General Booth ought to be seen now and then elsewhere than at Madame Tussaud's not asking for money!” Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.315.

³⁶⁶ *The Christian Mission Magazine*, November 1878, p.305.

³⁶⁷ Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, pp.217-8, 321.

³⁶⁸ *The Officer*, January 1919, pp.1, 8.

their profession, seeking equal esteem with the pastors of other movements.”³⁶⁹

At first the only training available for Christian Mission evangelists or Salvation Army Officers was of the apprenticeship model, and there was little enough of that. Bramwell Booth was painfully aware of the lack. He confided to his diary in February 1877, “Oh this miserable hunt for men ... we must take in and make our own men.” And to his mother he wrote in May of that year, “If this ship is going to live out the storms, ought not the whole strength and skill of everyone aboard be concentrated on the one great want, organisation of the rank and file, and training of the officers? ... Here is no plan for training these women. After all we have said and seen and suffered, we are daily taking out girls without any previous training or education whatever.”³⁷⁰

The earliest systematic attempt was made when ten young men were sent to assist Captain Ballington Booth in the establishment of the Manchester Temple Corps, as reported in *The Salvationist* of May 1879.³⁷¹ “Training Homes” were subsequently opened in London, firstly for women under Emma Booth in April 1880 and then for men under Ballington and later under Herbert Booth in October that year. Emma, only 20 years of age at this time, remained in this work for eight years and became known as the “Training Home Mother”. A basic catechism, *The Doctrines and Discipline of The Salvation Army*, “prepared for the Training Homes by The General” was published in 1881.

In 1881 the London Orphan Asylum in Clapton was acquired and this remained the “International Training Home” until 1930, when a new College was built at Denmark Hill, South London.³⁷² By the end of 1882,

³⁶⁹ Bryan Wilson, “Sect development”, in Bryan Wilson (Ed.), *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organisation and ideology in social and religious movements*. London, Heinemann, 1967, p.34.

³⁷⁰ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, pp.132-3.

³⁷¹ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.67.

³⁷² Despite the “international” label, Clapton served mainly the British Territory although large parties of missionaries were also dispatched together in the early years. Other Territories usually established their own institutions. However, over the years small numbers of overseas cadets attended. At Denmark Hill in 1970-72, I was one of about ten non-British cadets, out of about 200 in the two sessions in training.

more than 400 cadets had been sent out as officers after training for a few weeks, or months at most.

A new system was instituted in 1886, whereby instead of entering and being commissioned in “dribblets”, cadets came into training at half-yearly intervals. Three months were spent in the classroom, with practical work in the immediate vicinity, after which the cadets were sent out for a further three months “brigading” in various parts of the country under the Training Officers. Commissioning and appointment to the “Field” followed. By June 1886, some 2,600 cadets had passed through the system.³⁷³

The system was further modified in 1894, when Candidates began with prescribed local training in their home Corps, followed by seven weeks in the Training Home, four months in twos and fours out at Corps, then a final three weeks back at Clapton. A year’s probation followed their commissioning.³⁷⁴ The length of training was increased to ten months in 1903.³⁷⁵ That term remained the norm until the mid-1960’s.

Training at what Hulda Friederichs generously dubbed “The Sandhurst of The Salvation Army”³⁷⁶, majored on three books: the Bible, the Orders and Regulations for Field Officers and the Doctrines of The Salvation Army.³⁷⁷ Reading, writing and elementary mathematics also needed to figure in the curriculum for some. The main purpose of training was not, however, academic. William Booth had a horror of academic learning for its own sake, which Murdoch attributes to his revivalist “fear of ministerial education... When attempting to discern why the clergy lacked fire, revivalists identified the problem as formal training...

³⁷³ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.70.

³⁷⁴ *The Officer*, April 1894, pp.114-7.

³⁷⁵ Arch. Wiggins, *The History of the Salvation Army*, Vol 4, London, Nelson, 1964, p.209.

³⁷⁶ Hulda Friederichs, *Romance*, pp.95-114.

³⁷⁷ “One of the ‘Scholars’”, *A School of the Prophets*, London, 3rd edn., 1901, p.67.

Seminaries were the bane of inspired preaching.”³⁷⁸ In this Booth was supported by Railton, who wrote to Bramwell in 1877, “I shall always I trust continue dead against any approach to a college sort of thing which cannot ever be justified from scripture experience, and can never produce anything but parsons. We want to train men to be like us, without time for self, always at it, and yet always being stoked and fed up as they fly.”³⁷⁹

The real purpose of training was “officer formation”. In his *Servants of All*, Bramwell Booth identified the task as “character-building” and “the training of the heart”; the Training Home as a “manufactory for the making of men.”³⁸⁰ “The main aim was to influence the spiritual life of the cadet. Personal contact with the leader, by interviews and meetings, loomed larger than anything else in the curriculum. That and the cadet’s own contact with sinners constituted the chief objectives...”³⁸¹ T. Henry Howard, erstwhile Training Home Principal, described the aim as helping the cadets to “get a fairly good knowledge of themselves, and also to set up right standards by which they can measure their future life and work.”³⁸²

Terms of Engagement

Commission, Covenant and Undertakings: these three instruments define and document the relationship between the officer and the organisation, although the Covenant is, strictly speaking, an agreement with God as well as, or even rather than, with the Army. Examples of Covenant and Undertakings are found in Appendix 8.

Rank is conferred with a “commission”, which constitutes the officer’s authority to act. At first the appointment of officers was fairly

³⁷⁸ Norman Murdoch, *Origins*, p.2.

³⁷⁹ Quoted by Bernard Watson, *Soldier Saint*, p.38, from The Railton papers. Poor Railton – his own two sons, thanks to their mother’s family money, went to Oxford, and both of them became parsons – one an archdeacon.

³⁸⁰ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.51-2.

³⁸¹ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.133.

³⁸² “One of the Scholars”, *School*, p.vii.

informal but it became more formalised with the development of institutional training. The *War Cry* reported commissioning meetings from the 1880's on and the 1886 inauguration of "sessions" with definite commencement and commissioning dates gave more scope for public commissioning exercises. At first a fresh commission was issued for each new appointment but from 1898 "new and artistic" commissions were provided as a "permanent certificate of officership" while a "special form of 'Marching Orders'" was provided for changes of appointment.³⁸³ Distinction was soon made between Staff and Field ranks, providing different ladders for promotion as well as differing benefits and emoluments. These caused much heart-burning until their abolition in the early 1930's, although the higher ranks continued to be characterised as "staff" until late in the century when they became known as "conferred" ranks. A table of ranks is provided in Appendix 3.

The "Undertakings", pertaining to the acceptance of Orders and Regulations for Officers, included promises to work a certain number of hours per day, that gifts would not be accepted,³⁸⁴ that no other trade or moneymaking activity would be engaged in and that courting and marriage regulations would be observed. Early versions in North America at least, according to some sources, included a promise to "never, without having first obtained the consent of the Commissioner, to take part in opening any place for religious services, or in carrying on services in any place within three miles of any then existing station of the Army, under penalty of forfeiting \$250 to the Commissioner for the benefit of the Army if I should in any way prove unfaithful to this solemn pledge."³⁸⁵ Undertakings appear to have been supplied at first as part of the application form for appointment as an officer, and were later also signed,

³⁸³ *The War Cry*, 19 March 1898, p.5.

³⁸⁴ Probably the most notorious incident in this respect was the dismissal of Captain 'Gypsy' Smith in 1882 because he accepted a gold watch as a farewell present from the local free churches of Hanley – he had dissuaded the soldiers from giving him anything. Smith became widely known as an independent evangelist. (G. Smith, *Gypsy Smith, His Life and Work, by Himself*, London, 1903, p.133.)

³⁸⁵ 'A.S.', *The New Papacy*, Toronto, Albert Britnell, 1899, p.62; 'Norah Marks', *Facts About the Salvation Army*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1889, p.156.

as the “Field Officer’s Bond”, at the conclusion of training, before commissioning. The application form also included the Salvation Army doctrinal statement and marriage conditions for officers. They were also known as “The Officers’ Declaration”.³⁸⁶

Early forms of Undertakings seem ambiguous about the non-contractual nature of an officer’s engagement. “I fully understand that he (the Commander) does not undertake to employ or retain in the service of the Army anyone who does not appear to him to be fitted for the work, or faithful and successful in it...” could imply that those who met the standard were considered to be employed, even although they also undertook to “discharge the Army, and you or the Commissioner for the time being, from all liability in respect of salaries, acknowledging that I fully understand that you do not engage to pay me or guarantee that I shall be paid any salary while holding an appointment...”³⁸⁷

The modern version is quite explicit: “I understand and agree that there is no contract of service or employment nor any other legal relationship between the Army and me.”³⁸⁸ The Undertakings “spell out very clearly that there is no contractual relationship between the officer and The Salvation Army. It follows therefore that the officer is not an employee nor is The Salvation Army his employer.”³⁸⁹

A test case was *Rogers v Booth* which involved a claim by an officer under the workers’ compensation legislation in force in Britain at the time. The court found,

It is a relationship pre-eminently of a spiritual character. They are united together for the performance of spiritual work and, in order to carry out efficiently the end they have in view, they submit to a very strict discipline, and a very strict command... the necessary contractual

³⁸⁶ “The Officers’ Declaration”, article by Colonel William Gist, *The Officer*, October 1928 pp.303ff.

³⁸⁷ 1891 American form of Declaration, cited in A.S., *New Papacy*, p.64.

³⁸⁸ Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 2001/IA/09.

³⁸⁹ Major Peter Smith (Legal and Parliamentary Secretary, International Headquarters), unpublished paper, ‘Current and Future Legal Issues’, International Conference of Leaders, Melbourne, 1998, p.1. In the European Union at least, this principle is now under threat by the courts.

element which is required before a contract of service can be found is entirely absent. The parties, when they enter into a relationship of that kind, are not intending to confer upon one another rights and obligations which are capable of enforcement in a court of law.³⁹⁰

The Covenant was the brainchild of Bramwell Booth, according to his daughter Catherine, and was signed by cadets on the final 'Spiritual Day' (a day spent in religious services intended to inculcate personal consecration to the cause) before commissioning.³⁹¹ She gave no date for this initiative, but the earliest *War Cry* report for a Covenant Day is in the issue of 13th May 1922.

A brochure on training first published in 1923 provided a former cadet's account of the commissioning events. Referring to the final Spiritual Day, she wrote,

In the afternoon meeting all received the Covenant form to pray over and sign. Towards the end of the evening meeting we repeated the words of the Covenant after the General:

"I give myself to God, and here and now bind myself to Him in a solemn covenant. I will love and trust and serve Him supremely as long as I live. I will live to win souls, and will not allow anything to turn me aside from seeking their salvation as the first great purpose of my life. I will be true to The Salvation Army and the principles represented by its flag, under which I stand to make this Life-Covenant."

The colours were held over us, we sang...the General prayed that we might be true to the Covenant which we afterwards signed.

The Commissioning Day was also described.

The Afternoon Dedication Service, held in the Congress Hall, transformed us all into officers, and when we marched into the crowded hall, at 6pm, to receive our appointments, our hearts beat with unusual rapidity. The General's message to the Cadets began, "In the name of the Lord, I receive you into our Ranks as Officers of The Salvation Army."

The next chapter referred to another occasion, when the Commissioning and Appointment evidently took place together:

"To be Lieutenant and appointed to Camlachie, and may God bless you, and give you a long life of soul-winning," said the Training Commissioner, as he handed an officer's commission to a girl, 19 years of age.³⁹²

³⁹⁰ (Rogers v Booth (1937) 2 All ER 751) page 754, quoted by D.J. Turley/C.J. Jamieson (Bell Gully Buddle Weir), Unpublished legal opinion on "Status of Officers", October, 1992, p.8.

³⁹¹ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.136.

³⁹² *The Training of Salvation Army Officers*, London, 1927, pp.27-31.

It was on the basis of these documents that Salvation Army officers could be described as clergy, and like other clergy fell within the category of “employed by God”. Up until now this has secured the Army against legal action by officers in common law legal jurisdictions.

The Work

The activity and employment of an officer was described as “the work”, in a manner comparable with St Luke’s use of “the way” for being a Christian (e.g. Acts 19:9). In *Servants of All*, written to explain and promote the role of officers, Bramwell Booth quotes letters from officers using the word in this manner: “I was sorely tempted to leave the work...” and, “I value the work too highly to leave it...”³⁹³ In expressions such as to “enter the work”, to be “still in the work”, to “leave the work”, this remains a Salvation Army idiom for officership to this day.

Bramwell Booth noted that “little by little the conception of a Salvation Army officer has grown until it has come to include very much. A servant of God, and a servant of the common people living amongst them, such a one must be a fisher of men, in touch with them and yet above them, an example to them, a friend, an advisor, confessing their sins, pleading for them at the Throne of Mercy, sharing their sorrows, rebuking and warning them in truth, albeit, with tears, a faithful messenger of the Cross, a shepherd of the sheep, caring for the household of faith, patient, kind, a leader of the Lord’s host, the servant of all.”³⁹⁴

Not all officers met such exacting standards. Bramwell Booth’s wife, Florence Booth, responsible for the oversight of the British ‘Field’ 1919-1925, expressed dismay at the proposition made by an officer who “had been on furlough for a year, owing more, I believe, to discouragement, on account of her poor work, than to ill health. She

³⁹³ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.105, 112.

³⁹⁴ W. Bramwell Booth *Servants*, p.18.

wished to come back, and we were considering her case. There was evidence that, when consulting the doctor from whom we wanted an opinion as to her fitness to return to the Field, she said that as a Field Officer she would be in a little home where she would be able to rest whenever she desired, and go to meetings occasionally.”³⁹⁵

It is true that the general expectation of workplace ethic was more strenuous in the Victorian era than today in some countries. Longer hours and fewer holidays were the norm. The Booths were however classic workaholics with a spiritual imperative, and a similar commitment was expected of anyone enlisting in their Army. Editorialising in *The Officer*, Frederick Booth-Tucker claimed that, “We have no hobbies... unless it be a hobby to want to save the largest number of souls with the highest possible salvation in the quickest space of time by the best imaginable methods.”³⁹⁶ The *Orders and Regulations* insisted that “Holiness also supposes the F.O. [Field Officer] to be saved from idleness. Idleness in a Salvation Army officer is sin. Idleness means broken vows. It means hypocrisy, it means heartlessness, and such things cannot be imagined where the Spirit of Holiness reigns.”³⁹⁷ Bramwell confessed in a letter to his father, “This feeling that you are a poor sinner loaded with guilt if you stop work for ten minutes, even in a railway train, is really dreadful.”³⁹⁸

In retrospect, Bramwell’s daughter expressed regret that this had been perhaps too extreme. Of Bramwell she wrote, “It was a flaw in his well-balanced mind that he did not take the need for relaxation seriously. He never learned to relax ... It would not be an exaggeration to describe his life as an orgy of work.” She notes that in fifty years he never took a

³⁹⁵ Florence Booth, *Powers of Salvation Army Officers*, London, undated but mid-1920’s, p.18.

³⁹⁶ *The Officer*, February 1893, pp.1-2.

³⁹⁷ *Orders and Regulations*, 1886, pp.7-8.

³⁹⁸ Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.199. (A retired railway guard told me in 1971 how Bramwell used to take over a compartment of his commuter train by spreading his papers on all the seats, and would take umbrage if asked to let more people into the compartment if there was a full train.)

holiday in which any one complete day was free from work. When his doctors urged him in his seventies to relax, he “could not easily break the bondage of mental habit.”³⁹⁹

Would-be Candidates for Officership were certainly urged to count the cost. “To come here,” warned an early recruiting pamphlet, “means to throw yourself into a life where shadows and gloomy disappointments are plentiful, where misunderstanding and misinterpretation of friends and foes will bring to the heart many a sting hard to be borne – a life from which the gratification of self, the pleasures of ease, comfort or wealth have for ever been banished, and in which the ceaseless pulling against the tide of popular feeling and worldly ambition will lead to isolation, derision and contumely. It means care on behalf of the souls of others, and sorrow on account of their sins. A little of the great burden on behalf of a lost world, which crushed the great heart of the Saviour of mankind until it broke, shall be laid upon your shoulders.”⁴⁰⁰

Bramwell Booth illustrated the “work”, the Field Officer’s way of life, by quoting a diary, “supplied to me by an old Field Officer”.

MONDAY

Arose at 7a.m. – a good night’s rest after yesterday – hard but happy fight .

Began the week in faith for a time of great blessing.

9a.m. – Visited Sunday’s converts. Saw them during the breakfast hour. We had cheer and prayer. Then went visiting Soldiers and Recruits who were prevented from attending meetings. Found three sick.

1p.m. – Hour for dinner. Found wife had been dealing with a backslider – a poor woman who appears to be very easily driven back.

Afternoon resting.

7p.m. – Open Air - Boro’ Lane – great impression made by one of last night’s converts, who testified.

8p.m. – Indoor Meeting. The converted Irishman and two saved footballers testified – spoke myself on Prodigals – had two at the Mercy-seat – one from a Lodging house – found he was a poor backslider.

9.45pm – On way home from Meeting visited two backsliders – they were very grateful for my visit.

TUESDAY

After breakfast and family prayer answered correspondence from D.O. – went to see Mr. Thompson concerning work for last night’s Lodging-house man – got him fixed up.

³⁹⁹ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *ibid.*, p.100.

⁴⁰⁰ Emma and Herbert Booth, *Called Out*, p.12.

10.30a.m. – Went to see a gentleman with reference to the taking of a small room down among the navvies who are opening up the new line – took building.
Afternoon. – Visited from door to door – saw twenty-five families and prayed with them.

Evening. – Soldiers' meeting – spoke to them on responsibility for the drunken classes.

9.30p.m. – Held Census Meeting to consider condition of Roll Book – found it was necessary to specially look up several backsliders and to follow down one or two offended. Local Officers appear to feel the burden of the Corps.

WEDNESDAY

After breakfast visited Soldiers and Recruits.

Afternoon. – Crys delivered. Wife and self busy with them – folding, etc., until 4.30p.m.

Night. – Children's special Band of Love Meeting at 6.30 – gave tea and drills.

Senior Meeting. Spoke on 'God's open door' – also had good powerful three-minute addresses from six Bandsmen – finished at 9.30 with one good case at the Mercy-seat.

THURSDAY

Was called up about 3 o'clock in the morning to visit a dying man – often been to our barracks – was with him until he died at 7. After breakfast went visiting.

Afternoon. – Held Cottage Meeting amongst some old cottagers – had sixteen present – one old woman converted.

Evening. – Salvation Meeting – got a runaway girl – just starting a life of ill-fame – took her back to her home 16 miles off by last train tonight. Tired, but happy.

FRIDAY

10a.m. – Attended Officers' Council – Divisional Officer gave explanations *re* New Scheme and told me the Target for my Corps – saw Divisional Officer on important question.

Afternoon. – Visited the navy quarter and managed to have a word with several of their wives – sold Crys and got a promise from several that they would attend Saturday night's Free-and-Easy.

Special preparation for Holiness Meeting.

7.15p.m. – Local Officers' Meeting.

8 p.m. – Holiness Meeting.

9.30 p.m. – Made up Corps books. Found soldiers were doing much better in giving, as a result of a talk a few weeks ago.

SATURDAY

Assisting wife with house-cleaning till mid-day – gave special attention to Barracks windows.

Afternoon. – Went with four Soldiers to gates of football-field. Sold 65 Crys, and spoke to several persons about Salvation.

Special thought and reflection *re* Sunday's Meetings.

7 p.m. – Open Air, Market-place.

8 p.m. – Free-and-Easy. Had several navvies present – got one converted.

9.45 p.m. – Had an hour's special dealing with God *re* Sunday.

SUNDAY

7 a.m. – Knee-Drill.

8.15 a.m. – Breakfast.

10 a.m. – Open-Air Meeting.

11 a.m. – Holiness Meeting.
12.45 p.m. – Dinner.
2 p.m. – Four Company Open-Airs – ten Soldiers in each. Wife conducted Open-Air with Converts.
3 to 3.30 p.m. – Attended Junior Meeting – examined Register.
3 p.m. – Wife did first part of Adult Meeting.
3.30 p.m. – I conducted the latter part of Adult Meeting – had 45 testimonies.
4.15 p.m. – Met three Corps Cadets and gave them counsel.
5 p.m. – Tea.
5.30 p.m. – Met Bandsmen and had special prayer with them.
5.45 p.m. – Open-Air.
6.30 p.m. – Salvation Meeting.
8 p.m. – Prayer-meeting. Held on until 9.45 – got five persons to seek Salvation. Accompanied two Converts home, and reached quarters at 10.30. Rather weary, but cheered.⁴⁰¹

At the heart of the Work was the imperative, “Go for souls and go for the worst!” – a saying attributed to William Booth. Booth summed it up with, “The end of The Salvation Army Officers is to convert men, to change their hearts and lives, and make them good Saints and Soldiers of Jesus Christ.”⁴⁰² Commissioner T. Henry Howard’s charge to 400 cadets being commissioned in 1905 made the task clear: “If these officers do not get the people saved from their sins, and bring lost souls to the world’s Redeemer, believe me, no amount of drumming, no amount of flag-waving, no amount of band-playing, will count for success.”⁴⁰³ Bramwell Booth described “fighting” as the “Central Idea of The Salvation Army”, to which “the selection, the consecration, the separation, the training of our Officers... are but preparatory.”⁴⁰⁴

Preaching on “the Spirit of Holy Warfare”, William Booth encouraged officers to, “meet and grapple with evil and its consequences... fighting the enemies of God and man who are raging and triumphing outside our camp.” He contrasted this with “the Church... ordinarily occupied with herself. Her clergymen ... do not feel any responsibility for the welfare of the people outside their own particular

⁴⁰¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.88-90.

⁴⁰² William Booth, *International Congress Addresses 1904*. London, 1904, p.86.

⁴⁰³ *The Field Officer*, December 1905, p.450.

⁴⁰⁴ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p. 64.

circle.”⁴⁰⁵ As far as the Work is concerned, officers today are still appointed to a “district” as well as to their particular charge. “The primary purpose of corps officers is to bring the message of salvation to the unconverted in their district, and to lead and train the soldiery to win souls for the kingdom of God.”⁴⁰⁶

Poverty, Suffering and Sacrifice

The theme of poverty and willingness to sacrifice oneself for the cause is too frequently touched on to be ignored. Begbie admitted that “It was a charge against (Booth), ... that he underpaid his Officers and condemned them to lives of inordinate hard labour. The fact was, that William Booth believed in poverty and feared riches.”⁴⁰⁷

Bramwell Booth named poverty as one of the problems to be “faced by the would-be Life-Servant of the Army”. He stated that “There is no guarantee of salary or other emolument – not for a single day – no, nor of a single penny... Theirs must be a very real life of faith.” He claimed that one of the benefits of this regime that, “We have been very little troubled with those who are in the service of the Temple for a piece of bread!” He quoted with approval the assessment of Sir Walter Besant, writing of Salvation Army officers; “But they must remain poor. They must always remain poor. That is essential. They must never let the world suspect that the old passion of devotion is decaying. The last words of the dying Catherine Booth were a command. ‘Self-Denial,’ she said, ‘will prove your love to Christ.’ Therefore they must remain poor.”⁴⁰⁸

Quite early Booth became concerned that his officers’ survival was at stake, and issued an “Order against Starvation”.

⁴⁰⁵ William Booth, *International Congress Addresses*, p.101. Thus apparently breaking his own regulation that “The F.O. must not ... pull to pieces the creed or denounce the practices of any other religious organisation...must never allow himself to say anything, either in public or in private, reflecting on ministers or religious teachers, which is calculated to lessen their influence and power to do good.” (*Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, pp.530-1.)

⁴⁰⁶ *Orders and Regulations for Corps Officers*, London, 1976, p.1.

⁴⁰⁷ Harold Begbie, *Booth*, II, p.177.

⁴⁰⁸ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.40-3.

He had learned with great concern that the bravest officers who had gone to the towns recently entered, had endured the greatest privations, going, in fact, to the very brink of starvation without informing him, and this, even in cases where they actually had money in their possession, which they had intended to use for the payment of rent or other debts. Such devotion, however noble, was to be avoided and condemned, especially because it not merely exposed the strength and life of the officers to great risk, but was likely to bring great discredit upon the Army.⁴⁰⁹ [An interesting hierarchy of arguments.]

Nevertheless, the *Orders and Regulations* prescribed suffering as part of the commitment: "The F.O. must choose not only the Salvation of Souls as the end of his existence, but that suffering, without which they cannot be saved. He embraces not only the end, but the means by which alone this end can be accomplished."⁴¹⁰ Bramwell adverts to Paul's words in Colossians 1:24 to provide Biblical underpinning for this expectation: "Christ gave himself for the world. He asks that those who have given themselves to Him will do the same thing and fill up the measure of His sufferings. That is the root idea of every true Salvation Army Officer."⁴¹¹

Maud Booth, recalling her experiences working with slum officers in Whitechapel, London, said that,

No salaries were required by these dear girls. All they wanted was food and clothing, with money to pay for their rent and to get necessities for the sick and starving. The motive of their labour was love, not money, and this has always been their power with the poor. The thought of making money in a work that, above all others, should be characterised by a total disregard of self-interest or self-glory, would never be tolerated by the true Salvationist.⁴¹²

In his memoirs, Bramwell Booth referred to the experience of Colonel Jacob Junker in Germany, when arraigned before the local Schiedsrichter on a charge of treating his officers with undue severity after complaints were made by some "deserters". In his defence

⁴⁰⁹ *The Christian Mission Magazine*, December, 1878, p.317.

⁴¹⁰ *Orders and Regulations*, 1886, p.9.

⁴¹¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p.17.

⁴¹² Maude Booth, *Beneath Two Flags*, p.102.

Junker referred to his military career and the privations endured for king and Fatherland.

“And sir, shall I not suffer some little hardship and privation and pain in warfare against the powers of darkness? Shall I not press on to the end, to save some souls for whom my redeemer died?...”

The court was silent. The judge wiped a tear from his cheek: the defendants [*sic*], ashamed, withdrew the charge, and, as a result of the incident, throughout the Rhineland the purpose of the Salvation Army was understood as never before.⁴¹³

An outsider's viewpoint is provided by “Norah Marks”, the pseudonym of a Chicago reporter told off by her editor to infiltrate the Salvationists. Presented with an application form for officership, “I was absolutely dumbfounded by the picture it presented of complete renunciation of self, hopes, plans, ambitions, prosperity... The Trappist monks give up scarcely less, because while immolated it is with the reverence of the world. With these Salvationists there is poverty perpetually enjoined, scorn, ridicule, a crushing of every part of the nature but the religious, and what seems a heartless abandonment of their bodily welfare by those with whom they serve.”⁴¹⁴ Booth was in fact dogged by accusations of heartless ill-treatment and neglect of his officers.⁴¹⁵

The “suffering” alluded to arose not only from the Army's ascetic discipline; it also followed the reactions of both mobs and the civil authorities to the Army's activities, particularly in the open-air. In Britain the licensed trade sometimes both paid the mob and then sat on the bench to sentence their victims. In most countries where it “opened fire”, members of the Salvation Army were subjected to abuse and intimidation, many suffering serious injury and some even death at the hands of their

⁴¹³ W. Bramwell Booth, *These Fifty Years*, London, Cassell, 1929, pp.131-2.

⁴¹⁴ ‘Norah Marks’, *Facts About The Salvation Army: Aims and Methods of the ‘Hallelujah Band’*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1889, p.160.

⁴¹⁵ J.J.R. Redstone, *An Ex-Captain's Experience of The Salvation Army*, London, Christian Commonwealth Publishing Coy., 2nd ed., 1888. Also John Manson, *The Salvation Army and the Public*, Routledge, London, 1906. Well into the second half of the 20th century, Corps Officers in New Zealand would be expected to see that all Corps expenses were paid before they could draw their full allowance.

persecutors. In 1882 alone, 642 soldiers were assaulted in the United Kingdom, one third of them women and 23 of them children... sixty Army buildings were damaged.”⁴¹⁶ In Britain, some 600 Salvationists had been imprisoned by the end of 1884, and it was not until 1912 that the last British officer spent time in prison for preaching in the street.⁴¹⁷

Obedience

The section on “Obedience” in the Orders and Regulations begins with the F.O.’s need to “obtain a cheerful and willing obedience from those under his command,” and to “secure (it) without the display of any domineering, masterful spirit... To make his Soldiers serve him, an officer must be willing to serve them.” Further, “the F.O. must be an example of obedience to his soldiers ... A proper respect for those in authority over him and a ready compliance with their wishes will do much to beget in those under him all necessary respect for his own authority.”⁴¹⁸

Booth boasted that The Salvation Army

is the only religious body founded in our time that is based upon the principle of voluntary subjection to an absolute authority. No one is bound to remain in the Army a day longer than he pleases. While he remains there he is bound by the conditions of the Service. The first condition of that Service is implicit, unquestioning obedience... We were told that in a democratic age the people would never stand the establishment of what was described as a spiritual despotism... Despite the alleged unpopularity of our discipline, perhaps because of the rigour of military authority upon which we have insisted, the Army has grown from year to year with a rapidity to which nothing in modern Christendom affords any parallel.⁴¹⁹

It is intriguing, as Norman Murdoch observes, that Booth’s “increasing autocracy bucked the times. The working class was gaining the franchise as Booth restricted it. As a result, his Army became his Army, or that of the officer in the locale, when it came to government, just

⁴¹⁶ K.S. Inglis, *Churches and the Working Classes in Victorian England*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963, p.192.

⁴¹⁷ Frederick L. Coutts, *No Discharge in This War*, London, Hodder, (1975), 2nd Edn 1981, p.94.

⁴¹⁸ *Orders and Regulations*, 1886, p.32.

⁴¹⁹ William Booth, *In Darkest England, and the Way Out*, London, 1890, pp.242-3.

as Victoria's government became increasingly the peoples' government."⁴²⁰

Such obedience Bramwell Booth characterised as "The Yoke" in his *Servants of All*, and described "as one of the happiest results of our system... the growth of the habit of obedience to superiors." He quotes a fragment of correspondence to illustrate its value: "I shall never be able to repay you, my dear leader, for the labour and patience you have expended on me. I feel I can at last say, by God's grace, that my self-seeking and pride are really broken down... Your tears and prayers with me, and your determined mastering of my unwillingness has won the day."⁴²¹

Defending the "despotism" of which the Army was accused, G.S. Railton compared it with the general acceptance of the orders of a policeman in directing traffic – "all were fully aware that without just such acts of despotism in our city thoroughfares traffic would become utterly impossible... We have already seen that the extent of the Army's victories has always kept pace with its advance in the direction of thoroughly military organization."⁴²²

Obedience was expected firstly in respect of the methods of evangelism espoused by Booth. In a letter dated 7th March 1877, he gave an account of his dealings with a missionary who preferred different tactics: "I wrote him very frankly and told him that the only way in which he could walk in harmony with me was in carrying out my wishes... I told him he must go in and do Mission work on Mission lines, or move off."⁴²³

The yoke proved most irksome to some however in its application to the power of appointment. As noted previously, itinerancy was part of the Army's Methodist inheritance. Maud Booth wrote that

⁴²⁰ Norman Murdoch, letter to the writer, July, 2002.

⁴²¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.70, 72.

⁴²² G.S. Railton, *Twenty-one Years*, p.175.

⁴²³ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.90.

officers in the Army are liable to removal, promotion, or any other change of circumstances without a moments warning or any reason assigned. This is quite true, and is known to every Candidate, and yet they multiply rapidly, even among those whose faces have been set like flint against it... Nothing human ever could do work such as this, and, if not human, its results being eminently Christian, what can it be but the Holy Spirit that can so change multitudes of human hearts, that they yield perfect obedience, that rarest of all fruits in this age, and especially in this land of self-assertion and independence.⁴²⁴

Ironically, it was in that land, the United States, that Maud and Ballington Booth resigned rather than accept a change of appointment in 1896.

Bramwell Booth recalled that, "In the early days of the Army's expansion in the United Kingdom, one of the most anxious problems which concerned the Founder... was the unwillingness of a certain proportion of the first leaders to be moved from one place to another – from one appointment to another... Here was a serious question of principle... " Apparently the principle was the occasion of some disagreement in 1878, when Booth resumed autocratic powers and a minority of missionaries parted company with him. "Twelve or fourteen years later the question again came to the front... Two men, both holding important positions... agitated for a change in the Army system." The Founder resisted the move. "His pronouncement was accepted throughout the then Army, to the immense gain of the movement. Several officers resigned... in particular the two men referred to promptly took their departure. They both came back a year or two later acknowledging their mistake..."⁴²⁵

Others were more malleable. "'Since receiving my appointment to South Africa, I have never for a second doubted the divinity of that appointment.' This expression of Commissioner Rees at the recent farewell meeting which took place at International Headquarters, undoubtedly voices the feelings of the nearly 1,600 officers who have just farewelled in Great Britain. But that it is possible to arrange such a changing over of officers, the magnitude and influence of which can

⁴²⁴ Maud Booth, *Two Flags*, pp.127-8.

⁴²⁵ W. Bramwell Booth, *These Fifty Years*, London, Cassell, pp.142-8.

scarcely be conceived, without difficulty, shows on the part of those officers affected by the change, their reliance on God and the confidence of their leaders.”⁴²⁶

Enduring to the End

The killing pace of the Work likely contributed to the high turn-over of personnel. Horridge gives figures of about one third and one half for the loss of “workers and members” respectively in the 1880’s but notes that in the 1890’s officer resignations decreased to about one quarter per annum.⁴²⁷ The expectation was that officership would be a life-long vocation – a fiction not laid to rest in official documents, as we shall see later, until the 21st century.⁴²⁸ This was not due to any doctrine akin to the indelibility of priestly character but in practical terms the moral implications were similar.

The language used at times would not have been out of place in a Roman Catholic publication concerning priestly character:

The ex-officer, no matter what was the cause that resulted in his loss to our fighting forces, is still a child of the Army. He entered the sacred circle. He became one of us, sharing our joys and sorrows, losses and crosses. He received the commission of a divinely-appointed authority to proclaim Salvation, build up men and women in their most holy faith, and help to win someone to God. He received the spirit of officership, whereby he mingled amongst us, for a season, as one of us, and go where he likes, and do what he likes, the imprint of the life he lived will remain. Time will not efface it; sin even will not blot it out. So that in a sense which we ought ever to remember, the ex-Officer still belongs to The Salvation Army.⁴²⁹

Asked about those who had left the ranks of officership, William Booth claimed that, “We remain in sympathetic and friendly relations with the great bulk of them ... a large proportion – in this country nine out of

⁴²⁶ *The Officer*, August, 1894, p.240.

⁴²⁷ Glenn Horridge, *Origins*, p.225. John Manson in his *The Salvation Army and the Public* (1906) computed the number of “worked-out” Salvationist men and women officers amongst the public at over 5000. (Cited by Brian Lunn, *Salvation Dynasty*, London, Wm. Hodge, 1936, p.183.

⁴²⁸ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p.17.

⁴²⁹ *The Field Officer*, December 1900, pp.453-4.

ten – remain with us, engaged in some voluntary effort in our ranks.”⁴³⁰ The seriousness with which such lapses were viewed is evidenced however by the frequency of cautionary articles in Officer publications, usually in the form of letters from ex-officers. In his *Servants of All*, Bramwell Booth quotes three such letters, one from an officer who was tempted to give up but hadn't done so, and two from people who had resigned – one to become a soldier again while the other had “become a castaway”.⁴³¹ I found at least nineteen contributions on this subject printed in *The Officer* and *The Field Officer* between 1894 and 1917. These ranged from short letters like the “confession by an ex-officer” which concluded with a call for “life-long endurance”⁴³² to two-part articles like that by The General on “Conservation of Officers”.⁴³³ Putting one's hand to the plough and then turning back was considered a serious matter and a cause for great anxiety.

Fortunately some saw the errors of their ways and returned – an editorial writer in 1900 observed that, “it must be gratifying to the General and Field Officers alike that the year now closing has been marked by the return of a larger number of ex-officers to the ranks, in different capacities, than has any previous period of our history.”⁴³⁴ The actual numbers were not given however.

An earlier issue shared,

that Brigadier Miles, after resigning and going to take work in America, has given up that work and come back again to the Army, expressing his deep sorrow for having, in a fit of depression and discouragement, left its ranks. He has been re-accepted, with the rank of Major, and is in charge of a Division. His advice to people who think they can be happier or better off under any other flag is that it is all a lie of the devil, and that they should stick to the Yellow, Red, and Blue. Ex-Commissioner Adams has also returned to the fold. He has acknowledged his sins and unfaithfulness, and confessed, with tears, to have wrongly done and said many things against the Army, its leaders,

⁴³⁰ William Booth in Friederichs, *Romance*, p.13.

⁴³¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.105-8.

⁴³² *The Field Officer*, November 1905, p.401.

⁴³³ *The Officer*, March and April 1897.

⁴³⁴ *The Field Officer*, December 1900, p.453.

and his comrades, which he now regrets and acknowledges to have been untrue. He is re-accepted, with the rank of Captain. Pray for him.⁴³⁵

Evidently the higher they climbed, the further they fell. Too delightful to omit (as well as significant in terms of the Army's internal debate on social action) is the following:

We regret to report the resignation of Colonel Boon. He has left the Army with a view to joining the Independent Labour Party, in the hopes of securing by direct political agitation and law reform the results which we believe can best and indeed *only* be achieved by salvation. We can only say that we believe our comrade has made a fatal mistake, which he will regret both in time and in eternity... Who can doubt that a drunkard-saving, slum-visiting, people-converting F.O. ranks far higher in the *Heavenly* scales than any M.P. in the land.⁴³⁶

It is interesting that no such condescending remarks were made concerning Commissioner Frank Smith, the real originator of the "Darkest England" scheme, who resigned on several occasions, and finally in 1891 after disagreeing with Booth over the accounting arrangements for the social work funds. He was a confidant of Keir Hardie, served four terms on the London County Council and as a Labour MP 1929-31. He remained close to the Booth family, speaking out on Bramwell's behalf in the 1929 constitutional crisis. Florence Booth sat by his deathbed in 1940 and Catherine Bramwell-Booth conducted his funeral.⁴³⁷

A Clayton's Priesthood⁴³⁸

In the previous chapter we outlined the development of a distinct leadership or officer caste in the Salvation Army during the "Booth" period of Army history – from the 1860's up to the deposition of Bramwell Booth in 1929. It was shown that the Army resisted the notion that it was a

⁴³⁵ *The Officer*, January 1898, p.12. It would be unimaginable for such information to be published today. While as recently as 1999 an African Territorial Commander was reduced in rank from Commissioner to Colonel at the time of his retirement as a disciplinary measure (for making unauthorised promotions on the basis of tribalism), this was not officially published outside his own territory.

⁴³⁶ *The Officer*, August 1894, p.232.

⁴³⁷ See Norman Murdoch, *Frank Smith: Salvation Socialist*. Alexandria VA, 2003.

⁴³⁸ "Claytons: Proprietary name of a substitute for hard liquor... Usu. As a quasi-adjective indicating a pretence to or a largely unsuccessful imitation of the 'real thing'." (Harry Orsman: *Oxford Dictionary of New Zealand English*, Oxford, O.U.P. 1997.)

church, which would have implied that its officers were clergy. In practical terms, however, this is what came about, and when it suited its purposes, the Army was quite happy to accept and take advantage of this implication.

In this chapter we have been looking at a “theology of officership” as revealed in the character and functions expected of officers and the conditions under which they operated over this same period. We need to ask whether or not these also indicated a distinct clerical group within the organisation. The ambiguity observed in the previous chapter applies here too. Evidence could be produced to support either view.

On the one hand, the qualities of life prescribed by the Founders – being thoroughly saved and sanctified, eager to save sinners, filled with compassion for the lost and suffering, loyal, humble, perseverant, endued with the spirit of enterprise – would be expected to some degree of any Salvation Army soldier, officer or not. Again, leadership is exercised at many levels, and not only by officers. All Salvationists are subject to some form of the Regulations. All Salvationists as Christians are regarded as having a “call” to some vocation and we have seen that the Founders believed in the call of all Salvation Army Soldiers to ministry. Some form of training for their particular role would be recommended for every sphere of service. All soldiers sign a form of “Covenant”. Responsibility for the “lost” of their own neighbourhood is expressly enjoined on all Salvationists. The standard of living at which early officers were supported was assumed to be about that of the average of their soldiers.⁴³⁹ Obedience “to the lawful orders of my officers” was a pledge in every Soldier’s *Articles of War*. “Enduring to the end”, with a life-long commitment to service in the Army, was always held up as an ideal for all ranks, whether in a voluntary or a professional capacity, however honoured in the breach.

⁴³⁹ Harry Williams refers to this in Frederick Tucker’s 1881 case as “accommodation to a life which materially equated with the standards of a Victorian postman”. Harry Williams, *Booth-Tucker*, p.43.

The distinctive quality of officership could not therefore be located in any or all of these features per se. Neither would it ever have been accurate to generalise that officers would have these characteristics or qualities to a higher degree than possessed by non-officers.

On the other hand, we can see that all these qualities would naturally be expected to be most characteristic of officers. And it came to be assumed that officers would meet a higher standard than Soldiers would. T. Henry Howard wrote that, “when Cadets are made to perceive the standards by which they must measure their work and conduct, they not only see how far short they fall, but ceasing to measure themselves, their abilities, and their doings, by one another as Soldiers, they aim at far higher success than would be possible if they did not adopt the standards presented to them.”⁴⁴⁰

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 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 was naturally a process. The first officers were already Evangelists; they simply added ranks. Later candidates for officership were pressed into service without training or special recognition of their roles, or were given a few weeks on-the-job apprenticeship assisting in a corps. Elizabeth Herdman in New Zealand, in the early 1880’s, before any training facilities other than assisting in an appointment were available in this country, simply received a note making her an officer and giving her an appointment.⁴⁴¹ With the introduction of training and

⁴⁴⁰ “One of the ‘Scholars’”, *School*, Introduction, pp. vii-viii.

⁴⁴¹ Letter in New Zealand Salvation Army Archives. See Appendix 6.

commissioning, the elaboration of “Army” practices, customs and rituals, and the steady accretion of tradition, a mystique gradually became associated with officership. This process was probably accelerated by the tendency to sentimentalise and romanticise everything to do with the Army. Booth was the “dear old General” at 48 years of age.⁴⁴² The “dear old Congress” (Clapton Congress Hall), the “dear old flag” and the “dear old days” in training are all quoted in a letter from an officer “who had not been long in the field”.⁴⁴³

This ambiguity over the status of officers arose in part from the Methodist theological roots we noted in the previous chapter, 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. Bramwell Booth felt this: “We had no precedent to go on, very little experience to guide us... We had to build the ship while we were at sea, and not only build the ship, but master the laws of navigation, and not only master the laws of navigation but hammer sense into a strangely assorted crew! ...The character of the work was so new in religious history that many decisions, even though they seemed at the time to involve only minor points of policy and method, proved to be of great importance.”⁴⁴⁴

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 positively eschewed any such intention. 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

⁴⁴² Bramwell Booth, Letter of 8 September, 1877, in Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.79.

⁴⁴³ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, pp.74-5.

⁴⁴⁴ Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, pp.22-23.

and an episcopal system of government under different names. And legally, as we have seen, the Army chose for practical reasons to stake out grounds for having its officers recognised as clergy.

This analysis of the character and qualities of officership leads us to the same conclusion we came to in the previous chapter; that it is difficult *in practice*, leaving aside distinctions of legitimacy and apostolic provenance, to distinguish officership from the clerical status in any other church.

ENTR'ACTE: FROM THE ERA OF THE BOOTHS TO THE 1960'S

“Fortunately I didn’t go to any place of devotion, though I did get mixed up with a Salvation Army procession. It was quite interesting to be at close quarters with them, they’re so absolutely different from what they used to be like when I first remember them in the eighties. They used to go about then unkempt and dishevelled , in a sort of smiling rage with the world, and now they’re spruce and jaunty and flamboyantly decorative, like a geranium bed with religious convictions.”

– From “Louise”, a short story by “Saki” (H.H. Munro), in *The Toys of Peace*, published in 1923.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴⁵ H.H. Munro, *The Short Stories of Saki*. London, John Lane The Bodley Head, 1930, p.449

William Booth was “Promoted to Glory” in 1912. In accordance with the Deep Poll of 1878, a sealed envelope was opened by the Army’s solicitor and to no-one’s surprise was found to contain the name of William Bramwell Booth. Then 56 years of age, Bramwell had been the Founder’s right hand for more than thirty-five years, and had in reality run the Army for the last twenty years while his father had returned to his first love of peripatetic evangelism and made imperial progresses around his far-flung dominions.

Bramwell had a prodigious capacity for work, and continued to keep his hand on the day to day affairs of the organisation. The first part of his Generalship was overshadowed by the Great War, which almost overtook his International Congress called for June 1914. He sought to preserve the Army’s internationalism and maintain links with his forces amongst the Central Powers, setting himself against anti-German hysteria. His Christmas message for 1915 included, “Every land is my Fatherland for all lands are my Father’s” and soon after the end of the war called upon a German officer to address a meeting in Westminster Central Hall. He gave special attention to youth work and promoted missionary expansion – the flag was raised in 23 new countries between 1913 and 1928. Under his leadership the number of Corps and Outposts increased from 9,415 to 15,163, and the number of commissioned officers from 15,988 to 25,427.⁴⁴⁶

Bramwell lacked his father’s charisma however and his profound deafness isolated him to some degree. His senior commanders grew restive at the closeness of his control and the suspicion that he promoted and favoured members of his own family above long-serving officers. Opposition was spearheaded by his sister, Evangeline, Commander in USA from 1903, and his brother-in-law Frederick Booth-Tucker, who resented being deprived of active command and being retired at the age of seventy-three. Bramwell resisted in particular the suggestion that he forgo the right to nominate his successor and allow election by senior

⁴⁴⁶ St John Ervine, *God’s Soldier*, II , p.851. It is interesting to compare these figures with the 15,339 corps and 25,716 officers in the 2004 *Yearbook*, p.33.

commanders.⁴⁴⁷ When he fell gravely ill in 1928, fears that his daughter Catherine would succeed him prompted a number of Commissioners to requisition a High Council in terms of the 1904 Deed Poll which provided for the removal of a General who became “unfit for office.” Bramwell was deposed by 52 votes to 5 in February 1929, made a Companion of Honour by George V in April and died in June of that year.

Edward Higgins, Bramwell’s Chief of Staff for ten years, was elected to replace him, and secured the passage of the Salvation Army Act through the British Parliament in 1931, regularising the election of successive Generals by High Council and vesting Salvation Army property in a Trustee Company instead of in the General as sole Trustee. Evangeline Booth finally had her turn at the top 1934-39 but by this time the fire had gone out and the Army was in retreat in the land of its birth. The Australian George Lyndon Carpenter (1939-46) struggled to hold the international Army together – it was proscribed in the Axis nations, money was in short supply and travel restricted – and Albert Orsborn (1946-54) faced mounting tasks in the post-war reconstruction period with diminishing resources. In these years Europe especially turned away from religion in general and the Army’s well-tried methods failed to connect with an increasingly secularised society.

⁴⁴⁷ “[William] Booth, after long consideration and constant seeking for the guidance of God,” wrote Bramwell, had decided that the appointment of a General by his predecessor “was on the whole the safest and best.” (Ervine, *God’s Soldier*, II, p.908) “[The General] is not the maker or unmaker of the original Trust. He is the Trustee, the servant of the Trust. His great duty is to conform to its terms, preserve its integrity and spirit, to guard and fulfil it, and to hand it on in complete and unimpaired efficiency to his successor.” (Letter from Bramwell Booth to Evangeline Booth, 24 November 1927, quoted by Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.488.) Bramwell Booth’s stubbornness on this point, claiming that he could not relinquish a sacred trust God had inspired the Founder to institute, is interesting in the light of Bryan Wilson’s comment on the “absoluteness” of sectarian ideology. “Revealed truth being God’s will, cannot readily be countermanded... ‘Reform’ is not possible in a sectarian organisation, since it must cast doubt on present and past arrangements which were ordained by God.” (*Patterns of Sectarianism*, pp.10-11) Was Bramwell still a “sectarian” while his subordinates were becoming more flexible? The question still arises in connection with the sacraments, which William Booth purported to leave as an open question, pending “some future day, when we shall have more light, and see more clearly the way before us.” (See p.73, above.) It is an open question as to whether Booth really meant this. However, the question is increasingly debated. See David Taylor, *Army, Order or Church*, Paper presented at United Kingdom Territory Theological Symposium 2004, pp.15-19. It would be difficult for the institution to change. However, in recent years we have seen the late Herbert W. Armstrong’s World-wide Church of God adopt a Trinitarian, evangelical theology.

In one of Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes stories, Holmes draws Dr Watson's attention to the curious incident of the dog in the night-time.⁴⁴⁸ Watson protests that the dog did nothing; it did not even bark. That was the curious incident, Holmes rejoins. The close on forty years of near silence on the theology of officership in Salvation Army publications up until about 1960 are similarly informative: they suggest that Salvationists did not spend much effort or time in thinking further about the theological implications of decisions made about these matters. In the words of Lieut-Colonel Fred Hoyle (R), "Looking back on my training days I cannot remember anything being taught on this subject (officership and the 'priesthood of all believers'), or anything being said in any of the many councils I attended."⁴⁴⁹ The slender record could also indicate that there were limited opportunities for the expression of opinion, and little use of the one forum for discussion, the pages of *The Officer*, seems to have been made to discuss this issue.

There is a discontinuity between the concerns of the period described in the last chapter, and those of the later 20th century and the present. As we have seen, interest in the earlier period was centred on the personal qualities and work of officers, but less concerned with how they stood *vis-à-vis* the ministries of the churches. The attitudes and parameters established in the nineteenth century continued to provide the intellectual and spiritual framework and the regulatory expectations for officership through most of the twentieth century. The literature does not reveal any significant development or florescence of new thinking in the intervening period. This is not to say that Salvation Army writers have not subsequently referred to these themes in, for example, devotional or biographical contexts, but the principles espoused by the Founders were still taken for granted.

During these middle years I have been able locate only a few, mostly oblique, references to the theme of this thesis. There were some contributions of the spiritual and motivational kind, largely reiterating the

⁴⁴⁸ Arthur Conan Doyle, "Silver Blaze".

views of the previous generation. General Edward J. Higgins' little book *Stewards of God* from the early 30's, consisting of advice to Corps officers, might be taken as representative of this genre. Booth family and other citations we have noted from the 1920's and 30's were mostly biographical and historical, referring to the period before 1900 in any case. In the 1925 *Year Book*, an article on "The Salvation Army officer and his work" stated that "Salvation Army officers are divided into two main classes, the Local Officer and the fully commissioned officer. The first class... voluntarily devote their spare time... Commissioned officers are drawn from the rank and file of soldiers and Local Officers... Upon completion of their training the young officers are commissioned and drafted to suitable appointments." This statement links commissioned and local or non-commissioned officers and implies no essential distinction in character between them. The only difference lies in the training and full-time availability of those commissioned.⁴⁵⁰

Staff-Captain Carvosso Gauntlett reviewed two German Catholic works, *Der Salutismus* by P.A. Classen, and *Catholic Salvationism: The Salvation Army and its World Propaganda* by Martin Fassbender, in 1928. He made "a call to maintain these Army methods that have led to victory in all lands ... to maintain and advance throughout our ranks what they [the German authors] have termed the *Lay Apostolate* - the royal priesthood which, our Founders taught us, included all from the General down to the latest convert; an Apostolate of deeds, of prayer, of sacrifice, of good example, and of the love that seeks the lost: the Apostolate of Salvationism!"⁴⁵¹ Catholic writers, however well disposed towards the Army, would naturally see all Salvationists – officers and soldiers alike – as lay, like lay members of an Order in the Church. That very ascription assumed that there was also an alternative, non-lay status to which Salvationists did not aspire. This was tantamount to accepting second class ecclesiastical status for officers, although it is doubtful whether

⁴⁴⁹ *The Officer*, December 1987 p549. Hoyle was commissioned in 1941.

⁴⁵⁰ *The Salvation Army Year Book*, 1925, p.23.

⁴⁵¹ Carvosso Gauntlett, *The Staff Review*, April, 1928, p.220.

Gauntlett would have been content with that interpretation. Indeed, The fact that he found it necessary to emphasise the Lay Apostolate might indicate that he realised this was in danger of neglect in favour of a more professional/specialised officer cadre.

General Wilfred Kitching (1954-63), at the end of this period, avoided the imputation by not using the word “lay” at all. Writing in a series of *War Cry* articles in the 1950’s on the character of Salvation Army soldiership, Kitching said that

The usual distinction between officers and soldiers is obviously useful at certain levels, but the nomenclature can be misleading, and at times there may be danger in the distinction. There is in God’s sight no different order of believers, even though there are different callings. All believers – and to us that means soldiers as well as officers – belong to the “community of God”, and have gifts according to their calling.

The corps that revolves too much around the officer is a corps which is falling short of its calling. Soldiers who fail to realize their obligations as co-workers with those who have been appointed as their leaders can well be “out of step” in the march. In the set-up of our corps life the relationship of soldiers with their officers is something different and apart from the usually understood relationship of a congregation with its minister... He (the soldier) sees in his officer a God-called man or woman needing the assistance of others in his task.⁴⁵²

Kitching possibly intended to suggest that Salvation Army soldiers were expected to be more active in the affairs of the Army than church members were assumed to be in those of the church. He also probably wished to imply that the soldiers would be more active in mission, in evangelism and deeds of service than were the majority of church members. He gave the impression that officers were officers and soldiers were soldiers because of their differing gifts, although he did not elaborate on the nature of those gifts. However, those of the soldiers were evidently more appropriate for followers than for leaders, and the officer role took precedence if the function of the soldiers was to support it.

These three writers in any case presented with some authority (The *Year Book* was an official publication, contributions to *The Staff Review* would have been approved for publication by General Bramwell Booth, and Kitching was General himself), the Army’s official commitment

⁴⁵² Wilfred Kitching, *Soldier of Salvation*, London, 1963, p.49.

to the “functional” view of Salvation Army officership. That is, officers differ from non-officers only in their role and not in any ministerial or priestly character or status.

We have seen already that there was another strand in the Army’s thinking about officership – that it did enjoy some special status, and that officers were different from clergy but equal. In an article on preserving the Army’s distinctiveness, Brigadier Bramwell Taylor noted that “we take pride in the fact that we are different from other members of the ‘Ministering Fraternity’... We are not ‘ecclesiastics’ according to the accepted interpretation of that term, although we qualify under its most sacred meaning.”⁴⁵³ The nature of the differences or similarities was not spelt out.

The extract from the story by “Saki”, given at the head of this section, reminds us that although the Army’s conscious ecclesiology appeared to undergo little development in this period, sociological changes of significance for its future direction were inevitably taking place. Philip Escott suggests that “the movement seems to have become almost petrified in the form it held at William Booth’s death in 1912.”⁴⁵⁴ This may have been true of the Salvation Army’s constitutional structure (until 1929) and general strategy but not of its constituents. Upward mobility had long been a feature of sectarian life in Britain. The oft-quoted judgement of the 84-year-old John Wesley on Methodism could have been repeated of Salvationists by Bramwell Booth:

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...⁴⁵⁵

As Bryan Wilson comments of the Nazarenes, an American Methodist offshoot,

⁴⁵³ *The Staff Review*, January 1926, p.113.

⁴⁵⁴ Phillip Escott, *Church Growth Theories and The Salvation Army in the United Kingdom*. PhD thesis, University of Stirling, 1996, p.335.

They were recruited mainly of the lower classes. As their members rose in social status and as the discipline and orderliness of religious commitment led to habits of frugality and responsibility which increased opportunities for economic gain and social responsibility, so the Nazarenes ceased to be so dominantly identified with the very lowest sections of society. They gradually came to manifest a concern for status, prestigious buildings and display which characterised other denominations.⁴⁵⁶

Salvationists may or may not have risen to the same degree as the Methodists – I have not seen any research on the socio-economic status of Salvationists in the twentieth century – but the same process will have been taking place as for the Methodists and Nazarenes. While the social structures and class patterns differed from the British model, Salvationists in countries like New Zealand likewise participated in the general rise in the standard of living with increased opportunities for education, leading to diversification of occupation. It can be surmised that the proportion of blue-collar workers in the ranks diminished and that of business and professional people increased, but hard statistical data has not been abstracted. Soundings from Corps Rolls and Electoral Rolls would be informative. Some Salvationists of course sought the shelter of more respectable and less socially embarrassing religious groups and others drifted from any religious profession, but many took the Army with them as they rose. The matter of attitudinal change is also discussed in Chapter Seven, below, under the heading “Soldier Attitudes”.

One of the characteristics of a “conversionist” sect or movement consolidating or denominationalising is a change of focus from a mission to maintenance, from a crusade to change the world to a preoccupation with the interests, needs and desires of the existing members. The Salvation Army probably began this journey even before the period under consideration here. This development did not necessarily involve a change in activities at first, but rather subtle changes in the way those activities were addressed. For example, brass bands were originally pressed into service within the Salvation Army in order to augment open-

⁴⁵⁵ Quoted by J.H. Plumb, *England in the Eighteenth Century*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1950, p.97.

⁴⁵⁶ Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, p.108.

air witness – to support hymn singing, drown out the opposition and, because brass banding was a fashionable element in popular culture, to attract attention. The evangelical intention was gradually subsumed by the social and cultural needs of the bandsmen themselves, even though the ostensible rationale and rhetoric was unchanged. In time the actual music reflected this change of purpose; what William Booth called “soul-saving” music – inseparable from the words of the hymns and songs it accompanied – became music for the sake of the music. The musicians became much more presentable (as Saki observed) and the composers more inventive. The music became in fact decadent: the arrangement of themes from Tchaikovsky might do people good as music but was unlikely to touch their conscience with the memory of words of hymns they once learned in Sunday School.

If one of the presenting characteristics of the sectarian ethos was the holding of the “world” at arms-length, The Salvation Army certainly conformed to type in that respect, but the period from the Booths to the 1960’s saw a steady, if slow, retreat from the ghetto. In 1929 an officer so misguided as to mention in speaking at a youth meeting that she had attended a cinema found the rest of her remarks drowned out by energetic singing led by the senior officer presiding.⁴⁵⁷ In the 1930’s it was still reprehensible to attend a football match – the advent of a Salvation Army bandsmen’s rugby club team in Christchurch in the late 1930’s greatly perturbed the Englishman serving as Chief Secretary in New Zealand. (The Divisional Commander defended them however.)⁴⁵⁸ In the 1950’s it was still daring to attend a dance. Today salvationists still takes the pledge to abstain from alcohol and gambling, but the “world” is now on their side as far as tobacco is concerned. Robertson sums it up in

⁴⁵⁷ Told of Ensign Bennett, Divisional Young People’s Secretary, Wellington, 1929-30.

⁴⁵⁸ Cyril Bradwell, *Touched with Splendour*, pp.49-50. The story is probably not apocryphal that a bandsman who bought a ticket to a Sunday sports fixture was ‘stood down’, while one who climbed over the fence of the grounds on the same occasion escaped without censure.

observing a shift “from abstention from worldly amusements and fashions to the injunction to be judicious and selective in such indulgences.”⁴⁵⁹

The Salvation Army has displayed a sectarian tendency to provide an all-embracing social milieu for its members. This aspect is also discussed in Chapter Seven, but it might be suggested that this period from the 1920's on saw a change from most activities being evangelical in intention (if not in achievement), and directed outward, to more activities being provided for the entertainment of the Salvationists themselves. This probably took place in two stages. At first the same activities, like brass banding, served both purposes, while later new activities which had no explicit evangelical rationale, such as “socials” (games, as an alternative to dancing) were introduced, along with youth groups, Baden Powell organisations and other recreational activities. These did serve as points of entry for potential converts but they also served to hold the members together and make it unnecessary for them to seek diversion elsewhere.

The very smallness of the movement (consistently about six and a half thousand soldiers in New Zealand from the 1920's to the present day), and the practice of holding regional and national meetings, congresses, band festivals and sports meetings, fostered a significant sense of community. These activities, plus the tendency for officers' children to leave home and marry into the local Corps when their parents were appointed elsewhere, led to a situation where many Salvationists had relatives and friends, or at least acquaintances, throughout the country. In Tom Aitken's words in 1964,

The smallness of the group, coupled with a sense of the peculiarity of the Army's customs, has tended to make the Army an “in-group” for its members. This tendency towards exclusiveness has probably weakened since the war, for the Army now co-operates far more than it did with other organisations, but the Army is still tightly bound together as a social group.⁴⁶⁰

⁴⁵⁹ Roland Robertson, in Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.74

⁴⁶⁰ T.G. Aitken, MA thesis, *Aspects of the History of The Salvation Army in New Zealand, 1929-1963: A Study in Adjustment*. VUW, 1964, p.29. Aitken compares the Reports of pre-war Territorial Commanders with those of their post-war successors. The former mention few organisations outside the Army; the latter give long lists of religious and secular organisations on which the army is represented.

However, in terms of Wilson's observation that "sects have a totalitarian rather than segmental hold over their members,"⁴⁶¹ I suggest that in the period under review this hold was in the process of relaxing. The tendency observed amongst Methodists in the nineteenth century, when "the 'Means of Grace' were fighting a losing battle to rival 'the social party, the secular concert, or the tennis club' as a claimant for the time and energy of members," was now to be found amongst Salvationists.⁴⁶²

A fear of being "led astray" by "worldly" education – an offer to pay for a university education for Bramwell Booth had been declined by his parents – might also have been a matter of class attitude amongst some New Zealand Salvationists before and even after the second world war. Another indicator of change might therefore be found in the increased number of Salvationists accessing higher education. Mavis Clarke in 1950, for example, was the first Salvationist from Gisborne to attend university.⁴⁶³ Commissioner Harewood's 1960 Report on the New Zealand Territory stated that eight officers had university degrees, two were qualified pharmacists and six were certified teachers.⁴⁶⁴ From being rare, Salvationists obtaining tertiary education had become sufficiently numerous to be perceived to require some special pastoral support lest they be lost to the movement, and Salvation Army Student Fellowships became established in countries like the United Kingdom and New Zealand in the 1950's. By the 1970's higher education was sufficiently common for this organisation to have outlived its usefulness and fade away, in New Zealand at least – though it is interesting that the British weekly *Salvationist* still reports the names and degrees of Salvation Army graduates.

⁴⁶¹ Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.24.

⁴⁶² A.D. Gilbert, *Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change 1740-1914*, London, Longman, 1976, p.181, citing Minutes of the Wesleyan Conference, 1890, pp.354-5.

⁴⁶³ Joan Hutson, *As for Me and My House: A salute to early Salvation Army families of Gisborne, 1886 to 1952*. Wellington, Flag Publications, 2004, p.123 of typescript.

⁴⁶⁴ Cited by T.G. Aitken, MA thesis, *op.cit.*, p.28.

Such observations need not be confined to the Army in Western countries. In countries with entrenched class or caste systems, upward mobility might also be observed, within limits. In India for example, the Army recruited chiefly amongst the lowest castes; the higher castes might often admire and support its work financially, much as the aristocracy did in Britain, but few of them were prepared to sign up.⁴⁶⁵ The Army itself, however, offered the means of rising in status. Joseph Dahya, son of a sweeper, retired in 1971 as a Commissioner in the Salvation Army, and his son became a medical practitioner. In many third world countries the Army, along with other churches, has undertaken to provide schools, and mission-school education has been the key to advancement. Well out of our immediate period, Mugabe's first post-independence cabinet in Zimbabwe included two Salvationists.

The processes of institutionalisation and clericalisation naturally affected the character of the Army's leadership as well. St. John Ervine believed that "the success of the Army... was the cause of the change in the spirit of its officers. Formerly, they were men of God: now they were men of affairs... [Commissioner Elijah] Cadman did not care whether he was a corporal or a commissioner so long as he saved souls. His successors wanted to save souls, but they also wanted to be commissioners..."⁴⁶⁶ The judgement is perhaps too sweeping but inevitably the second and third generations of leadership differed in attitude from the pioneers. George Bernard Shaw predicted in 1905 that

its present staff of enthusiast-commanders shall be succeeded by a bureaucracy of men of business, who will be no better than bishops, and perhaps a good deal more unscrupulous. That has always happened sooner or later to great orders founded by saints; the order founded by William Booth is not exempt from the same danger.⁴⁶⁷

Shaw, as an observer of human nature, anticipated the sociologists here. Wilson says that,

⁴⁶⁵ Commissioners Hugh Sladen (1878-1962), grandson of an earl, and Mildred Duff (1860-1932), daughter of a county MP, were rare exceptions. Commissioner Jacobus Corputty (1907-1990) of Indonesia declined the hereditary regency of Ambon in order to remain a Salvation Army officer.

⁴⁶⁶ St. John Ervine, *God's Soldier*, II, pp.862-3.

⁴⁶⁷ George Bernard Shaw, in the Preface to "Major Barbara". *The Complete Prefaces*, London, Paul Hamlyn, 1965, pp.126-7.

... the Churches have increasingly adopted the same style of operations and similar methods of organization as the large concerns of business, education and recreation in modern society... Administration has in some measure superseded spirituality, and rational business organisation has replaced the distribution of grace or the reception of divine inspiration... There can be few human activities on which rational planning, administrative co-ordination and the regulations of bureaucratic organization have such deleterious effects as religious movements.⁴⁶⁸

The accountants always seize the commanding heights of the economy. This is not to say that Salvation Army officers in administrative roles inevitably become less “spiritual” but particular spheres of responsibility shape the responses of the individual – we see from where we sit. The Army’s early leaders tended to be out front leading the charge; their successors became more cautious about counting the cost.

These changes did not affect just the higher echelons of command of course. Thomas O’Dea commented that when a professional pastorate emerges,

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.⁴⁶⁹

Without wishing to be overly cynical, or impugn the spirituality of second and third-generation officers – I am one – it must be admitted that the demands of ministering to an established congregations naturally shape the role, outlook and expectations in ways quite different from those of the pioneer and itinerant evangelist – and attract a different candidate.

It would be fair comment to say that rising standards of living, improved educational levels and the progressive secularization of western society, combined with the general diminution of evangelical zeal almost inevitable amongst the second and third generations of a

⁴⁶⁸ Bryan Wilson, *Religion in Secular Society*, pp.138-140.

⁴⁶⁹ T.F. O’Dea, *The Sociology of Religion*, Upper Saddle River NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1966, p.91.

movement, impacted upon The Salvation Army's self-understanding and behaviour in the post-Boothian era. However, rhetoric often persists long after conviction has faded and we no longer walk the talk. The cinematic cartoon roadrunner character, charging well over the edge of the precipice before suddenly realizing that the void has opened below, might be analogous to the way the Army's sectarian persona was maintained long after many Salvationists had ceased to take it seriously, except for a niggling and ritualised sense of guilt. At the tail end of the period, I suspect that most Salvationists would have struggled to recognise themselves in Robertson's mid-60's summation:

In essentials... the Army remains the same as in the early years of the present century – an authoritarian organisation, demanding extensive commitment and obedience to its rules and regulations, which also extend to matters of private thought, conversation, socialisation of children, work and leisure, financial expenditure, dress and physical health.⁴⁷⁰

Gordon Moyles offered an interesting critique of Robertson, suggesting that he has been misled by the traditional rhetoric of the Army's "stated policies and doctrines", and that "he ignores the beliefs of the Salvationists themselves, never acknowledging that there might be a vast difference between the formalized beliefs of the organization and of lay Salvationists."⁴⁷¹ Any such formal statements tend to be left behind in the wake of a sectarian community accommodating to the wider world. At the same time, the Army continued – as it still does – to retain *in some measure* such distinctively sectarian characteristics as "tests of merit on would-be members, ...discipline, regulating the declared beliefs and the life habits of members, prescribing and operating sanctions for those who deviate, ...demands ...for commitment from its members."⁴⁷²

For the purposes of our main theme, then, the general tendency of the Army in the period under consideration might be described as "denominationalising", and the corollary of this was that the soldiers were

⁴⁷⁰ Roland Robertson, in Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.89.

⁴⁷¹ Gordon Moyles, *Blood and Fire*, pp.228-244.

⁴⁷² Bryan Wilson, *The Persistence of Sects*. Article in *DISCUS* Vol. 1 No. 2 (1993) p.2.

more likely to regard their officers as clergy and the officers to see themselves in that role.

PART TWO

THE SECOND CENTURY.

A.F. Walls, an Anglican layman, taught Patristics in a West African theological college in the 1950's. Visiting local churches in his district he realised that the things he was teaching about during the week, he could observe actually happening at the weekend. He discovered that the same kind of consolidation and reflection he described taking place in the second century churches, was in progress in West African churches in their second century.⁴⁷³ The second century seems to have a similar significance for The Salvation Army. Major Nigel Mason acknowledged this in his perceptive contribution to the "theology of officership" debate in 1974. "In terms of development," he wrote, "we are only at the beginning of things for the Army. For the whole Church, it could well be that we have hardly yet emerged from the 'primitive Church'. We may be but commencing the fuller history of the Church's life."⁴⁷⁴ More recently, 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."⁴⁷⁵ General Paul A. Rader acknowledged that "The Salvation Army is passing through a critical metamorphosis of self-understanding."⁴⁷⁶

The Salvation Army entered its second century in the 1960's. Its first great age of expansion was well and truly over; it was now becoming more self-conscious, and beginning to clarify and rationalise what it had

⁴⁷³ A.F. Walls, *The Missionary Movement in Christian History: Studies in the Transmission of Faith*. Maryknoll NY/Edinburgh, Orbis/T&T Clark, 1996. P.xiii. I am grateful to Major Kingsley Sampson for this reference.

⁴⁷⁴ *The Officer*, November 1974, p.501.

⁴⁷⁵ Roger L. Green, 'The Salvation Army and the Evangelical Tradition', *Word and Deed*, May, 2003, p.61.

⁴⁷⁶ *Word and Deed*, Fall 1998, p.1.

been doing, as well as adjusting to the fact that it was now operating in a world strangely different from that in which it had taken shape. The beginnings of a more widely reflective tendency can be seen. Salvationists in general were becoming more aware of the rest of the church, and some more informed about theological issues and more likely therefore to question the Army's own position. This can be illustrated by the publication in 1960 of Brigadier Harry Dean's *The Sacraments, The Salvationist's Viewpoint*. There had been earlier a few articles or pamphlets on this subject, or the odd chapter in a book here and there, by that time long out of print or inaccessible to most. The new booklet marked the opening of new phase of self-awareness and questioning. Dean followed it up with articles dealing with responses he had received to the book.⁴⁷⁷

The election of the scholarly Frederick Coutts, who had spent more than half his service in literary work, as General in 1963 probably encouraged as well as adding some cachet of respectability to theological thinking.⁴⁷⁸ Writers such as Fred Brown, Bernard Mobbs and Harry Dean took up the task of earlier intellectuals like Alfred G. Cunningham and Carvosso Gauntlett in trying to widen Salvationists' theological horizons. *The Officer*, edited in turn by Eric Coward, William Burrows and William Clark, entered a halcyon period. It had a significant educative role and its book reviews stretched its readers' interests.

The Salvation Army was also affected to some extent by a new wave of radical, popular theology associated with writers such as John A.T. Robinson, Harvey Cox and Paul Tillich, and for perhaps the first time began to develop some conscious pluralism of theological outlook. For example, some tension can be remarked between more liberal and the more conservative outlooks. At the 1958 Commissioners' Conference, Lt.-Commissioner Alfred J. Gilliard, Principal of the International College

⁴⁷⁷ *The Officer*, September-October, November-December 1962.

⁴⁷⁸ John Gowans (General 1999-2002) comments in his memoirs that "Frederick Coutts was regarded by some as a dangerous liberal. When Commissioner Coutts was elected to the office of General, one leader was overheard to say that this particular High Council's selection heralded the end of The Salvation Army." (John Gowans, *There's a Boy Here*, London, 2002, p.57)

for Officers (a London-based advanced training centre for potential leaders) “spoke of the problems of theological ‘idiom’ involving officers from various countries.” He was obliged to defend his College against claims by “a number of Commissioners that some officers had been disturbed at some teaching which they regarded as ‘the infiltration of liberalism’.”⁴⁷⁹

Norman Marshall, an American officer who served as chairman of the International Doctrine Council in the 1980’s, wrote of the “London bias” as a “liberal bias which must be confronted carefully”. He attributed this in part to Commissioner A.G. Cunningham who “has cast an influence passed down through the Literary Department that has been damaging for many in his train have occupied positions of influence and have been writers of Army literature. Also, there has been an influence of London University cast upon some officers who have studied there.”⁴⁸⁰

Some of this related to differing emphases on matters like Biblical inerrancy, or what Marshall called the “authenticity of the Scriptures” and views on creationism/evolution. Just sometimes shades of emphasis and indications of polarised assumptions became apparent, as when a British reviewer damned with faint praise (“could have some value...”) an American Commissioner’s book on the Bible, suggesting that “a simplistic view is in danger of creating some pitfalls for the uninitiated reader.”⁴⁸¹ Again, there was a perception of differing interpretations of the Wesleyan doctrine of entire sanctification – like the Corinthians, some said “I am of Brengle” and others “I am of Coutts”.

To some degree the different emphases were represented respectively by the British (International Headquarters) Salvationist literary establishment and the United States, as the two chief publishing centres of the Army. The International Training College in London would

⁴⁷⁹ Unpublished Reports and Recommendations of the 1958 International Conference of commissioners. Heritage Centre, London.

⁴⁸⁰ Norman S. Marshall, unpublished letter dated 13 January, 1990, in Heritage Centre Archives.

⁴⁸¹ *The Officer*, January 1982, p.26. (Fred Hoyle, reviewing a book by Robert A. Hoggard.)

be more likely to encourage the use of Biblical commentaries published by SCM and the American Schools for Officer Training to prefer work of more conservative provenance.⁴⁸² However, lest it be thought that this was simply an Atlantic divide, occasional letters to the American New Frontier over the years have accused the editor, Dr Robert Docter (who undertook this task on top of his regular job as a professor of psychology and his local officer responsibilities), of pursuing a 'liberal agenda'. Very little in it – certainly nothing like a full-scale public liberal-fundamentalist breach, and the administration was unwilling for major differences of theological opinion to become widely debated in print. The “Fred Brown affair” of 1970, when a British officer was suspended and eventually compelled to resign over the refusal of the hierarchy to approve publication of work deemed too radical, demonstrated that the institution would not bend too far.⁴⁸³

The Salvation Army Students Fellowship provided a semi-official but semi-independent forum for slightly radical discussion in these years and spawned a variety of periodicals, usually quarterly: *Magazine* in Great Britain, *Battlepoint* in New Zealand, *New Soldiers* in the USA and *Impact* in Australia. These were mostly short-lived although *Battlepoint* survived for 25 years, until 1988. The novelty and difficulty of achieving any forum for free discussion is illustrated by the appearance of the February 1963 number of *Magazine* with several pages featuring only the word “censored”. However the Students Fellowship Council, meeting without the official Headquarters representative, had the offending articles

⁴⁸² I recall a fellow-cadet at Denmark Hill in 1970 asking his tutor why SCM rather than IVP commentaries were recommended. Escott quotes Captain John Read, senior tutor at Denmark Hill in the early 1990's, as referring to the “liberal woolly tendency” of the educational syllabus before he instituted a radical revision of the syllabus which is now more recognisably evangelical.” (Philip Escott, thesis, *Church Growth Theories*, p.145.)

⁴⁸³ *Secular Evangelism*, by Fred Brown, London, SCM, 1970.) The case attracted embarrassing public notoriety in Britain. (Gordon Batten and others, letter in *Battlepoint* #29, September 1970 pp13-15; Harold Hill, *Battlepoint* #30, December 1970 pp1-6. Articles and correspondence can be found for example in *The Guardian* of 18th September, 9th,10th, 13th, 17th October 1970; *The Times* of 9th June 1970; *The Daily Telegraph* of 15th and 19th October; *The British Weekly* of 17th September, 16th October. The *War Cry* did not report the affair at all.)

printed and circulated to subscribers independently.⁴⁸⁴ One of the Army's occasional underground reform movements or ginger groups, the Salvation Army Renewal Group, was stillborn in the late 1960's.⁴⁸⁵

Membership of the World Council of Churches and of local and national ecumenical bodies, helped broaden Salvationist understanding. In the early 1980's the organisation responded to the World Council of Churches' Lima Document on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. This discussion document, along with the Army's response (Territories were asked to set up working parties to contribute to that response), was circulated internationally amongst officers for information.

From the 80's on there were a number of indicators of increasing interest in academic theology:

- Literary activity: such officers as John Coutts, John Larsson, Philip Needham, William Clark, Shaw Clifton, John Rhemick and Chick Yuill continued to push back the boundaries of Salvationists' theological ignorance. They were joined by non-officer writers, a new generation of Salvationist academics like David Green, David Rightmire, James Read, Jonathan Raymond and Donald Burke – all North Americans.
- Increasing numbers of tertiary-educated Salvationists and officers obtaining theological qualifications.
- More extensive Biblical and theological training for officers, which in most 'Western' countries and some others has involved formal relationships between Salvation Army Training Colleges and external, degree-conferring institutions.

⁴⁸⁴ The Salvation Army was not alone in this suspicion of student radicalism. Michael King in *Being Pakeha Now*, describes how Archbishop Liston summarily closed down a contemporary Auckland Catholic youth publication.

⁴⁸⁵ I received material from the Renewal Group (mentioned by Robertson in B. Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.105) in the 1960's but it had faded by the end of the decade. A later, more focussed, effort, the Independent Salvationist Forum, a 1996 UK reform movement of officers and soldiers, with a retired Colonel/Territorial Commander as spokesman, was dismissed by the UK Territorial Commander as "subversive and schismatic." (Richard Pears: *Towards a Theology of Salvation Army Officership: An Examination of Officer Ministry in the United Kingdom*. Oxford MTh thesis, 1996, pp.24-6.)

- The establishment of institutions like the Catherine Booth Bible College⁴⁸⁶ and the Ethics Centre in Canada.
- The holding of international symposia and commissions on educational and theological themes.
- The publication of the American biannual *Word and Deed* since 1998.

Most of the above do not relate directly to the debate on the theology of officership, but they do indicate an increasing interest and relative openness (a Salvationist *glasnost*?) in which such discussion could emerge.

⁴⁸⁶ Since re-named the *William and Catherine Bible College* – reversing the usual trend.

CHAPTER FIVE

PUTNEY DEBATES OF A NEW MODEL ARMY

How do wee know if whilst wee are disputing these thinges another companie of men shall gather together, and shall putt out a paper as plausible perhaps as this? I do nott know why it might not be done by that time you have agreed upon this, or gott hands to itt, if that be the way. And not only another, and another, butt many of this kinde?

Colonel Henry Ireton, at Putney, 1647

The “Putney Debates” is the name historians have given to the series of discussions held by the Council of Cromwell’s New Model Army, at Putney in October-November 1647. At the end of the English Civil War they were trying to reach agreement on a political settlement which might take into account the aspirations of the Levellers, the extremist element which wanted to abolish not only the monarchy but also the class structure of English society and its political expression. The Salvation Army has not been playing in such major league, and yet it is an Army, and its debate has been in part about whether there should be “classes” within it, a debate ultimately sharing the same religious roots as the Levellers’ vision. As already suggested, Salvation Army history tends to replicate that of the wider Church. And although “debate” is perhaps not the best word for a forty-year long exchange of views, the word does recognise that for the first time in Salvation Army history there has been scope for significant expression of personal opinion in print.

Previous chapters have traced the formation of a professional ministry, officership, in the Salvation Army and explored what was believed about that ministry. A strand of uncertainty and ambiguity about the Army’s attitude to the character of its clerical group has been noted. On the one hand the Army was reluctant to describe itself as a church or to regard its officers as clergy, while on the other it was willing to do both of these when they might appear to be to its practical advantage. The intention of this chapter is to trace the movement’s subsequent internal discussion of the nature of officership.

A word of explanation is necessary to put this “debate” in context. The General’s Advisory Council was inaugurated in March 1947⁴⁸⁷ and the institution of regular Commissioners’ Conferences, later International Leaders’ Conferences, from 1949, both of them involving only the most senior level of command. Apart from these, and the International Doctrine

⁴⁸⁷ The General’s Advisory Council “had up to 11 members appointed year by year, and met three times annually in the absence of the General, conveying its findings to him or her by means of recommendations.” (Colonel Laurence Hay, “The General’s Consultative Council” in the *The Salvation Army Yearbook*, 2003, pp.5-6)

Council (discussed in Chapter Six), The Salvation Army has not had any other formal, constitutional provision for discussion of significant issues since William Booth abolished government by Conference. It was assumed to be unnecessary – everyone knew what had to be done, and had only to get on and do it, under the direction of those God had raised to command. That basic principles, or their application, might be open to widespread discussion, let alone doubt, was beyond surmise. People who didn't like it, left.

For officers, now a body of about 25,000 people internationally, *The Officer* in its various forms was for a hundred years the only forum in which issues might be raised for discussion. Even then, the extent of censorship, whether editorial or self-imposed by contributors, at least in the earlier decades, is difficult to determine. Nevertheless the pages of *The Officer*, particularly over the past fifty years, provide a rare opportunity for taking the pulse of The Salvation Army, at least from the officers' point of view. For much of the period, there is no other public record. (I have not had access to foreign language editions of *The Officer* published in various countries from time to time; the English language edition is made available to all English-speaking officers in the world.) For rank and file Salvationists there were no means of raising issues publicly until the launching of periodicals like the student publications already mentioned, or official organs like *The Salvationist* in Britain and *New Frontier* in USA Western Territory in the 1980's, and the IHQ Website Discussion Page in the 1990's.

What follows in this chapter is a survey of contributions on the theme of the "theology of officership" over the last forty years of the twentieth century, chiefly in *The Officer*, and since its inception in 1986, of *The Salvationist*, and most recently of *Word and Deed*. (This chapter does not touch on articles or correspondence on the role of women officers, which will be treated separately.) For this section I reviewed a total of 53 articles (including Editorial columns) and 57 letters. Many of the letters were part of discussion following articles. *The Officer* ran 42 articles and 32 letters, and *The Salvationist* 8 articles and 22 letters on this theme. By decades, the 1960's saw 10 articles and 4 letters, the

1970's 10 articles and 8 letters, the 1980's 10 articles and 12 letters, the 1990's 19 articles and 27 letters. While hardly indicative of a deluge of controversy, these figures suggest that with the mid-80's advent of *The Salvationist*, the British weekly not restricted to officer-readers, the debate gathered some momentum. It is interesting that *The Salvationist's* American contemporaries carried very little discussion on such matters – this researcher could locate only one relevant editorial comment, in *New Frontier* of May 1988, and some discussion arising from the reprinting (from *The Officer*) of a contentious article in 2000 by Lieutenant Minna Karlstrom of Finland.⁴⁸⁸

More than half of *The Salvationist* correspondents on this subject were officers. The debate has been conducted largely amongst officers because until comparatively recently the majority of Salvationists have not been greatly concerned – possibly because most twentieth century Salvationists have regarded the Army as their church, simply viewed their officer as their minister, and not been interested in the small print. For example, a lay correspondent in *The Salvationist*, David Stirling, expected his officer to be the professional ministerial person, “my God-appointed priest”.⁴⁸⁹ Officers on the other hand have obviously felt a greater need to understand and interpret their role in changing times.

The subject of debate with which we are concerned over this period is firstly about the nature of officership in the Army. Are officers clergy? The obvious answer was yes – officers in most countries enjoy that legal status and recognition in the community, and exercise a role within their community of faith similar to that of other ministers.⁴⁹⁰ Some officers clearly felt the need for some distinct recognition of their higher

⁴⁸⁸ *New Frontier*, 2 June 2000 and 19 September 2000, p.2. Karlstrom's article was reprinted from *The Officer* of October 1999.

⁴⁸⁹ *The Salvationist*, 12 September 1998, p.19.

⁴⁹⁰ In a few countries, officers have employment contracts. In Finland for example, The Salvation Army never sought legal recognition as a “church”, so its officers cannot be clergy, although attempts are now being made to secure this. (Email to the writer from Commissioner Shaw Clifton, 26 November, 2003.) Curiously, Jarl Wahlstrom (General 1981-86) served as a Finnish military chaplain during World War II, which suggests a *de facto* clerical recognition by the state. (2004 *Yearbook*, p.28.)

calling, even though they may have been slightly uncertain about how this ought to be expressed. Against this was the other Army tradition, expressed in the Gauntlett and Kitching quotations above (pp.150-51), that the Army was a movement rather than a church and that all its members shared an equality of status, distinguished only by variety of function. We have already seen both these points of view expressed by the founders of the Army. In either case, the second question follows as to the function of officership: what are officers supposed to do? As time went on, as the number of officers in many Western countries has declined,⁴⁹¹ and work formerly done by officers was seen to be done increasingly by non-officers, this second question gained greater urgency for some.

The first ranging shots were lobbed in the "Captain's Diary", a regular column in *The Officer*. The writer referred to the priesthood of all believers, which was to become a leitmotif in the ensuing years. Pointing out that this phrase meant the corporate "priesthood of *all the believers*" rather than of "*each believer*" individually, the writer called for "more teaching in our ranks about the nature of the Body of Christ on earth, the doctrine of the church and its consequent need to make some apostles, some pastors and teachers."⁴⁹² In the June 1963 issue an article by Captain Cecil Waters also proposed greater attention to the doctrine of the ministry. In 1974 Major William Clark introduced the expression "Theology of Officership" for the first time, asking,

Do we accept that there is a theology of Christian ministry and therefore of Army officership, and if we do, how should we define it? ... Dialogue on the subject within the pages of THE OFFICER is hereby encouraged.⁴⁹³

The articles and letters of the early 1960's introduced most of the themes to which correspondents would revert for the next few decades. Writers were no doubt sometimes unaware that the ground had been

⁴⁹¹ See footnote 692 on page 256.

⁴⁹² *The Officer*, January-February 1960, pp.47-8. Correspondents often overlooked the point that *all* churches believe in the "priesthood of all believers". The question is whether some believers are more priestly than others.

⁴⁹³ *The Officer*, January 1974, p.47.

fought over previously. Some of the later participants in the debate, because they had become officers at a later date, or were not officers at all, were therefore less likely to have had access to earlier contributions to *The Officer*. While the recurrence of themes shows that these were matters of continuing significance, it also makes for it difficult to establish any sort of chronological development in the debate.

“Debate” implies some dialogue, of which there was in fact not much at first. Although there was a series of spirited exchanges exchange in *Magazine* on the matter of “clericalism” in the Army between June 1962 and October 1963 involving Max Cresswell, Roy Terry, Hazell Langley and John Coutts, none of those writers believed that officers ought to have clerical status. For the most part, however, the debate consisted of a series of solo manoeuvres and untidy skirmishes rather than a set battle. At the same time, simply summarising the various views presented largely obscures what process of interaction did occur and also the fact that sometimes an external event would trigger a new phase of discussion. General Arnold Brown’s introduction of the word “ordain” into the commissioning ceremony in 1978 constituted just such a trigger event.

To establish some order in presentation, although at the sacrifice of much sense of cut and thrust of debate, I suggest that the contributions could be subsumed under five main headings:

- (1) Those ascribing some special character, status or quality to officership. Some adhered to what we might call the “Bramwell Booth” argument: “different from the churches but equal to them”.
 - (2) Those maintaining a simple, functional view of ministry.
- With the introduction of ordination in 1978, we find
- (3) some opposing the innovation and
 - (4) some supporting, or at least accepting it.
 - (5) Some concerned to explore the function of officership, whether or not ordained.

(1) Officership having some special character or status.

This is a rather diverse group, but the unifying factor is that all appeared to think it important to establish that officership enjoyed a special status, even if some expressed it in terms of “function”. For some this was simply to establish equality with clergy of other denominations, while others seemed to attach a mystical significance to the officer role. Commissioner Edgar Grinstead, writing on “Spiritual Doctrines of Command” and clearly taking a high view of officership, stated that ‘We believe in the divine origin of the Army and that its pattern of leadership is inspired by God.’ He referred to the “spiritual authority vested in God-called officers” and claimed that “such power to command and act is given in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost”.⁴⁹⁴ Captain Douglas Hillborne similarly asked, “Is officership a Higher Order? ... For the Ministry and officership, is there not a special anointing? We detract from officership and our place in the Church of Christ at our peril. There must be no self-importance, pomposity or ‘Lording it’ over the flock of God, but how sad to lack the priestly expression of spiritual authority, and the spiritual elevation of privilege.” He was anxious that “If you detract from the ministerial function of officership, what have you (or our people) left? You cannot state that the Army is not a church on the one hand and be upset if the officer is not recognised as one of the ministers at a civic gathering.”⁴⁹⁵

Bramwell Booth’s position was staked out again by General Frederick Coutts in his “General’s Affirmation”, a kind of policy manifesto after his election as General.

To spell it out with such courtesy and clarity as public circumstance may require so that none shall have any cause not to acknowledge every officer man or woman, married or single – as ‘a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine.’ To insist on such recognition is not to want to turn our officers into ministers (in the denominational sense of the word), but to save any from grasping at a clerical collar as if it were a lifebelt which alone could win a more perfect acceptance of their service in the sight of God. No blessing –

⁴⁹⁴ *The Officer*, January-February 1961, p.2.

⁴⁹⁵ *ibid.*, January-February 1962, p.46.

episcopal or non-episcopal – can make us more truly what by divine ordination we now are: ministers of grace.⁴⁹⁶

Captain Michael Pressland adduced support for the Salvation Army's functional view of ministry from contemporary New Testament and Patristic studies, while at the same time following earlier Salvationist claims that Salvation Army commissioning was every bit the equal of church ordination.⁴⁹⁷ The corollary, that ordination was no more significant than commissioning, was left unstated.

Captain Philip Williams of Canada was concerned to explain that "the 'priesthood of all believers' does not teach the equality of minister and layman in the Church" but that "every man and woman has direct access to God..." He went on to say that "the role of the Minister, set aside and ordained to preach the Word, is scriptural and a fundamental and integral part of the Church. No layman is commissioned to do that..."⁴⁹⁸ This opinion is certainly far removed from the historic Salvation Army position laid down by William and Catherine Booth, as outlined in earlier chapters.

Colonel John Hunt (R) quoted John 15:16 to support his sense of the special significance of having been "chosen by Jesus". The implication would appear to be that, as Christ was addressing his inner group of disciples, the call could be seen as constituting a special ministerial group.⁴⁹⁹ This illustrates a tendency to limit the application of such passages in this way and begs the question of whether Christ's words might also be taken as addressed to "all who will believe through their message" (John 17:20).⁵⁰⁰ A number of contributors to this debate employed the same kind of argument.

⁴⁹⁶ *ibid.*, January 1964 p.3.

⁴⁹⁷ *The Officer*, June 1969, pp.373ff. (Pressland did come out strongly on the "functional" side in a letter in March 1974 and an article that August.)

⁴⁹⁸ *ibid.*, February 1971, p.128.

⁴⁹⁹ *ibid.*, March 1974, p.112.

⁵⁰⁰ Hunt is in good company of course; the Church has always done it. The Second Vatican Council adopted the same device in, for example, restricting to bishops the application of Jesus' words in Luke 10:16 (*Lumen Gentium* Chapter 3, #20, in Austin

Editorial comment in July 1976 also belongs under the heading of “special ministerial status”. William Clark acknowledged the influence of John Macquarrie, whose two-article series on “The Church and the Ministry”, I Ministerial Functions and II Ministerial Character, had recently appeared in the *Expository Times*, January and February 1976. Clark claimed that because of

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”.⁵⁰¹

Clark appeared to be feeling his way towards a definition of clerical status derived not from historic apostolic succession, but based on the personal spirituality of the officers. He was careful to deny that this was the case, saying, “by ‘a particular quality of character’ is not meant a higher spirituality than those who have not been so called.” However, when he came to answer the question, “what characteristics should mark those who are called to fill our particular place in the church”, the three characteristics proposed appeared to relate to the area of ‘spirituality’. Only the first is a description peculiar to officers. That is “a particular kind of sacrifice” by which he means a self-denying life-style; specifically, availability for appointment “at the disposal of the divinely-directed Movement, The Salvation Army”. The only other marks he suggested are “our attitude to success and rewards” and “our readiness and ability to be supporters of needy people”, neither of them confined to officer ranks.

A two part *Officer* article by Lieut-Colonel Fred Hoyle (British Territory) in December 1987 and January 1988 was entitled “Priesthood and Officership”. Within the context of the priesthood of all believers, and while discounting any sacerdotal role for officers, Hoyle thought that

Flannery (ed.), *Vatican Council II, The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*, Collegeville Min., Liturgical Press, 1975, p.372.)

⁵⁰¹ *The Officer*, July 1976, pp.289-90.

officership had much in common with the Catholic or Anglican conception of priesthood. He referred to the priestly character of the New Testament community, and said that priesthood must emerge from that Christological and pneumatological base. He believed that the priest's role was to represent Christ to the people, being co-opted by Christ for this role, which involved an element of aloneness and special responsibility for leadership.

Major David Pickard insisted that "Officers do have a distinctive function and it is surely not one that can be shared by all. If it were so, then the concept of officership would be redundant and we would not need officers at all. I, too, think that we might need to reassess the idea of officership, but those who have been given this special ministry should seek to elevate officership to the high calling we know it to be."⁵⁰² Lieut-Colonel Alan Atherton, also British, wrote, "Officership must be seen in the context of the whole Christian Church... It is a part of the total ministry of the Church. Because the Army is of the Body of Christ, it is within the line of spiritual apostolic succession... Officers are among those ministers, separated to a sacred and spiritual office. As long as the Church exists, officers will be called into ministry."⁵⁰³

All these clearly see officership as a higher calling of some kind, although they would differ as to what kind. Against them we find ranged the following writers.

(2) Concern about a tendency towards "clericalism" and a continuing preference for a "functional" view of ministry.

The 1960 writer of "The Captain's Diary" noted that, "The distinction we make between officer and soldier is one of function and not of essence (*sic*). There is no essential difference in quality (except as it resides in completeness of consecration) between the service of the officer and the service of the soldier. We know of no ecclesiastical

⁵⁰² *The Salvationist*, 13 July 1996, pp.12-3.

⁵⁰³ *ibid.*, 3 August 1996, p.13.

ordination bestowing peculiar gifts.”⁵⁰⁴ This was the first use of the word “ordination” in this discussion; it was however rarely mentioned before Brown’s 1978 Innovation. The assumption that officership required a more “complete consecration” than did a secular vocation is interesting. By this expression presumably the writer meant an officer’s willingness to be available for appointment, so this implies consecration to the Army rather than to God. (God and the institutional Church are easily confused.)

In the number following Commissioner Grinstead’s article on “Spiritual Doctrines of Command”, whether or not by design, the Editor expressed concern about the tendency to clericalism. He quoted approvingly F.D. Barry, Bishop of Southwark, as suggesting that “clericalism was one of the worst disasters to befall the Church... based on a false division between clergy and laity ... beginning with the mistake of identifying the Church with its office-bearers, as in the phrase, ‘Going into the Church’ – i.e. taking the part for the whole.” The Editor compared this with the Army expression, “Entered the Work” as evidence of a similar tendency, and argued against accepting a passive role for the soldiery. He concluded, “Perhaps we are at fault for narrowing the meaning of The Call: for every sanctified man is called to be a priest and every seeking heart is a holy place where he can minister.”⁵⁰⁵

Later that year a retired officer, Major Oliver Clarke, weighed in on the same theme, with a complaint which also helps cast light on William Booth’s views.

Of recent years I have noticed a growing tendency to pronounce what we call the Benediction ... in the pontifical manner: ‘The Blessing ... be with YOU all’...

“We do not claim endowment by apostolic succession in the sacerdotal sense. We believe in ‘the priesthood of all believers’. It was against this practice that the Founder remonstrated ... when Commissioner Jeffries, asked to pronounce the Benediction, merely said: ‘The blessing of God Almighty be with us all.’ Note, he even did say *us* instead of *you*; but he gave the appearance of administering something instead of invoking the same by saying ‘*May* the blessing of Almighty God be with us all.

⁵⁰⁴ *The Officer*, March-April 1960, p.117.

⁵⁰⁵ *The Officer*, March-April 1961, pp.142-4.

We have already gone far enough already for the good and safety of our Movement in the direction of classifying officership as a higher ORDER. Does this seem to be pedantic? To my view a vital issue is at stake, namely: a Clericalism versus Laity; Ecclesiasticism versus an Evangelical non-conforming Movement...⁵⁰⁶

Brigadier Eric Coward asked if there was not “some confusion here between function and status”. He pointed out that many officers discharged their vocation in servant roles – “mere hostel managers, nurses, office-workers” – and would never enjoy clerical or civic status and recognition, but be accepted as ministers by those they served. He also referred to the anti-clericalism that for centuries had marked the “lower classes” for which the Army was raised up and was anxious lest “keeping up with the cloth” would mean deepening alienation from “our people”. He wrote “the ‘priestly expression of spiritual authority’ has little to do with status or official duties. Our authority is in our acceptance as servants of all. In this ministry there is no priestly class or higher and lower orders. But officership is a higher vocation because we have obeyed the call to place our whole present and future in the hands of God and the Army.”⁵⁰⁷ Coward thus took up the key polarity of function and status, and came down on the side of the former. At the same time he muddled the waters in that a “higher vocation” sounds very like a matter of status. He is probably referring to what the Captain’s Diary had called a “completeness of consecration” and later participants would characterise as availability for appointment, which could be seen as one of the marks of officership much as celibacy distinguishes the Catholic priesthood.

Major William Burrows repudiated “any suggestion of an officer possessing any peculiarly priestly sanctity” or role as mediator. He cited Emil Brunner’s characterisation of the formation of priesthood as a retrograde step in the history of the Church, reverting from New Testament transcendence of the opposition between the profane and the holy, to the Old Testament conception of a sacrificial cultus. Asking

⁵⁰⁶ *The Officer*, September-October, 1961, p.339.

⁵⁰⁷ *ibid.*, May-June 1962, pp.188-9.

“What, then, is the distinction between officer and soldier?” he replied that “It is a distinction of function rather than of capacity. The officer is being financially supported so that, with all of his time, he may represent his soldiers in caring for the flock and in promoting the evangel. It is their task as well as his; only he is set free to do tasks impossible to a man who has to earn his own living.”⁵⁰⁸

Burrows devoted a December 1964 editorial comment to “Lay Ministry”, suggesting that rather than taking exception to some cleric’s appellation of this term to Salvation Army officership, “we ought to fasten on such a designation as the highest compliment that could be paid to our movement.” Having cited examples of non-officer Salvationist leadership, Burrows asked,

Could it be that a yearning for ecclesiasticism, felt in some quarters, is to be seen as a yearning for status...? If so, the attempt will fail. Election is never to special favour but only to greater responsibility... Jesus undertook a ‘lay’ – a practical, unclerical – ministry.⁵⁰⁹

Articles by Commissioner Hubert Scotney (an Australian) laid out the received view very clearly. Writing on Salvationist principles, he included this under the “Principle of Equality”:

Officership indicates special functions within the structure, rather than superior status.⁵¹⁰

Later he wrote,

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.⁵¹¹

Another contribution under this heading was the reprinting of an article by A. Skevington Wood, a Methodist historian, on the “Priesthood of All Believers”. Originally published in *The Christian Graduate* and reprinted by permission, this article traced the development of Methodist ministry as a lay phenomenon. It was written as a protest against what

⁵⁰⁸ *The Officer*, June 1963, pp.356-7.

⁵⁰⁹ *ibid.*, December 1964, pp.861-2.

⁵¹⁰ *ibid.*, April 1969, p.254.

⁵¹¹ *ibid.*, July 1969, p.452.

the writer saw as “the astonishing and disturbing” Methodist capitulation to “historic Romanism” in negotiations with the Anglican Church on ministry.⁵¹² The inclusion of such outside writing in the pages of *The Officer* was uncommon and clearly signalled editorial, and therefore official, disagreement with clericalising views in the Salvation Army. Coutts, as General, would have approved its inclusion.

Major Hubert Boardman (Great Britain) observed that the lack of theological definition had resulted in “a great deal of confusion in our thinking”. After surveying New Testament teaching, he noted that, “It was only when the Early Church had begun to settle down and felt the need to protect the institution, that it sought to do this by founding a special professional religious caste, who would protect and preserve it and, unfortunately in the process, often impede its progress.” In each age, as new expressions of Christian life similarly became more established, the same process could be seen. He quoted David Jenkins in *Protestant Ministry* as saying that the Church forgot its function of this total ministry of the whole Church and proceeded on the assumption that its primary function was “to provide a milieu in which professional ministries could exercise their gifts”.

As the Army evolved and took on forms of establishment so the development of its professional officer caste, with a corresponding separation between officer and laity, became increasingly apparent... More and more did officers begin to assume a “special (priestly?) role”, assuming greater responsibility, while increasingly congregations opted out of their own responsibilities and adopted an attitude of ‘paying an officer’ to do the job! ... In this unfortunate evolution, I would contend that our ranking system has been one of the greatest contributory factors, for it has tended to emphasise an officer’s status rather than his true function.⁵¹³

William Clark’s 1974 Editorial quoted the contemporary *Orders and Regulations for Officers* to describe Salvation Army officers: they are

men and women who (a) have left ordinary pursuits and occupations; (b) have consecrated their lives to the service of God and the people; (c) have undergone a course of training; and (d) are, unless retired, engaged in full-time service as leaders in the Army’s ranks.

⁵¹² *The Officer*, September 1965, pp.621-6.

⁵¹³ *ibid.*, August 1972, pp.345-50.

Clark notes that (b) applies to every Salvationist, and that (a), (c) and (d) concern function, with the proviso that every Christian also engages in full-time service.⁵¹⁴ *The Orders and Regulations* therefore provided no grounds for claiming any special spiritual status for officers.

Brigadier Ernest Yendell claimed that

officership outweighed so many other things and had been regarded from the very beginning as being in a privileged apostolic succession. While it is true that several aspects of officership could apply equally to soldiership or to Christian discipleship in general, I still find myself regarding the officer as one “set apart” for special ordination as a minister of God’s grace to God’s people and, with and through them, to the people at large. Our call is not to rank and status, but to officership, a term embracing for us values both priestly and apostolic, to say nothing of vital leadership, within God’s kingdom. “Officer” is a term that must never be devalued... denoting spiritual commission and privileged position by all who respond to this special calling of God.⁵¹⁵

Major Stanley Richardson declared,

If my position is purely functional, I am redundant... Many officer positions could be replaced by non-officer personnel... It would appear that some officers are afraid of any appearance of superiority or status seeking. Our superiority is surely to be found in two aspects – privilege and *responsibility*.⁵¹⁶

These letters led to a spirited response from Lieutenant Shaw Clifton who contributed an article on “Martin Luther and the Priesthood of All Believers”. Describing the context and summarising the argument of Luther’s *Address to the German Nobility*, Clifton noted that Luther rejected any clergy/laity division, saying that the cleric acts on behalf of all Christian people and distinctions are derived not from qualifications but from function. The implication for Salvation Army officership was that “the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers is incompatible with the idea of there being any difference in kind between officers and others. Had Luther been asked... to pronounce upon a theology of officership, he would not have been able to reply in terms of “privileged apostolic succession” or “privileged calling”... Luther could never have used

⁵¹⁴ *The Officer*, January 1974, p.47.

⁵¹⁵ *ibid.*, March 1974, pp.112-3.

⁵¹⁶ *ibid.*, March 1974, p.114.

theology to point up any distinction between clergy and laity save one of function.”⁵¹⁷

Richardson, responding, was surprised that Clifton ignored “the evidence that almost without exception the churches that sprang from the Reformation accept a doctrine of the Ministry.”⁵¹⁸ Clifton responded that his article had been written out of concern “that participants in the ‘officership’ debate might lack basic information on the history of Protestant thought” and that “Major Richardson’s comments ... confirmed my worst fears. I take it (from his previous letter on the subject) that when he speaks of a ‘doctrine of the ministry’ he means a doctrine that affirms the existence of a priestly virtue not available to lay Christians. If so, his statement that ‘almost without exception the churches that sprang from the Reformation accept a doctrine of the Ministry’ is factually incorrect.” Quoting from Methodist, Baptist, Congregationalist and Presbyterian traditions, Clifton showed that these all rejected any sacerdotal status for ministry, and contended that Anglicanism was in a different category, being a compromise between Roman and Reformation thinking. “Salvationists should feel ill at ease at any suggestion that it be applied to their officers.”⁵¹⁹

Major Paulo W. Rangel, Brazil, attempted to “demonstrate that the concepts ‘laity’ and ‘clergy’ constitute an anti-biblical classification, contrary to the concept of the Church and contrary to its nature... Our position as officers has to do with our pastoral functions, which do not include superiority....” He was concerned that “there is still too great a distance between Salvationist people and the leadership... Decisions, as a rule, are still centralized, giving little or no opportunity of participation for soldiers, recruits and friends...”⁵²⁰ “Time to lay aside the priest concept” was the message of a letter from John and Kathleen Lowther. Objecting to an article by Commissioner Dinsdale Pender equating officership with

⁵¹⁷ *The Officer*, September 1974, pp.408-10.

⁵¹⁸ *ibid.*, November 1974, p.498.

⁵¹⁹ *ibid.*, January 1975, pp.33-4.

⁵²⁰ *ibid.*, May 1996, pp.229-32.

priesthood, the Lowthers believed “that introducing the concept of Salvationists being either priests or laymen is not only an affront to our origins in the reformed wing of the church and bad theology, but one reason for the priesthood of all believers not functioning as it should in staffing our Army.” They noted that “when the pastorate pulls all functions of leadership and ministry to itself the result is an overworked officer/pastor/priest and a passive soldiery/congregation/laity.”⁵²¹

John Coutts, United Kingdom, a former officer, university teacher and long a spokesman for reforms in the movement, writing in the *Salvationist*, welcomed General Gowans’ world-wide consultation in 2000 about the future of officership. Noting that “for the Salvationist, the Christian Church is defined by faith, not by Church order”, John Coutts repeated that “this means that our view of ministry is ‘functional’ ... Some hold that ordination to the priesthood is indelible – ‘once a priest always a priest’. But the Salvation Army view is ‘captain is as captain does’.”⁵²²

Ordination

A 1966 Editorial on “Qualified or Commissioned” had rejected the concept of “ordination”. “Perhaps because in some communions the word ‘ordination’ carries the idea of the conferment of special ‘grace’ but also (and primarily) because our word more nearly describes what we mean and also has a military connotation, we use the word ‘commissioning’.”⁵²³ The words “ordination” and “ordain” were in fact rarely used in a Salvation Army context prior to 1978. (Some examples are given in the chapter on “Official Words”.)

However, in 1978 General Arnold Brown provided for the word “ordain” to be used in the Commissioning of officers. The circumstances attending this decision, and its sequelae, are also discussed in the following chapter.

⁵²¹ *The Salvationist*, 12 April 1997, p.7.

⁵²² *ibid.*, 27 May 2000, p.7.

⁵²³ *The Officer*, September 1966, pp.645-7.

Curiously, this innovation seemed at first to pass without comment. It was not until 1985, seven years after the introduction of ordination, that signs of disquiet appeared, by which time Brown had been retired for four years. One wonders whether earlier expressions of opposition were not published or whether it just took a long time for the significance to dawn. People would have heard the word at six annual commissioning meetings by the time anyone remarked on it in print.⁵²⁴ Following this somewhat delayed reaction, responses and contributions dealing specifically with ordination could be grouped under three headings: those against ordination; those in favour of it; those accepting it but on their own terms.

(3) Those uncomfortable with or against the use of the term “ordination”

Most opponents of this innovation did so because of their commitment to the traditional, functional view of officership.

In his regular 1985 column “Matters Arising”, Scottish officer Captain Chick Yuill described his “discomfort” on hearing at commissioning the words, “It is my privilege to commission you as officers of The Salvation Army and ordain you as ministers of Christ and his gospel.” Admitting that “it might be argued that it has been inserted simply to amplify and explain the meaning of our commission as officers,” he noted that “‘mere words’ have a life of their own, and I fear that this one might lead us along a pathway which God never meant us to tread.”

Yuill went on to set quotations from Luther on the priesthood of all believers alongside extracts from the WCC’s Lima Text on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. (This also appears to be the first time this document had been commented on critically in this journal.) He claimed that “the whole tenor” of Lima “is governed by a view of the ordained ministry as possessing a priestly status... it is to the ordained ministry that the Church looks for ‘an example of holiness’, and it is the ordained ministry who ‘signify and represent’ the presidency of Christ at the eucharist.” He reminded readers that “William Booth saw his officers, not

⁵²⁴ I was unaware of the change until Yuill’s 1985 letter (this page) drew attention to it.

as an ecclesiastical caste with a calling to the holy life beyond that of the rank and file soldiery, but as ordinary men and women, singled out for leadership and service... Moreover he saw the 'presidency of Christ' as a reality in the midst of his people, a reality which required neither ordained clergy nor eucharistic celebration..."

"May I suggest" wrote Yuill, "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."⁵²⁵

Yuill's comments provoked more reaction than any other single contribution to *The Officer*, six letters appearing in the following ten months, with further articles and letters on the subject being printed from time to time.

Mrs Major Sandra Dalziel of London wrote "that my spine chills whenever I hear that word 'ordination'" and feared that it had been "copied from elsewhere for reasons that have little to do with theology" ... to "make us feel 'one above', extra special."⁵²⁶ Colonel Hubert Boardman likewise felt a "certain discomfort" with the use of the word, which seemed to be an "attempt to identify ourselves more closely with practices which our Founder abandoned for the sake of the mission... and do not benefit our cause."⁵²⁷

A first mention of ordination from a non-officer perspective is found in *The Salvationist* of the same year. David McKenzie wrote,

The Salvation Army's contribution to the debate about women priests would carry more weight had we not introduced the concept of "ordination" into the commissioning ceremony a few years ago. The arguments in the Anglican Church are not about whether women should be allowed to preach or do pastoral work; the church already has 'women in ministry' as deaconesses. The argument is about the mystical

⁵²⁵ *The Officer*, October 1985, pp.438-40.

⁵²⁶ *ibid.*, January 1986, p.15.

⁵²⁷ *ibid.*, pp.15-7.

– dare one say magical? – nature of the priesthood, and about the *fitness* of a woman to represent Christ in this role... “Ordination”, with its unfortunate connotation of grades of spiritual authority rather than differences of function, has eroded this fundamental principle. If all are priests, then all are ordained. What we have done is not to exclude women, but to exclude all who have not passed through a Salvation Army training college!⁵²⁸

Another non-officer comment came from Robert Docter of California, writing editorial comment in *New Frontier*. He expressed disquiet over the use of “ordination” in commissioning, lest it imply “an increasing separation of the officer corps from the laity of Army”.⁵²⁹

The Officer's regular columnist for 1988 was an American, Major Joseph Viola. He returned to the matter of ordination, noting that “the ‘ordination’ service will create the usual perennial debate as it did when the terms ‘ordination’ and ‘ordained’ were first introduced into our commissioning festivities.” (Evidently all had not been silent between 1978 and 1985 after all.) Viola observed that “in America most officers with whom I have spoken seem very comfortable with these words”, because American Salvationists were tired of being thought of as “a glorified YMCA” and wanted to be recognised as a church. However he believed that if that was the purpose of the change, it was not working, “in this country at least”, and that if they really wanted to carry that argument they should re-introduce baptism and communion as well.

He drew attention to the fact that the Army was clearly not using the term ordain to denote a special character, “an external sanction” for the officer, in the way other churches used it. “When an officer decides to leave the work... he or she immediately loses all the rights and privileges of ministry (conducting weddings ceremonies, dedications, etc)” whereas “in the majority of major denominations the principle ‘once a minister always a minister’ applies, unless the individual is defrocked...”. He noted that amongst many other churches, a reciprocal recognition of ministerial credentials is granted. Our standing aside from this principle “does not completely invalidate our use of these words – it merely makes them

⁵²⁸ *The Salvationist*, 2 August 1986, p.3.

⁵²⁹ *New Frontier*, 11 May 1988, p.7.

quite unnecessary.” He concluded, “we should review why we use these words and ask if their use really accomplishes the intended purposes.” Viola believed that it was pointless to use a word generally used for conferring a priestly character if it was not in fact used that way.⁵³⁰ The same point was made by Colonel Gordon Sharp (R). Referring to the fact that “the Army does not differentiate between officership and appointment”, that...”no officer may be unavailable for appointment and retain his officership”, Sharp contrasts this with “most other denominations, [in which] ordination is a distinct state... This point of view has never found acceptance within our movement. It is only recently that the words ‘and ordain’ have been added to the ritual of commissioning officers. That change seems a little pointless so long as the link between officer-rank and appointment remains an unaltered concept.”⁵³¹

Lieutenant Martin Howe wrote, “We must continue to reject the sacrament of ordination with its consequences of distinction between ‘special’ and ‘average’ Christians.”⁵³² Lieut-Colonel David Guy also reiterated that “it is the restriction of priestly ministry to the *ordained*, commissioned, official, trained, salaried ministry that departs from the New Testament insight and against which the doctrine of all-believers’ priesthood makes its protest.”⁵³³

Another non-officer contribution is found in Andrew Watkinson-Trim. “I am not and never have been a lay member of The Army and wish to dissent from this creeping churchification. Our Founders accepted and implemented the New Testament doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. Officers were not ordained and soldiers were not laymen (in itself a sexist term). I understand that ‘ordination’ was imported into the Army to demonstrate that our officers are just as much ministers as the

⁵³⁰ *The Officer*, May 1988, pp.222-4.

⁵³¹ *ibid.*, November 1992, p.488.

⁵³² *ibid.*, July 1988, p.314.

⁵³³ *ibid.*, April 1990, p.178.

leaders of any other church. How sad! Such a concern for status and respectability would have horrified the first Salvationists.”⁵³⁴

Captain Cecil Waters was one of three who wrote about ordination in February 1993. He felt that “the increasing, formal use of the word ‘ordain’ may well encourage misconceptions – for instance that some are, by virtue of being ‘ordained’, be able to do things which the rest of the church cannot do for itself... We must be sure that it does not carry any suggestion of imputed grace or spiritual status.” He followed this up with a study of New Testament words, showing that “while Biblical usage does not require us to understand ordination... as imputing special grace... there is no biblical reason to prevent us using the word ‘ordain’ interchangeably with ‘appoint’ or ‘commission’”. However he concludes that “because the term has a different significance for the rest of the church, we should avoid using it.”⁵³⁵

Cadet Stephen Court of Canada wrote in May 1993, dissenting from the views expressed by Robinson (p.192, below) in explanation of “ordination”.

He claims that the function of an officer can be distinguished from those of other soldiers by the covenant that, “I will live to win souls, and I will not allow anything to turn me aside from seeking their salvation as the first great purpose of my life.” This statement is offered as justification for ordination. But what of the soldier? ... A good soldier makes war his business. He may do something in other lines of duty ... but after all, fighting is his trade... There is no difference between the two functions, 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.”⁵³⁶ Major Laurence Hay, New Zealand, trenchantly noted

that cadets are still to be ordained as well as commissioned. I have not been ordained. What then do I lack for my ministry? If I do lack something, what is it, and how do I acquire it? If I lack nothing, then

⁵³⁴ *The Salvationist*, 11 July 1992, p.12.

⁵³⁵ *The Officer*, February 1993, pp.71-6.

⁵³⁶ *ibid.*, May 1993, pp.214-5.

ordination is an empty charade and should be abandoned forthwith. In my view, no convincing justification has yet been put forward for this radical change in our theology of ministry. Or have I missed something?⁵³⁷

Hay was supported by Lieutenant Paul M Waters, Norway, who observed that no-one appeared to know what “ordination” meant, that the word “minister” in the ordination/commissioning ceremony was very confusing in Norway as there was no parallel other than “priest”, and that no-one had adequately rebutted objections raised. “Either ‘ordination’ is the same as ‘commissioning’ – in which case why bother with it or else it means something which at least some officers cannot accept.”⁵³⁸

A letter from Major David Pickard in March 1995, claiming that officer-ordination conferred spiritual authority and constituted a priestly class, was also refuted in the April number of *The Officer* by Colonel William Clark (R) and Major Cecil Waters.

“We Don’t Need an Ordained Clergy” was the headline for an article in a 1996 number of *The Salvationist* by Major Ian Barr. Reacting against the use of “lay Salvationists” for “non-officers”, Barr noted that its increasing use was “mirrored by an increasing use of the 16th century word ‘ministry’ to describe the work of officers and the equally loaded word ‘ordained’ to describe their status.” Reiterating the functional base of any difference between officers and soldiers, he protested against the “churchification” of our language.⁵³⁹ Barr returned to the fray in May 1997 under the heading, “Do We Really Need Officers?” He quoted an article by Rev Dr Janet Wootton, a Congregational Minister, that raised the question of “How do we square ordination with the priesthood of all believers?” Apparently Dr Wootton had asked, “Why not ordain caretakers too.” Barr agreed with her conclusion that “What is important is that local congregations ensure that anyone who serves God in their midst is called, equipped, prepared and set aside for the task.” Allowing

⁵³⁷ *The Officer*, July 1994 p.336.

⁵³⁸ *ibid.* September 1994, p.432.

⁵³⁹ *The Salvationist*, 21 September 1996, p.5.

for the difference in polity between Congregationalism and The Salvation Army, there was agreement “with the premise that in theological terms there are no functions open to ministers (officers) that are closed to members (soldiers).”⁵⁴⁰

(4) Those supporting, defending or accepting the use of “ordination”.

Commissioner Victor Keanie (R), commented on Yuill’s strictures on the Lima document, “as one closely involved in this matter” (the Army’s response to Lima). He defended the Army’s use of term “ordained”. “The term ‘ordained’ was introduced into the commissioning formula by General Arnold Brown as a result of representations from a number of territories in which the concept of an ‘ordained ministry’ was becoming necessary to give The Salvation Army and its officers the place in church and state relationships which we rightly claim. In some countries where the word can be translated only by the equivalent of ‘laying on of hands’ it is not used. The concept of our ‘ordained ministry’ is still distinctively our own...” He quoted the dictionary definition of “ordination” – “admission to the ministry” – suggesting that it was an appropriate term for the description Yuill gave of entering upon officership. He felt that Yuill’s use of the expressions “‘singled out’ and ‘the sense of divine calling’ surely tend to demolish the argument developed on ‘the need to re-emphasise the truth that there is no real difference between officers and soldiers...’”, and urged “that we do not swing to the opposite extreme from that envisaged in this (Lima) document.”⁵⁴¹

Another retired British officer to respond was Brigadier Norman Gothard (R), who although also “uneasy about anything that sounds ‘churchified’, felt that “the word ‘ordained’ in this connection does not rule out the ‘priesthood of all believers’. He quoted a number of examples of

⁵⁴⁰ *The Salvationist*, 10 May 1997, pp.8-9.

⁵⁴¹ *The Officer*, February 1986, pp.76-7.

the use of the word from the AV translation. He pointed out that the conduct of the office-holder, rather than the name of the office, commends its holder. Like Keanie, he appeared to come down on the side of some special status for officers however: "All believers have access to God through Jesus... but all are not called to the ministry of the Gospel. Those who are, are privileged responsible beings, separated and consecrated to stand between God and the people, and as such are 'ordained to preach the word of the Lord.'"⁵⁴² Major Arthur Brown, Great Britain, also came down on this side of the argument, claiming support from Old Testament priestly distinction (as reflected in the AV's Hebrews 5:1 – "taken from among men" and "ordained for men in things pertaining to God") and modern English usage of "professionals" and "laymen". On this rather shaky exegetical base he could claim, "herein lies the essential difference that sets us apart from those to whom we minister and endows us with the authority to do what we do and be what we are..."⁵⁴³

Major Clifford Hurcum, Great Britain, argued that the principal requirement for officership – or ministry in any other church tradition – was always the conviction of having received a call from God, and described this as scripturally based, giving Biblical examples of "call". This "remains central to the whole concept of ordination." Like Clark in July 1976, he distinguished between the general "call" to all believers to participate in the priesthood of all believers, and a "specific 'call' to some, for full-time commitment. Whilst we do not give support to the sacerdotal doctrine, we nevertheless believe that for some, there comes a direct call to be 'set apart' to offer all their time and minister as: 'Apostles... prophets... evangelists... pastors and teachers, to equip God's people for work in his service' (Ephesians 4:11)."⁵⁴⁴ Along with a number of contributors, Hurcum looked for a middle way, a functional ministry with special character. He also, like most others, seemed to assume that a Biblical call to ministry was, *ipso facto*, a call to full-time ministry, which

⁵⁴² *The Officer*, April 1986, p.167.

⁵⁴³ *ibid.*, February 1993, pp.81-3.

⁵⁴⁴ *ibid.*, March 1989, pp.134-7.

overlooked the possibility of “tent-making”, worker-priest model of ministry as exemplified by St Paul.

Commissioner Stanley Walter, Southern Africa, adroitly fence-sitting in a paper given at the 1988 International Conference of Leaders, made a number of references to ordination in the course of a general survey of “Officership, its Meaning and Theology”. He quoted John Stott as claiming that “the Pauline doctrine of ‘every member ministry’ does not mean that ordained clergy are irrelevant”, and confining the application of the pastoral injunction of Ephesians 4:11,12 to such a clerical group. Further on he used the AV translation of Mark 3:14 (“And he ordained twelve...”) “to read a “special call and ordination” into the calling of the disciples. (Using “ordained” for *epoieson* was anachronistic and misleading in this context.) Walter (a Canadian) expressed himself as “quite comfortable with the use of the additional word ‘ordain’ in our commissioning service... (it) helps our soldiers to realise that our officers are as fully accredited and accepted as ministers of the gospel as are those of other churches”. However he did not want the word stressed “at the expense of that peculiarly Army sense of the word ‘commissioning’”⁵⁴⁵.

Lt.-Colonel Earl Robinson described the officer, as a result of God’s calling, as “ordained by God just as surely as are any who, since the first century of the Church, have thought of themselves as serving in the apostolic succession.” Robinson described the Commissioning ceremony as “parallel to the act of ordination”. The three steps in the ordination to Salvation Army officership – signing of a covenant, the commissioning and the prayer of dedication – he saw as “in keeping with the traditional meaning of ordination in the Church as a whole.”⁵⁴⁶

Major David Pickard, United Kingdom THQ, argued that the definition of officership in the Orders and Regulations (“have left other pursuits and occupations; have dedicated themselves to the service of God and the people”) suggested that “officers belong very much to a

⁵⁴⁵ *The Officer*, September 1989, pp.396-402.

⁵⁴⁶ *ibid.*, February 1993, pp.77-81.

‘special spiritual caste’, a priestly class, and by virtue of our calling and consecration, set apart from those whom we lead. The divine ordination... gives us spiritual authority...”⁵⁴⁷

Brigadier Bramwell Darbyshire (R), was emphatic about the status of officers.

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.⁵⁴⁸

(5) Those using the word “ordain” on their own terms

It would be incorrect to say that all protagonists for “ordination” belonged to the “status” school. Some were, and, as we have seen, obviously welcomed its introduction as an additional support. Others, realising that the word would not now go away, sought to explain or use it in such a way as to secure the “functional” view and play down any implications of “status”.

In 1989 Major Raymond Caddy, International Headquarters, defended ordination’s introduction to the Salvation Army on the grounds that “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.” In Church terms, “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

⁵⁴⁷ *The Officer*, March 1995, p.143.

⁵⁴⁸ *The Salvationist*, 18 April 1998.

(see Romans 12, 1st Corinthians 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.”⁵⁴⁹ This argument is of interesting in two ways. Firstly, Caddy safeguarded the Army’s traditional functionalism while accommodating the new use of ordination. Secondly, he lined up Pauline passages about spiritual gifts with this functional use of ordination; as all Christians were recipients of spiritual gifts, this meant that all were ordained. This broke new ground in this discussion.

In 1995 Major Clifford Kew, International Headquarters, published a series of articles on “A Theology of Officership”, again accepting the use of ordination but making it clear that he saw its meaning as functional only. In Part One he asked, “Does an officer belong to a special spiritual caste, which makes him different from all other Salvationists and gives him ‘ex-officio’ special rights and authority and privileges and, in a special sense, grace?... It is rather strange that spiritual ministry has so often come to be seen in terms of priesthood, often ritual priesthood. There seems to be a built-in tendency for spiritual calling to revert to religious office.” He noted that this made it all the more important “to examine our theology of officership, to ensure that we are not following outdated patterns of ministry.”⁵⁵⁰

In Part Two, Kew set the prophetic against the priestly tradition, and noted that New Testament ministry cut across the priestly emphasis. New Testament offices of evangelists, pastors, deacons, presbyters and bishops were descriptions of the work people did, not priestly office. “If they were ever ordained it was not into a formal or ritual ordaining, far less a hereditary qualification, but a into pragmatic and practical ministry. It was a matter of function and not position.”⁵⁵¹

⁵⁴⁹ *The Salvationist*, 20 May 1989, p.5.

⁵⁵⁰ *The Officer*, February 1995, pp.87-90.

⁵⁵¹ *ibid.*, March 1995, pp.131-4.

In Part Three he traced the development of “an exclusive monopoly of ministry” by a clerical caste, while the function of the laity was depressed in the second and third centuries, and the influence of Augustine’s doctrine of indelible ministry, the idea of apostolic succession and priestly authority to administer sacraments. Passing on to the Army’s use of ordination, he said “we can live with the word as an added explanation of ministry but not as a ritual qualification for ministry in any exclusive sense...” If we in the Army believe in a priesthood, it must not be just the priesthood of an officer elite, but the priesthood of all believers. We are all bridge-builders for God.”⁵⁵²

Eric Welsby wrote that “lay” was “quite appropriate when referring to Christians who although committed to full-time service, are serving in a non-professional capacity – that is, without financial reward.” He felt that the dictionary definition, “to set apart for an office or duty”, gave sufficient justification for the use of ordain, “although some may feel it to be elitist or at least seeking parity with other denominations.”⁵⁵³

Colonel Shaw Clifton, by now Territorial Commander in Pakistan, published *Who are These Salvationists?* in 1999. In the course of a general description of The Salvation Army, Clifton described the priesthood of all believers as the basis for the Army’s functional approach to church order. It did not touch “... upon the question of who does what in the life and affairs of the church” but allowed “the recognition of distinctive roles for both the laity and the clergy”. He noted that

some non-ordained members of the church are allowed to take up wider responsibilities and to carry out the same functions in a corps as an ordained and commissioned officer. I refer here to sergeants, envoys and auxiliary-captains. (In Pakistan we also use the term corps leader for such a person.)... We believe the grace that energizes the ordained clergy is the same grace and of the same order as that which empowers and sustains the ministry and service of lay persons... Any distinction between them is one of role or function, not one of priestly or spiritual status.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁵² *The Officer*, April 1995, pp.173-6.

⁵⁵³ *The Salvationist*, 21 December 1996, p.20.

⁵⁵⁴ Shaw Clifton, *Who Are These Salvationists?* Alexandria VA, 1999, pp.27-9. Clifton also argues that the Army is a “Church”, which by the evidence he adduces, he means a “denomination”, or what Booth would have called a “sect”, over against the Army’s

Clifton thus combined the use of clergy and laity terminology with a functional view of ministry. It is unclear however, why “corps leaders” were not ordained when there was no distinction of “role or function” between them and corps officers.

(6) Exploring the function of officership; attempting to define, describe or clarify the role.

- Some writers sought to define officership in terms of tasks or roles appropriate to officers. Lieut-Colonel David Guy asked, “What is the function that explains and identifies an officer; that differentiates him, in practical terms only, from a soldier; that provides the clue to his calling and effectiveness or otherwise in pursuing it?” He pointed out that the tasks of preaching, pastoring or representing the Army in the local community, are all discharged by soldiers as well as by officers, along with the “somewhat hazy concept of spiritual leadership.”⁵⁵⁵ Other writers were more sure that they could identify certain tasks as peculiarly officer ones. Some saw the role as one of equipping the soldiers. Lieutenant John G Merrit of USA offered a study of ministry in the Epistle to the Ephesians. From this he drew the “primary function of every Salvation Army Corps officer” as being “the equipping of the saints for the work of service, to the building up of the body of Christ... training of members of the Church – of the soldiers of the corps – to become functioning members of the body of Christ – and of the Salvation Army.”⁵⁵⁶ Captain Anthony Stone of New Zealand suggested that in the first instance his job was, like any other soldier, to contribute from his own gifts to the well-being of the body; and secondly, after Ephesians 4:12, “to prepare God’s people for works of service” – “to train God’s people to minister to one

customary reference to itself as “an integral part of that universal fellowship of Christian believers known as the Church.” (*Orders and Regulations for Officers*, 1974, p.v.)

⁵⁵⁵ *The Officer*, January 1986, pp.15-8.

⁵⁵⁶ *ibid.*, June 1970, p.375.

another.”⁵⁵⁷ Captain Louis Kinsey believed that the special function of officership was to “be influential in our role as leaders in training and motivating others to be better ‘priests’ themselves.”⁵⁵⁸

- An official American definition suggested that the role was *sui generis*, but essentially evangelical. “All of God’s people are equally called. The call to officership is the call to a particular role in Christian work. Strictly speaking, this role is neither altogether that of minister nor of social worker. It includes most aspects of both roles but can only properly be described as the role of the Salvation Army officer, the primary purpose of which is to reach the spiritually and physically impoverished with the gospel of Jesus Christ.”⁵⁵⁹

- Some also saw the officer as the focus or representative figure for the congregation. Major Cliff Ashworth’s 1996 article, “Yes – officers are still needed!” set out to re-examine the basis of officership, referring to it as “our ordained ministry”. Recognising the ministry of the whole church, the priesthood of all believers, he said, “such ‘lay-ministry’ does not do away with the need for, in our case, the ministry of officers. Rather these two enhance one another. Ashworth suggested the two ideas of “focussing” and “enabling” as descriptive of the officer-role. “The officer ... represents the work which properly belongs to the whole body.... Does not supersede the work of the whole community... the officer enables the community itself to fulfil the mission... does not abrogate the ministry... he/she facilitates it” in the manner of Ephesians 4:12.⁵⁶⁰ Likewise Major Ray Harris (Canada). Noting that “our own movement has a certain ambivalence about the meaning of ordination”, he “would contend that apart from the matter of function, we need to give attention to an officer’s representational role. Like the captain of a hockey team or a Member of Parliament, officers of The Salvation Army represent something greater

⁵⁵⁷ *ibid.*, August 1986, pp. 365-6.

⁵⁵⁸ *The Officer*, July 1990, pp.315-6.

⁵⁵⁹ *The Role of the Corps Officer in the United States of America: Guidelines for CO’s in the USA*. Approved by the Commissioners’ Conference, USA. October, 1972.

⁵⁶⁰ *The Salvationist*, 18 May 1996, pp.8-9.

than themselves... to serve and equip that which we represent.” He quoted Leslie Newbiggin, that “we set apart a man or a woman to a ministerial priesthood not in order to take away the priesthood of the whole body but to enhance it”, and Richard Neuhaus as saying, “The ordained minister ... is to illuminate the vocation of the Church and the vocations of the many people who are in the Church. That means that ordination is not exclusionary but exemplary.”⁵⁶¹

- Some saw leadership as the particular responsibility of officers. Colonel Harry Williams of Southern India in “The Priest and the People”, said he used the term “priest” loosely to describe the “leader of a group of believers”. Setting out four roles – ritualistic, sacerdotal, executive and “spokesman on religious matters”, he observed that there were none that could not be performed by a layman. He concluded somewhat paradoxically, “Today I believe we are faced with the paradox that the wall between the functions of the priest and people must be broken down, at a time when the priest must, more than ever before, stand forth as a skilled and disciplined leader, meriting the respect and support of his congregation.”⁵⁶² Captain David Radford said that it was “clear from Scripture that some people are called to have authority and responsibility for other believers”.⁵⁶³

Lieut-Colonel Earl Robinson in an article on “Ordained to Spiritual Leadership”, looked at functions of an ordained officership. In Part One he took the Pauline gifts of *proistemi* and *kuberneseis* from Romans 12:8 and 1st Corinthians 12:28 respectively, and explored the qualities of spirituality, knowledge of God, self-denial, humility, love and integrity required of “those called and ordained to a ministry of spiritual

⁵⁶¹ *Word and Deed*, Vol. 2, No. 1, November 1999, pp.43-4. It is interesting that the officer was thought to be representative of salvationists to the wider community, but the traditional clerical argument that the priest in some way represents Christ to the people was not mooted at all. The concept of the priesthood of all believers appears to be too deeply rooted for that concept to suggest itself. E.L. Mascall rejects the “protestant” representative theory with the observation that “there can hardly be a more blatant way of clericalising the clergy and delaicising the laity than to transfer the functions of the latter to the former.” (*The Recovery of Unity*. London, Longmans 1958 p.8.)

⁵⁶² *The Officer*, August 1970, pp.550-2, 558.

⁵⁶³ *ibid.*, November 1990, pp.513-4.

leadership.” He went on to examine the further requirements of 1st Timothy 3:17. Part Two dealt with the concept of ‘servant leadership’, summarising points from work of Robert K. Greenleaf, Myron Rush and John Stott.⁵⁶⁴

- Some writers suggested a mix of roles, generally reflecting the usual run of clerical responsibilities in churches. Major William Burrows suggested “that there are four major responsibilities which are inescapable”: the prophetic (“by which we mean the proclamation of the Word”), that of pastor, that of the priest and finally that of the evangelist. Burrows was a little obscure on the priestly role: “The priestly office involves the conveying of another’s sins to God and the mediating of God’s grace to them. In some communions this is interpreted sacramentally. Salvationists interpret it sacrificially.”⁵⁶⁵ From the explanation that follows it appears that he meant by this a sacrificial life-style. It is improbable that he was ascribing any priestly character to officership, as that would contradict his opinion already stated earlier in the article.

Lieut-Colonel Fred Hoyle, whose 1987-88 articles on “Priesthood and Officership” have been mentioned above, also examined in them the roles of leader, teacher, preacher and pastor. Like many writers examined, Hoyle appeared to refer specifically to people in a clerical role without considering whether the categories could apply equally to other Christians.

Major Clifford Kew drew attention to the need for officers to find a balance between being a priest and being a dog’s-body; not to be so immersed in the meeting of multitudinous needs that the prior responsibility to preach the gospel is neglected.⁵⁶⁶ Major Jean Bradbury, United Kingdom Candidates Secretary, described the roles of an officer as: a spiritual leader, a communicator of the faith, a pastor, an enabler

⁵⁶⁴ *The Officer*, May 1993, pp.223-37, June, 1993, pp.253-6.

⁵⁶⁵ *ibid.*, September 1966, pp.465-7.

⁵⁶⁶ *ibid.*, May 1995, pp.233-5.

and a representative – for Christ, his gospel and for the Army.⁵⁶⁷ David Sterling described the officer's "primary tasks" as "to preach the gospel and shepherd the flock" and to serve as a "spiritual mentor and confidant".⁵⁶⁸

- For a number of writers, it was not what officers did that marked them out – such narrow terms as those offered really excluded all except Corps Officers. Rather, it was the conditions under which officers served that gave them a distinctive character, and in particular the officer's availability for appointment. A 1976 editorial mentioned being at the "disposal of the... Movement", elsewhere described as "availability" or "appointability", as a particular mark of officership.⁵⁶⁹

"Officership is Availability" headed an article by Colonel Wesley Harris in Australia. Having described officership as "a miracle and a mystery" and "sacramental", Harris said, "the essence of officership is availability." Admitting that "availability to God" and "availability to the people" should mark all Salvationists, he said, "officers are called, in a particular way, to be available to The Salvation Army."⁵⁷⁰ This was not a new argument, but Harris made it particularly his own, returning to it in 1987 and in 1998.⁵⁷¹ Lieut.-Colonel Kenneth Manson referred to the same concept in addition to that of the 'call', in "Change of Function": "I am an officer by the calling of God. I bind myself in a covenant with Him to serve Him within the Army. I am commissioned by God to be an officer. My appointments given and received within that framework are settled by another. Our calling never changes but our function does."⁵⁷²

Colonel Gordon Sharp (R) said that for him personally the elements were 1. A sense of calling; 2. Working out that calling in

⁵⁶⁷ *The Salvationist*, 9 May 1998, p.16.

⁵⁶⁸ *The Salvationist*, 12 September 1998, p.19.

⁵⁶⁹ *The Officer*, July 1976, p.290.

⁵⁷⁰ *ibid.*, June 1979, pp.243-5.

⁵⁷¹ *ibid.*, August 1987, p.371, *The Salvationist*, 5 December 1998, p.15.

⁵⁷² *The Officer*, June 1990, pp.274-5.

appointments; 3. His role in relation to fellow Salvationists; 4. The role of the Army in the particular circumstances in which an officer was called to work. He noted that the “act of appointing is a human act... mistakes are possible”. He quoted an officer as saying, nevertheless, that “No place was the wrong place, no time the wrong time, to do God’s will.”⁵⁷³ An Australian officer working in London, Captain Howard Davies, drew attention to the unspoken assumption that “availability” assumed a close connection between the will of God and the decisions of appointment boards. He argued that the need to fill “the more secular” Headquarters appointments with non-officers, presumably to free up people with a “spiritual” call and training for spiritual work also raised questions about the accountability of the senior Army administration for the deployment of officer-strength. “At what point or level,” he asked, “does administrative decision become the ‘divinely-directed Movement’?”⁵⁷⁴

- Other writers again looked beyond the officer-conditions to the attitude required to accept them, and the sense of vocation involved in making an officer-covenant. Reacting to suggestions that the doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers left no special significance for officership, Colonel Dinsdale Pender, Scotland, asked, “What Is Special About Officership? ... if any soldier can do what an officer can do...” Pender believed that the officer’s calling was unique – to specific tasks, to full-time service and professional development, to a vision of the needy world and what they could do to meet those needs (= a “call”), and by virtue of the covenant, a sacred vow with a life-time commitment. He saw this not as a matter of elitism but of special privilege and responsibilities. Pender provided a list of supporting Scripture references, none of which could be applied exclusively to officers.⁵⁷⁵

Given that an Army needs leaders and strategists, Major Ian Barr agreed that the Army needed officers and that officership needed “to be defined within the purpose and mission of the Army” rather than “in terms

⁵⁷³ *The Officer*, November 1992, pp.486-8.

⁵⁷⁴ *ibid.*, September 1976, p.421.

⁵⁷⁵ *ibid.*, February 1990, pp.51-3.

used by other churches... in order to prove some point of equivalency". He suggested three non-negotiable aspects of an officer's life style and role: firstly, the Covenant - a "perpetual thing", which "once signed could not be unsigned" – secondly the identity of The Salvation Army itself, which Barr describes as "a radical fighting force" rather than a "passive institution", and thirdly the mission of proclaiming the gospel.⁵⁷⁶

Answering "Just what is officership?" Barr suggested that it had "three dimensions: it is a mode of being, a function, and it is a lifestyle." By "mode of being", he meant "a matter of being rather than doing", "a sense of 'being' an officer in the realm of the spirit." He ascribed this to the conditioning or "spiritual foundations laid in training" and observed that former officers tended to retain it. (Shades of indelible character...) By "function" Barr did not necessarily mean an evangelist or leader-role, since many officers did not have those specific appointments, but rather, "being available to concentrate on the issues we signed up for. Our function is not defined by our appointment, but by our covenant." He was not referring here to "availability" as he included that under "Lifestyle" – in fact as "the only lifestyle necessity". Other outward expressions of lifestyle were incidental, "occasionally based on little more than the social conventions of a particular society at a particular time..."⁵⁷⁷ Major David Pickard held, on the other hand, that "the call, the covenant and a sense of identification with the Army are not just the foundations of officership. They are the bedrock of salvationism. The role of officers is a separate issue."⁵⁷⁸ He did not however enlarge on that role.

Those looking for qualities peculiar to officership in fact tended to stray into theological quicksand. Recognising this, Major Cecil Waters urged a return to an unabashedly Salvationist argument from simple pragmatism. Under the heading "Us and Them", he suggested that "we will go on looking for a definition of officership unless and until we

⁵⁷⁶ *The Salvationist*, 10 May 1997, pp.8-9.

⁵⁷⁷ *The Officer*, December, 1998, pp.26-7.

⁵⁷⁸ *The Salvationist*, 7 June, 1997.

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”. The usual arguments – the call to a specific task, to full-time service, to a covenant – all applied equally to some soldiers. The anomalies did not permit classification. 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.”⁵⁷⁹ Major Clifford Ashworth also acknowledged that “officership can be expressed in a variety of ways. Most officers are leaders of corps communities... Some... serve in caring or medical fields, educational or administrative ones.... The reality of officership can be expressed in a variety of contexts.” He also claimed that “current developments in the UK Territory mean that increasingly officers will be able to concentrate on... ‘front-line’ activities – by which is meant the work of corps and social centres.”⁵⁸⁰

One of the more extensive contributions to this debate seems not to have been heard at all widely. Major Ian Cooper, a British officer (the quality of whose scholarship is indicated by his membership of the committee that revised the translation of the New English Bible) wrote an 8,000-word monograph, *A Theology of Salvation Army Officership* some time after Lima in the 1980’s. Divided into sections of *Officer*-article length, it sadly does not appear to have been published but was accessed by the Heritage Centre Archives in 1989.⁵⁸¹

⁵⁷⁹ *The Officer*, July 1992, p.317.

⁵⁸⁰ *The Salvationist*, 18 May, 1996, pp.8-9.

⁵⁸¹ Cooper was disappointed in his hope that he might have been involved in the Army’s response to Lima, but was an adjunct lecturer for the International College for Officers for many years. (Letter to the writer from Mrs Major E. Cooper, dated 2nd January 2003.) It is possible that Cooper’s outspoken public support for Fred Brown in 1970 affected his subsequent opportunities to be heard within The Salvation Army in Great Britain. In the

Writing from the functional point of view regarding officership, Cooper does indeed define, describe and clarify that role. Acknowledging that “Booth’s doctrine of officership was a ‘high’ one, placing the officer in responsibility for fostering spiritual growth and guiding the mission...” Cooper also noted that Booth “felt no need to add ordination or apostolic validation at the hands of bishops.” He concluded from this that definition of ministry in the Salvation Army “does not involve directly any attempt to meet the criteria of other churches for valid ministry.”⁵⁸² Having based Christian ministry on that of Christ and traced its apostolic development, Cooper regretted that the emphasis on ministry by the whole body had been lost by division between ordained and lay, and the reintroduction of the title of priest. He observed that “the New Testament challenges... the inevitable tendency for human organisations to reflect human values which can operate on the basis of power rather than grace.”⁵⁸³

With a passing glance at the development of the military rank system (“It would be interesting to bring to bear on this deeply entrenched aspect of our structure the theological principles which underlie Christian ministry.”), Cooper said that by contrast the content of officership had always been deeply theological. In common with other Free Churches the Army esteemed vocation more highly than ordination and this call was validated by the congregation and the organisation’s leadership. He quoted the definition of officership from the Orders and Regulations, but noted that this was a practical definition, omitting vocation and the relationship of officer to soldier, that it was not set within the context of the whole people of God and did not relate vocation to the mission and pattern of Jesus. The wording of the Officer Covenant and Commissioning service however supplied some of these. The Salvation Army has seen commissioning as the heart of ordination. Of the recently-

words of Walter Brueggemann, “The dominant culture... is grossly uncritical, cannot tolerate serious and fundamental criticism, and will go to great lengths to stop it.” (*Prophetic Imagination*, p.4.)

⁵⁸² Ian Cooper, “A Theology of Salvation Army Officership”. Unpublished monograph in Heritage Centre archives, 198?, pp.1-2.

⁵⁸³ *ibid.*, pp.5-6.

added ordination, Cooper noted that it “does not have the meaning of conferring a unique and indelible clerical character... officership is terminable.” “Apostolic ministry” meant in accordance with the Apostles’ teaching and being sent by Christ as they had been sent – “not ministry conferred by an unbroken chain of bishops.”⁵⁸⁴

In addition to the primary evangelistic role, officership could involve a wide variety of other functions or ministries, many of which could also be discharged by laymen. It was difficult to draw clear boundaries. “Certain traditional aspects rest on their utility to the work rather than theological essentials – custom tends to sanctify practice.” There was a need to review the life-style expected – such as the requirement that both spouses needed to be officers, and review the utilisation of married women officers. The Army had tried to avoid making a priestly elite. Officership needed to be kept as something which is *sui generis* in the realm of spiritual leadership. There was a danger that what had evolved would now be given sacred status, making us reluctant to change.⁵⁸⁵

Cooper then described the way in which all soldiers, not just officers, took responsibility for the mission. He pointed out that without needing to officiate at sacraments, officers lacked a clearly distinguished clerical role, though they did have representative and legal functions. However, there had always been a strong emphasis on the officer vocation. He felt that there were four elements that distinguished the role of officers from that of soldiers. Firstly, there were special sacrifices implicit in officership, not only those arising from obedience and appointability but also the proneness to misunderstanding and isolation of command. Secondly, the pastoral expectations went beyond those expected of Christians in general, as the Army invested particular responsibility in the appointed officer leader. Thirdly, the officer acted as the bridge between the local unit and the organisation as a whole, functions as the focus of unity and integrity of values for the group, and

⁵⁸⁴ Cooper, pp.7-10.

⁵⁸⁵ *ibid.*, pp.10-12.

represents the Army in the district. Fourthly, the vocation demanded exemplary qualities of life and spiritual leadership.⁵⁸⁶

Cooper is mindful that the military style system could be abused, so warns that these roles needed to be exercised in a servant manner, and that the leader's task is to facilitate the ministry of those he or she leads. He refers to the difficulty of integrating the old style of command with the modern need for consultative leadership. He also identifies problems regarding the role of women in the Army, and says that "society has now gone ahead of a movement that once led the way in using the gifts and abilities of women; perhaps it is time for us to ask why."

The final section concerns the relationship of the soldier to the officer, and here Cooper probes a number of issues that arise when the tradition of obedience faces the reality of the voluntary nature of lay participation.⁵⁸⁷

Observations on the debate to this point

While our examination of the theology of officership in the earlier period was dependent largely on official publications, prescriptions and descriptions, or on the opinions of the founders and senior leadership of the Army, in the later period described in this chapter we have been able to sample more grass roots officer (and, eventually, non-officer) opinion. During the first forty years of the Army's second century, a major focus of discussion on the theology of officership has no longer been concerned primarily with the qualities and roles of the officer, but with the officer's status. Brown's introduction of ordination suggests that this preoccupation was shared by the senior hierarchy as well.

That basic ambiguity about the status of officers – whether they are distinguished from soldiers solely by their role and function or whether they enjoy some distinctive character or status – which we saw in the

⁵⁸⁶ *ibid.*, pp.13-5.

⁵⁸⁷ *ibid.*, pp.18-21.

origins of the Salvation Army's professional ministry group, persists today in the minds of Salvationists.

Advocates of the functional school have been more numerous in presenting their views in the sources examined, and have tended to be more cogent in expression of those views. Those wedded to status tended to respond on a more emotive level, on the basis of assumptions less rigorously examined. It could not be said that the debate gave grass-roots support for the introduction of "ordination".

Where people did examine the roles or functions of officers, they generally covered the same ground we have seen traversed in earlier chapters. 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.

CHAPTER SIX

OFFICIAL WORDS

"I don't know what you mean by 'glory,'" Alice said. Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. "Of course you don't – till I tell you. I meant 'there's a nice knock-down argument for you!'" "But 'glory' doesn't mean 'a nice knock-down argument," Alice objected. "When I use a word," Humpty Dumpty said in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean – neither more nor less." "The question is," said Alice, "whether you can make words mean so many different things." "The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master – that's all." Alice was much too puzzled to say anything, so after a minute Humpty Dumpty began again. "They've a temper, some of them – particularly verbs, they're the proudest – adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs – however, I can manage the whole lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what I say!" "Would you tell me, please," said Alice, "what that means?" "Now you talk like a reasonable child," said Humpty Dumpty, looking very pleased indeed. "I meant by 'impenetrability' that we've had enough of that subject, and it would be just as well if you'd mention what you mean to do next, as I suppose you don't mean to stop here all the rest of your life."

From *Through the Looking Glass*, Chapter VI, by Lewis Carroll.

The previous chapter traced the unofficial debate that has taken place over the past forty years on the status of Salvation Army “orders”. The present chapter looks at what the organisation has said officially on the same matter. The key word is “ordain”, and the debate is about what it means. No doubt the unofficial discussion helped prompt the movement to seek to clarify what Salvationists were intended to believe about ministry, just as the official pronouncements in their turn fuelled further debate.

The official statements looked at in this section concern:

1. The use of the word “ordain” in Commissioning of officers.
2. The Salvation Army’s response to the World Council of Churches’ Lima Document.
3. The book, *Community in Mission*, by Philip Needham.
4. The work of the International Doctrine Council in
Salvation Story
Servants Together.

1. The Use Of “Ordain” In Commissioning Of Officers

We have seen that there is some tension between the arguments of those who sought to identify officership with the historic ministry of the Church and those who, regarding this as irrelevant, claimed a unique status for the Army outside the traditional ecclesiastical arrangements. With the adoption of the language of ordination, the hierarchy came down on the side of the former – while at the same time attempting to keep a foot in both camps.

Traditionally, cadets were commissioned as officers. Although “ordination” was not in regular Salvation Army usage, isolated examples can be found, usually invoking Biblical precedents. In 1911 Colonel John Dean made a comparison between the Apostolic call and life with that of Salvation Army officers. “From the general body of disciples there followed a special selection for the office of apostleship, the commission or ordination conferring new powers and new teaching.” The terms of officer commissioning were those of Matthew Chapter 10.⁵⁸⁸ Again, in a 1927 booklet on officer training, a section is headed, “Chosen and Ordained”.⁵⁸⁹ The use of the word in this context probably owes more to the AV translation of John 15.16 than to any claim to ecclesiastical status.

Some evidence of an informal use of the word is also provided by Colonel Frank Bell in a pamphlet of 1948. This included representations he had made to Generals and to members of the 1934, 1939 and 1946 High Councils as well as a general review of what he saw as weaknesses in the contemporary Salvation Army. Amongst signs of the “drift to Churchism, conventionalism, professionalism and secularism”, Bell included “commissioning becomes ordination”.⁵⁹⁰ This does not appear to have been common, however. The practices of other churches were of marginal interest to most Salvationists.

⁵⁸⁸ “Notes of an address to Officers” in *The Field Officer*, November 1911, pp.401-4.

⁵⁸⁹ *The Training of Salvation Army Officers: Glimpses of the work at the International Training Garrison, London*. London, 1927, p.31.

⁵⁹⁰ Frank Bell, *The Fight for the Flag*, privately circulated, 1948, p.25.

Just occasionally the word was used when reference was made to Salvation Army ministry in comparison with that of other denominations. For example General Albert Orsborn, in an article on “The Office of a Bishop”, claimed that “the apostolic succession is not in flesh and blood, not in the gift and power of men, but in the witness and work of the Holy Spirit ...spiritual ordination is in the gift of God, a conferment, not an attainment.”⁵⁹¹ Later, in the course of an article on the World Council of Churches, he stated that “We cannot allow the effective ordination (commissioning) of our officers, including the women, to be challenged. We should never agree to their re-ordination at the hands of anyone.”⁵⁹²

Another example is found in an article, “Ordained by God”, written by Frederick Coutts when Territorial Commander in Australia Eastern. Writing on the 100th anniversary of William Booth’s ordination, Coutts noted that “Ordination as such meant recognition as a minister and provided him with accredited status within the Connexion. But the imposition of hands did not make William Booth a man of God.” Arguing on the basis of Catherine Booth’s “law of adaptation”, Coutts went on to ask, “How can ecclesiastical garments which fitted in the third century, and possibly in the tenth, be deemed the only adequate attire for the twentieth?” Coutts called Booth’s contemporary, the Anglican scholar Hort, to the witness stand: “The true apostolic succession means nothing more than the continual call of men to service by Christ Himself. No ceremony avails to effect it. ‘The true succession,’ to quote Cromwell, ‘is through the Spirit.’”⁵⁹³

An editorial writer in the Australian War Cry commented, under the heading “Truly Ordained”, on the commissioning of officers in Sydney and Melbourne. Quoting an expression of Albert Orsborn’s, the writer stated: “Although in these important ceremonies there is no laying on of hands,

⁵⁹¹ Albert Orsborn, in *The Officers’ Review*, November-December 1947, pp.330-1.

⁵⁹² *The Officer*, March-April 1954, p.77.

⁵⁹³ *The Salvation Army Yearbook*, 1958, pp.10-3.

these young ministers of Christ are truly ordained: theirs is the 'ordination of the nail-pierced hands'.⁵⁹⁴

Captain Earl Robinson of Canada provided an extended comparison between commissioning and ordination in 1968. While on the staff of the Toronto Training College, he wrote the following for inclusion in the commissioning booklet of the Messengers of Faith session in the Canadian Territory (and it was reprinted in *Servants Together* in 2002 when he was chairman of the International Doctrine Council):

There are three steps in the ordination to Salvation Army Officership in keeping with the traditional meaning of ordination in the Church as a whole:

1. THE SIGNING OF THE COVENANT:

This involves the recognition that the essential basis of ordination is that Christ calls and ordains, so that the covenant is made between the individual and his Lord: 'Called by Almighty God to proclaim the gospel ... I give myself to God, and here and now bind myself to Him in a solemn covenant.'

2. THE COMMISSIONING:

The Officer is given authority to manifest the saving grace of God in the ministry of leadership within The Salvation Army. This is the outward authentication of the inward summons, and, as with the laying on of hands, has to do with the symbol of the passing on of wisdom and authority by the one already ordained...

3. THE DEDICATION:

The Officer is, by prayer, committed to the help and guidance of the Holy Spirit, and to the intercessions of the Church (the Dedicatory Prayer). This dedication follows the declaration by the Officer that he or she understands the implications of the signing of the Covenant and the commissioning, will be loyal to Scriptural truth, and, by living and word, be true to the apostolic succession of being Christ's messenger.

The Salvation Army Officer is thus ordained a minister of the saving grace of God, a prophet and a priest, a pastor and teacher, a servant, as much as any minister of any denomination.

*Notes by: Captain E. Robinson.*⁵⁹⁵

This certainly belongs in that Salvation Army tradition that seeks validation by claiming equivalence to church practice and status.

⁵⁹⁴ *The War Cry* (Australia), 16 January 1965. It should be noted that "commissioning" had never involved "laying on of hands", as "ordination" might, as illustrated by the frontispiece to this work. There is no requirement for this however.

⁵⁹⁵ International Doctrine Council, *Servants Together*, London, 2002, p.77-8.

In 1978, the word “ordain” was introduced into the internationally required rubric for commissioning Salvation Army officers. According to the explanation offered in *Servants Together*, the book on “Salvationist Perspectives on Ministry” published in 2002, “it was believed by Salvation Army international leaders in the 1970’s and 1980’s that these signs of equivalence of standing with the ordained clergy of other churches might be aided by associating the historic Church term, ‘ordain’, with our traditional term, ‘commission’.”⁵⁹⁶

This sentence could be taken as suggesting the writers’ distancing of the present hierarchy from their predecessors’ concerns. We have learned from Commissioner Victor Keanie that there had been “representations from a number of territories”⁵⁹⁷ but I have not been able to identify those representations or territories.

The initiative was taken by General Arnold Brown in 1978. In his memoirs Brown explained that, “Some, I felt, did not fully understand that the granting of a commission not only admitted the recipient to officership, but also conveyed all that is commonly drawn from the term, ‘ordination,’ only the ceremonial form of conferment being different. As General I had full support in revising the wording of the commissioning statement so that the thought of ‘ordination’ was more explicit...”⁵⁹⁸

Brown evidently consulted the retired General Frederick Coutts as to a way forward. A letter from Coutts on 20 February 1978 suggested that the following sentence could be added to the commissioning ceremony:

“In accepting these pledges which you each have made, I commission you as officers of The Salvation Army and ordain you as ministers of Christ and of His Gospel.”⁵⁹⁹

On the 28th February Brown wrote to the secretary of the Advisory Council to the General asking that the matter be tabled, beginning his letter with

⁵⁹⁶ International Doctrine Council, *Servants Together*, p.73.

⁵⁹⁷ *The Officer*, February 1986, p.77.

⁵⁹⁸ Arnold Brown, *The Gate and the Light*, Toronto, Bookwright Publications, 1984, p.22.

⁵⁹⁹ Letter in IHQ Archives.

You will know my anxiety to secure in the minds of the cadets being commissioned as officers, and in the minds of those who attend the Dedication Service during a Commissioning Weekend, that the ceremony is in every way, and equals, an ordination.⁶⁰⁰

He also made the point, taken from General Coutts's letter, that by this addition, "ordination is not linked with any human movement but with Christ himself, following our Lord's own practice (John 15:16)". (We note again the tendency to restrict the application of Jesus' words to a "clerical" group.)

The Advisory Council seems to have been less than enthusiastic. It recommended that "in territories where the phrase 'ordained as a minister of Christ' seems to be required it might well be used", but hoped that the General "would not feel it should be made obligatory upon all".⁶⁰¹

Their hope was not realised. Following this, the Chief of the Staff, Commissioner Stanley Cottrill, wrote to all Territorial Commanders on 30 May 1978 as follows:

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 "ordained" has no exact equivalent, a translation should be used which will give the nearest possible meaning to the English-language expression.⁶⁰²

General Brown's announcement of the change was an aside in an address to officers attending the 1978 International Congress. Reviewing the variety of "Covenants" into which Salvationists might enter, such as Soldiership and Marriage, he went on to speak of the "Covenant of Officership".

For a few, in these days of ecumenical activity, the validity of officership is under scrutiny. Some of our clerical brethren seem fond of reminding us that there are three forks in the road where

⁶⁰⁰ Letter in IHQ Archives.

⁶⁰¹ No. 1078, 19 April 1978.

⁶⁰² Letters in IHQ Archives.

the Army marches one way and the historical churches another. The road along which we march, according to some, is the road of omission – we have no ceremony of baptism; there is no observance of Holy Communion; and our officers are not ordained in the episcopal sense of the term.

But allow me to say that the swearing-in of a soldier demands no less a commitment to Christ than the rite of baptism; that for the Salvationist every meal is a “holy communion” and the whole of life is sacramental (nor is the penitent-form as an outward form of inward desire to be overlooked) and, in the commissioning of an officer, he – and she! – is in every sense of the word “ordained” to the ministry of Christ in the world. (The wording of the commissioning ceremony has just been extended to say so!)⁶⁰³

This, in what was essentially a private gathering, appears to have been the extent of public announcement of the change. Apart from that, Salvationists would have had to pay close attention to a commissioning service to learn that anything had changed. This low-key promulgation seems at odds with the desire to heighten public awareness of the real significance of Salvation Army commissioning, though it does reflect Brown’s assumption that nothing of significance had changed.

The matter was reviewed ten years later, at the 1988 International Conference of Leaders (Lake Arrowhead), after which the Conference Implementation Commission minuted the following at its meeting of 25-28 October 1988:

ORDINATION

The introduction of the word had been important for the USA where it was desired to manifest equal status with the ministers of the Gospel. It had been helpful in India and generally accepted in Africa. However in some languages no direct translation was possible. There were territories, particularly in Europe, where the use of the word caused some distress. Territorial leaders in such situations should be sensitive to the feelings of their people. Generally it was felt to be difficult to withdraw the use of the word. A warning was issued that ordination might be legally construed as “ordination for life” making possible legal action against termination of officership in some instances.

The following recommendation was agreed:

The Commission recommends that the use of the word “ordination” be confirmed. Any territorial variation deemed wise

⁶⁰³ *The Officer*, October 1978, pp.438-9.

may be cleared through the International Secretary with the approval of the Chief of the Staff.⁶⁰⁴

This recommendation was accepted by General Eva Burrows and conveyed to Territorial Commanders in a letter dated 16 November 1988:

Ordination

It is confirmed that this word will remain as part of our commissioning ceremony. However, in the event that a variation to this rule is deemed wise in a particular territory a proposal should be submitted by the TC/OC to the IS for decision by the CoS.⁶⁰⁵

In 1992, by letter of 3 February, Burrows requested that the Advisory Council to the General revisit the issue, saying:

Because there continues to be some questioning in certain parts of the world about the use of the word "ordained" in the commissioning of cadets, I have looked into the origin of its introduction into the ceremony... I would value consideration of this matter by the members of the Advisory Council ... Also to enquire as to whether a clear statement should be sent out by the CoS as a Memorandum.⁶⁰⁶

The Advisory Council took into account a number of observations: that the initiative to use the word ordination was said to have come from the USA; that it was thought to give officers a status similar to that conferred on ministers of other churches; that it was loaded with theological implications considered by some to be incompatible with the concept of the priesthood of all believers; that it could imply "continuation" whether the officer remained an officer or not (though it was noted that in the USA officership and therefore ordination was rescinded by the same authority that conferred it); that General Brown had pointed out that ordination was not linked with any human movement but with Jesus Christ himself; that "ordination" could not always be exactly translated.⁶⁰⁷

Having discussed the matter, the Advisory Council reported:

⁶⁰⁴ CIC Minute 1, 1988 Conference of Leaders. IHQ Archives.

⁶⁰⁵ ICL Follow-up letter 2, IHQ Archives.

⁶⁰⁶ IHQ Archives.

⁶⁰⁷ Unpublished notes on Commissioning and Ordination of Cadets; Advisory Council Minutes, March 1992. IHQ Archives.

Acknowledging the differences of view and practice held in various parts of the world, it re-affirms Rec 1078 of the Council and the Rec on "Ordination" agreed by the CIC of 1988.

It also recommends that it would be helpful for a clear statement on this issue to be sent out by the CoS to territorial and command leaders.⁶⁰⁸

Commissioner Bramwell Tillsley, Chief of the Staff, issued M283, "Commissioning and Ordination of Cadets" on 28 April 1992 and sent it to all Territorial Commanders and Officers Commanding under cover of a letter signed by General Burrows. It stated:

By the issuing of this memorandum it is confirmed that the word "ordained" will remain as part of our commissioning ceremony. Therefore, after the cadets have made their Affirmation of Faith, the officer conducting the commissioning shall 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 Christ and his gospel."

Should a variation to this rule be thought wise in a particular territory, a proposal should be submitted by the TC/OC to the IS for decision by the CoS.⁶⁰⁹

The matter did not go away. While my research has not shown whether in fact variations were sought, it is possible that not all Territories employed the official rubric. If this were the case, translation difficulties no doubt played a part.

In May 2000, General John Gowans rephrased the form when he commissioned cadets in London and repeated his new wording in Atlanta a month later. He said, "Accepting your promises and recognising that God has ordained you to preach the Gospel, I now commission you an officer of The Salvation Army." Colonel Gudrun Lydholm, a member of the International Doctrine Council, felt that "this wording more clearly confirmed Salvation Army belief in God as the one acting" and corresponded with Gowans, proposing a further modification to the wording.⁶¹⁰ Gowans then asked the International Doctrine Council to recommend possible changes to the 1992 wording "that might more clearly reflect Salvation Army theology associated with ordination and

⁶⁰⁸ Rec.No. 2043. IHQ Archives.

⁶⁰⁹ IHQ Archives.

⁶¹⁰ Colonel Gudrun Lydholm, correspondence with the writer dated 17 December 2002.

commissioning.” A meeting of this body on 2 November 2001 produced four variations that were then discussed by the newly instituted General’s Consultative Council. As a result of this process a Memorandum from Commissioner John Larsson, Chief of Staff, was issued on 1 February 2002, and included the words:

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.”⁶¹¹

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. This reflects what Coutts had written in his letter of 20 February 1978, although the actual rubric he had suggested at the time did not convey this meaning. It remains to be seen if this compromise proves acceptable to protagonists on both sides of the debate that clearly continued behind the scenes over the course of the subsequent twenty-four years.⁶¹²

I have not been able to discover any further extant correspondence or records that might clarify the extent to which theological issues were traversed in the discussions referred to above. Of the Advisory Council’s activity, in most cases only its recommendations appear to have been kept on file.

2. The “Lima” Document

The 1982 Lima Document on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* was produced by the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches, of which The Salvation Army was a founding member in 1948.

Some elements within the Salvation Army have always been wary of this association. General Albert Orsborn was reluctant to be involved

⁶¹¹ IHQ Archives.

⁶¹² Shaw Clifton, when Territorial Commander in New Zealand 2002-2004, declined to use the new form of words on the grounds that they confused “ordination” (which the Church does) and the “call” (which God provides) He felt it left open the possibility of someone saying, “God has already ordained me; you must now commission me.”

when the World Council was formed. In an address on the Salvation Army in relation to Ecumenism, given to the 1969 Commissioners' Conference, Commissioner Hubert Westcott quoted Orsborn's six-page memorandum to the Advisory Council in 1947 as concluding with, "I do not wish my period of leadership to be associated with the gravitation of the Salvation Army nearer to church life in faith and order." Having received the Advisory Council's recommendation, Orsborn commented, "It occurs to me to wonder why we should participate in the Assembly... but the majority of our leaders think that we should be represented and therefore I have told the Chief to arrange it." Orsborn later thought fit not to replace the retiring Commissioner A. G. Cunningham on the executive council of the WCC Central Committee.⁶¹³ His successor, Wilfred Kitching, wrote concerning the WCC that "I have no hesitation in saying that we may have at times lost something by seeking to withhold interest in the affairs of the Church."⁶¹⁴

Successive Generals or other leading Army figures involved in the ecumenical movement have been at pains to explain the nature and limits of this association over the years, especially at times of WCC General Assemblies.⁶¹⁵

For some there was possibly a fear of absorption into some generic super-church, espousing modernist or possibly Roman doctrines (depending on the individual phobia), and the loss of identity and mission. At the extreme end some sympathised with the views of Dr Carl McIntire, a Presbyterian minister who established an "International Council of Christian Churches" and mounted demonstrations at WCC gatherings. He published the rabid *Christian Beacon*, which charged the WCC with

⁶¹³ Albert Orsborn, *The Officer*, March-April 1954, pp.73-8; Arnold Brown, *The Gate and the Light*, Toronto, Bookwright Publications, 1984, p.232; Hubert Westcott, Unpublished paper in Report on 1969 Commissioner's Conference, p.1. Heritage Centre Archives, London.

⁶¹⁴ *Magazine*, (British SASF Quarterly), December, 1961, p.5.

⁶¹⁵ See Albert Orsborn, *op.cit.*; Wilfred Kitching in *The Officer*, September-October 1961, pp.289- 294, 323-34, November-December 1961, pp.361-5; Reginald Woods in *The Officer*, March- April 1962, pp.109-13, May-June 1962, pp.167-72, July-August 1962, pp.257-60, September- October 1962, pp.289-94, March 1963, pp.125-8, April 1963, pp.161-4,167; Harry Williams in *The Officer*, April 1979, pp.150-4,178.

being a Catholic-modernist-Communist conspiracy. Commissioner Reginald Woods, the Army's representative on the WCC Central Committee in the 1960's, took his influence sufficiently seriously to rebut some of his allegations in an article in *The Officer*.⁶¹⁶

Chiefly American anti-Communist fears and regard for the sensibilities of donors were certainly a factor contributing to the Army's withdrawal (suspension of membership pending discussions) from the Central Committee of the WCC in 1979 over the issue of aid to liberation movements in Africa.⁶¹⁷ The deaths of Army personnel in a 1978 guerrilla attack on a mission station in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia helped point the issue.⁶¹⁸

The Army's concerns were not solely political however. The 1980 Report of a Commission also referred to a "change of emphasis", if not a change of policy, in the Council's approach to ecumenism. "The WCC has undoubtedly become more active in recent years in its quest for church union." Referring to the influence of the Faith and Order Commission's 1975 study booklet, *One Baptism, One Eucharist and a Mutually Recognised Ministry*, the Report says that "the emphasis on a 'mutually agreed ministry' has made it necessary for The Salvation Army to define more clearly the position of an officer in relationship to other ministers and in relationship to the soldiery... It would be fair to say that the Army takes 'the priesthood of all believers' more literally than most member churches and therefore gives its laity – at least theologically – a more important role than that accorded by most other churches... this is a position which the Army wishes to safeguard." The report suggested that "the Army will have to be prepared to find itself increasingly 'out of step'

⁶¹⁶ *The Officer*, April 1963, p.162.

⁶¹⁷ Norman S. Murdoch quotes letters from the SA Archives in USA supporting this allegation, and says that letters in London Archive files show that "leaders in London had tried unsuccessfully to mollify the American leaders' WCC opposition." "In Darkest Africa': Martyrdom and Resistance to Colonialism in Rhodesia." Monograph of 22 April 2002, pp.9-12. Copy in possession of the writer.

⁶¹⁸ Henry Gariepy, *The History of The Salvation Army*, 8, Atlanta GA, 2000, p.20.

with other denominations, even to the extent of becoming a permanent irritation to them.”⁶¹⁹

The Army eventually settled on maintaining its association by adopting non-voting “fraternal” status in 1981.⁶²⁰ This fraternal relationship derived from the Army’s new status as a “Christian World Communion”, which it shares with such bodies as the World Methodist Council, the Lutheran World Federation and the Baptist World Alliance. This reflects the Army’s international polity as distinct from membership of the Council by separate national churches of each denomination.⁶²¹ Strictly speaking, because of its centralised authority the Salvation Army is also unlike the denominational world bodies mentioned above; a closer parallel would be the Roman Catholic Church, were that body to belong to the World Council of Churches.

The North American Army remained suspicious of the WCC. Commissioner Victor Keanie’s Report on the 6th World Assembly (Toronto, July 24th-August 10th, 1983) commented, “We were aware of a lack of interest and in some cases antipathy regarding the WCC on the part of Canadian Salvationists (in common with their USA neighbours)... It seems obvious that our North American friends have not understood the relationship of the Army to the WCC and in general seem to be adversely influenced by the media interpretation of the Council’s activities.”⁶²²

The WCC produced its Faith and Order Paper 111, the “Lima” document on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, in 1982. This was the end product of many years of discussion by the Faith and Order Commission and conferences at Accra (1974), Bangalore (1978) and Lima (1982). The

⁶¹⁹ Unpublished, “Findings of the Commission Appointed to Review the Relationship of The Salvation Army with the World Council of Churches”, January, 1980. Heritage Centre Archives.

⁶²⁰ Arnold Brown, *Gate and Light*, p.239; letter dated 31st July 1981 from Arnold Brown to Philip Potter of WCC. It is interesting that these events did not figure in the annual account of Salvation Army activity provided by the official *Year Book*.

⁶²¹ *One Faith, One Church: The Salvation Army’s response to Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*. London, 1990, p.1.

⁶²² Victor Keanie, unpublished Report, 1983, p.2, Salvation Army Heritage Centre.

text represented the areas of 'theological convergence' among the major confessional groups as the conferences brought together not only the WCC member bodies but also representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and some other non-members. The document was transmitted to churches with a request for their official response. As a very minor player, The Salvation Army was not represented on the Commission but was invited to make a response. To prepare a response, The Salvation Army asked all Territories to set up study groups "composed of theologically and experientially qualified Salvationists, ordained and lay."⁶²³ While the Army had in the past produced material on its understanding of the sacraments of baptism and Holy Communion, this paper contained the first extensive official statement on the Army's doctrine of ministry, even though it was necessarily reactive, taking its cues from the Lima paper.⁶²⁴

Max Thurian of Taizé, who had presided over the drafting of the Lima document, edited the responses, which were published as *Faith and Order Paper 137 – Churches Respond to BEM*. Pages 230-253 of Volume IV contain the Salvation Army statement.⁶²⁵ Copies of the Army's response were distributed to officers in some territories at least, as it became available.⁶²⁶ The Army also published its response separately in book form in *One Faith, One Church* in 1990.

⁶²³ World Council of Churches, *Faith and Order Paper #137*, p.232.

⁶²⁴ "Churches were asked to engage in *ecumenical* (rather than *comparative*) ecclesiology... asked to see the ecumenical consensus as normative and to re-examine their own doctrines and practices." (William Tabbernee, 'Ministry in an Ecumenical Age', in *Ministry in Australian Churches*. Melbourne, JBCE, 1987, pp.118-9). Perhaps this was a counsel of perfection for defensive churches. Dagmar Heller, writing in *The Ecumenical Review*, April 1999, notes, "In the end, only a few churches have actually taken up the proposals of the Lima document which could lead to a rapprochement. And churches which have expressed difficulties with the text at certain points offer no alternative proposals, but implicitly insist that others should simply come over to their point of view." Not surprisingly the result pleased no one. Collins (*Diakonia*, pp.256-7) says that Catholics felt the BEM document was "protestant"; whereas Volf (*After Our Likeness* p.20) claims that Protestants felt "left out".

⁶²⁵ For the sake of conciseness and convenience, Lima document will be footnoted as #111 and the Salvation Army response as #137.

⁶²⁶ Letter to all officers in New Zealand from Lt.-Colonel Trevor Standen, Field Secretary, dated June 1987. Copy held by the writer.

Anxious to find what common ground it could, the Army welcomed the invitation to contribute, “despite the fact that the Army’s traditional approach to the subjects dealt with differs significantly from the hypothesis on which the present study rests” and regretted that “the sincerely held views of non-sacramentalist Christians are ignored in this document.”⁶²⁷ Because of its non-sacramental stance the Army was inevitably out of step with the major groups represented and its response could probably be characterised as “Yes, but...” The Movement had not been comfortable with the 1975 revision of the Functions and Purposes section of the WCC constitution which gave “increased prominence to the World Council’s role in encouraging church unity” and the introduction of the phrases “visible unity” and “eucharistic fellowship”. It regretted “the apparent elevation of apostolic tradition to the level of apostolic faith”.⁶²⁸

Salvationist reviewers were “troubled by the apparent inference that we start divided and must see how we can achieve unity” whereas the Army’s assumption was that “we are already ‘one in Christ Jesus’” and that “the task facing the Church is to see how that can be realized and made visible...”⁶²⁹ Perhaps a subtle distinction, but probably intended to reinforce the Army’s support for the 1950 WCC Toronto Statement that “no church... is required to give up its self- understanding or subscribe to one understanding of the Church”.⁶³⁰

The passages dealing with baptism and the Eucharist are outside the scope of this essay but we are concerned here with the section on Ministry. What follows is a clause by clause summary of salient points from Lima together with points made in the Army’s response.

⁶²⁷ #137, p.230. However, the “Canberra Statement”, adopted by the Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches in 1991, included the concession that, “we gladly acknowledge that some who do not observe these rites share in the spiritual experience of life in Christ.” This was a generous gesture to such minuscule bodies as the Society of Friends and The Salvation Army.

⁶²⁸ #137, p.231.

⁶²⁹ #137,p.233.

⁶³⁰ #137,p.232.

The Lima paper on Ministry opened with Section I: "THE CALLING OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE OF GOD." This showed that the mission of the Church of calling all humanity into fellowship with God was vested in the whole community of the faithful. The Army agreed that "this Scriptural and evangelical exposition coincides with the Salvation Army's understanding" and read "in the broadest sense" a reference to "the gifts of the sacraments." It agreed too that "any consideration of ordained ministry" must work from the perspective of the whole people of God" and viewed its "commissioned and ordained officers" from this perspective.⁶³¹

Section II: "THE CHURCH AND THE ORDAINED MINISTRY" began by providing a glossary to avoid confusion – charism, ministry, ordained ministry and priest were defined. The Army agreed with the definitions given while dissenting in one respect: "...we do not invest the laying on of hands with the significance indicated here" as an assumed concomitant of ordination.⁶³²

A: "The Ordained Ministry", outlined the need for church leadership, whose ministry "is constitutive of the life and witness of the Church, and traced its origins to 'the Twelve'." Its role was to represent Jesus Christ to the Community, proclaim his message of reconciliation, to be leaders, teachers and pastors, to build up the Community, to be examples of holiness and loving concern. The Salvation Army supported all this as coinciding with its own views on the "calling and status of its commissioned officers" and it supported "the need to avoid dogmatic claims regarding the ministry of any one church or any one form of ordination".⁶³³ However, it dissented from "the assumption that our ministry is founded on that of the apostles. Like theirs, our ministry is founded on Christ".⁶³⁴

⁶³¹ #137, p.246-7.

⁶³² #137, p.247.

⁶³³ #137, p.248.

⁶³⁴ #137, p.247.

Short interpretative passages of “Commentary” were scattered through Lima. The Army response put a curious spin on the Commentary to paragraph 14, which held it appropriate for an ordained ministry to be given the task of presiding at the Eucharist, while admitting the absence of explicit New Testament evidence that this was required. The Army commented that “We read into this an acceptance of the fact that the Eucharist was not instituted as a form, ceremony or sacrament, which is the Salvation Army viewpoint.”⁶³⁵ It is not clear that this was the point the authors of the Lima document had in mind here.

B. “Ordained Ministry and Authority” stated that the authority of the ordained minister is rooted in Jesus Christ and conferred by the Holy Spirit, not as the possession of the ordained person but as a gift for the body, with whose co-operation it is exercised. The Army supported this, with the accolade that “paragraph 16 could easily have come from the Orders and Regulations for Salvation Army Officers”.⁶³⁶

C. “The Ordained Ministry and Priesthood” derived the priesthood of the whole community from that of Christ, but noted that ordained ministers could also be described as priests because of their service of edification and intercession. The Army preferred not to use the term “priest”, but said “the paragraph describes the function and relationship of our ‘priesthood of all believers’ and of our ordained and commissioned officers.”⁶³⁷ It demurred from the expression “priesthood of all baptised” as unsupported by Scripture.

D. “The Ministry of men and Women in the Church” acknowledged that “there is in Christ no male or female” (Galations 3:28) and noted that “the Church must discover the ministry that can be provided by women as well as that which can be provided by men.”⁶³⁸ However, it admitted that the churches differed on the admission of women to ordained ministry. The Salvation Army, “having at least twice as many ordained women

⁶³⁵ #137, p.248.

⁶³⁶ #137, p.248.

⁶³⁷ #137, p.248.

⁶³⁸ #111, p.24.

officers as men”, preferred “to accept the open door to the full involvement of women in the work of the Kingdom.”⁶³⁹

Section III: “THE FORMS OF THE ORDAINED MINISTRY”

“Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons”. Lima admitted that the New Testament showed a variety of forms rather than prescribing a single pattern of ministry and traced the development of the three-fold patterns to second and third century developments. Nevertheless, it suggested that the three-fold pattern “may serve today as an expression of this unity we seek and also as a means of achieving it, even though the “present forms of the traditional pattern raise questions for all churches”.⁶⁴⁰

The Salvation Army was happy with the three-fold pattern as three levels of ministerial authority, indicating that it had its own administrative levels, but found “attempts to give distinct theological meaning to these levels unconvincing and confusing”.⁶⁴¹ It preferred to see the gifts of *episkope* and *diakonia* operating in and characterising all levels of ministry. Interestingly it did not attempt to make anything of the apparent equivalence of the Divisional Commander’s role to the episcopal role.

“Guiding Principles for the Exercise of Ordained Ministry” laid down that ordained ministry should be exercised in a “personal, collegial and communal” way. It should be “constitutionally ordered”, with “regular representative synodal gatherings” and “active participation of all members in the life and decision-making of the Community.”⁶⁴² The Salvation Army’s support for the latter concept, and its citing of Advisory Boards and Corps Councils as such bodies, might have given the impression that it possessed a more democratic or representative polity than was actually the case.

“Functions of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons”. Uniformity on this question was not required but the Commission made tentative

⁶³⁹ #137, p.249. “Twice as many ordained women officers as men” seems somewhat of an exaggeration for the 1980’s, although it might once have been true. “More women officers than men” perhaps would have been more accurate.

⁶⁴⁰ #111, p.25.

⁶⁴¹ #137, p.249.

⁶⁴² #111, p.26.

suggestions. The Army claimed that its functionaries already “conformed in a general way to each of the categories described”, but took the view that “functions rather than the title or form of ordination are of most importance” and that “the true ministry is unified, not compartmentalised”.⁶⁴³

“Variety of Charisms” should characterise the community, and the ordained ministry, itself a charism, should not “become a hindrance for the variety of these charisms”.⁶⁴⁴ The Army endorsed this, and felt that its own existence and history illustrated the need for the Church “constantly to receive new impulses from the Holy Spirit... unrestricted by ecclesiastical structures”.⁶⁴⁵

IV: “SUCCESSION IN THE APOSTOLIC TRADITION”

“Apostolic Tradition in the Church” meant continuity in the permanent characteristics of the Church of the Apostles, which were then listed. The Salvation Army agreed, with the reservation that it did not see the celebration of baptism and the eucharist as a necessary part of that tradition. The Army also reiterated the distinction it made between “succession in the apostolic faith” and “succession in the apostolic ministry” and said that it did not “give to apostolic or any tradition the same value as to the scriptures. It observed that “historical continuity alone does not guarantee apostolicity.”⁶⁴⁶

“Succession of the Apostolic Ministry” was described as an expression of permanence and continuity of Christ’s ministry, in which the ordained ministry has a particular task. Orderly transmission had been facilitated by the development of the episcopate. It was suggested that general acceptance of the episcopate “will best further the unity of the whole Church if it is part of a wider process by which the episcopal churches themselves also regain their lost unity.”⁶⁴⁷

⁶⁴³ #137, pp.249-50.

⁶⁴⁴ #111, pp.27-8.

⁶⁴⁵ #137, p.250.

⁶⁴⁶ #137, p.250.

⁶⁴⁷ #111, p.30.

The Salvation Army opposed the concept of “mystical transmission from one ordained minister to another” and suggested that “orderly transmission” was to be found in “faithfulness to the word of God and an openness to the Holy Spirit.” It welcomed the acknowledgement that “continuity in apostolic faith, worship and mission have been preserved in churches which have not retained the form of historic episcopate... the reality and function of the episcopal ministry has been preserved ... without the title of bishop.”⁶⁴⁸

V: “ORDINATION”

“The meaning of Ordination” was that “the Church sought to continue the mission of the apostles and remain faithful to their teaching” by ordaining certain of its members by invocation of the Spirit and the laying on of hands. The Lord was the true ordainer and the rite denoted action by God and by the Community.⁶⁴⁹ The Salvation Army supported the meaning of the above, and was gratified that Commentaries 39 and 40 recognised the validity of different ordination practices. It would not support episcopal re-ordination of ministers from non-episcopal traditions.

“The Act of Ordination” was placed by tradition in the context of worship, and particularly of the eucharist, and this was seen as preserving the understanding that ordination was an act in which the whole Community was involved. The Army was happy with this, notwithstanding the reference to the eucharist.

“The Conditions for Ordination”. It was seen that people were called in differing ways to the ordained ministry but that the Community must authenticate the call. They could be professional or remain in other occupations, and could be celibate or married. Study, preparation and training were required, and no time limit was generally envisaged in their commitment. Ordination could not be repeated, and need not be repeated after absence from the role. It was accepted that the disciplines of no one church could be seen as universally applicable. Discrimination

⁶⁴⁸ #137, p.251.

⁶⁴⁹ #111, p.30.

on grounds of race or sociological group was inappropriate. The Army did not dissent from these.

However, the Army's responses to Section V appeared to miss some cues. On V, A, for example, "The Meaning of Ordination", it merely expressed "interest" in the comparison between the Greek *cheirotonein* and the Latin *ordo*, noting that Salvation Army "appointment" was consistent with the former, even though it used the expression "ordain" in connection with its commissioning of officers. The Army evidently overlooked the opportunity to protest against the implication of classes of Christian inherent in the derivation of ordination – possibly because its recent adoption of the term had cost it the high moral ground in this argument.

Again, on V, C, "Conditions for Ordination", the response also seems to miss the real issue as far as the Army's position was concerned. The Salvation Army supported the conditions suggested, including ordination for life and the unrepeatability of ordination, viewing its own officership as a life-long vocation. It found that its own appointment of lay-salvationists as "envoys" was analogous perhaps to that of lay-readers but it had no equivalent of non-stipendiary priests. The Army however evidently missed the significance of the implication that ordained persons were seen as having an indelible character, whereas no Salvation Army officer could retain his or her commission and rank if not in an appointment (except for a short period of special leave). This was perhaps a crucial difference but seemed to be glossed over, possibly because the Army confused its expectation of life-long commitment with the catholic church view that orders retained their validity even when the ordained person no longer functioned as a minister.⁶⁵⁰

VI: "TOWARDS THE MUTUAL RECOGNITION OF THE ORDAINED MINISTRIES."

The Commission called for churches to make deliberate efforts to examine their understanding and practice of ministry and make changes

⁶⁵⁰ #137, p.253.

if required. The issue of apostolic succession was seen as key, with the act of transmission including invocation of the Spirit and the laying on of hands. Steps would be required of both episcopal and non-episcopal churches. Differences over the ordination of women needed to be explored openly rather than glossed over. While mutual recognition would require no one liturgical form, it should be public and related to a common celebration of the eucharist.

The Salvation Army expressed disappointment in the emphasis on “the laying on of hands” and the “need to recover the sign of episcopal succession.” It felt that Salvation Army officers could “claim the right to be accepted as part of the ordained ministry through which God has been pleased to perform all the essential functions outlined in this section of the Lima text.”⁶⁵¹ The Conclusion summarized The Salvation Army’s response to the Faith and Order Commission’s request for comments on four points.

1. The extent to which the Salvation Army can recognize in the Lima text the faith of the Church through the ages.

The Salvation Army found itself in “complete harmony” with those parts of the text that embodied the “faith of the Church” as distinct from what it saw as the “traditional observances of the churches”. It regretted that the text “fails to make clear the crucial distinction between the sign and the truth signified”... and that “it ascribes to the sacraments powers belonging to the Holy Spirit alone.” It feared “a resultant tendency to ritualism and a movement away from apostolic simplicity ... the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith being largely obscured by a mist of liturgical traditionalism.”⁶⁵²

The Army’s claim to apostolic simplicity on the basis of non-observance of the sacraments and the absence of a set liturgy is tendentious. Here the Army was responding to the Lima position on baptism and eucharist but did not address the issue of ministry, unless by inference.

⁶⁵¹ #137, p.253.

⁶⁵² #137, p.253-4.

2. The consequences which The Salvation Army can draw from this text for its relations with other churches.

The Salvation Army had no difficulty in seeing itself in fellowship with other churches, but regretted that a literal application of the Lima text might result in the exclusion from that fellowship of non-sacramental Christians. It contended that “visible unity lies in a concerted proclamation of our common faith by word and life; that ecumenism lies in common faith and witness and mutual recognition rather than unified church practices.” Salvationists would hope for respect for their “sincerity and spiritual perception as a valid interpretation of the apostolic faith despite our non-observance of apostolic tradition.”⁶⁵³

Again, an expectation of “live and let live” would have implications for ministry but these were not spelt out.

3. The guidance which The Salvation Army can take from this text for its worship, educational, ethical and spiritual life and witness.

The Salvation Army had “endeavoured to identify their faith with that expressed in the text ...Aspects of our own worship which seem to parallel traditional rites have been identified and our worship and ceremonies have been closely examined to ensure that their content is as spiritual and growth-producing as we claim.” However, the Army felt that “there is a need for the continuing witness to the freedom of God to bless his people even outside the traditional sacramental means of grace.”⁶⁵⁴ As a result of these exercises, “a clearer definition of our ecclesiology and the theology of Salvation Army officership is being prepared.”⁶⁵⁵

4. The suggestions The Salvation Army can make for the ongoing work of Faith and Order as it relates the material of this text on baptism, eucharist and ministry to its long-range research project, “Towards the common expression of the apostolic faith today.”

⁶⁵³ #137, p.255.

⁶⁵⁴ #137, p.255. This could also be interpreted as the perceived freedom of The Salvation Army to decide how it would permit itself to be blessed.

⁶⁵⁵ #137, p.256.

The Salvation Army suggested that the difficulty here is that they made their “approach to the subject from a different hypothesis”; from a conviction of the value of emphasising points of Christian unity and valuing the rich diversity of expression “without any sense of superiority of one over another”. Rather than “the highlighting of differences”, the Army would prefer to see the churches demonstrating their existing unity in mission and evangelism. It 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.⁶⁵⁶

In sum, then, the Salvation 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. This may have been because the gap between the Army’s practice and that of most other churches was more obvious in this respect, and because the Army had done some thinking about this issue. With reference to the matter particularly addressed in this thesis, 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, as we have noted, missed a significant area of difference under V,A, “The Meaning of Ordination”, and C, “Conditions for Ordination”.

As can happen when pragmatic decisions are made without having a clear theological principle, inconsistencies of policy and practice are not uncommon. Captain Alan Harley, speaking on “ordination” to Australian cadets in 2002, recalled that when he resigned from the Salvation Army to enter the Congregational ministry, he was not required to be ordained because his Salvation Army commissioning was accepted as equivalent. When however after a long and distinguished career in that communion he rejoined the Army as an officer, he was required to be re-commissioned.

⁶⁵⁶ #137, p.256.

Comments on the Army's IHQ website discussion page cast further light on the recognition of credentials. Barbara Moulton of Canada wrote (19th February 2002) that she and her husband, after serving as officers for seven years, transferred to another denomination in the Wesleyan-Arminian tradition, which recognised their prior ordination. Thomas G. World of USA found that his Territory would not transfer his ordination even though requested by the Bishop of his new denomination, even though his Territory was stated to be a signatory to an agreement on transference of ordination. Of course we are not informed of all the circumstances which might have obtained.

In New Zealand the practice has been that officers whose period "out of the work" has been comparatively brief – perhaps two years or so – have been re-accepted as officers without re-commissioning. Others, after many years' absence, have been re-accepted as Auxiliary-Captains for a probationary period before restoration to substantive rank, even although the regulations for Auxiliary-Captains expressly forbade this practice. However, in recent cases where people have returned after many years in secular employment, some have been warranted as Lieutenants – which title, since the 2001 revision of ranks, has been not counted as a commissioned rank. If later reaccepted as commissioned officers, they are not now to be recommissioned but must re-sign their covenant.⁶⁵⁷ This is curious, in that one would expect the covenant to be seen as the expression of a personal relationship with God, independent of ecclesiastical role, whereas a commission seems to be for a specific officer role and is not valid when the holder is not exercising that role. This points again to the ambiguity associated with officership. Current policy seems to assume in practice a permanent ontological "character", related to the commission, which is denied in theory.

⁶⁵⁷ New Zealand Minute PAO 1202. For example, the Kilgours, having been officers, resigned and worked for another church for many years, subsequently becoming "Lieutenants" in 2001. A *Bulletin* dated 8 July 2004 stated: "The Territorial Commander is pleased to announce the re-acceptance as Officers of Captains Ian & Shirley Kilgour. Effective 20 May 2004. The Captains Kilgour will take part in a special re-signing of their Covenants, on Monday July 12, 2004 at THQ."

The variety of local application of regulation might be regarded as comparable to Roman Catholic ordination of married priests in some dioceses, or Anglican Ordination of women in some provinces but not in others.

It is interesting that at the same time as the Army was dismissing as irrelevant the theological fine print on matters of faith and order, it had adopted a form of words, "ordination", that did not belong to its own tradition. It interpreted this term in a sense unacceptable to the mainstream of that tradition which held apostolic succession to be important. With all due respect to the erudition of those concerned with fashioning the Army's response to Lima, possibly it was able to do this because its own ecclesiology had not been thought through.

3. "Community in Mission"

Their work on the Lima document on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* evidently alerted the Salvation Army's leadership to its lack of a coherent ecclesiology and the difficulties inherent in maintaining a merely reactive mode. In its concluding comments in response to the Lima document, The Salvation Army referred to the preparation of "a clearer definition of our ecclesiology and the theology of Salvation Army officership." This was the book *Community in Mission, A Salvationist Ecclesiology* by the American officer, Major Philip Needham and published in 1987. The Foreword by General Eva Burrows explains that Needham had been "invited to produce a volume which would be a supplement to The Salvation Army's official response to the Lima Document, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*".

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."⁶⁵⁸ Within the elaboration of this theme, he refers to an ordained or specially designated ministry firstly in connection

⁶⁵⁸ Philip Needham, *Community in Mission*, London, 1987, pp.4-5.

with the means of celebrating and nurturing the “pilgrim people” on their journey.

Needham describes the significance of the Mercy Seat and the swearing in of soldiers as celebration of embarkation on the Christian pilgrimage and the Love Feast as a means of celebrating its continued nurturing. “Any meal is a love feast where he (Christ) is present in fellowship.”⁶⁵⁹ Needham invokes the concept, going back to William Booth, that any and every meal should be the locus of such celebration with the risen and present Christ. (We have already encountered Henry Lunn’s 1895 interview of Booth, reported as follows. “Do you substitute anything,’ I asked the General, ‘for the Sacraments?’ ‘Only so far,’ he said, ‘as to urge upon our soldiers in every meal to remember, as they break the bread, the broken body of our Lord, and as they drink the cup, His shed blood...’”)⁶⁶⁰

According to Needham, these “key characteristics of ministry in the pilgrim Church are celebrated primarily through ordination.” However, he is evidently not reserving the presidency over such celebrations to an ‘ordained class’. Calling attention to the disparity between the New Testament accounts of initiation for specific ministries and the elaboration of orders along with the concept of clerical classes which subsequently developed, he claims that “the understanding of ordination which arises out of a Salvationist ecclesiology can best be described in the word commissioning... This emphasis on function or mission, rather than ecclesiastical status, broadens the concept of ministry to include everybody in the fellowship... In Salvation Army practice, soldiers are commissioned to specific responsibilities. This is true of both laymen and ministers...” He concedes that “Clearly there are ‘status’ overtones to the

⁶⁵⁹ There appears to be some current support, in the wake of the 1997-98 International Spiritual Life Commission, for reviving the Moravian/Wesleyan and early Salvationist “love feast” as an alternative to a return to the celebration of Holy Communion by Salvationists looking for the recovery of ritual in their liturgy. This seems to have had little impact in New Zealand. “We affirm that our meals and love feasts are an anticipation of the feasts of eternity, and a participation in that fellowship which is the Body of Christ on earth,” states the Report of the International Spiritual Life Commission, quoted in *Salvation Story, Study Guide*. London, 1999, p.117.

⁶⁶⁰ *Review of the Churches*, April, 1895..

Army's military form of ecclesiastical government, and there have been those who have mistakenly viewed the officership calling as spiritually superior to that of the local officer."

However, he sees the commissioning concept as faithful to New Testament understanding in that "all God's people are called to specific ministries, that the Church is charged to give spiritual direction in discerning and developing individual gifts for ministry, and that each member is to be commissioned to carry out responsibilities which best utilise his gifts." The rite of commissioning is inclusive because it does not discriminate on the basis of social class or sex and the call to ministry is "addressed to all pilgrims in a Church which is on the move... It embodies the dynamic understanding of ministry because of its emphasis on mission rather than maintenance."⁶⁶¹

Needham concludes this section with consideration of the question of Church structure and government. He notes that the New Testament does not prescribe any particular form of government but that these developed in response to social and cultural setting and the requirements of the mission. The Salvation Army opted for an episcopal form of government expressed in the language of the military, which "fostered decisive leadership, courage in times of trial, mobility, adaptability, focus of action and clear cut goals...(and) lay participation." Needham acknowledges the weaknesses inherent in this form – "the monopoly of leadership by a hierarchy of professional soldiers... the insidious pull towards rigid hierarchy and immobile bureaucracy."⁶⁶² This was strong language and remarkably open for an officially endorsed statement.

In a section on how the Church celebrates its missionary purpose and nurtures its missionary preparedness, Needham notes that Salvationist rites such as soldier-enrolment, commissioning of local officers ("lay leaders", meaning that this is not their full-time occupation) and ordination to the (full-time) ministry ought all to "emphasise a commissioning for battle". He reiterates the Army's opposition to

⁶⁶¹ Philip Needham, *Community*, p.47-9.

⁶⁶² Philip Needham, *ibid.*, p.50.

“interpretations of ordination that stress the conferring of a unique spiritual status”. He concludes, “We hold that all Christians are called to ministry and mission and that full-time ministry, while exceptional in some ways, is not essentially different from lay ministries. The difference is in the combination of gifts required, the extensive development of professional skills for ministry undertaken, and the time for formal ministry committed. Ordination, then, is commissioning to specific ministries within the context of the Church’s mission – ministries that require theological training, specialised skills, pastoral leadership and a full-time vocation...the ordained ministry can only be understood as functional...”⁶⁶³

Needham notes but does not elaborate on the fact that “lay participation” fostered by the military model historically has not included participation in government. As we have already seen, not only has this role in practice come to be restricted to the “officer class”, but also the presidency at the rites of celebration for the embarkation on and nurturing of the soldier’s pilgrimage. However, it must be said that this officially commissioned and promoted Salvationist ecclesiology, while accepting and employing the language of ordination makes it clear that this is seen simply in functional terms. One has the impression that Needham, while accepting the term as a *fait accompli*, is fighting a rearguard action to ensure that the traditional Salvation Army concepts are not lost sight of. The picture of officership thus presented is therefore faithful to that aspect of Salvation Army tradition.

Further, a great strength of *Community in Mission* as an ecclesiology is that it deals pre-eminently with the ministry of the Army as a whole, and only *inter alia* with that of the officer corps in particular. In this it would have earned the approbation of Hendrik Kraemer, prophet of the *laos*, who urged that “the general plan of these books be: the Ministry of the Church as incumbent on the whole body, specified subsequently by a treatment of the Ministry of the Clergy and of the Ministry of the Laity,

⁶⁶³ Philip Needham, *Community*, p.65.

always keeping in mind their co-existence and inter-existence.”⁶⁶⁴ It also reflects the general, if still theoretical, recovery of the Church’s appreciation of the basic “ordination of baptism” and concept of the whole people of God over the past forty years, across the whole denominational spectrum.

4. The International Doctrine Council

The Doctrine Council was instituted by General Higgins in January 1931, “to examine and report to him as to the correctness and harmony with Salvation Army principles and doctrines, as defined in our Deed Poll of 1878, of the teaching contained in all Salvation Army publications such as Song Books, Company Orders, Directories, Advanced Training, and similar lesson Courses and Text Books, and other publications in which doctrinal teaching appears in any form.”⁶⁶⁵ The first chairman was Commissioner A.G. Cunningham and the secretary Brigadier S.C. Gauntlett.

Amongst subsequent tasks committed to this body, now styled the International Doctrine Council, has been the preparation and revision of successive editions of the *Handbook of Doctrine*. The latest version of this is called *Salvation Story*. More recently still, the Council has produced a book on the Salvationist understanding of ministry entitled *Servants Together*. This section concerns these two works, in so far as they touch on the theme of this thesis.

The Handbook of Doctrine

As previously noted, The Salvation Army arose as something akin to a parachurch movement, with a limited evangelical focus. The Eleven Points of doctrine, the formulation of beliefs based selectively on the articles of the Methodist New Connexion and similar to those of the Evangelical Alliance, contained no doctrine of the Church or of ministry.

⁶⁶⁴ Hendrik Kraemer: *A Theology of the Laity*. London, Lutterworth, 1958, p.155.

⁶⁶⁵ Unpublished paper in The Salvation Army Heritage Centre, London.

Dr Roger Green, American Salvationist and theologian, suggests that this lack of ecclesiology might be traced to the Booths' pre-millennial eschatology. Salvationist literature from the heady days of exponential growth sometimes gives the impression that the world was about to be won for Jesus in the very near future, largely through the instrumentality of the Salvation Army. With the urgency of the task of mission, no time could be spared for hair-splitting about a dispensation and order that was in any case about to pass away.⁶⁶⁶ Another point of view could be that what passed for ecclesiology in the Army was to be found in its disciplines rather than its doctrines; in the expanding body of descriptive and prescriptive regulation.

The first exposition of Salvation Army beliefs was contained in *The Doctrines and Disciplines of The Salvation Army*, prepared in 1881 for use in training officers. An identical public edition, hastily made available to refute charges about a "secret book", was made available in 1883.⁶⁶⁷ In 1885 *The Doctrines of The Salvation Army* appeared. A more extensive *Handbook of Salvation Army Doctrine* was published in 1922, the title being changed to *The Salvation Army Handbook of Doctrine* for the third edition in 1927 and an expanded version in 1940. A new, substantially revised, edition appeared in 1969.⁶⁶⁸ This was the work of Colonel Gordon Mitchell and edited by Lt.-Colonel Cyril Barnes, and then re-written in part by General Frederick Coutts.⁶⁶⁹

An abridgement of the 1969 version entitled *The Doctrine We Adorn* (the title is from the AV of Titus 2:10) was written by Colonel Ernest Yendell for English Second Language readers and published in 1982. It was designed as a companion volume to *Chosen to be a Soldier* (the 1977 update of *Orders and Regulations for Salvation Army Soldiers*).

⁶⁶⁶ Roger Green, in conversation with the writer, December, 2002.

⁶⁶⁷ Catherine Booth, 'The "Secret Book" so called', Appendix to *The Salvation Army in Relation to The Church and State*, London, 1889, pp.78-92.

⁶⁶⁸ Information compiled by Colonel Earl Robinson. Letter to General Paul Rader dated 27 January, 1999. The Salvation Army Heritage Centre Archives.

⁶⁶⁹ Information from Commissioner Shaw Clifton, May 2004.

None of the pre-1969 editions of the Handbook made any reference to a doctrine of the Church. In the 1969 edition, and in *The Doctrine We Adorn*, the Church is discussed under the general heading of “The Ministry of the Holy Spirit” within the section on Trinitarian doctrine. No reference is made to a “separated ministry”. Rather, it is stated that “men and women were called to be co-workers with God and were equipped by the Holy Spirit...”, that “He still calls, appoints and equips believers to serve the Christian fellowship and to be nourished by it... to be witnesses for Christ in the world... to be concerned about the daily needs of his fellows.”⁶⁷⁰

In 1992 General Eva Burrows asked the International Doctrine Council to prepare a new edition, which appeared in 1998 under the title of *Salvation Story*. This publication was a radical departure from earlier handbooks, and a serious effort to relate to a new generation of more theologically-aware Salvationists. It was written in narrative style rather than as a series of proof-texted propositions – the fish is alive and swimming rather than dissected on a slab. Members of the Council responsible were Colonel David Guy, and later Colonel Earl Robinson, as Chairman; Lt. Colonel Ray Caddy, then Lieut-Colonel Rae Major, and later Colonel Benita Robinson as Secretary; Colonel John Amoah, Colonel Philip Needham, Major Christine Parkin, and Colonel Gudrun Lydholm.

Although the doctrines as set out in successive deeds poll and in various Acts of the United Kingdom parliament remain essentially unchanged, *Salvation Story* does include for the first time a chapter on the doctrine of the Church, entitled “The People of God”. It 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.”⁶⁷¹

⁶⁷⁰ *Handbook of Doctrine*, 1969, pp.70-3; *The Doctrine We Adorn*, 1982, pp.41-2.

⁶⁷¹ *Salvation Story*, London, 1998, p.100.

With reference to Ministry, within a section headed “The Holy Spirit empowers the whole church for witness”, 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 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.⁶⁷²

The description of the role of those ordained corresponds generally to the functions that have come to be associated with the ministerial class in the modern church rather than to any single Biblical model. All of the tasks referred to are also regarded as incumbent upon all Salvationists, whether officer or not, although the “focus” function is more particularly and appropriately that of one in leadership or “command”.

The expression, “the gift of the Holy Spirit”, cannot refer to the general experience of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, common to all believers, as that is not limited to those ordained. Nor can the gift be identified as one of those specific endowments described in the Pauline epistles of the New Testament. The writers presumably refer to a spiritual gift for the particular role of “full-time office-bearers”, sought by specific invocation on the occasion of ordination. To say, “*the* gift” could however give the impression of referring to some generally recognised authority (Biblical? Historical?) for the concept of a separate ministerial group. [This could amount to a claim to ordination in the historic sense.](#)

However, the important thing is that the statement establishes the principle that the ministry of particular persons arises from the ministry of the whole Christian community and it is at least an attempt to describe and justify what happens in practice.

Servants Together

The continued debate described and illustrated in the previous chapter pointed to the need for further clarity on The Salvation Army's theology of ministry. The 1995 International Conference of Leaders meeting in Hong Kong recommended "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 evangelisation."⁶⁷³

General Paul Rader committed this task to the International Doctrine Council. Members of the Council at this time were Colonel Earl Robinson (Chair), Colonel Benita Robinson (Secretary), Lieut-Colonel Ray Caddy, Professor Roger Green (the first non-officer appointee to the Council), Colonel Gudrun Lydholm, Colonel Phil Needham and Major Christine Parkin. Together they produced the book, *Servants Together*, subtitled *The Ministry of the Whole People of God, Salvationist Perspectives*, and published in 2002.

The introduction to the book admits that Salvationist theology, despite the collectivist character of the military metaphor, has tended to be individualistic. Section One, "The Calling of God's People", therefore places the concept of ministry in the context of the calling of all God's people to worship, community and mission. Section Two the "Ministry of the Whole People of God", postulates three theological bases for this ministry: vocation, the priesthood of all believers and the gifts of the Spirit. Section Three considers "Leadership" and attends to the matter of Commissioning or ordination to specific tasks in the Church. Section Four deals with the character of such leadership, exemplified in Jesus Christ. Sections Two and Three are of particular interest for the theme of this thesis.

⁶⁷² *Salvation Story*, p.108.

⁶⁷³ *Servants Together*, London, 2002, p.127.

Section Two, Chapter Four, on Vocation, refers to the dangers of the medieval concept which implies that the primary vocation is holy orders while that of the laity is second best. "For those who grew up in the Army the implied message was often that the true vocation was that of the officer ... being a soldier was second class". To counter this the writers set out the Biblical principle that all believers are called to the ministry of reconciliation (2nd Corinthians 5:18-20), a ministry that "may be demonstrated by various means in the vocations to which God has called us."⁶⁷⁴

Luther's teaching on vocation in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520) is cited as having helped break down the false dichotomy between sacred and secular. At the same time, the writers note that "this doctrine of vocation does not in any way deny that some are called to the specific ministerial tasks of preaching, teaching or administration."⁶⁷⁵ In Chapter 5, the priesthood of all believers is presented as another way of breaking down the distinction between sacred and secular. The concept of priesthood is traced through Old and New Testaments, the Patristic period (in a sentence or two), and then in the thought of Luther and Wesley. The point is reiterated that the priesthood of all believers does not mean that all believers should hold the office of "priest" – this term now being used to denote preaching, teaching and leadership functions. The section applies this thought to the Salvation Army today with a warning against the tendency that "those with more public abilities ... may assume some special status or privileged place."⁶⁷⁶ Chapter 6 is given over to an exposition of the Pauline gifts as described in 1st Corinthians 12, Romans 12, and Ephesians 4, with reference also to 1st Peter 4. It is noted that the terms in these lists are not used to describe any hierarchy or ministerial status and any connection between ministry gifts and place or status in the church or Corps is denied. Unresolved is the problem that, at least in contemporary culture, the gift of leadership is likely to be

⁶⁷⁴ *Servants Together*, pp.39-40.

⁶⁷⁵ *ibid.*, p.42.

⁶⁷⁶ *ibid.*, p.50.

recognised by status, (and that leadership status not accompanied by appropriate gifts is likely to be less effective). Having given an account of the 20th century Pentecostal movement and its second and third “waves”, the writers note that “charismatic renewal has not materially affected the structure of church government.”⁶⁷⁷

Section Three is concerned with “The Leadership of God’s People – its Scope”. While vision-casting, teaching, administration and pastoring are not the sole concern of leaders, these roles are “so vital that they should be owned and guarded by those specially appointed.” It is also acknowledged that “at a time of change, the Salvation Army is seeking to redefine its leadership.”⁶⁷⁸

Chapter Seven deals with “Commissioning”, the Army’s traditional term for the act of recognising a ministry role. “It signifies a calling from God rather than some special status, and the assurance for those who are commissioned lies in that calling rather than in some privileged position.” This is affirmed as a Biblical principle. It is frankly acknowledged that most of the early Salvation Army leaders were ‘lay’ and that “distinctions between the laity and the clergy would arise only after the institutionalisation of the Salvation Army.” A most significant paragraph suggests that “We now have the opportunity in The Salvation Army *to return to the Biblical principle that all are in ministry.* (My italics.) While distinctions between officers and soldiers may at times be useful and appropriate, we recognise that all officers are first and foremost soldiers in the Army and that everyone in the Army is in ministry both in the context of his or her daily vocation and in the context of life in the corps... We commission both officers and local officers to their respective ministries.”⁶⁷⁹

The admission that the Army had strayed from a Biblical principle may refer especially to the loss of evangelical fervour amongst the laity,

⁶⁷⁷ *ibid.*, p.60

⁶⁷⁸ *Servants Together*, p.61.

⁶⁷⁹ *ibid.*, pp.65-6.

though the context could also imply that the widened gap between officer and soldier in terms of status was also to be deplored. The chapter goes on to suggest ways in which the practice of “commissioning” could be developed and extended to further “lay” roles to reinforce the understanding that all were equally in ministry.

Having warned that a “passive laity and a clergy defensive of its status and role” can inhibit the life and work of the Church, the chapter concludes with a warning against “an imbalance in another direction which devalues the role of so-called ‘professionals’... The doctrine of the priesthood of all believers ... acknowledges the specific authority of those who are called and trained for ministries of preaching, evangelism or administration... The call for commissioning in this chapter does not negate the understanding that some are commissioned to the ministry of officership within The Salvation Army. Those who are commissioned to that office are also ordained to servant leadership.”⁶⁸⁰

Chapter Eight goes on to explain what is meant by “Ordained to Servant Leadership”. *Salvation Story* is quoted to affirm that all Christians share in ministry so that “in that sense there is no separated ministry”, but also to insist that “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.” It is tacitly assumed that the phenomenon of full-time office-holding is ordained by Christ rather than administratively determined by the Church... However, the writers go on to admit that “full-time office-holders could include any believer, not exclusively clergy or Salvation Army officers.... The term ‘ordination’ is, however, normally used specifically with reference to clergy or Salvation Army officers.... This does not mean that preaching, teaching and exercising authority cannot be part of the ministry of soldiers, but it emphasises that an ordination to spiritual leadership is especially integral to officership.”⁶⁸¹

⁶⁸⁰ *Servants Together*, pp.67-8.

⁶⁸¹ *ibid.*, pp.69-70.

The writers note that questions arise concerning the ordination of Salvation Army officers because of comparisons with the practices of other denominations. One is whether the terms “commissioning” and “ordination” are interchangeable and carry the same meaning. Significantly, perhaps as a “first” for an official Army publication, it is admitted that people have different opinions on this. Some hold that there is no difference and others claim that the introduction of “ordain” indicates a change in mindset “from mission to maintenance” within the Army, and a change of perception of both officership and of The Salvation Army as a whole. However, the fear we have seen expressed by many correspondents in Salvation Army periodicals, that ordination presupposes a priestly order foreign to the Army’s ethos and theology, is not spelt out. The writers conclude that under the circumstances it might be best to maintain the use of both terms. Perhaps this is a tacit admission that the Army, like Anglicanism, needs to be sufficiently broad to accommodate a range of views.

In response to the question of why the term “ordination” was introduced, it is suggested firstly that it was to “facilitate an understanding of how solemnly the commissioning of Salvation Army officers is regarded and understood”. A second reason was the desire that a Salvation Army officer should be regarded as equal to any priest or minister of other denominations. There follows a brief historical survey of commissioning, showing that early leaders held this conviction, and a brief account of the process by which “ordination” came to be introduced into Salvation Army usage.

A further question addressed concerns the ways in which the ordination or commissioning of officers relates to the ordination of other clergy. A brief reference to the setting aside of some Old and New Testament characters for ministry is followed by a summary of Presbyterian Thomas F. Torrance’s analysis of ordination in Protestant ministry in terms of source, end or nature and its act. We have already met with this in 1993 *Officer* correspondence from Earl Robinson, whose notes from the 1968 Canadian Commissioning Brochure (referred to earlier) are also quoted in full at this point.

The chapter goes on to say that despite parallels with the ministry of other denominations, officership differs because “in keeping with our tradition of not drawing rigid lines between officers and soldiers, it has been one of the distinctives of The Salvation Army to believe that there is no essential ministry exercised by a Salvation Army officer that could not also be carried out by a soldier.” It has therefore to ask what is unique about a Salvation Army officer, and how the call to officership differs from the call to ministry incumbent on all Christians? The writers suggest that possible responses “have to do with an authority of office in terms of the officer’s relationship to the movement, the expectations of the movement towards the officer, decision-making powers related to finances, property, worship leadership and availability. The officer has a particular function to be a focus for mission and ministry of the Army. He or she is responsible through life and by ministry to ensure that the Word of God is proclaimed and the grace of Christ is offered in all possible ways to a needy and suffering world.”⁶⁸²

As already acknowledged, anything officers do that could be done – is at times done – by a non-officer, and there is no role from which a non-officer would be disqualified on theological grounds.

The writers then tease out the implications of some of the particular functions they have ascribed to the officer. They set out to show, within the same chapter and section as the “uniqueness of Salvation Army officership,” the ways in which officers, like clergy of other denominations, are “set apart for the ministry of the Word and Sacrament.” (Is the “uniqueness” then in relation to other soldiers rather than to other clergy? Perhaps the composite nature of the authorship is evident here.) The task of the preaching of the Word is comparatively straightforward – the officer’s covenant refers to the calling to “proclaim the gospel”. Difficulty with the parallel concerning sacramental usage is acknowledged; officers usually do not perform baptisms or preside over the Eucharist. However the writers refer to *Salvation Story* and the 1998 *Report of the International Spiritual Life Commission*, where it is asserted

⁶⁸² *Servants Together*, pp.78-9.

that “Christ is the one true sacrament, and sacramental living – Christ living in us and through us – is at the heart of Christian holiness and discipleship.”⁶⁸³

The writers recognise that neither of these roles – preaching the word or living out the life of Christ – is assigned only to officers. However, they assert that, “In signing their covenants, Salvation Army officers, *particularly* (my italics) accept the call to live the life of Christ, who is the one true sacrament, in an exemplary and sacramental way as spiritual leaders in the Church of Christ and in the world, just as Christ called his first apostles for that purpose.”⁶⁸⁴ Perhaps the reference to the apostles is intended to assert a parallel leadership role for officers; a kind of virtue by association. As we have seen before, it could be implied that the calling of the disciples established in perpetuity a special class in the church, rather than their being seen as a pilot scheme for emulation by all the faithful. The following paragraph goes on to expand on “sacramental living” as embracing the social service implications of the gospel.

It has to be said again that the insertion of “particularly” only serves to emphasise that there is no essential difference in role between officers and soldiers.

The final section of Chapter Eight refers to “spiritual leadership” and “servant leadership”. Maintaining their even-handed approach to the roles of officers and soldiers, the writers note that “When someone is ordained to such spiritual leadership, he or she is ordained to a ministry of servanthood to God and his world. This applies equally to leadership exercised by officers and soldiers.”⁶⁸⁵ Having referred to “ordained servant leadership” as descriptive of officers on page 58 at the end of Chapter Seven, the writers now by implication extend the word “ordained”

⁶⁸³ Robert Street, *Called to be God's People*, London, 1999, p.89.

⁶⁸⁴ *Servants Together*, p.79. Cf. Charles Davis' rationale for relinquishing the daily Mass on his leaving the priesthood: that “Christ is the great sacrament as the presence and embodiment of the saving union between God and men... The visible Church is the fundamental sacrament in so far as it is the permanent, manifest presence of Christ in the world...” Charles Davis, *A Question of Conscience*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1967, p.230.

to soldiers as well – perhaps another indication of authorship by committee.

Chapter Nine is about Team Ministry, which is held up as a model appropriate to the times as well as Biblically and theologically sound. It is noted that theologies of vocation, gifting and the priesthood of all believers have led in places to a startling growth in lay leadership, within both para-church organisations and denominations. Referring to the Army in particular, it mentions that in many places soldiers are increasingly taking responsibility for mission initiatives... “In the Army, we may well retain our military form of government... but we must be careful that the structure does not get in the way of the Army’s mission in our present cultural situation.”⁶⁸⁶ The writers may have in mind a more “Western” cultural situation rather than that of the third world, where more than 70% of the Army’s strength is now found and where anecdotal evidence and my own observation suggest that a more authoritarian structure is still preferred.

The writers are aware of concern about the changing relationship of officers and soldiers in this milieu – “Officers should not feel threatened when soldiers and employees take leadership responsibility. Nor should they contrast short-term service unfavourably with their own life-long commitment... Soldiers and employees should take care that they are not overly critical of what they perceive to be unfair advantages associated with being officers.”⁶⁸⁷ Again, such a passage is indicative of the realism with which the writers attempt to address the contemporary situation.

The final Section of the book deals with the Character of the Leadership of God’s People. Attention is drawn to the tension throughout the ages between “prophetic” and “priestly” modes of leadership and the necessity for both. The requirements of sense of call, spiritual depth, courage, personal discipline, relationship-building, empowerment of others, creativity, passion for mission and personal and vocational growth

⁶⁸⁵ *Servants Together*, p.81.

⁶⁸⁶ *Servants Together*, p.89.

⁶⁸⁷ *ibid.*, p.90.

are discussed. In some ways this section is an updating of the kind of prescription for an officer's character found in early editions of the Orders and Regulations.

As throughout the text, it is evident that the writers have to safeguard the principle that all soldiers are equal, including the officers, and that all can do anything required of anyone else, while at the same time having to secure some distinct role for officers. The latter is not unequivocally established. The final chapter, on the Future of Leadership, maintains this even-handed approach, asking, "What shape will officership and all forms of spiritual leadership in The Salvation Army take?"

Servants Together offers a range of comments and suggestions for future directions, reflecting the groundswell of officer opinion, particularly in the West.

For example:

- "We know that opportunities for full-time spiritual leadership will expand both within officership and alongside it...
- We know that for some the call to full-time Christian leadership will be less tied to life-long officership in The Salvation Army, but instead may include periods of short-term service.
- We also know that, in some countries, we will see the traditional model of officers married only to officers altered for those married couples where spouses have separate callings that are incompatible within that model..."
- It observes that alternative forms of officership will need to be explored where traditional officership is declining.
- It warns against "the temptation to gain acceptance in the wider ecclesiastical world by uncritically adopting practices, rituals and terminologies that devalue our own creative history."⁶⁸⁸

Is it possible that this is an oblique reference to the Army's adoption of "ordination"? Perhaps this is another indication of collective

⁶⁸⁸ *Servants Together*, pp.114, 118, 123.

composition. Or perhaps the writers were thinking rather of the tendency for Corps to become “churches” and Corps officers to style themselves “pastors”, and the reintroduction of ersatz sacramental practices unofficially at a local level as an accommodation to the ascendant pentecostal/charismatic religious sub-culture in some western or “first world” countries.⁶⁸⁹

The conclusion refers back to the Council’s mandate from the 1995 International Conference of Leaders, which requested, “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...” Was that intention realised?

Servants Together does:

- Explore the roles of officers and soldiers.
- Explain what is meant by the “priesthood of all believers.”
- Provide, however briefly, the historical and theological context for Salvationist practices in relation to ministry, in a way not hitherto attempted in a Salvation Army publication.
- Point up a number of contemporary issues about officership and ministry in The Salvation Army.
- Exhibit the extent of the Salvationist glasnost, being open about problems and disagreements in a way almost unprecedented in official publications.
- Establish clearly the principle that there is no distinction in status between officers and soldiers, and that there is nothing done by one which cannot be done by the other. It is notably even-handed in many references – phrases like, “Salvation Army officers, and other leaders...” abound. In their conclusion, the writers encourage Salvationists to greater involvement as “whether officers or soldiers, they are commissioned by God for ministry in

⁶⁸⁹ For example, at the Hutt City Corps in New Zealand, known as Crossroads Community Church, an influx of former Baptists has been accommodated by the provision of the elements for the communion service as an integral part of the traditional Salvationist “altar call” at the conclusion of Sunday meetings. This led to an exchange of views with the organisation’s hierarchy.

his world and in his Church and that, whatever ordination they may claim, it is essentially an ordination by God to be servants of their Servant Lord.”

Having established that principle, Servants then struggles a little in clarifying what is unique about the role of the officer. It tries to do this in two ways:

The first simply describes the way The Salvation Army is organised (as quoted above, on p.247⁶⁹⁰). Even the “spiritual” language of the final sentence could be transposed to reflect the function of an executive in a commercial operation working to a mission statement. It is not so baldly stated, but what the paragraph does show is that officers are paid to run the organisation. (Some non-officers are also paid to run the organisation in most of the ways mentioned, except in most cases the last – availability for appointment.) At any rate, this is a pragmatic exposition, uncomplicated by theological special pleading or comparisons.

The other way officership is described is in terms and categories borrowed from the clerical models of other denominations. It is inevitable that similar functions should be described in similar ways, and it is true that the book is in part a response to the greater ecumenical awareness of contemporary Salvationists. However, it could imply that the Army is still concerned to show that it is “like the other churches”, or “as good as them”. This illustrates that the ambiguity we have traced through the course of discussion on Salvation Army ministry is still to be found: the adoption of the language of ordination has simply reinforced the tension. We are left with the fact that all soldiers are equal but some are more equal than others. It is sometimes argued that the difference between officers and soldiers is to be found in the officer’s “Covenant”. However, this document does not commit officers to any more than the soldier’s covenant does. Both describe the individual’s relationship with God rather than with The Salvation Army. It is the “Undertakings”, containing the conditions of service undertaken by an officer, which make the difference.

⁶⁹⁰ *Servants Together*, p.78.

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.

PART THREE

OFFICERS WHO MAY NOT BE OFFICERS

CHAPTER SEVEN**AN OFFICER BY ANY OTHER NAME**

*What's Montague? It is nor hand nor foot,
Nor arm, nor face, nor any other part
Belonging to a man. O, be some other name!
What's in a name? That which we call a rose,
By any other name would smell as sweet;
So Romeo would, were he not Romeo call'd
Retain the dear perfection which he owes
Without that title...*

William Shakespeare

Romeo and Juliet, Act II, Scene II

The ambiguity about the status of officers – the question of whether they are clerical or lay – brings us to the matter of The Salvation Army's understanding of the role of those who have clerical functions but are not accorded the status of clergy. It also raises the matter of the Army's "theology of the laity". This is therefore tackled under two heads; firstly we look at the matter of auxiliary officers, whose status is ambiguous even within the Army's own terms of reference, and secondly we examine the role of the soldiers. (This is not an attempt at a Salvation Army theology of the laity, or soldiery, but looks at the role of soldiers *vis-à-vis* officers.)

Geoffrey Rowell notes that amongst the factors bringing "powerful pressures to bear upon older understandings of order and ministry in the Church" are "declining vocations to the ordained ministry and the need to sustain the ministry of the church to the whole nation... financial pressures and burgeoning lay ministries..."⁶⁹¹ As The Salvation Army shares these pressures,⁶⁹² it is useful to explore the way in which they have contributed to the development of auxiliary officership. If the theme of this work is the way in which Salvation Army officers are clergy who

⁶⁹¹ Geoffrey Rowell, "Afterword", in Christine Hall and Robert Hannaford (Ed.), *Order and Ministry*. Leominster, Gracewing, 1996, pp.161-162.

⁶⁹² Comparison of *Yearbook* figures show declining officer statistics in some Western territories and rising employee statistics. (Non-western countries' patterns differ.)

		Active Officers	Retired Officers	Employees
New Zealand	1984	403	168	569
	2004	374	187	2552
Norway	1984	387	266	451
	2004	199	252	1042
c.f.				
Zimbabwe	1984	242	71	355
	2004	456	105	1433
Korea	1984	317	45	236
	2004	522	115	377

are not clergy, the counterpoint is the phenomenon of officers who are not officers.

NCOs

In every army in the world, it is the NCOs who train the troops and hold them together and see themselves as the real leaders of the army. The Salvation Army soon found itself in need of such leaders. The purpose of this chapter is to trace the process by which elements of this unpaid, volunteer group evolved to become a paid, full-time parallel structure to officership, a pseudo-diaconate to a pseudo-priesthood maybe - and to examine the implications of this development.

At first the volunteer officials of the Mission, the Elders, Secretaries and the Treasurers, became the "local officers",⁶⁹³ or "petty officers" as the 1878 Orders and Regulations called them,⁶⁹⁴ the backbone of the corps, as distinct from those commissioned officers who were posted in and quite soon posted away again. One of the many anomalies of the rank structure is that in this Army the non-commissioned officers have usually been "commissioned" to their tasks. (Just as Presbyterians ordain Elders, while at pains to point out that their ordination differs from that of Presbyters.⁶⁹⁵)

Catherine Booth, in an address given at Cannon Street Hotel, March 20th 1883, having described their forces of voluntary speakers and evangelists (officers), said that, "God is showing us by circumstances the want of other kinds of officers. We have a new order of officers called 'Sergeants', who come between the corps and the paid officers, and we

⁶⁹³ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, p.177.

⁶⁹⁴ "N.C.O., Non-Commissioned, or Petty Officer, or simply 'officer', one not wholly employed in the service." *Orders and Regulations for The Salvation Army*, 1878, p.iv. The Salvation Army had a nautical flavour. Elijah Cadman's honorific of "captain" at the port of Whitby first arose from fishermen's usage and older Salvationists still today refer to the Commanding Officer as "skipper". Likewise the 1878 O's and R's refer to assistant officers as "Mates or Lieutenants". Sandall records the brief annals of the Salvation Navy consequent on John Cory's gift of the steam yacht *Iole* to William Booth in 1885. Sandall, *History*, II, pp.99-100.

⁶⁹⁵ Norman Pritchard, in William Tabbernee (Ed.), *Ministry in Australian Churches*: p.93.

hope soon to have a force of those who will systematically visit every public house in the country...”⁶⁹⁶ *The Doctrines and Disciplines* of 1881 already referred to the Colour-Sergeant and the Paymaster-Sergeant, amongst others.⁶⁹⁷ The idea must have been taken up enthusiastically, for the 1886 *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers* lists seventeen varieties of sergeants in its index.⁶⁹⁸

It is curious therefore to find *The Officer* remarking in 1893 that “The General feels very strongly that the missing link in our system is between the F.O. and the private soldier. We have perfected the F.O. and perfected the soldier, but what is needed is to hitch the one to the other. This he is confident can be done by means of the Company Sergeant.”⁶⁹⁹ With the abundance of sergeants already engaged, what was he thinking of? He may be describing the role of the Corps Sergeant Major, but that worthy had long since been gazetted.⁷⁰⁰ Alas, the proposal was not elaborated upon.

Envoys

The next development recorded was the introduction of “Envoys” – a rank seemingly more diplomatic than military. From 1893, in an endeavour to establish and maintain Salvation Army work in country villages too small to support officered corps, the Army began to set up “Circle Corps” to link together a number of village “societies” (a term inherited from Methodism). Meetings in these centres were led by “Local Specials” sent out from other Corps – hence eventually the term “envoy”. A February 1896 *War Cry* introduced the first of this rank, an ex-officer,

⁶⁹⁶ Catherine Booth, *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and State*, London, 1889, p.37. Clarence Wiseman, (General, 1974-77), quoted this passage “to show that in the early days, there was no distinction of spiritual status between ‘paid’ officers and ‘unpaid’ voluntary speakers, soldiers and sergeants.” *The Officer*, September 1969, p.587.

⁶⁹⁷ *Doctrines and Discipline of The Salvation Army*, pp.110-11.

⁶⁹⁸ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, pp.635-6.

⁶⁹⁹ *The Officer*, July 1893, p.201.

⁷⁰⁰ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, pp.177-8.

Dick Moses, asked by his D.O. to oversight the struggling outpost of Flushing.⁷⁰¹

In June 1896 *The War Cry* announced that “The new Circle Envoys are being made the most of and put on a proper footing. A commission and a bond are being drawn up for them. The bond will be signed by the British Commissioner, and for the Home Office by the Circle Secretary, and endorsed by the D.O. and the P.O. The Commission will also be signed by the Commissioner, so they will be commissioned direct from the Home Office like Secretaries and Treasurers.”⁷⁰² (It did not take long for this Army to spawn its own corps of babus.) A “General Order” published in the same organ prescribed a regulation badge to be worn on the right arm.⁷⁰³ In a supplementary book of regulations issued in 1896, Envoys appeared in Chapter XXXV, on “The Circle”. “Local Officers, who shall be known as Envoys, will assist in conducting the meetings at the different Societies composing the Circle. They may be men or women, and shall, as far as possible, be appointed two by two. A plan of meetings and appointments of Officers will be necessary, and shall be issued every quarter.”⁷⁰⁴

The Local Officer, describing “Envoys: Their Duties and Qualifications” explained that, “It is, in short, the old local-preacher system militarized and adapted to Army warfare.”⁷⁰⁵ This was a rare instance of a direct comparison being made between a “church” and an “Army” office, and an interesting assumption of the readers’ familiarity with a Methodist model. It also reveals the assumption that officers were thought of as equivalent to ministers.

⁷⁰¹ *The War Cry*, 29 February 1896 p.6, col.1.

⁷⁰² *ibid.* 27th June 1896, p.7, col.4.

⁷⁰³ *The War Cry*, 21 November 1896, p.8, col.1.

⁷⁰⁴ *The Why and Wherefore of The Salvation Army Regulations*, London, (undated but described as “just issued by the Publishing Department” in *The War Cry* of 30 May 1896, p.9, col.1.) p.93.

⁷⁰⁵ *The Local Officer*, November 1897, p.106.

Envoys would work under the direction of the D.O. and would fulfil at least three appointments per quarter.⁷⁰⁶ Shortly afterwards the same periodical noted that “One feature of the British Winter Campaign is the raising of 500 Envoys, in order that the thousands of English villages might hear the glad tidings... Up to the present only between four and five hundred men and women in all have been commissioned Envoys.”⁷⁰⁷ Week by week from 1896 *The War Cry* named new appointees, such as the 23 announced in the number of 13th November 1897. The impetus must have slackened, however, since a glossary in the 1906 Year Book stated that “There are at present 302 Envoys in Great Britain.”⁷⁰⁸ (Or perhaps their numbers had indeed proved a recruiting ground for Officers, as the General had hoped in the article referred to next.)

William Booth devoted four pages to Envoys in *The Local Officer* of January 1899, at which time he stated that the office of Envoy “was some six months ago created...” (Either the editor had been sitting on the article for a couple of years or the General was still not up with the play.) An important consideration for the cash-strapped Army was that “The Envoy will not require monetary support of any kind, seeing that like other Local Officers he either earns his own livelihood by the labour of his hands, or is possessed of some other means of subsistence... occasionally arrangements will be made by his Captain for the payment of Travelling Expenses.”⁷⁰⁹ (The inference being that it should not become habitual.)

The next step in the evolution of this subsidiary order of officers was proposed by Bramwell Booth in “The General’s Seventieth Birthday Manifesto,” twenty-five years later. Item three was “The establishment of a new order of officers – to be known as “Auxiliary Officers” – to be enlisted for a term of years rather than for life; a thousand such for the

⁷⁰⁶ *The Local Officer*, November 1897, p.106.

⁷⁰⁷ *ibid.* January 1898, p.169.

⁷⁰⁸ *The Salvation Army Year Book*, 1906, London, 1906, p.49.

⁷⁰⁹ William Booth, “The Envoy”, in *The Local Officer*, January, 1899, pp.161-4.

U.K. and a thousand for other European countries.”⁷¹⁰ It would be interesting to know what lay behind this proposal, and why it did not bear fruit for more than thirty more years.

Instead, it took another six years for a further, arguable, step in the deployment of Envoys to be made. The War Cry headed the announcement with “Envoys in Charge – First Commissions Issued”. The article went on, “Under the British Commissioner’s scheme for appointing Envoys in charge of The Army’s work in rural communities and other places where a full-time Officer cannot be stationed”, three Envoys were placed in charge of Societies. Envoys would wear Sergeant’s stripes with the word “Envoy” in wreath above. It was not spelt out how this differed from what had been happening for forty years because it was still the case that “The Envoy will receive no monetary consideration for his services.” Perhaps the heading to the article gave a clue: the novelty may have lain in the fact that these Envoys were permanently attached to a particular Society, in charge there, rather than peripatetic, based elsewhere. Indeed Envoy Mrs Davis of Penrhynduedraeth, Wales, was described as “a stalwart who for a number of years has carried on The Army’s activities in her neighbourhood.”⁷¹¹ If this were the case, “Envoy” became a less apt description. Possibly another novel feature lay in the proposal of training; Envoys “will be expected to take up ‘The Envoy’s Efficiency Course’, which consists of twelve months’ lessons.”⁷¹²

Two varieties of Envoys evolved. The first were the unpaid, part-time, volunteer variety, who were engaged in evangelical work, either in charge of smaller corps or outposts, or available for “supply” in the Methodist lay-preacher tradition. The second variety of Envoy were those in whole-time, paid employment in some branch of the Army’s work,

⁷¹⁰ Bramwell Booth in *The Salvation Army Year Book*, 1927, London, 1927, p.41.

⁷¹¹ Mrs Davies in fact ran the Corps, which her late husband had founded, without commission or remuneration for 40 years. (*The Officer*, December 1964, p.861.)

⁷¹² *The War Cry*, 7 January 1933, p.15, col.1.

sometimes in a “ministry” role of spiritual leadership and sometimes in some ancillary support role in clerical or social work.⁷¹³

In the case of the volunteers, the title of Envoy often appeared to be awarded as a token of esteem for a senior local officer rather than for any specific envoy-like errand. Envoy Olive Lord of Linwood, Christchurch, a long-serving worker amongst the youth of the Corps, would be an example. In the case of someone looking after an “outpost” or some other responsibility, the title was often retained as an honorific long after the person concerned had ceased to exercise the role. In New Zealand, an outstanding example of Envoy was Stephen Buick, a.k.a. the “Taranaki Prophet”, an ex-officer, who from 1887 until his death at the age of 93 sixty-five years later, visited the farmers of north Taranaki.⁷¹⁴ Another well-known Envoy from the 1940’s to 70’s was Hollis Reed, in private life a businessman, Wellington City Councillor and President of the New Zealand Manufacturers’ Association for some years, who in his spare time and at his own expense travelled the country with a remit to ginger up Youth Work. Others were Wes McMillan, public servant of Napier, whose activities involved “supply” and occasionally taking temporary charge of un-officered Corps mainly in Hawkes Bay, and Richard Sharp, public servant in Wellington and New Zealand diplomat in New York, Ottawa and San Francisco. Wally Morris, businessman in private life, had a brief as a national fundraising and property development consultant through the 1960’s to 90’s.

Envoys like Henry Milans, an American journalist, and Tamokichi Ohara, a Japanese pharmacist, achieved international reputation in the Salvation Army.⁷¹⁵ In Rhodesia in the 1960’s and 70’s Envoy Chasi was a successful builder who moved to a new satellite African township near

⁷¹³ The analogy with Wesley’s “lay preachers” holds good here, in that Methodism also distinguished between “lay speakers” or “exhorters” (part-time volunteers) and “lay preachers” (full-time, employed). (See James W. Laner and Roger D. Carlson, “A Brief History of the Office of Lay Speaker in the United Methodist Church and its Predecessor Bodies.” <http://layspeaking.org.history.htm>).

⁷¹⁴ Cyril Bradwell, *Fight the Good Fight*, Wellington, 1983, pp.73-4, 91.

⁷¹⁵ Herbert A Wisbey Jr., *Soldiers Without Swords*, New York, The Macmillan Coy., 1955, p.151. Albert Kenyon, *In High Esteem*, London, 1969, pp.67-70.

Harare and found there were no churches. By the time Headquarters were able to appoint regular officers, Chasi had recruited a Corps of two hundred uniformed soldiers, with a brass band, which met in a Hall of his own construction. Dr George Hazell, an educationalist, had a roving commission to support youth and children's ministry in Australia.⁷¹⁶

Some Envoys (of either volunteer or paid variety) were ex-officers who still felt a call to ministry. Some were younger people testing their vocation before becoming officers. Some were would-be officers who had not been accepted for training, for whom this ministry was a consolation prize (which meant they were loosed upon the world without training to do work for which they had been adjudged unsuitable to be trained.) Others again were people with a "late vocation", or who were not interested in becoming commissioned officers. Commissioner Stanley Walter, outlining "various distinctions" of service, described Envoys as people who did "not qualify for commissioning as officers because their training or abilities may be suitable for only one particular type of appointment, they may not be willing to be moved to a different location, their commitment may have limitations such as the need for part-time secular employment, and of course, their length of service is uncertain."⁷¹⁷

The other variety of Envoy, those in full-time paid service within the Army structure, were perhaps what Bramwell Booth had intended by "Auxiliary Officers" in 1927; it would have been less confusing had they retained that distinctive title instead of sharing the designation of Envoy. At least in New Zealand their advent appears to have been related to the wartime shortage of personnel for appointments. The first Envoy of this kind to be mentioned in the *Disposition of Forces*⁷¹⁸ was Envoy Farland,

⁷¹⁶ Visiting Indonesia Hazell discovered that there Envoys were a more lowly creature, the title being "limited to those whose education and other qualities fall below the minimum for officership, so that to be a well-educated Envoy was an oxymoron." They were puzzled that he was both an Envoy and a school principal. (Letter to writer, 18.07.03.)

⁷¹⁷ Stanley Walter, "Officership, It's Meaning and Theology", *The Officer*, September 1988, p.402.

⁷¹⁸ The annual *Disposition of Forces* is the Salvation Army equivalent of a clerical directory, listing officers under the heading of their appointments.

manager of the Wellington Men's Shelter and Labour Yard in 1939-40. The 1940 *Disposition of Forces* showed Envoys stationed at four Corps. 1944, four were listed as being in "War Work", which meant running canteens for the troops in military camps and at railway stations, and one in Public Relations. In 1948, four were leading Corps, two were in social appointments, two worked in "Trade" (the Army's supply company) and one in the property department at THQ. New Zealand Envoys I can remember from the late 1940's/early 1950's were John Beattie, who worked as cook at the Hodderville Boys' Home in the Waikato, Alex Coster, head shepherd at the Putaruru Training Farm and William Triplow, a builder, who served for several years as Territorial Property Inspector. In 1960, there were 9 Envoys of this kind serving in New Zealand: three working in Corps, four in Social Services and two on THQ.⁷¹⁹ From being a stopgap measure, Envoys had become part of the regular forces.

In New Zealand at least (and such regulations appeared to be at territorial discretion) by the 1970's these two varieties of Envoy, part-time volunteer and full-time employee, were distinguished as "Divisional" and "Territorial" Envoys. The former were appointed by Divisional Commanders and the latter from Territorial Headquarters. In the 1980's my brother-in-law, a businessman, was for a time a Divisional (Youth) Envoy in his spare time, while my father-in-law, employed full-time by the Salvation Army to manage a private hotel, was described as a Territorial Envoy. By 1985 the picture was complicated further by a distinction between full-time paid Divisional Envoys and volunteer unpaid Divisional Envoys.⁷²⁰ In New Zealand, the rank of Envoy as a designation for full-

⁷¹⁹ *New Zealand Disposition of Forces*, 1960. Various editions of the *Disposition of Forces* reveal curious anomalies, such as the appointment of "Hon. Captain" Winifred Samwell as Corps Officer at Waitara 1947-50. Archives files show that she began training as an officer in 1927 but did not complete the course because of poor eyesight. As an "Honorary Captain" she later "filled a gap" in Karori then in Waitara. Robert McCallum, upon discharge from the navy, became Corps Officer at Otahuhu as an Envoy in 1945, appeared in the 1946 *Disposition* as Hon. Captain and in 1948 as Captain.

⁷²⁰ New Zealand Minute ACE 0585, 9 May, 1985.

time, paid employees was finally phased out by the end of the century, with the people either retiring or becoming Auxiliary-Captains. Existing volunteer Envoys and retired employee Envoys retain the rank, although in the case of employed Envoys by this time the rank seemed to be associated with a particular appointment and lapsed when the person left it.⁷²¹

As was the case with the later Auxiliary-Captains, the ambiguous character of the Envoy's role sometimes led to uncertainty over the extent of their responsibilities, status and powers. A "name and address supplied" letter to *The Salvationist* from a volunteer, "Divisional Envoy" running a U.K. Corps in his spare-time noted that "In my corps I am not quite a soldier and neither am I an officer... There seems to be an obvious and definite split between officers and soldiers, or even soldier-leaders like myself... At divisional meetings, if I am able to attend, I feel that I am not treated entirely as a colleague."⁷²² A letter posted on the Salvation Army website by an American Envoy as late as 2000 drew attention to the fact that although acting in a full-time pastoral role as a Corps Officer, he was not empowered to solemnize marriages. "The biggest unanswered question is ordination. Commissioning ties into benefits (eventually), but ordination impacts ministry immediately. Many Envoys (myself included) who serve as Corps Officers are recognized by governmental authorities as having authority to marry and sign marriage certificates. But Policy prevents us from doing so unless we have a prior license from another ordaining body." He went on to enlarge on the pastoral handicap this entailed.⁷²³

⁷²¹ For example, John and Dawn Hoare of Wellington, who spent two years managing a Motel for the Army in Russell in the 1990's. From time to time over the years some full-time employees, usually in Social Institutions, were ranked as "sergeant". Two were recorded in the 1960 NZ Disposition of Forces. This rank was also discontinued here in the 1990's. Sergeant Jim Glander, working at Omahu Hostel in Wellington, told me that he was given a choice of alternative honorifics, and opted for "Orderly". International statistics as at 1 January 2002 still gave the number of "envoys/sergeants full time" as 1,130. (*The Army Scene*, Hong Kong, April, 2003, p.16.)

⁷²² *The Salvationist*, 30 January 1988, p.10.

⁷²³ Garry M. Sapper, USA Central Territory, on www.salvationarmy.org, 30/08/2000.

Auxiliary Captains

In the late 1950's Bramwell Booth's plan for the employment of a class of auxiliary officers resurfaced. It seems that at first British military nomenclature was intended, as a 1958 letter from Commissioner Edgar Grinstead (British Commissioner) to Lt.-Commissioner Reginald Woods (Literary Secretary at IHQ) expresses pleasure that "the proposal to appoint Warrant Officers will be proceeded with soon." He also encouraged "the full designation being used in conversation and certainly in public (not 'warrant' or 'WO' as in the forces)."⁷²⁴ However, the Minute from Chief of the Staff, when it appeared, concerned 'Auxiliary-Captains'.

The General has decided that Salvationists unable for valid and acceptable reasons to enter a training college but desirous of giving full-time service to The Salvation Army, may, while undertaking responsibility of a Corps, or serving in a similar capacity in Social or comparable work, receive the designation of Auxiliary Captain, provided they have been soldiers for at least two years and are over thirty five years of age.⁷²⁵ The designation of Auxiliary Captain must not be introduced into any territory, nor exceptions made to the foregoing conditions without the approval of the Chief of the Staff, who will also give directions as to the conditions of acceptance and service...⁷²⁶

The draft of the "Employment Statement" was adapted from that for Envoys and included: "I understand that although I may be required to perform duties of a religious nature, an Auxiliary Captain is not a Salvation Army Officer or a Minister of the Gospel of that branch of the Christian Church known as The Salvation Army, and that my appointment as an Auxiliary Captain does not entitle me to the rights and privileges of a Salvation Army officer." This interesting document implies that officers are ministers like those of other churches, but protects the clerical closed shop.⁷²⁷ In similar vein, a later but undated set of terms of reference

⁷²⁴ Edgar Grinstead, letter dated 22nd December, 1958. (Heritage Centre Archives.) Interestingly, an anonymous feature-writer in 1992 explained that "Salvation Army Auxiliary Captains would be better described as Warrant Officers – those who hold their office by warrant and are intermediate between commissioned and non-commissioned officers." *The Salvationist*, 1 February 1992, p.9.

⁷²⁵ The age above which candidates were ineligible for entry to the training college at that time.

⁷²⁶ Minute signed by William J. Dray, Chief of the Staff, dated 23 May 1959.

⁷²⁷ Draft "Employment Statement" in Heritage Centre Archives.

includes the clause: "Although an Auxiliary-Captain is not a commissioned officer of The Salvation Army, I understand that, as an Auxiliary-Captain, I may be required to perform duties and accept responsibilities which are usually performed by a commissioned officer to the extent that they may be performed by a lay person."⁷²⁸ The use of "lay" in this context also reveals an assumption about the clerical status of officers. A later writer asked, "What rights and privileges" are enjoyed by commissioned but not by warranted officers? "Research shows that question to be an unanswerable enigma. Possibly the sentence is intended to cover minor, localised limitations which may arise. In Scotland, for example, Auxiliary Captains may not conduct weddings."⁷²⁹

The "Memorandum of an Auxiliary Captain's Engagement with The Salvation Army" (1st January 1960), set out the conditions to be signed by applicants for Auxiliary Captaincy. Amongst significant points made in this document was the insistence that Auxiliary Captain, "it should be understood, is an appointment, not a rank." It also described such persons as, "undertaking as VOLUNTARY WORKERS (*sic*) full-time responsibility for the oversight of a Corps, or serving in a similar capacity in social or comparable work... They will receive a Warrant of Appointment, signed by the Territorial Leader... subject to Orders and Regulations for Officers where applicable [attention was drawn to the 'Undertakings' at this point]... will be regarded as self-employed... will be required to give full-time service to The Salvation Army and engage in no other occupation... both husband and wife will be required to sign the form of application." Although they would "receive a commencing subsistence allowance equivalent to that received by a commissioned officer of 3 years' service," they "will not be employed by the Army under a contract of service, and will have no legal rights to wages, their status as voluntary workers being in this respect the same as that of Officers."

⁷²⁸ "Agreement Between Applicant for Auxiliary-Captain and The Salvation Army", undated but including reference to Orders and Regulations Governing the Retirement of Auxiliary-Captains, 1963.

⁷²⁹ *The Salvationist*, 1 February 1992, p.10.

Men who had served 25 years before retirement and women who had served 20 years, would be permitted to retain the designation “Auxiliary Captain” in retirement. Applicants had to be at least 35 years of age; if after four years service they had at least 15 years to serve before the retirement ages of 65 for men and 60 for women, they could apply for commissioning to substantive rank as Captains, provided they had completed certain in-service training requirements.⁷³⁰

While the details of these conditions varied in time, the essentials remained unchanged for more than forty years; Auxiliary Captains were to enjoy all the disciplines, but were less certain of the “rights and privileges” (undefined) of Salvation Army Officers.

A Minute issued in 1972 provided the opportunity for “carefully selected” Auxiliary Captains and their wives to attain full status as officers. The conditions stated were that they should have done a minimum of four years service, been through the usual processes for the acceptance of officer-candidates, completed a correspondence course, undergone intensive residential training of at least three months and not be above 50 years of age nor within the usual age-span for training. Their commissioning was not to be included with that of cadets but recognised separately as the Territorial Commander may think appropriate.⁷³¹ The rank was not intended for short-term service as Envoyship could have been. The distinctive thing about Auxiliary Captains is that they wanted to be officers but were above the age for acceptance into training. Ideally then, their equivalent training was in-service over five years, after which they could apply for commissioning. In practice the quality of training offered varied widely from place to place and from time to time.

Towards the end of the 20th century in some Territories, like UK and USA Central, training was professionally managed. Without these late-vocation candidates, the officer shortage would have been much more severe. In 1990, 55 cadets entered the UK Officer Training College;

⁷³⁰ Document in Heritage Centre Archives.

⁷³¹ Minute 1972/IA/3 by the Chief of the Staff, Arnold Brown, dated 1 May, 1972.

45 Auxiliary Captains, aged 40 to 55, also began in-service training.⁷³² The age for acceptance to training college gradually crept upwards. When my father, aged 30, applied for training in New Zealand in 1936, permission had to be sought from London; by the end of the century the cut-off age was 50. The point of having Auxiliary Captains at all became obscure. Instead, beginning in the UK, flexible training for older candidates serving as “Cadet-Lieutenants” began to be introduced, with a combination of practical appointments with correspondence courses and residential block courses.

Auxiliary Captains appeared on the New Zealand scene in 1961, according to the annual *Disposition of Forces*. Up until 1974 this publication included a summary of the numbers of officers of each rank in the Territory. Curiously, this did not include the “officer wives”. Where the officers were married, wives were enumerated separately. The statistics shown for Auxiliary Captains in 1961 therefore presented as, “Auxiliary Captains, 1; Auxiliary Captain wives, 1.” In 1962 the figures were 5, and 3 wives; in 1963, 9 and 6 wives. The figures levelled off, then declined for some years, but by the late 1990s there were 22 Auxiliary Captains (including wives) in New Zealand, out of a total of 370 active officers.⁷³³ They served in a wide range of appointments; in pastoral, social and administrative work. With the revision of the rank system in 2002, all remaining Auxiliary Captains in New Zealand were commissioned with the substantive rank of Captain. In some Territories it is intended to phase the rank out over ten years.

McKinlay examines the conditions of Auxiliary Captaincy from an American perspective, the rank that was an “appointment” rather than a rank having been introduced in the United States as late as 1975. He notes that the innovation was “partly in response to the need for ethnic and other kinds of qualified leadership and partly to provide for converts who wanted to join the leadership team but were unable... to accept all

⁷³² *The Salvationist*, 1 February 1992, p.8.

⁷³³ An interesting example of rank discrimination is found in the fact that up until the practice ceased in 1979, Envoys were included in the *Disposition of Forces* under their appointments, but the rank did not appear in the statistical summary.

the requirements for full officership. In the first case the Army broadened the use of a category of employee that was legally empowered to function like an officer. The rank... was first used in 1975 to describe employees recognised as licensed ministers, but several important questions regarding the status of such persons for tax and other legal purposes were not finally resolved until the Army's legal counsel prepared a detailed clarifying document in 1981. It defined an Auxiliary Captain as "an individual who is unable, for valid and acceptable reasons, to become a candidate for commissioned officership in the Salvation Army, but who is otherwise qualified."⁷³⁴ In 1980 there were 137 persons in the two categories of Envoy and Auxiliary Captain in the American field, making up 4% of total full-time leadership personnel; by 1990 their numbers had increased 49% to 204 persons, or 6% of the total.⁷³⁵

A down side of this rank that was not a rank, for officers who were not officers, is that they, along with Envoys, were sometimes made to feel second-class by their soldiers, or even worse, by comrade officers. Occasionally this surfaced in print. *The Salvationist* article already cited mentioned that, "One of the group ... had met a soldier who said, 'Oh, but you're not really an officer, are you?' The unthinking remark touched a sore spot."⁷³⁶ Again, in a letter to the editor of *The Officer*, Mrs Captain Eva Phillips of Australia recalled that on the occasion of her commissioning (having been an Auxiliary Captain), she overheard another officer say in the foyer, "Anyone would think it was a proper commissioning! I'm off as soon as it starts..."⁷³⁷ As the person

⁷³⁴ Ed McKinley, *Marching to Glory*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2nd edn. 1995, p.329. The "valid and acceptable reason" was usually that the candidate was over 35 years of age, the cut-off age for admission to officer training school at that time. McKinley also refers to Envoys, as "full-time employees in local leadership positions who lack full officer privileges, and who, unlike auxiliary captains, are not eligible for promotion to commissioned status after a certain number of years of successful service."

⁷³⁵ Statistical Report to USA National Headquarters for the years ending 31 December 1980 and 31 December 1990. (USA National Archives.)

⁷³⁶ *The Salvationist*, 1 February 1992, p.9.

⁷³⁷ *The Officer*, July 1994, p.336.

responsible for Auxiliary Captains' training in New Zealand for several years, I heard similar dismaying reports.⁷³⁸

Not surprisingly in view of the international variety of interpretation of these appointments, discussion about their character continued. At the 1988 International Leaders' Conference there was some discussion about the difference between "warranting" and "commissioning". In some parts of the world auxiliary captains were apparently commissioned and it was asked why that should not be the case when local officers were said to be commissioned. In the USA auxiliary captains were not warranted but given a memorandum of appointment and licensed. Other inconsistencies were noted, such as that "auxiliary" implies "assistant" whereas auxiliary captains were often commanding officers. If the title were an appointment rather than a rank, how was it retained in retirement when the appointment was no longer held?

Commissioner Walter mentioned that, "There has been a strong plea from one Territorial Commander to dispense with various grades of officers, as he says a person is either worthy of an officer role or not."⁷³⁹ However, a proposal from the floor to do away with the distinction between captains and auxiliary captains "was not greeted with any enthusiasm."⁷⁴⁰ The question began to be asked more frequently, however. An *Officer* article by Lieutenant Gregory Van Brunt of USA argued strongly that "there is no difference, nor should any be made, between the two...The one noticeable difference... is in attendance at the school for officer training... what they miss at training is made up for in life-experience, seminars, and the equipping of the Holy Spirit... Why

⁷³⁸ For example, an Aux.-Captain asked to meet a homeward-bound missionary officer at the airport was greeted with, "I thought they would have sent a proper officer to meet me!"

⁷³⁹ Stanley Walter, *The Officer*, September 1988, p.401.

⁷⁴⁰ Minutes of the 1988 International Leaders' Conference, Session 1, pp.1-2. Heritage Centre Archives.

can't they sign the officers' covenant and receive an officer's commission, if they are doing the work of an officer?"⁷⁴¹

Short-term commissions

At the same time, the idea of short-term commissions – for “real” officers rather than second-class officers – began to be mentioned. One of the earlier protagonists was Major John Gowans, later to be General. In an early 1970's article he pointed out that many young people were willing to give service without tying themselves down to a lifetime commitment. He argued that shortage of candidates, the rate of resignation and the increasing dearth of officer-leadership in the United Kingdom all called for desperate measures. Further, given that two thirds of British officers resigned rather than retired from service, short-term commissions were already a reality.⁷⁴²

Reaction was not encouraging. Captain O.W. Akpan from Nigeria did “not see the need to make officership an easy ‘merry-go-round’ contract ... When God calls I believe He gives no limit, it is for all of life's span.” He did admit, however, “our service conditions contribute in some measure to officers deserting the ranks and many youths frowning at officership.”⁷⁴³ The economic conditions for officership made it difficult for people with extended-family responsibilities to commit themselves. For Major Stanley Richardson of the British Territory, although he supported such short-term opportunities being made available, the proposal raised fundamental questions about our understanding of officership. These included, “(1) Is the officer a ‘minister’ who, having received a specific calling, has made a total commitment? (2) Do we accept the fact of ‘ministry’ and ‘laity’? – terms which have no clear meaning in the Army. (3) Are the terms ‘the call’ and ‘covenant’, used regarding officership, now

⁷⁴¹ Gregory Van Brunt, “Auxiliary-Captains: are they officers or not?” *The Officer*, January 1993, pp.29-30.

⁷⁴² John Gowans, “Short Service Commissions”, *The Officer*, March 1971, pp.189-190, 193; John Gowans, “Short Term Commissions”, *Impact*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1973.

⁷⁴³ *The Officer*, December 1971, p.655.

redundant? (4) Do we base our practice on expediency or on the basis of scriptural teaching?"⁷⁴⁴ Mrs Colonel Rose Fleming of Ceylon wrote that "something in me trembles at the thought of young people entering training to become officers for a few stated years", and asked, "Is there no way in which officers can be convinced that theirs is not a job but a sacred calling?" She also believed that Auxiliary Captaincy already provided for short-term officership.⁷⁴⁵

However, twenty-five years later the question was still live. Lieutenant John Norton, a Canadian serving in the Republic of Georgia, suggested a "new complementary expression of officership..." which would enable people to "minister full-time under a different set of remuneration and commitment standards. These alternate officers would commit to the same spiritual and moral obligations as other officers but would not make the same life-time commitment and/or meet the same requirements as regular officership. These officers could be viewed as like military reserve officers." (Presumably equivalent to territorials in the N.Z. Army.) He felt this would "also answer the inherent paradox already in existence among the many soldier-employees who work for the Army."⁷⁴⁶ The question remained sufficiently live to be placed on the agenda of the International Commission on Officership in 1999, although, as we shall see, General John Gowans evidently felt unable then to implement his earlier proposal.

This survey of auxiliary officership raises questions about the connection between officer status and officer function. People enjoying a variety of status, as Envoys, Auxiliary Captains, Corps Leaders or soldiers without any conferment of rank, have discharged what appear to be the essential functions of officership. They have pastored, preached, taught, managed, led and acted as the focal bearers of the Salvation Army message, tradition and authority, either without rank or with a rank expressly designated as less than "clerical". At the same time, many

⁷⁴⁴ *ibid.*, December 1971, pp.655-6.

⁷⁴⁵ *ibid.*, January 1972, pp.37-8.

⁷⁴⁶ *The Officer*, September 1997, pp.46-7.

commissioned officers have over the years served in roles that did not include any of these activities. Their sole officer-distinction has been covenanted appointability. The traditional Salvation Army rubric, in distinction from the Church's clerical orders, is that "captain is as captain does."⁷⁴⁷ The exceptions, however, seem to be too numerous to prove the rule.

CANNON FODDER?

An outline of the history of auxiliary officership, in which we have seen that people who were soldiers rather than "real" officers, functioned as officers, leads us naturally to consider what The Salvation Army has said about its soldiers *per se*. How are they different from officers?

While we have approached this question as derivative from an investigation of ordained, officer ministry within The Salvation Army, it is helpful to remember that the last fifty years have seen a general reaction against this approach to the study of Church order within the ecumenical context. The World Council of Churches established a Department of the Laity in the late 1940's and for many years attempted to redress the balance so that ecclesiology was not seen as pertaining solely to the professional religious classes. Vatican II broke new ground for the Catholic Church in embracing in a new way the principle of the priesthood of all believers and grounding all Church office in the whole People of God.⁷⁴⁸ The Salvation Army's pragmatic ecclesiology had always been premised on this understanding – officers were soldiers before they were officers. The Territorial Commander is still a soldier at some Corps.

Thirty years ago a former editor of *The Officer* noted the decline in candidates for officership and the increase in Salvationist graduates taking up careers in service professions. At that time he felt that "the role of the corps officer as 'minister' is still clearly defined, except, possibly, as between full-time Envoys and part-time Envoys in charge of corps." But,

⁷⁴⁷ John Coutts, in "Captains for all Seasons?" *The Salvationist*, 27 May 2000.

⁷⁴⁸ *Lumen Gentium* Chapter II, in Austin Flannery (Ed.), *Vatican Council II: the Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Collegeville MINN, Liturgical Press, pp.359ff.

he asked, "Is not the distinction between officer and non-officer in the wider conception of ministry becoming more difficult to make? Are they not all 'on the field'? Maybe the Lord is calling us to analyse our distinctions a little more carefully."⁷⁴⁹

We have seen that in the early Salvation Army, before growing institutionalisation stratified the ranks and roles, there was a clearer recognition that all ranks were "laity"; all were the people of God, all were soldiers called equally to the battlefield. Bramwell Booth recalled,

The bishop, as my dear father used to say, has no advantage in this over the washerwoman; the poor Congo rubber-getter in his lash-driven toil may be as favoured in this respect as the refined aristocrat who profits by his far-off agony; the factory girl is on equality here with the doctor of divinity... You know how a thousand evidences have sprung up around us of the mighty results which have followed their witness... which we have seen, by the power of the Holy Ghost working through our people – whether separated and consecrated as leaders or not. Indeed, I am not sure that when the final account is taken it will not appear that the rank and file of the Army have done as much as, or more than, the officers.⁷⁵⁰

Bernard Watson observed that

the Army was certainly not created by an officer marching before and a mass of highly docile soldiery coming on behind. Sometimes the picture emerging from a study of Army history is of the soldiery advancing enthusiastically and the officer behind having a bit of a job to keep within shouting distance!⁷⁵¹

John Macquarrie had recognised much the same thing;

One thing that seems clearly demanded by the secularized situation of today is a fuller recognition and a higher valuation of the lay apostolate... We shall have to be prepared to recognize the Spirit's working outside of the usual ecclesiastical channels, and that we shall also need to be willing to give to the laity more initiative and responsibility than they have usually enjoyed. Both of these points can be illustrated by ... the Salvation Army.⁷⁵²

However, we have traced the gradual status-isation of the officers. What, during this process, was happening to the soldiers?

⁷⁴⁹ Lt. Colonel Eric Coward in *The Officer*, December 1973, p.550.

⁷⁵⁰ W. Bramwell Booth, *Talks With Officers*, London, 1921, p.14.

⁷⁵¹ Bernard Watson in *The Officer*, April 1970, p.265.

⁷⁵² John Macquarrie, *Principles of Christian Theology*, London, SCM, 1966, p.376.

Soldier attitudes

Firstly, they came to think of themselves as “laity”, and they came to expect of the officers the same kind of pastoral ministry they understood to be incumbent upon the clergy of the churches. David Stirling, writing to *The Salvationist*, perhaps encapsulated this attitude with the remark that he expected his officer to be the professional ministerial person, “my God-appointed priest.”⁷⁵³

Secondly, they increasingly viewed the officers as the professionals who were paid to evangelise the unconverted. Bernard Watson believed that the “imaginative, more independent freedom of action among our ‘laity’ declined in the days when the Army had to be organised more precisely and also, perhaps, because there were years when the Army in some countries had a full quota of candidates entering training.”⁷⁵⁴ From the Headquarters vantage point, officers were easier to control and had more time than the soldiers.

Social evolution reinforced this tendency. As the first generation of converts was followed by a second, and then a third, what Donald McGavran called “redemption and lift”⁷⁵⁵ took place. The children and grandchildren of those who had experienced the miracle of the changing of beer into furniture did not necessarily enjoy a vital conversion experience of their own. They grew up within the world of The Salvation Army and it was their familiar sub-culture, but they did not necessarily inherit the evangelical imperative.⁷⁵⁶ That could be left to the officer. Unfortunately, for many officers their time also tended to become wholly absorbed in looking after the soldiers and administering the machinery. It

⁷⁵³ *The Salvationist*, 12 September 1998, p.19.

⁷⁵⁴ Bernard Watson, *The Officer*, April 1970, p.264.

⁷⁵⁵ Donald McGavran, *Understanding Church Growth*, Grand Rapids MICH, Eerdmans, 1970, pp.262-75. See Bryan Wilson’s *Religion in Secular Society*, pp.107-11 for a succinct account of the process.

⁷⁵⁶ Commissioner Paul du Plessis writes, “I once did a survey of perceived ‘gifts’ in India and found a great shortage of that of evangelism! I suspect that may be a reflection of the increasingly ‘care’ orientation of the movement.” (Email to the writer, 13 May 2004.)

became less clear that anyone was actually minding the shop (the core business of evangelism).

One of the things that happened towards the end of the 19th century was the strong development of the Army's musical subculture – bands and songster brigades. Watson argued that “the allocation of large groups of men and women into the musical sections within the Army tended to diminish independent, imaginative, versatile action by non-officer Salvationists.”⁷⁵⁷ In the early Salvation Army meeting places, the Salvationists sat on the tiered platform, while the unsaved filled up the body of the hall. Those unsaved who came out to the Mercy Seat in due course took their places on the platform. In the course of evolution, however, the musical sections came to occupy the platform, and the remaining soldiers filled the seats left vacant below by the receding tide of popular interest. The ascendancy of these musical combinations in Britain and the “old Dominions” – Australia, New Zealand and Canada in particular – tended to relegate the congregation to an audience role, like the faithful at the Tridentine mass. As, with advancing years and a changing society, that audience too diminished, the band could be left playing to the songsters and the songsters singing to the band. For many Salvationists, “evangelism” came to mean the band playing hymn-tunes in the street, in a tight circle facing inwards towards the bandmaster, with backs to the audience.

What was true of the “field” (that is, the evangelical, church-oriented work of the Army) was also the case in social work. Amongst the pioneers of Salvation Army social work had been ordinary Salvationists who saw a need and did something. In Britain a Mrs Cottrill of Whitechapel, London, started taking straying girls into her home in the early 1880's.⁷⁵⁸ In New Zealand Mrs Rudman and Mrs Hawker in Wellington and the Brownlie sisters in Dunedin undertook the same work.⁷⁵⁹ Inevitably such work grew too large to be undertaken by private

⁷⁵⁷ Bernard Watson, *The Officer*, April 1970, p.264.

⁷⁵⁸ Robert Sandall, *History*, 3, p.15.

⁷⁵⁹ Cyril Bradwell, *Fight the Good Fight*, Wellington, Reed, 1983, p.50.

individuals and was taken over by the organisation, growing into an official and comprehensive social programme, staffed mainly by officers, who became the professionals, paid to care for the needy. It did not take many years for the Social wing to take on an existence almost independent of the Field (church) activities of the Army, particularly after the launching of the “Darkest England” scheme in 1890 and the requirement that social funds be kept separate from those of the field. Social officers were at first trained separately from those intended for the Field, and officers tended to spend their careers in one or the other branch of the service.

The tradition of lay-initiative has never been entirely lost, as exemplified by Envoy David Ndoda of Bulawayo, Zimbabwe, who at his own volition and expense founded a home for orphans after the *chimurenga* of the 1970's⁷⁶⁰, and some non-officer staff have always been employed in social work over the years. However it is only within the past twenty years that serious efforts have been made to reintegrate the differing expressions of the Army's ministry. Soldiers generally have only recently, in some places, begun to reassume interest in and ownership of social work in a voluntary capacity, or, increasingly, as paid employees.

Officer attitudes

These developments, contributing to a widening gulf between the concerns and preoccupations of officers on the one hand and soldiers on the other, also had consequences in the attitude of officers, perhaps especially corps officers, towards soldiers. A broad divide may be discerned between

- Seeing soldiers as “cannon-fodder”, whose role is to be occupied so far as possible in Army activities, building the Salvation Army institution.

⁷⁶⁰ Ndoda's citation for the award of Order of the Founder in 1997 read, “His service as a Salvation Army school teacher, YP local officer and Corps Officer spanned 50 years. In retirement this service reached its peak in caring for those marginalised by society, caring sacrificially for homeless street children, providing shelter and education and seeking to restore them to families and mainstream community.” (1999 *Yearbook*.)

- Viewing soldiers as the front line of evangelism, outside the organisation's official structure and programme, to be resourced and supported as well as led, in building the Kingdom of God.

These points of view represent a divide between the tendency to "clericalise" the "laity" and the recognition of a distinct "lay apostolate". Both have been strongly represented over the years.

The view that the soldiers should be fully engaged in the work of the Salvation Army grew out of two things. Firstly, converts from the kind of social milieu common to many early Salvationists lost their friends and interests with conversion, and had to replace them. The Corps became their new way of life. The dynamic is similar to that in Alcoholics Anonymous, where neophytes are urged to attend, if possible, "ninety meetings in ninety days". A new circle of friends and activities has to be substituted for one now perceived as unsafe. In the same way, in the Army, both the converts and their leaders were so filled with enthusiasm that attending Salvation Army activities every night of the week seemed the most desirable thing possible. Inevitably, as they lost touch with the "world", they were absorbed into what became in time a semi-autonomous religious sub-culture.

Secondly, the expanding Army needed the manpower. Bramwell Booth wrote, "Every soldier is expected to do something of the collecting, the cleaning, the visiting, the band playing, the caring for the children, the seeking after our lost sheep, and the score of other duties demanding attention. Tens of thousands of our soldiers devote every moment snatched from their daily labour to the work of their Corps. They delight that it should be so. Many of them owe to the Army everything they possess of happiness in this life, and all they can look forward to, of peace in the life to come. In no unimportant sense, it is their mother. It is their home. It is their friend. It is their recreation. It is the embodiment of all that ennobles and elevates their lives."⁷⁶¹

Colonel Alex Nicol, according to Frederick Booth Tucker, suggested to the Founder that the Army should have an internal, spiritual

⁷⁶¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p.23.

“Labour Bureau” (it had pioneered the idea of a Labour Exchange for unemployed people in 1890 as part of the ‘Darkest England’ scheme) “for soldiers who were willing to work but had nothing to do. However, it has now been decided that the census meeting of each corps should, for the present, undertake the additional duties of a Labour Bureau.”⁷⁶²

A paradox may be seen at work, in that on the one hand the soldiers were to be set to work in ministry, while some also came to regard ministry as the exclusive responsibility of the officers. All of these are generalisations of course; both voices continued to be heard, and in recent years there has been a renewal of the understanding that pastoral care is a joint responsibility. For example 1991 *Salvationist* correspondent, I.W. Kennedy, asked for the principle of the priesthood of all believers to be explained in some publication as “this biblical principle is surrounded by confusion in our movement with its military terminology and distinction between officers and soldiers”. It was suggested that “lay personnel beyond the realm of local officership and envoyship could play an increased role in pastoral care. It might be one answer to the reduced intake at the Training College.”⁷⁶³ In New Zealand at any rate the recent proliferation of lay pastoral teams within Corps has been accompanied by complaints that the officer never visits. (A complaint not restricted to Salvation Army congregations.⁷⁶⁴)

Quotes like those from Bramwell Booth and Nicol, above, might give the impression that secular work was simply a means to the end of being able to devote the rest of one’s time to the War, or at most provided further opportunities for witness to fellow-workers, rather than being a God-given vocation in its own right. Roy Terry, writing in *Magazine* in 1963, lamented that “Even our active laymen are mostly, to use Hendrik

⁷⁶² *The Officer*, June 1893, p.176. (The Census Board, made up of the senior Local Officers in a Corps were equivalent to Elders in a church. Strictly speaking, their task was to maintain and review the rolls.)

⁷⁶³ *The Salvationist*, 28 September 1991, p.11.

⁷⁶⁴ See Penny Jamieson, *Living at the Edge*. London, Mowbray 1997, p.54. “As a bishop I have had more letters than I could wish for from parishioners who find fault with their vicar... Generally it is a failure to visit or to respond in some way to a need.”

Kraemer's phrase, 'clericalised laity'. Most lay Salvationist activity is specifically 'religious' activity – keeping the organisational works going, and while there are Salvationists active in the world at large (whose lives do not revolve solely around the S.A. hall) they don't seem to receive much encouragement from officialdom, still less any constructive help."⁷⁶⁵

Admittedly William Booth wrote a series of letters about "work" in the *War Cry* and the *Social Gazette*, later collected in a volume on "Religion for Every Day". In these he encouraged Salvationists to think of work as of value in itself, "good and honest work, honourable in the sight of God, and serviceable to your fellow-men."⁷⁶⁶ However it is true that the main focus on the workplace in Salvation Army writing has been related to the soldiers' witnessing. At least this angle did acknowledge that soldiers' lives were not simply coextensive with the organised Corps programme.

Appreciation of the fact that non-officers are the people nearest the front line tends to be mentioned more often in recent material than in the earlier records. The reason may be that in the early Army it was taken for granted; only with the institutionalising of the officer/soldier roles, and the focus on that of the officer, has it been necessary to re-emphasise the theory to redress an imbalance.

Wilfred Kitching referred to Salvationists in industry as "the 'paratroops for the Kingdom', the behind-the-lines fighters."⁷⁶⁷ He also recounted the story of how "in the early days of the second world war negotiations were being conducted with a high ranking military officer on the issue of appointing a number of Salvation Army officers as chaplains in the British Army. The negotiations were not entirely successful but what pregnant truth there was in the observation of the military officer

⁷⁶⁵ *Magazine*, October 1963 p13 (Quoting Kraemer, *A Theology of the Laity*, p.167.) A New Zealand Salvationist, Ian Brooks, elected a Member of Parliament in the 1960's, apparently found that his comrades in the Corps at Blenheim were puzzled by his ceasing to attend their mid-week Bible study.

⁷⁶⁶ William Booth, *Letters to Salvationists on Religion for Every Day*, London, 1902, reprinted Atlanta, 1987, p.29.

⁷⁶⁷ Wilfred Kitching, *Soldier of Salvation*, London, 1963, p.55.

when he said, 'Should you be unduly troubled if none of your officers are appointed as chaplains; for surely if every Salvation Army soldier in our ranks lives up to what I imagine are his convictions, he will always as need arises be an unofficial chaplain?'"⁷⁶⁸

Philip Needham, in a 1965 article, made an impassioned protest against clericalism in the Salvation Army and the systematic officer-recruitment of all the most promising soldiers. He felt it reflected an overriding concern for the continuation of the institution rather than a commitment to its mission. "There is a sacred aura about officership, that is, the complete identification with the sacred institution. It is as though the Army were God's right hand. That we refer to officership as 'full-time service' is a gross perversion of the Christian faith. If there is any full-time Christian service, it is in the life of the laymen in the world. The particular and inherent weakness of a professional clergy – and this is particularly true of the Army – is that it is not full-time Christian service."⁷⁶⁹

Correspondence in *The Salvationist* has occasionally focussed on the 'them and us' aspect of officer-soldier relationships. A letter from J. R. Anderson complained that obituaries of officers were illustrated with photographs while those of soldiers were not: "You should know how the rank and file of the Army feel about it."⁷⁷⁰ G.W. Lesworthy of Florida, drawing on 50 years' experience of soldiership in Britain and the USA, complained of the "shunting aside of the soldiers... You stress 'officership' so much that soldiers have no choice but to feel 'put down'".⁷⁷¹ This was denied by Margaret Songer of California, who hadn't

⁷⁶⁸ Wilfred Kitching, "The Salvationist in Industry", *The Officer*, January-February 1959, p.4. In fact the first admission to the Order of the Founder, instituted in 1917 to recognise service which "would have specially recommended itself to the Founder," was of "Private Bourne (United Kingdom) for manifestation of out-and-out Salvationism whilst on active service with the Forces in France, which gained for him the title of 'Unofficial Chaplain' of his battalion." *Yearbook*, 1921, p.25

⁷⁶⁹ Philip Needham, in *New Soldiers*, Spring 1965, p.43.

⁷⁷⁰ *The Salvationist*, 3 January 1987, p.10.

⁷⁷¹ *ibid.*, 5 December 1987, p.12.

seen anyone “put down for being ‘only’ a soldier.”⁷⁷² Editorial comment regretted any polarisation, especially “since the Salvation Army advocates the priesthood of all believers and is essentially a lay movement seeking the evangelisation of the people by the people.”⁷⁷³ A decade later Graham Millar, having been an officer for 23 years, then a soldier, and then writing from the perspective of a soldier leading a Corps, had come to the conclusion that the Army existed for the Officers, was “officer-centred”. Colonel Glen France, writing in the same number of *The Officer* expressed a similar point of view. He reported a local officer as saying, “...It’s an officer’s Army. What are you going to do about it?”⁷⁷⁴

Unintended slights can be built into the system, such as in the “Bulletins” issued from Headquarters when for example some Salvationist dies – the names of next-of-kin who are officers may be mentioned while their non-officer siblings are not. Or the statement in the 1987 version of the *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers* giving less than generous recognition to vocations other than clerical with, “No call can be more important than that to officership.”⁷⁷⁵ Or when in a *War Cry* article appealing for candidates for officership, a Territorial Commander suggested that people who have achieved secular goals might now “move from success to significance”, quite unconscious of the slight implied on those fulfilling a different calling.⁷⁷⁶ Norman Murdoch also draws attention to the way in which official histories can minimize non-officer initiative, emphasising for example Railton’s official 1880 invasion of the USA, while downplaying Eliza Shirley’s independent enterprise in

⁷⁷² *ibid.* 30 January 1988 p11

⁷⁷³ *ibid.*, 6 February 1988, p.2.

⁷⁷⁴ *The Officer*, October 1999, pp.22-3. Graham Millar was stationed at Mana Corps. It is salutary to compare these remarks with the opinion of Thomas O’Dea, quoted above on [p.158](#).

⁷⁷⁵ *Chosen To Be a Soldier*, London, 1987, Chap. IX, Section 6, p.79.

⁷⁷⁶ *The War Cry* (New Zealand), 11 August 2001, p.14.

1879 and largely ignoring the significance of James Jermy's 1872 free-lance Christian Mission effort.⁷⁷⁷

Commissioner Edward Carey, speaking on the significance of "Layman's Councils", quoted Harvey Cox: "The clergy serve as 'ministers to the ministers', as kitchen troops in the divine army. And kitchen troops should be court-martialed if they confuse the fighting men either by adjuring them to spend more and more time in the mess hall, or by implying repetitiously that the only true job in the army is that of the kitchen officer while the rest are not really full time." Carey asked, "Wouldn't it be the supreme irony if we, in the Army that brought the layman to a new sense of involvement in the supreme task of making the Gospel of Jesus Christ relevant to ordinary people in the ordinary pursuits of life, should now back away from the challenge of a greater sphere, a greater usefulness for talented, dedicated Christian soldiers at the very moment in time when other churches are responding?"⁷⁷⁸ From time to time other writers have addressed the same point.⁷⁷⁹

A voice in council

As well as the question of how far the soldiers should be involved in the fighting, the question has also arisen as to whether they should have a part in the direction of the War. Norman Murdoch observes that Booth's assumption of total control ran counter to the democratisation of western society.⁷⁸⁰ (Notwithstanding that the years since have seen periods of totalitarian rule in Europe as elsewhere.) Soldiers simply did

⁷⁷⁷ Norman Murdoch in *Ohio Academy of History Newsletter*, May 1987, pp.12-3.

⁷⁷⁸ Edward Carey, Minutes of the 1969 Commissioners' Conference, p.28.

⁷⁷⁹ For example, Alan Steven, "Mobilisation of the Laity", *The Officer*, February 1990, pp.93-6; Cecil Waters, "All Christians Called to be Full-time", *The Salvationist*, 25 November 2000, p.21; Phil Wall, 'Work Place Warriors', in a four part series in *The Salvationist* in November 2001.

⁷⁸⁰ Hattersley suggests the reason was to do with class – middle-class Methodism was becoming democratic while working-class Salvationism was still autocratic. (Roy Hattersley, *Blood & Fire*, p.225.) The Army's polity has not been able to respond so easily to social change however, because of the absence of any formal representative mechanisms.

not have any voice in council. Cyril Bradwell, writing of the deposition of Bramwell Booth, describes how "In June 1928 thirty-one leading officers in New Zealand despatched letters to General Booth urging him to agree to some modification of his powers. The rank and file Salvationists in this country were never consulted and never informed, even after the deposition, of this step."⁷⁸¹

A telling admission allegedly by the retired General Albert Orsborn in 1963 encapsulated the hierarchy's clericalist mindset. Roy Terry wrote, "That the Salvationist layman has always been passive and receptive was shown recently at a London Regional meeting (of the Students' Fellowship), reported in *Vanguard* (a Salvation Army youth periodical), where General Orsborn is said to have deplored the tendency among the present-day youth of the Army to ask questions, and to have affirmed his belief that the motto of the Salvationist layman has always been, and should remain so in the future, 'Ours not to reason why'."⁷⁸² Philip Needham, in the article already quoted, stated that, "if the Army's soldiery were to become once more a truly Christian lay movement, the Army's official power structure would change accordingly... There is a danger, of course, that the Army's official leaders will have identified themselves so closely with the Army's power structures that reform would meet with misunderstanding and ever active opposition."⁷⁸³

Nevertheless, 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 local and territorial level. Perhaps the American innovation of Advisory Boards – bodies of well-disposed and preferably wealthy and influential non-salvationists who were invited to support with expertise and fund-

⁷⁸¹ Cyril Bradwell, Unpublished MA thesis, *Outline History of The Salvation Army in New Zealand*, Canterbury University College, 1950, pp.91-2.

⁷⁸² *Magazine*, February 1963, censored supplement p.(iv). However, the words attributed to Orsborn by Terry are not found in the *Vanguard* report of this meeting (March 1962, pp.13-16 and May 1962, pp.20-24), suggesting that either Terry had been misinformed or that *Vanguard* had exercised editorial discretion. In fact, Orsborn was quoted as saying that "questions are a healthy sign."

⁷⁸³ Philip Needham, *New Soldiers*, p.44.

raising the activities of the Army⁷⁸⁴ – led to questions about why soldiers could not have similar input into the affairs of their own organisation. Corps Councils were the outcome, in the late 1950's.⁷⁸⁵ A Commission on Corps Councils had reported and General Kitching was able to tell the 1958 International Conference of Commissioners that a Minute would be issued on the subject. The resulting bodies consisted of the senior local officers of a Corps, plus a few other soldiers or adherents or supporters, chaired by the Corps Officer. Personnel are not elected, but appointed by the Corps Officer, the names needing to be approved by the Divisional Commander. A Council's role is advisory only; decision-making is the prerogative of the officer. Decisions, or recommendations, are by consensus, not by voting. The system at least provides a forum where matters concerning the Corps can be discussed. Of course, Salvation Army faith communities, like any other, have their power-brokers – a wise officer will work with them if he wants an easy ride. Or wants to get anything done.

In New Zealand Commissioner A.J. Gilliard convened a successful series of Local Officers' residential Councils – as Cyril Bradwell says, Gilliard was rare in believing that it might be important to discover what the rank and file were thinking.⁷⁸⁶ However, his successors did not attempt to institutionalise this development, and the leading "laity" were left feeling that they could keep on saying the same things but that no one would do anything about them.⁷⁸⁷ In an article on "Laos – the Whole People of God", New Zealander Max Cresswell appealed against the attitude "which says, 'If you want to influence Army affairs, then you should become an officer.'" He urged that "soldiers should be enabled to

⁷⁸⁴ In New Zealand, the first such board was established for the Putaruru Training Farm, in 1951.

⁷⁸⁵ *Orders and Regulations for Governing a Corps Council* were issued by IHQ, 21 January 1959.

⁷⁸⁶ C.R. Bradwell, *Touched with Splendour*, Wellington, Flag Publications, 2003, p.149.

⁷⁸⁷ Long-serving local officer, Dixon McMillan of Wellington, in conversation with the writer, and recalling his father's generation's similar impressions from forty years earlier.

make their views known on any subject or plan of action, and that existing boards and councils should be enlarged to include suitable lay Salvationists, including those bodies responsible for officer appointments.”⁷⁸⁸

A Canadian initiative in 1966 was the Advisory Council of Salvation Army Laymen, or ACSAL, which operated on both regional and national levels. The Territorial Commander, Commissioner Clarence Wiseman, characterised this development in an Officer article as “Coming of Age – A study of Salvation Army Soldiership in the latter twentieth century.”⁷⁸⁹ This example was followed in a number of other Territories, such as Australia, New Zealand, the United States, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The New Zealand ACSAL was prompted by Dr Len Sampson, a New Zealand educationist working in Vancouver, who wrote to a number of influential Salvationist soldiers in New Zealand urging that the Canadian example be followed. The idea was taken up by Commissioner Charles Davidson, Territorial Commander, in 1968. Membership was limited to three years which meant that a large number of Salvationists were able to have the opportunity to serve on this council and have direct consultation with the Territorial Commander and Chief Secretary. It did not endure, however. In the words of sometime member, Cyril Bradwell, “the abolition of the Council in the late 1990s appeared regrettable and somewhat arbitrary, with no clear rationale promulgated.”⁷⁹⁰ Such a development illustrates how vulnerable innovations might be when lacking any constitutional base.⁷⁹¹

⁷⁸⁸ *Magazine*, June, 1962, pp.3-7.

⁷⁸⁹ *The Officer*, September 1969, pp.586-90. In his autobiography, Wiseman attributed ACSAL itself to “lay” initiative. It “grew out of the concern of a few soldiers who felt that some method should be developed so that the Army could benefit from the knowledge and experience of Salvationists holding positions of responsibility in the secular world.” (Clarence Wiseman, *A Burning in My Bones*. Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979, p.166.)

⁷⁹⁰ C.R. Bradwell, *Touched with Splendour*, p.319.

⁷⁹¹ Peter Price refers to the same vulnerability in 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

In 1969, Commissioner Carey, USA National Commander, mentioned that the National Layman's Commission was being disbanded and Territorial and maybe Divisional Commissions were being established instead to allow for broader representation and more frequent meetings. He noted that any recommendations of national import could be referred to the national Commissioners' Conference, "so that the lay voice will still be heard in the top policy body of the Salvation Army in the USA."⁷⁹² (Perhaps more a *bat-kol* – the "daughter of the voice", or echo, than a voice?) In the non- western world, more conservative attitudes prevailed. At the 1971 International Conference of Leader's Commissioner Chun of Korea expressed himself anxious that the proceedings relating to Advisory Councils should not be publicised – the Minutes record that "he felt the repercussions might be greater than he could hold."⁷⁹³

By this time Wiseman, now General, had had further thoughts on ACSAL, and concluded that the separation of officers from non-officers "was in violation of a very important theological principle... To have segregated groupings is really in violation of the concept of the priesthood of all believers." He had met with ACSAL groups in Canada and persuaded them that this was the case and "thereafter Officers came officially on to the ACSAL."⁷⁹⁴ Not all those with existing lay consultative Councils were persuaded on that occasion, however, and some hoped there would be time allowed for integration.

In 1978 the USA Western Territory initiated a Territorial Laymen and Officers' Council. In 1989 a significant USA National Forum was held, with both officers and soldiers involved.⁷⁹⁵ The British *Salvationist* reported in 1990 that an Advisory Council had been set up for the

dismantled at will." 'Vatican II: End of a Clerical Church?(1) in *Australian Ejournal of Theology*, http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_1Price.htm.

⁷⁹² Edward Carey, Minutes of 1969 Commissioners' Conference, p.27.

⁷⁹³ Minutes of the 1971 International Council of Leaders, p.53.

⁷⁹⁴ *ibid.*, p.54.

⁷⁹⁵ Garipey, *History*, 8, p.184.

territory, mainly made up from soldiery chosen from each of the territory's 21 Divisions. It described this as the "latest move in the territory's consultative process, which includes Corps Councils and Divisional Advisory Councils."⁷⁹⁶ A body involving both officer and non-officer representation in New Zealand was the Public Questions Board, established in the early 1960's by the innovative and far-seeing Commissioner A.J. Gilliard.⁷⁹⁷ This Board was able to make representations to the Territorial Commander on social issues and proposed legislative changes by Government. It had a rather chequered history; like the Cheshire cat, sometimes there was only the grin, as successive Territorial Commanders valued it to differing degrees. In recent years it has been known as the Moral and Social Issues Council, to bring it into line with comparable bodies in other Salvation Army territories.

Background study material circulated before the 1991 International Conference of Leaders included a section on "Making the Best Use of Soldiery". Recommendations were requested on, amongst other things, "The need for soldiers and local officers to have greater involvement in the decision-making processes of the Army." The paper also suggested that "the danger we are in today is that we are rapidly becoming an Army of, by, and for officers. We are in imminent danger of toppling from the disease of 'executivitis'." The comment was made that "in some parts of the world dialogue between officers and soldiery does not take place because of lack of knowledge of the consultative process – they only know autocratic leadership... Soldiers should be included in the consultative process at corps, divisional and territorial levels."⁷⁹⁸

Shortly after his election as General in 1994, Paul Rader also expressed his support for consultative leadership. He expressed his

⁷⁹⁶ *The Salvationist*, 20 January 1990, pp.1,4.

⁷⁹⁷ C.R. Bradwell, *Touched with Splendour*, p.284-5.

⁷⁹⁸ 1991 International Conference of Leaders file, Heritage Centre, Background papers, pp.54-5.

intention to “encourage the active participation of lay Salvationists in the whole area of the Army’s policy development and implementation of our mission.”⁷⁹⁹

Some moves were forced upon the organisation by outside pressures. Following a fraud case in 1992 when some funds of the UK Army were invested offshore and disappeared from sight (fortunately to be wholly retrieved some years later after painstaking detective work)⁸⁰⁰, the Charity Commissioners insisted on significant reforms in the Territory’s financial systems. A working party of Salvation Army and Charity Commission representatives ushered in a new era when qualified non-officer Salvationists and even non-Salvationists were appointed along with officers as Directors of the Army’s Trustee Company.⁸⁰¹

Soldiers in Officer Roles

The moves towards soldiers being involved in consultation and decision-making described so far assume the scenario of soldiers giving of their spare time on a voluntary basis to these ends. It is necessary to look also at the scenario to which Lieutenant Norton referred⁸⁰² – of soldiers in Salvation Army employment. Norton’s point was not just that soldiers were employed by the Army – that had been true from the earliest days. Some of these spent a lifetime in the Army’s service, filling very responsible roles, especially financial ones. Alf Andrews, a veteran member of the Finance Department, was said to have reconstructed virtually all the destroyed IHQ account books following the blitz. Eric Hoy was appointed the first non-officer manager of the Reliance Bank at IHQ in the 1970’s.⁸⁰³ The difference was that soldiers (not just in the guise of Envoys or auxiliary officers) were now being employed in ministry and

⁷⁹⁹ *The War Cry* (USA) 21 January 1995, p.7.

⁸⁰⁰ Henry Gariepy, *History*, 8, pp.278-9.

⁸⁰¹ *The Salvationist*, 2 November, 1996, pp.8-9.

⁸⁰² [See page 273, above.](#)

⁸⁰³ Gordon Sharp, “I brought my nets with me”, in *The Salvationist*, 24 October 1998.

administrative roles, hitherto reserved for commissioned officers, or at least for auxiliary officers. By the 1990's this was indeed a growing phenomenon – though not a particularly new one. At the 1971 International Commissioner's Conference, Frederick Adlam from Rhodesia had commented that, "In Rhodesia we do not have the rank of Auxiliary Captain but have fifty married Salvationists who are Corps Leaders. They are headmasters of schools where they work and run the Corps. Some are better run than Corps where there are officers."⁸⁰⁴

The "first world" Army was slower in adopting such expedients, although people had begun to call for them. Ron Woodcock, writing in *The Salvationist* in 1987, wrote, "Many times I have suggested that an officer should have the oversight of two or three small corps which would be run by soldiers. Laymen run churches in the Methodist and Congregational Churches. Sure we have nothing to lose and much to gain."⁸⁰⁵ Robert Docter in *New Frontier* in 1988 wrote of the need "to use the professional skills of non-officer laymen who want to serve God with their skills in the Army."⁸⁰⁶ In answer to a letter from Frank Boorman on the need to make better use of Officer Training College facilities by training "lay" Salvationists, the Principal of the International Training College, Colonel John Larsson, explained how Auxiliary Captains made use of the College. He added that the letter raised "matters that would need resolution for more to be done... The Army does not at present work with team ministries of full-time non-officer personnel."⁸⁰⁷

That statement was increasingly less likely to be accurate towards the end of the century. In New Zealand the trend probably began with the appointment of Youth Workers, attached to Divisions or Corps. Graham Goodisson for example spent fourteen years in this role, beginning in 1987 as a trainee SAYSO (Salvation Army Youth Service Opportunity)

⁸⁰⁴ Minutes of 1971 International Commissioners' Conference, Heritage Centre Archives.

⁸⁰⁵ *The Salvationist*, 26 December 1987, p.10.

⁸⁰⁶ *New Frontier*, 11 May 1988, p.7.

⁸⁰⁷ *The Salvationist*, 4 October 1986, p.2.

worker with Southern DHQ for two years. Twelve years followed with Wellington City Corps, six in a pastoral role with young people within the Corps (church), and six in “Community Youth Work”, which included building up a staff of six youth workers and establishing a youth-focused satellite faith community. Over the course of 15 years well over a hundred young New Zealand Salvationists have served in such roles for varying lengths of time. Over the same period an increasing number of larger Corps employed full-time non-officer pastoral workers or “Corps Assistants”, usually second career, late-vocation people recruited from within the congregation. Tony Grant of Palmerston North, for example, has worked in this capacity since retiring from secular employment in 1997, and Colin Davidson as Manager of Community and Family Services in the same Corps since 1996. The shortage of commissioned officers has also meant that responsibility for the leadership of some smaller Corps has devolved upon full-time, employed soldier “Corps Leaders”, sometimes styled “Divisional Assistants”. Michael and Sharryn McAuliffe led the Dannevirke Corps without rank from 1996 and with the rank of Lieutenant from 2003.

Not being subject to the appointability of officers, such non-officer pastoral ministers have tended to serve longer in the same appointments than officers do. Their pastoral relationship with people has also led to questions about how far they can exercise traditionally officer or clerical roles, such as the solemnisation of marriages.⁸⁰⁸ Faced with requests that such non-officers be licensed as marriage celebrants the New Zealand Territorial Co-ordination Council went as far as requesting the Secretary for Personnel to draw up guidelines for such authorisation but these were not issued. Of people already mentioned, Graham Goodisson was licensed as a celebrant under the umbrella of another denomination; Tony Grant did not persist with his application after finding his Commanding Officer opposed to the idea. Others have resorted to the

⁸⁰⁸ “Some denominations provide for the appointment of non-clergy marriage celebrants, e.g. New Life [Churches] will appoint suitable persons as celebrants provided a member church is their sponsor.” (Circular for *Prepare/Enrich New Zealand* by National Co-ordinator Max Palmer, July 2003.)

expedient of officiating at weddings while having an authorised celebrant sign the register. This practice has attracted the attention of the Registrar-General, who issued a circular suggesting that while he was “not aware of any New Zealand case law on this point... it is possible that a court will hold that the word ‘solemnised’ in the Marriage Act and the word ‘officiate’ in the marriage registration form require the authorised celebrant’s active participation in the legal aspects of the ceremony.”⁸⁰⁹ Unranked soldiers therefore face in this respect the same problem we have met with in the case of Envoys.

The same period has seen the appointment of more and more non-officer Salvationists to senior executive roles in the organisation, especially in the sphere of social work. Gordon Bingham was appointed Social Services Secretary for the USA Western Territory in 1985 after years in various social work roles in the USA Central Territory. In New Zealand the past 25 years have seen the expansion of Employment Programmes run by the Salvation Army. Salvationist soldier George Borthwick has headed this programme as National Manager since 1988, directing some two hundred staff. Neil Eliot, a Salvationist accountant was appointed Financial Secretary for the Australia Southern Territory in the 1990’s. *The Salvationist* in 1995 reported the appointment of “Non-officers for Strategic Posts”, including those of Divisional Director for Social Programme and Public Relations, in the UK territory.⁸¹⁰ Traditionally only officers would have held any of these appointments. In places the pendulum may have swung too far for some – hearsay evidence from Canada for example suggests officer and soldier resentment at the employment of non-Salvationists or non-Christians in senior management roles, with authority over officers.⁸¹¹

⁸⁰⁹ Brian Clarke, Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages: Circular to Marriage Celebrants, 28 February 2003.

⁸¹⁰ *The Salvationist*, 14 October 1995.

⁸¹¹ Allan Bacon, Overseas Development Officer for The Salvation Army in Canada, in conversation with the writer in July 2003.

In the USA the utilisation of soldiers in administration had been urged particularly by Commissioner Kenneth Hodder, as Territorial Commander for the Southern Territory and subsequently as National Commander. In the USA Southern Territory the role of Territorial Sergeant Major was instituted around 1990, providing a full-time lay advisor to the Territorial Commander, and also serving as chairman of the Territorial Commission on Planning and Goals. In a farewell message to the Southern Territory, Hodder commented that if he had his time over again, he would “have given greater significance to the place of the lay salvationists, our soldiery, on decision-making bodies.” He wanted “to stimulate a recovery of the biblical teaching concerning the status of soldiers and officers as equal partners... and looked forward to the day when non-officer soldiers will serve on territorial boards of trustees, finance councils, property councils and other decision-making bodies.”⁸¹²

Hodder returned to his theme when addressing the 1995 International Conference of Leaders in Hong Kong. Rehearsing the scriptural mandates and the principle of the priesthood of all believers, Hodder lamented that

the Army has yet to appreciate fully the need for the application of these principles to the governance, as well as the ministry, of our movement. ... beyond the scriptural, historical and philosophical dimensions of this issue, there is an additional reason for pursuing it...

The expansion of the work and the small size of the officer corps demands that we take advantage of those Salvationists who, based on their giftedness, training and experience, are prepared and willing to undertake administrative responsibilities. Furthermore... that task of administration necessarily translates into decision-making, meaning that the incorporation of soldiery into our decision-making structure may simply be forced upon us by growth... I suggest that we should now place ourselves in a proactive, rather than a reactive, stance.

Hodder went on to posit four criteria, “four dimensions of effective lay participation in governance:” communication, vision, reform and ownership. Hitherto the Army had tentatively tried some models for lay participation, such as the laymen’s councils, but Hodder saw these as interim measures, in which the laity would soon lose interest.

The failure of representative bodies to bring about effective lay participation in the governance of the Army is... traceable to the nature

⁸¹² Kenneth Hodder, “Let’s Use Soldiers”, in *The Officer*, October 1993, pp.435-6.

of our polity. As a hierarchical organization it simply is not possible to graft on a representative body of laypersons and expect that it will long endure.

He therefore proposed a three-part action plan. Firstly, forums where soldiers and officers can express their views directly to each other. Secondly, selection of qualified soldiers for service on boards of trustees, finance and property councils and similar decision-making bodies. Thirdly, "The Salvation Army must support organizational change initiatives that take place on a decentralized, localized basis." Hodder felt that these steps would be a start towards formulating and implementing a new theology of the laity. He concluded by quoting Pius X, who

in his 1906 Encyclical entitled *Vehementer Nos*, said: 'As for the masses, they have no other right than that of letting themselves be led, and of following their pastors as a docile flock.' Despite many protestations to the contrary, this has sometimes been our functional view. In this we have simply been wrong.⁸¹³

Anxiety about these developments has been expressed, particularly by officers. One concern was that officers with professional qualifications were being squeezed out of roles that enabled them to use that training. Major Gilbert Ellis of Norway felt that, "In the long term, if present developments continue, the officer-role will be reduced. Service in the Army will become increasingly a profession, and officership will be limited to the 'spiritual' sphere. The total dedication that officership has demanded will thereby be limited."⁸¹⁴ Major David Pickard was concerned that "elimination of officer-personnel from many administrative posts will lessen the scope of officership and leave many officers unable to use their principal gifts within the framework of their calling. To deny officers such opportunities on the grounds that they are trained for spiritual ministry, yet at the same time encourage an ever-growing number of lay people into full-time spiritual ministry would seem contradictory."⁸¹⁵

⁸¹³ Kenneth Hodder, extracts from a paper given at the 1995 International Conference of Leaders.

⁸¹⁴ Gilbert Ellis, "Army Service – Vocation or Profession", *The Officer*, September 1994, pp.418-20.

⁸¹⁵ *The Officer*, March 1995, p.143.

Another concern was that the availability of non-officer work within Army service would adversely affect officer recruiting. Jean Seymour thought that the “the massive input from lay personnel is having an adverse effect on young peoples’ willingness to consider officership. Being a layperson means that you choose a job that is suited to you, and you are given consideration, security of tenure and financial stability. You are a part of the Army and you have the kudos of a place in that organisation. That is not so for officers. They are subject to the authoritarianism of senior officers. This is the regime of any army, but given the present day circumstances, I find it quite unacceptable to treat officers that way... officers need to be treated no worse than lay persons.”⁸¹⁶ Major Graham Mizon of UK had a like concern for the recruiting implications. The “many opportunities that now exist for non-officers to engage in full-time service, coupled with flexible approaches to officer-training and service... poses the question: what is distinctive about a commissioned officer? He was worried “that officership could lose out for two fundamental reasons. First, a lack of clarity about what an officer is (or is not)... Secondly... if messages are sent out ... which seem to devalue this position.”⁸¹⁷

Yet another implication of the trend was spelt out by Commissioner Earle Maxwell, Chief of the Staff, in an address to the 1998 International Conference of Leaders. While the majority of governments still accepted the officer’s relationship with the Army as being entirely ‘spiritual’ and therefore no subject to employer/employee legislation, it was a different matter when the Army engaged an employee to do the same work as an officer. “Then it becomes very difficult – almost impossible – for the Army to claim that the officer performing this parallel function to that of the employee, should not be regarded as an employee! This relates particularly to administrative, financial, social service and public relations appointments.”⁸¹⁸

⁸¹⁶ *The Salvationist*, 13 July 1996, pp.18-9.

⁸¹⁷ *ibid.*, 8 June 2002.

⁸¹⁸ *The Officer*, August 1998, p.5.

My own sole contribution to discussion was in 1999 and was prompted by this same phenomenon – that the Army (in some Territories) had a dwindling pool of candidates but many able people wanting to serve in officer-roles although not under officer-conditions. I proposed a different solution; that leadership should be the sole criteria for holding officer rank – not appointability or certain financial arrangements. “Salvationist leaders in full-time ministry, whatever the formula for their relationship with the Army structure, should be called ‘officers’.”⁸¹⁹ This at least has the virtue of consistency, but it also depends upon the view that all Salvationists are lay, and that officership is simply functional. The question arising then would be what functions can properly be described as ministry, or leadership, and the corollary could be that all officers performing non-ministry functions should be reduced to the ranks. The proposal arose firstly from a sense that the existing two-tier system was inherently unjust and secondly from anxiety that with a diminishing pool of commissioned officers from which future leadership might be chosen, the majority of such leaders might tend to be conformists to the status quo and exclude many entrepreneurial types upon whom initiatives necessary for the organisation’s survival might depend.

The tacit assumption in much of this material, that soldiers are lay, with its implication that officers are clergy, has not gone unchallenged. Gordon Taylor asked in 1990, “Am I alone in disliking the increasing use of such terms as ‘lay evangelists’ or lay-personnel’ when referring to non-officers? Is it appropriate to use such terminology when we do not have salvationist clergy or priests? Surely we are all salvationists with a divine commission.”⁸²⁰ Letters from Andrew Trim and Mavis Cavell supported him in subsequent issues.⁸²¹ The Army’s theology of the laity, that all are laity, was not going to go away.

⁸¹⁹ *ibid.*, October 1999, pp.24-5.

⁸²⁰ *The Salvationist*, 12 May 1990.

⁸²¹ *ibid.*, 9 June 1990, 23 June 1990.

A recent contribution to this debate has been that of John Cleary, an Australian Salvation Army soldier, journalist and broadcaster. Cleary is concerned that in the “western” Army, the very institution of soldiership is withering away, with increasing numbers of both the “children of the regiment” and of new attenders at Army worship preferring some ambiguous membership status rather than making the lifestyle commitments incumbent on soldiers.⁸²² He sees the crisis as resulting in part from the Army’s inadequate ecclesiology, with its lack of clarity over the years about the connection between soldiership in the Army and membership of the Church.

Cleary’s remedy for this trend is a revitalisation of soldiership as special class of membership, a kind of elite shock troop or cadre, with a higher commitment to the War than that of ordinary members. By analogy Cleary suggests soldiership might be the equivalent of the diaconate in the traditional three-fold order of the Church.⁸²³ He believes that this would attract the commitment of a new generation looking for “something to live for, something to die for”. Certainly the decline of interest in soldiership in some western territories could eventually lead to it being merely a staging post on the way to officership, much as the “transitional” diaconate has been in the Catholic and Anglican churches until comparatively recently. Cleary’s proposal does resemble more closely the recovered Catholic institution of the “permanent diaconate”.

Analogies between traditional church categories and Salvation Army terms are at best only approximate, despite the religio-sociological similarities. Another analogy for soldiership apart from the diaconate might be the Third Orders of the Franciscan, Dominicans and Carmelites.

⁸²² Indicative of the tension ensuing from this development is a note by the Chief Secretary in the New Zealand *War Cry* of 21 June 2003 commenting on a 7 June *War Cry* report on the enrolment of “members” at a Corps, and advising that officially the Army knew no such category – people could be enrolled as “Adherents”, “Soldiers” or “Junior Soldiers” only.

⁸²³ John Cleary, “Chosen to be a Soldier”. Unpublished paper presented March 2002 at the Salvation Army College of Further Education, Sydney, and subsequently posted on the website www.barmyarmy.com, presented to the Territorial Co-ordination Council, Australia Eastern, and to the Australia-New Zealand Tri-territorial Theological Forum in May, 2003.

These Secular Tertiaries are bound by promises to a distinctive life-style and have a special interest in the particular focus and charism of their order but pursue ordinary secular vocations and may marry. For Salvationists, evangelism and social service could be postulated as their particular callings – although that would in fact be true now of only a minority of Soldiers.

While these analogies may or may not be entirely appropriate, and whether or not Cleary's proposal tacitly accepts the existence of "orders" of "status" or simply delineates roles within the movement; it looks as though his solution is predicated upon the validity and appropriateness of a traditional church model incompatible with one aspect of the Army's genius. It certainly assumes that officers are the equivalent of presbyters/priests. Unfortunately, it seems that the tendency of roles to assume the character of status is one of the things illustrated by the history of Salvation Army officership.

Although this thesis is not concerned with soldiership as such, except in so far as it relates to officership, the confusion between role and status also affects soldiers. The Salvation Army having inherited from Methodism the sectarian concept of membership, protected by commitments and covenants, there is always a tension between soldiership and being a Christian, simple, which in a traditional church setting would derive from infant baptism.⁸²⁴ Within membership of The Salvation Army there are degrees of association – Adherent, Recruit, Soldier, Local Officer – about which questions of status arise, quite apart from the officer-role.⁸²⁵

⁸²⁴ "I think church 'membership' is a false definition of reality. In our society two-thirds of the people who claim church membership never go. So what does membership mean? And yet we have somehow said, 'I love gay people; I just don't want any in the membership of the church.' Maybe the time has come to do away with 'church membership' and just say whosoever will may come into the congregation and be a part of the growing ministry and fellowship." (Tony Campolo, in *Leadership*, Summer 2004, Vol XXV, No.3, pp.54ff.)

⁸²⁵ "Adherency", a concept first mooted in 1886 according to Gordon Taylor (paper prepared for leaders at the request of General Larsson in 2003). It curiously provided for people to identify with The Salvation Army as their "church" without making any profession of faith, although there too there was local variation – in India profession of faith and abstinence from alcohol were required. After international consultation it was decided that in future people wishing to join The Salvation Army but not wanting to

Major David Taylor proposed in 2004 a solution somewhat akin to Cleary's.

Presently many types of ministry and leadership are only for soldiers, deeply threatening the integrity of the "priesthood of all believers" which *Servants Together* seeks to uphold. The Army faces the spectacle of two tiers of membership, in which to be an adherent – a Christian and a member of God's church – is to be a second class member of The Salvation Army, with restricted access to ministry. If we want to work out the consequences of transitioning towards "a Church", it will be more authentic biblically to embrace adherents (with a more helpful name) as full members and to acknowledge soldiership as an order within this branch of the Church, in some ways akin to the Nazarites, with whom Paul identifies on several occasions. The only alternative would be to scrap Adherency and keep to being an Order within the Church, a decision that is no longer realistic for us at this stage of our development.⁸²⁶

The pastoral implications of these "tiers of membership" have been referred to in connection with uniform-wearing on [page 88](#). The setting of such boundaries of association is particularly appropriate to what James Fowler would characterise as a "Level Three" kind of faith, comfortable for people requiring firm direction, black and white morality and official answers to all questions, and which have therefore served The Salvation Army well.⁸²⁷ The model is what Paul Hiebert describes as a "bounded set", where high thresholds protect the doctrine and mores of the ecclesial body, as against a "centred set", where attention is on message rather than the rules, and all-comers are equally valued.⁸²⁸ This culture

become soldiers could, upon profession of faith, be enrolled as "Adherent Members". (John Larsson, Letter to Territorial Commanders, Officers Commanding, National Commander, International Secretaries and all other members of the General's Consultative Council, 12 September 2003.) The Salvation Army in the "West", in its turn, would appear to be facing more acutely than hitherto the situation outlined by a Wesleyan preacher in 1907: "All the Christian Churches of England today have to deal with the question of their relation to numbers of people who join them in public worship, subscribe to their funds, live honourable lives, but decline to take the definite responsibilities of Church membership." (quoted by A.D. Gilbert, *Religion and Society*, pp.198-9.) Gilbert was commenting on the crisis faced when external recruitment had tailed off and endogenous growth was not providing replacement recruits.

⁸²⁶ David Taylor, "Army, Order or Church? An attempt to locate The Salvation Army within the wider family of churches and to consider the implications of this position." Paper read to the United Kingdom territory Theological Symposium, July 2004, p.15.

⁸²⁷ James Fowler, *Stages of Faith*. New York, Harper Collins, 1981, pp.151-173.

⁸²⁸ Paul Hiebert, *Mission and Renewal of the Church*. Pasadena CA., Fuller, 1983. Used for example by Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch in *The Shaping of Things to Come*.

now contributes, at least in the “West”, to declining membership rolls as many who grow beyond this stage no longer feel comfortable in such a milieu. The growing churches – tending to be right-wing, fundamentalist, charismatic bodies like the Destiny Church in New Zealand – mop up those people still attracted by this kind of culture. Wilson notes that “some sects show a capacity for growth and endurance, even when major religious organizations are suffering decline if not decay.”⁸²⁹ The comparison with such bodies as Destiny suggests further that the growing preference for membership rather than soldiership, with less stringent personal commitments to the organisation, can also be seen as indicative of a denominationalising tendency in The Salvation Army.

Comparisons between the Salvation Army and the Church do however lead me to one further observation. In both the Salvation Army and the Catholic Church in particular a shortage of vocations to officership or priesthood has, as we have seen, been met by an increase in the number soldiers or laity involved in roles hitherto reserved for commissioned or ordained people. Yves Congar, so radical as to warrant silencing by the Vatican in the 1950’s, now sounds positively reactionary on this. Allowing that the laity could be involved in the temporal but not the spiritual or ecclesiastical aspects of the church’s life, he was at pains to caution that even such temporal involvement

is not properly power, authority, participation in the ruling function of the church as power... It is chimerical to consider handing over the care of the Church’s temporalities to the laity... This task of the Church should be for its essential part, in the hands of Churchmen.⁸³⁰

The more recent expansion of ministries in the life of the Church has been deplored as a distraction from the laity’s real task of witness and service to the world. Pope John Paul II in *Christifideles Laici* n.13, 1987, has warned of the laity “being so strongly interested in Church

Peabody MASS, Hendrikson, 2003, pp.47-51, 226. The analogy of fences or wells in farming is often used for bounded or centred sets.

⁸²⁹ Bryan Wilson, in “The Persistence of Sects”, in *DISKUS*, , Vol.1 No.2 (1993) pp.1-2. *Internet Journal of Religion* 1997, Welcome.html – articles/welcome.html – articles.

⁸³⁰ Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, pp.244-6, 254.

services and tasks that some fail to become actively engaged in their responsibilities in the professional, social, cultural and political world.”⁸³¹

This has become a theme, repeated in, for example, the Vatican’s *Instruction on Certain Questions Regarding the Collaboration of the Non-Ordained Faithful in the Sacred Ministry of Priests* (15th August 1997), which aroused strong reactions.⁸³² Mary Ann Glendon, Harvard law professor and member of the Pontifical Council for the Laity, has regretted that “many Catholics came to believe that the principal way to be active as Catholics is to participate in the internal life of the Church.”⁸³³

A similar critique from a Lutheran source claims that

American Evangelicalism has spawned what may be referred to as “neo-monasticism”. Like its medieval counterpart, neo-monasticism gives the impression that religious work is more God-pleasing than other tasks and duties associated with life in the world... Similar to neo-monasticism is the neo-clericalism which lurks behind the slogan, “Everyone a minister”. This phrase implies that work is worthwhile only insofar as it resembles the work done by pastors.⁸³⁴

Similar anxieties have been expressed about the “clericalisation of the laity” in the Salvation Army debate reviewed in these pages. 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,

⁸³¹ Neil Ormerod, “Mission and Ministry in the Wake of Vatican II” in *Australian Ejournal of Theology* (http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_Ormerod.htm).

⁸³² *Voices*, online Edition, [http://www.wf-f.org/priest\(win-spr98\).html](http://www.wf-f.org/priest(win-spr98).html).

⁸³³ Mary Ann Glendon, “The Hour of the Laity”. *First Things*, 127, November 2002, pp.23-29. (<http://print.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft0211/articles/glendon.html>).

⁸³⁴ John T. Pless, “Vocation: Where Liturgy and Ethics Meet”. *Journal of Lutheran Ethics*, Vol.2 No.5, May 13th 2002. http://www.elca.org/jle/articles/vocation/article.pless_john.html

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.

CHAPTER EIGHT

A MONSTROUS REGIMENT OF WOMEN⁸³⁵

“Some of my best men are women”

Attributed to William Booth

Like many sayings attributed to public figures, this remark may be apocryphal, or part of the Army's oral tradition. According to Archivist Gordon Taylor, it first appeared in print in Albert Orsborn's 1958 autobiography, *The House of My Pilgrimage*. Given that Orsborn's parents were early day officers and that he himself was commissioned in 1905, it may have been part of his family tradition. Richard Collier accepted it as genuine in his 1964 *The General Next to God* and Flora Larsson used it as the title of her book about Salvation Army women officers in 1974. Jenty Fairbank found a similar quote from Booth in *The War Cry* of 4th January 1887. When Booth was speaking in New York on the 7th December 1886, “a gentleman enquired, ‘Why do you have women leaders?’ To this the General replied with a bland smile, ‘Because they often lead better than men.’”⁸³⁶

⁸³⁵ 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 p28)

⁸³⁶ *The Salvationist*, 19 February 1994, p.12.

If a question at the heart of this thesis is whether Salvation Army officers are, or are not, clergy, the question may have even more point in the case of women Salvation Army officers, given that ordination of women was not generally accepted in the 19th century. While the Army was not the first to accept the ministry of women on equal terms with that of men,⁸³⁷ 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."⁸³⁸

Over many years, Salvationists regarded the struggles of other denominations over this question with a certain smugness. Bramwell Booth said, "Few things the Army stands for have been more bitterly assailed than this – that woman is on an equality with man. Even yet many of the civil laws in the West make differences against her, although many have been altered. Many of the churches still refuse to allow her to witness for Christ in their 'sacred' buildings and their privileged conventicles. But, in general, the western world has changed its views, and very soon the religious section of it will have to follow or be hopelessly left behind."⁸³⁹ Of the furore following the ordination of eleven women by the American Protestant Episcopal Church in 1974, the editor of *The Officer* asked, "Salvationists may be forgiven for asking, in

⁸³⁷ The Quakers did not, from their inception, have regular clergy but recognised women preachers as equal with men. At the Bible Christians' first Conference in 1819, Elizabeth Dart headed the list of itinerant preachers, but even they reneged – in 1824 their constitution was amended to read, "That none of our females speak or vote (in conference) unless especially called upon." (Douglas Clarke, *The Expository Times*, May, 1984, p.233. Article reprinted from *St. Mark's Review*, December 1980, pp.48-53.) Antoinette Brown was ordained in the Wesleyan Methodist Church, USA in 1853 (Rosemary Reuthen and Eleanor McLaughlin, *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Tradition*. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1979, p.232. However, Brown is described as a Congregationalist in Judith L. Weidman (Ed.), *Women Ministers*. San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1981, p.2.)

⁸³⁸ *The Officer*, August 1914, pp.509-10. (Florence was wife of Bramwell Booth.)

⁸³⁹ W.Bramwell Booth, *Talks with Officers*, p.16.

response to such an item of news..." "What is all the fuss about? We settled the issue long ago."⁸⁴⁰

In fact such smugness was not always justified, and on two grounds. The first was theological, in that Salvation Army commentators did not always understand that apples were not being compared with apples. The debate had moved on; by the twentieth century the point at issue was not whether women could exercise public ministry, but whether they could be priests. The Army's tendency to overlook the distinction probably arose from the sketchy nature of its own theology of ministry. A later editor acknowledged this point, noting that "in one sense it might seem that we are not concerned with such an argument. The Salvationist stands outside all controversies between sacramental Christians..."⁸⁴¹ (Although he did go on to make the point that any officer, of whatever sex, is competent to administer whatever means of grace Salvationists do practise.) Commenting on the 1992 decision of the Church of England General Synod to ordain women, *The Salvationist* editor noted that "We ought not to use the moment to boast ... There are too many differences between Army officership and Anglican priesthood to make the comparison very useful."⁸⁴²

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, certainly relative to the general movement of Western society, and even by its own standards. Certainly this view was held by Mrs General Marie Wahlstrom, who referred to the equality of sexes in the Army's early days when speaking at the 1984 International Conference of Leaders. She went on to ask, "Would it not be correct to say that today this is rather the exception than the rule. If so, when and

⁸⁴⁰ *The Officer*, November 1974, p.527. Major Douglas Clarke claimed, "It could be argued... that in the whole history of the Christian Church there has been no statement as radical or as binding on the matter of the place of women as that adopted by The Salvation Army." (Douglas Clarke, *op.cit.*, p.234.)

⁸⁴¹ *The Officer*, January 1979, pp.1-2.

⁸⁴² *The Salvationist*, 28 November 1992, p.2.

how was the development reversed? Has the development of the Army begun to move in the opposite direction to the general trend in society, where women are increasingly active in every field...?⁸⁴³ Or Mrs Commissioner Marjorie Gauntlett, wife of the Chief of the Staff, claimed in an interview in the same year that "The role of women in The Salvation Army seems to be going backwards – it's less now than when we started!"⁸⁴⁴ Or Mrs Commissioner Marjorie Hodder, on her installation as National President of Women's Organisations in the United States in 1993, observed that "among the twenty-two officers holding the principal positions of leadership in the USA today, not one is a woman."⁸⁴⁵

Such concern was not new: Mrs General Florence Booth wrote in 1913 that

Sometimes I am almost tempted to feel that the progress of woman's position in the SA might be described in the words of the Irishman who wrote to a friend from one of the battlefields of the American Civil War, 'We are advancing backwards and the enemy is retreating on to us!'⁸⁴⁶

In 1930 Staff-Captain Mary MacFarlane of Australia had claimed that

to many of the younger thinking women-Officers of The Army, this question of equality of treatment and opportunity for men and women in the Army is a burning one. Many of them work on Headquarters where they see and hear much that makes them ask – "ARE EQUAL STANDARDS MAINTAINED FOR MEN AND WOMEN OFFICERS ACCORDING TO THE ARMY'S CONSTITUTION?" And with no uncertain voice they are answering "No!"⁸⁴⁷

In some ways the experience of women officers parallels that of soldiers in the dynamic of Salvation Army history – beginning with a claim

⁸⁴³ Mrs General Marie Wahlstrom, "The Place and Position of the Woman Officer in The Salvation Army". Paper read at the 1984 International Conference of Leaders, Berlin. Heritage Centre Archives.

⁸⁴⁴ *New Frontier*, 30 June 1984, p.1.

⁸⁴⁵ *The War Cry* (USA), 23 October 1993, p.19.

⁸⁴⁶ *The Field Officer*, March 1913, p.84.

⁸⁴⁷ *The Staff Review*, October 1930, p.339.

to equality, then experiencing a steady eclipse in role and respect, and then a slow and as yet tentative reassertion of significance.⁸⁴⁸

This chapter attempts to trace the rise and fall and rise again of sexual equality in The Salvation Army. It will simplify the process to look first at origins and general principles of female ministry in The Salvation Army, then at the role and experience of single women officers, and then at the situation of married women.

Catherine Booth was of course the moving spirit and exemplar of the role of women in the Army, having been a freelance preacher of some reputation from the early 1860's. Although she never held a rank or an independent command in her own right, Catherine Booth was in the centre of the Army's counsels as long as she lived⁸⁴⁹ and was known then and later as the "Mother of the Salvation Army". The movement's ethos reflects not only the force of her influence but also her husband's support for her position. Catherine's first essay on the rights of women, written at the age of 21, was a rebuttal of rather patronising and derogatory words about woman as a moral being, in a sermon she heard in a Congregational Church.⁸⁵⁰ The following year a connexional magazine article signed "C.M." (presumably Catherine Mumford) claimed,

⁸⁴⁸ Another parallel might be found in the internationalism of the Army, always claimed as a leading principle but also perhaps honoured in the breach. Despite its rapid international advance and the pioneering appointments to high rank of a very few people like Arnolis Weerasoriya of Ceylon in the 1880's and of Gunpei Yamamuro in Japan and Narayana Muthiah in India in the 1920's, the high command of the Army remained largely European, if not British, in character until late in the 20th century. Like Hobbes' papacy, the Army resembled the ghost of the deceased British Empire lingering, crowned, and seated upon its grave. Only at the first High Council of the 21st century did non-Europeans comprise as many as a third of its members, although by now 80% of Salvationists could be found in Africa, India, Asia and Central/South America. (824,533 soldiers out of 1,025,173 world-wide in the 2004 *Yearbook*.) It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that change is being forced upon the Army by political considerations as much as by progressively enlightened attitudes. The comparison with female ministry is not so far-fetched: in both cases the cultural conditioning is about power and control – which is the shadow side of orders in the church.

⁸⁴⁹ Catherine Bramwell Booth, in *Catherine Booth*, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1970, p.419, claims that this was true even on her deathbed, and that her reluctance to take pain-killing drugs when dying of cancer was because she wanted to keep her mind clear for this purpose.

⁸⁵⁰ Letter to Rev. David Thomas, in 1850; Catherine Bramwell Booth, *ibid.*, pp.49-52.

"It is a significant fact that in the most cold, formal and worldly churches of the day we find the least female agency."⁸⁵¹

Shortly before her marriage she addressed one of her long, instructional letters to her intended, about teetotalism (which he had adopted at her persuasion), and the equality of women with men in ministry. He responded briefly, "I would not stop a woman preaching on any account. I would not encourage one to begin. You should preach if you felt moved thereto; felt equal to the task. I would not stay you if I had the power to do so. Altho' I should not like it..."⁸⁵²

Catherine Booth was strong-minded, but far from a virago; none of this meant that she saw herself in this preaching role. As a young married woman when she was invited to address a Church leaders' meeting in the Circuit, "Of course I declined... I don't know what they can be thinking of."⁸⁵³ Her next step was more public however. In 1859, Sunderland minister Arthur Rees attacked the preaching of Mrs Phoebe Palmer, then touring England, in a sermon. He then published his sermon as a pamphlet. Catherine sprang to the lady's defence with a pamphlet of her own, the vigorous and erudite *Female Ministry*, about 11,000 words of it.⁸⁵⁴ It was not until the following year, however, that she herself told her husband, "I want to say a word," and preached at Gateshead's Bethesda Chapel on Whitsunday 1860. She continued to fill churches for the following twenty-eight years, and William *did* like it. Not infrequently in the early years of their freelance ministry, the family survived on Catherine's earnings from platform and pulpit.

Within weeks of Catherine's first sermon, William fell ill and for the following nine weeks Catherine filled his preaching engagements in the Circuit. In a letter to William, who was away recuperating at a health spa,

⁸⁵¹ Quoted by F.L. Coutts, *In Good Company*, London, 1980, p.64.

⁸⁵² Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Catherine Booth*, p.143.

⁸⁵³ Catherine Booth, letter to her mother in 1858, quoted in Catherine Bramwell Booth, *ibid.*, pp.180-1.

⁸⁵⁴ Reprinted in various forms, including as a chapter in Catherine Booth's *Practical Religion*, London, 4th edn., 1891, pp.131-67.

she wrote, "Don't forget to pray for me. I have borne the weight of circuit matters to an extent I could not have believed possible and have been literally the 'Superintendent'."⁸⁵⁵ After the founding of the Christian Mission similar situations arose – according to Sandall, in 1872 Catherine ran the Mission for six months while William was having a nervous breakdown from over-work.⁸⁵⁶ That the Booths were seen by others as equal in ministry is suggested by the foundation stone of Methodist Church at Ninfield East, Sussex, laid in July 1871 "...by Mrs Booth, assisted by the Rev. Wm. Booth, Founders of the Christian Mission."⁸⁵⁷

Encouraged by Catherine's example others joined forces. In 1870 Mrs Collingridge, who in 1868 was the first person employed by the Mission, was Superintendent of the Shoreditch Circuit and presided at meetings, becoming the first woman to hold office in the Mission as well.⁸⁵⁸ She was the usual preacher at the Peoples' Mission Hall, Whitechapel Road, and when her health broke down, was replaced by Mrs Reynolds. In 1873 Miss Billups and Miss Funnell were supply evangelists while Miss Walker and Miss Sutton assisted at Whitechapel and Poplar respectively.⁸⁵⁹ From 1874 however, evangelists were not merely on "supply", but stationed in charge of their local mission stations. Of the 27 evangelists early in 1875, 8 were women, but none of these were "in command".⁸⁶⁰ However, there was a shortage of Evangelists for the expanding work and, encouraged by Railton, Booth considered appointing more women, and in charge.

⁸⁵⁵ Catherine Bramwell Booth, *op.cit.*, p.190.

⁸⁵⁶ Robert Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.144-5.

⁸⁵⁷ Reported by Wesley Harris in letter to *The Salvationist*, 20 May 2000, p.24.

⁸⁵⁸ Extracts from the Minutes provide an appendix in Sandall, *History*, 1, pp.270-4.

⁸⁵⁹ *The Christian Mission Magazine*, September 1873, p.136.

⁸⁶⁰ Hubert Boardman, *The Officer*, November 1972, p.517.

The 1875 Conference, over the reservations of some Evangelists and even of Mrs Booth,⁸⁶¹ appointed Annie Davis in charge of the Barking Station – in what Railton described as a “daring experiment”.⁸⁶² Her success led to women evangelists being in the forefront of the great expansion by the end of the decade. Sisters Rachel and Louise Agar opened fire on Felling on Tyne in March 1878, the printer dubbing them “Hallelujah Lasses” on their posters. Booth or Railton wrote, “We have commenced operations on the Tyne at Felling, where a Mr Sharp... importuned us to send a sister. We sent two, and such has already been their success that we are sending two more, with whose help they will be able immediately to seize another town.”⁸⁶³ Within twelve months there were 22 Stations, 47 officers and more than 3,000 members in the Tyne district.⁸⁶⁴

In Coventry Mrs Caroline Reynolds and Mrs Honor Burrell led the charge. While Mrs Burrell was a widow, Mrs Reynolds was accompanied by her husband, who was not employed by the Mission. At Salisbury, Mrs Sarah Sayers was assisted by 16-year old Henry Edmonds.⁸⁶⁵ Of 91 officers in the field in 1878, 41 were women.⁸⁶⁶ By 1880, women were in charge of 46 out of 118 Corps.⁸⁶⁷

Mrs Reynolds, her husband deceased, went on to open fire in Ireland in 1880, and in this appointment became first woman Divisional Officer.⁸⁶⁸ Mrs Major Harriet Lawley served briefly as Divisional Officer for the Channel Islands in 1887 as a married woman (baby in arms) but

⁸⁶¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes and Memories*, pp.178-9.

⁸⁶² Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Catherine Booth*, p263, claims that Evangelist Abram Lamb resigned over this development.

⁸⁶³ *The Christian Mission Magazine*, May 1878, p.122.

⁸⁶⁴ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.7.

⁸⁶⁵ Robert Sandall, *ibid.*, 1, pp.177, 214-5.

⁸⁶⁶ Flora Larsson, *My Best Men Are Women*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1974, p.17.

⁸⁶⁷ P.J. Walker, “Proclaiming Women’s Right to Preach”, in the *Harvard Divinity Bulletin*, 1994, p.22.

⁸⁶⁸ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, pp.18-9.

had to give it up for family reasons – her husband, John Lawley, worked in the Candidates Department but then became ADC to William Booth.⁸⁶⁹ Captain Polly Ashton, with an encouraging letter from the dying Catherine Booth, was appointed “England’s first woman Divisional Officer” only in 1890.⁸⁷⁰ Bramwell Booth paid tribute to the examples of his sister Catherine as pioneer and leader of the Army in France and Switzerland from 1881 and of Hannah Ouchterlony as pioneer and leader in Sweden from 1883, as showing “that there was no adequate reason for withholding the higher Commands from women.”⁸⁷¹

The role of women was enshrined in the Constitution of the Christian Mission, Section XII of which stated,

Female Preachers – As it is manifest from the Scripture of the Old and especially the New Testament that God has sanctioned the labours of Godly women in His Church; Godly women possessing the necessary gifts and qualifications, shall be employed as preachers itinerant or otherwise and class leaders and as such shall have appointments given to them on the preacher’s plan; and they shall be eligible for any office, and to speak and vote at all official meetings.⁸⁷²

The Orders and Regulations for Salvation Army Staff Officers followed this up with,

One of the leading principles upon which the Army is based is the right of women to have the right to an equal share with men in the great work of publishing Salvation to the world... She may hold any position of authority or power in the Army from that of a Local Officer to that of the General. Let it therefore be understood that women are eligible for the highest commands – indeed, no woman is to be kept back from any position of power or influence merely on account of her sex... Woman must be treated as equal with men in all the intellectual and social relationships of life.⁸⁷³

Although the reiterated gender-exclusive language of the *Orders and Regulations* strikes a discord in this age, for the nineteenth century the Army’s stance was radical. An introductory note to the *Orders and*

⁸⁶⁹ Minnie Lindsay Carpenter, *Commissioner Lawley*, London, 1924, p.96.

⁸⁷⁰ Jenty Fairbank, in *The Salvationist*, 14 October 1995, p.10.

⁸⁷¹ W. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes and Memories*, p.181.

⁸⁷² *The Christian Mission Magazine*, July 1877, pp.182-3.

⁸⁷³ *Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers of The Salvation Army in the United Kingdom*, London, 1895, pp.16-7.

Regulations for Field Officers of 1886 and subsequently also safeguarded this commitment:

In the Army men and women are alike eligible for all ranks authorities and duties, all positions being open to both alike. In these Orders, therefore, the words 'man,' 'he,' or 'his' must be understood to refer to persons of either sex, unless otherwise indicated or evidently impossible.⁸⁷⁴

At intervals William Booth promoted the principle of equality. For example, in 1901 he wrote a "Letter to the Soldiers of the Salvation Army" on "Salvation Women", about the Position and Opportunities possessed by Woman in the Army.

Shall we tell them (young girls in the Army) that they are to grow up and settle down to the idea that the back-door drudgery of the Corps is all that lies before them? – that they can Give and Collect and do Tea Meetings and Harvest Festivals? That they can have Husbands and Children, and keep their Homes in order with a little singing, and a prayer, and a testimony or two thrown in now and then? Or shall we say to them, "Come along and take your stand by our side on the Salvation Army platform?..."

Quoting from *The Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers* he reiterated

Let it therefore be understood that no Woman is to be kept back from any position of power or influence merely on account of her sex.⁸⁷⁵

Booth returned to the subject in November with another letter, "More about Women's Rights", in which he urged women to take the initiative and claim their place.⁸⁷⁶ In another letter on the subject, in 1908, to be read out in every Corps of the 23rd August that year, he stated that "woman is equal to man."⁸⁷⁷

Women went on to provide more than half of the officer strength of the Army, since over the years there have usually been more single women officers than single men, and in the case of married couples, both partners have been officers. In the earlier years the Army's ranks offered a greater opportunity for independence than most available for women.

⁸⁷⁴ *The Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, facing p.v.

⁸⁷⁵ *The Field Officer*, September 1901, pp.422-4.

⁸⁷⁶ *The Field Officer*, November 1901, pp.513-4.

⁸⁷⁷ Quoted by Mary Morris, unpublished dissertation, *Female Ministry, Equality and the Salvation Army*, Oak Hill Theological College, London. Undated but accessed by the Heritage Centre Archives on 6 April, 1998.

Horridge notes that “by the 1890’s, more women Methodists and Anglicans were becoming officers, for the Army still offered a greater degree of equality than available elsewhere in religious societies.”⁸⁷⁸

In every part of the world women became the shock troops of salvation.

Some, like Eva den Hartogg⁸⁷⁹ in the Congo or Alida Bosshardt⁸⁸⁰ in the Netherlands, achieved some celebrity beyond the ranks. Salvationist publications like Marge Unsworth’s 1963 book *Great Was the Company*, Flora Larsson’s *My Best Men are Women* of 1974, and in New Zealand Barbara Sampson’s 1993 *Women of Spirit* chronicled the lives of others. Thousands of others have worked unsung for many years in hard and lonely places. Of single women officers Bramwell Booth wrote that, “Those women are worthy successors of the Apostles. Their devotion to the interests of others, their kindness, their patient toil, their enduring zeal, their humble following in the footsteps of their Master have done much to make The Salvation Army what it is.” Booth, while not claiming any special virtue for the single life, noted with approbation that many single women officers chose to remain single rather than to “marry out of the work”.⁸⁸¹

There was another side to all this of course, and because it bears on our theme it must be explored as well. Whatever the Army’s aspirations to equality, women were not treated equally with their brethren in many respects. The phenomenon of the glass ceiling was painfully apparent to women officers long before Ann Morrison identified

⁸⁷⁸ Glen Horridge, *Origins*, p.225.

⁸⁷⁹ Den Hartogg, a Dutch nurse, served in the Congo 1958-70 and thereafter wherever civil war and natural disaster occurred over nearly 20 years the media seemed to find her there. (Henry Maule: *Moved with Compassion*. London, Souvenir Press, 1977.) Also (http://www.urbana.org/_articles.cfm?RecordId=500)

⁸⁸⁰ (<http://www.sp.nl/nieuws/tribune/9708/interview.stm>.) Also Denis Duncan, *Here is My Hand*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1977. Bosshardt was a friend of the Dutch Royal family and took the Crown Princess selling *Strijdkreet* in taverns in the red light district.

⁸⁸¹ Bramwell Booth, *Servants*, p.109. Reportedly pressure was sometimes put on women not to marry: William Booth forbade Evangeline to marry, saying to her suitor, “You and Eva are both too important to The Salvation Army as individual leaders to be tied up together.” (Margaret Troutt, *The General Was a Lady*, Nashville, A.J. Holman Co. 1980, p.78.) “Railton allegedly once asked a missionary lass to pledge that she would not marry.” (Captain Christine Clement in *The Officer*, January, 1990, p.31.)

the problem in the American corporate world. MacFarlane gave examples from Australia of women being given less significant appointments than men and deprived of opportunities, their relegation to tea-making and sandwich-serving while men junior to themselves were given recognition and authority, and the dearth of women in executive roles and on Boards. Lt.-Commissioner Mrs Povlsen,⁸⁸² commenting on McFarlane's article, quoted "a lady doctor who ... declared her opinion that a woman officer would have to be practically abnormally gifted in order to get the same place in the ranks as an average man." A similar comment was made in a 1948 radio lecture on "The woman officer of the Salvation Army" by Dr Laura Petrie of Sweden.⁸⁸³ (Was she the same doctor?) Major Jenty Fairbank held the same view forty years later: "For a woman to be recognised as equal to a man she must show exceptional qualities – far surpassing his."⁸⁸⁴

Internationally, there has always been a tiny minority of senior women leaders – and this was true even in the days when there were far more women officers than at present. The 1908 *Year Book* listed only two women as Territorial Commanders, while Mrs Bramwell Booth was the executive head of Women's Social Work, assisted by Commissioner Adelaide Cox. In 1920 there were three women Territorial Commanders – all of them Booths – and two other women Commissioners. Soundings in the *Year Book* at ten year intervals between 1910 and 2000 reveal that the highest number of women Commissioners, Territorial Commanders or Officers Commanding was 6, in 1990; numbers mostly fluctuated between 2 and 4. An analysis of High Council membership provides the following figures:

⁸⁸² *The Staff Review*, October, 1930, p.348. The way the title is given indicates that the lady was widowed; had her husband been alive she would at that time have been referred to as "Mrs Lt.-Commissioner Povlson".

⁸⁸³ Flora Larsson, *My Best Men*, p.83.

⁸⁸⁴ *The Officer*, October 1988, p.408.

Year	Number attending	Number of women included
1929	63	7 (5 of them Booths)
1934	47	4 (3 of them Booths)
1939	55	2
1946	50	2
1954	48	3
1963	49	3
1969	45	2
1974	40	3
1977	41	3
1981	44	2
1986	46	5
1993	50	3
1994	44	2

Sources:⁸⁸⁵ (After 1994 the criteria for attendance were altered.)

Only two out of the seventeen Generals to date have been women; Evangeline Booth 1934-39 and Eva Burrows 1986-93. In the history of The Salvation Army in New Zealand there have been only three woman Divisional Commanders – Brigadier Florence Birks in the 1940's (being also Training Principal at the same time), Lt.-Colonel Edna Grice in the 1950's and Lt.-Colonel Raeline Savage in the 1990's.⁸⁸⁶ Curiously all three were based in Wellington but the absence of any local electoral system for such appointments negates the idea of Wellington being more

⁸⁸⁵ Frederick Coutts, *The History of The Salvation Army*, Vol 6, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1973, pp.85-8, 123-126, 155-8, 283-6. Frederick Coutts, *The History of The Salvation Army*, Vol. 7, London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1986, 70-72, 154-6, 241-3, 294-6, 324-6. Henry Gariepy, *The History of The Salvation Army* Vol. 8, Atlanta GA, 2000, pp.70-71, 134-5, 285-6, 300-2. Regarding the preferment of Booth children (men and women), William Booth would have rejected any charge of nepotism, pointing to his letting Ballington, Catherine and Herbert go because "I am not the General of the family; I am the General of The Salvation Army." (Richard Collier, *The General Next to God*, London, Collins, 1965, p.209) Bramwell punished officers, like G.L. Carpenter, who protested against favouritism shown to the Booth children, by consigning them to 'the freezer' – exile or diminished appointments. (Stella Carpenter, *A Man of Peace in a World of War*. Montville, Q'land., Published privately, 1993,, pp.160-1; F.A. McKenzie, *The Clash of the Cymbals*, New York, Brettano's, 1929, pp.44-9; Brian Lunn, *Salvation Dynasty*, London, Wm. Hodge, 1936, pp.234-42.)

⁸⁸⁶ Information from New Zealand *Disposition of Forces*.

liberal in these matters than the other Divisions. There have been no women Territorial Commanders or Chief Secretaries in New Zealand.

In most countries the number of single woman officers, once the backbone of both Field (Corps) and Social work, has steadily diminished. This has been partly because of the “officers marry officers” policy – and partly because of a decline in the number of unmarried candidates. In New Zealand, for example, analysis of appointments given in the annual *Disposition of Forces* shows that in 1918 there were 142 single women officers out of a total of 408 – 34.8% of the total. 80 out of 142 social officers were single women (25 were men 25 were their wives, and 12 were single men.) Single women provided 54 out of 146 field officers (45 of these were men, with 45 wives, and there were 2 single men.) This means that about a third of all Corps were led by single women, usually appointed in pairs, at that time. While single women have usually been appointed to smaller Corps, especially in recent decades, a minority have held large field commands. Two women were leading the largest Auckland Corps in 1918. By contrast, in 1998 there were 16 single women amongst a total of 280 officers – 5.7%. Of these, there were 9 single women in social work out of a total of 95 officers, and 7 out of a total of 191 field officers, leading about 6% of Corps. At the time of writing, in 2004, just four New Zealand Corps were led by single women.

Richard Pears gives the figure of 168 single women out of 1,184 field officers in the United Kingdom Territory in 1996, with no women Divisional Commanders amongst the eighteen officers in that position.⁸⁸⁷

The fact is that gender equality has probably always been resisted to some extent within the Army. Bramwell Booth recalled that this had been the case from the beginning. “Some of the men who had been

⁸⁸⁷ Richard Pears, Thesis, “Towards a Theology”, p.60. The decline in the number of women officers in top leadership positions reflects the decline in the number of single women officers, as well as the Army’s reluctance to give independent senior commands to married women. Single officers are always more “appointable” and the majority of single officers are women. My contemporary, Commissioner Robin Dunster, then TC in Congo Kinshasa, told me in 2001 that her appointments over 30 years had averaged 18 months and she had learned that if she wanted to do anything she had to do it quickly. Many do not survive this treatment. Perhaps the unprecedented resignation of the highly respected Commissioner Linda Bond from the leadership of the USA Western Territory in 2004 reflected the stress on single women in leadership roles.

converted in the Mission ... as soon as they found themselves in office and with a certain influence in their own societies, demurred when women were placed beside them in similar positions... To place a woman in charge of one of these Societies... involved a new departure... Some of the leading Evangelists... were opposed to anything of this kind.”⁸⁸⁸ Catherine Bramwell-Booth believed that “many Salvation Army officers have accepted the Booths’ ruling as to the position of women in the movement rather because it was their ruling than because the principle had been either understood or approved.” She also suggested that Bramwell Booth was in the end deposed because his subordinates feared that he had nominated a woman to succeed him.⁸⁸⁹

Colonel Julius Nielsen of Czechoslovakia / Hungary, invited by the editor to comment on MacFarlane’s article, questioned

the wisdom of women-Officers being made Divisional Commanders, or being given similar positions... Take the highest positions in the Army – those of the General, and the Chief of the Staff: surely every one of us wishes to see only a strong man in those positions... Let me speak quite frankly. We all know... that there are times when a woman needs to be alone in quietness and certainly not on the public platform. Her whole mental outlook and ability are influenced by the condition in to which women come at such times.⁸⁹⁰

One can only imagine the reaction of the soon-to-be General, Evangeline Booth, on reading this delicate allusion.

At grass roots level, male chauvinism has continued to be alive and well. When Captain Minnie Rowell was appointed to Fremantle, Australia, in the 1890’s “the soldiers let her know; we don’t want women officers. You can’t manage our corps.”⁸⁹¹ In his memoirs Cyril Bradwell

⁸⁸⁸ Bramwell Booth, *Echoes*, pp.177- 8.

⁸⁸⁹ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.198. Alas, it was probably not because they feared women in general, but a *particular* woman – Bramwell’s daughter, Catherine herself, whose name was believed to be in the sealed envelope. They did, after all, elect Evangeline Booth five years later. On the other hand, Evangeline was then 69 years of age, and they knew they would not have her forever, whereas Catherine was only 46 at the time. Had they known she would live to be 104, no doubt that would have strengthened their resolve.

⁸⁹⁰ *The Staff Officer*, October 1930, pp.346-7.

⁸⁹¹ Stella Carpenter, *A Man of Peace in a World of War*, Montville, Qld., Privately published, p.63.

records the diffidence of Adjutant Edna Grice when appointed as Commanding Officer of the Linwood Corps in 1938, “in that male dominant decade”, when “lassie officers had not commanded the corps since before the beginning of the century.”⁸⁹² Richard Pears in his 1996 thesis says that “anecdotal evidence gathered from dialogue with soldiers over recent years coupled to the comments of the interview group (of officers) clearly suggests that Corps in fact do not really want single women officers as their leaders... it is not unreasonable to suggest that the autocratic structure of the Army, which enables the officer appointment system to function, has also been instrumental in maintaining women officers in ministry. Had there been a membership-based selection system it may well have been a different story.”⁸⁹³ Colonel Brindley Boon wrote a column on “Feminism” on reading of a married couple described as the “Commanding Officers” of a corps, and quoted with apparent approval “a heading in my morning paper which stated, ‘It is still the men who wear the trousers and the women who iron them.’”⁸⁹⁴

One American woman challenged the Army’s system in 1970. According to Ed McKinlay a disgruntled ex-officer sued the Army for discriminating against her in appointments on the basis of her sex. The Army denied the charge – but won the case on the grounds that relations between a church and its Ministers were exempt from the relevant provisions of the Civil Rights Act.⁸⁹⁵

The overlooking of the possibility of women’s contributions is not confined to matters of appointment and promotion. A 1991 *Officer* editorial asked, “Where are the women?”, and drew attention to the fact that at the 1989 International Strategy for Growth Conference, 80 out of

⁸⁹² C.R. Bradwell, *Touched With Splendour*, p.250.

⁸⁹³ Richard Pears, Thesis, “Towards a theology”, p.64.

⁸⁹⁴ *The Salvationist*, 10 March 1990, p.3. Boon was however vigorously assailed for this gaffe by other correspondents.

⁸⁹⁵ Ed. McKinley, *Marching to Glory; The History of the Salvation Army in the United States*. San Francisco, Harper and Row, 1980, p.203.

96 delegates were men.⁸⁹⁶ More recently, a Secretary for Personnel in New Zealand reportedly tidied up the register of marriage celebrants by deleting the names of all married women – a stratagem that came to light the next time one was asked to conduct a wedding. A Commission on Wellington appointed in July 2002 to propose rationalisation of Salvation Army services in the City, consisted of one woman and eight men (all of whom were officers).⁸⁹⁷ Again, when two delegates were nominated by leadership from each of the three Australasian Territories to form a Tri-Territorial Theological Forum in 2003, members of the new body discovered that only men had been chosen. (Three women were appointed upon this being made known.)

In Western countries the retirement age for single women officers has until recently been set lower than that of men; 60 as compared with 65. (In the days when men Commissioners retired at 70, women Commissioners retired at 65.⁸⁹⁸) In the 1970's Major Roy Lovatt of Great Britain suggested that this was one reason for the lack of women in the higher levels of leadership and proposed that "equal length of service is more likely to produce a more equal balance of leadership than any other single factor."⁸⁹⁹ This was vigorously denied by Lt.-Colonel Ruth Brewer of USA who believed such a change would only make "necessary a longer time for them to live with existing inequities!"⁹⁰⁰

Some of those inequities have been material. Financial differentials and discriminatory housing practices have in part derived from the English class system (inevitably echoed in the international but

⁸⁹⁶ *The Officer*, September 1991, p.385.

⁸⁹⁷ To be fair, it transpired that it had been intended all the officers responsible for Wellington City appointments, both husbands and wives, would attend the meetings. That the wives all chose not to attend, or had perhaps not been specifically invited, also reflected the culture. (Commissioner Shaw Clifton, conversation with the writer, May 2004.)

⁸⁹⁸ That is, until 1986, when a graduated lowering of the retirement age was instituted.

⁸⁹⁹ *The Officer*, January 1976, p.37.

⁹⁰⁰ *The Officer*, June 1976, p.279.

long British-centred Salvation Army hierarchy) and the application, until the last quarter of the twentieth century, of benefits for those higher up the pecking order. (In Britain, carpet in quarters could be taken up and replaced with linoleum should a captain follow a colonel as occupant.⁹⁰¹ Such factors have perhaps impacted more on single women officers simply because few of them have risen high in the hierarchy.

For many years the rates of allowances (officers do not receive wages or salary) discriminated against women. For example, when The Officer of February 1897 announced new allowances, single men Captains were to receive 15/5 per week and Lieutenants 12/-; single women Captains were to receive 12/- and Lieutenants 9/-. Complaints about this sort of thing were not aired in print in the early days, whatever the private thoughts of the officers. While Staff-Captain Mary MacFarlane, in the October 1930 Staff Officer article already cited, denied that equal standards were maintained "in the matter of salary and quarters", she did not allude so much to the discriminatory pay rates as to the living conditions. (Field and Social officers had quarters provided free, as did married staff officers, while single staff officers had to find their own accommodation and were allowed a mere 5/- extra for rent. She was supported in this complaint by Commissioner Johanna Van den Werken, to whom also the editor had referred the article for comment.⁹⁰² In fact it was the normal expectation of society that women could live more cheaply than men. However, equality in Salvation Army allowances was achieved some time after the Second World War,⁹⁰³ putting the Army well in advance of secular salary structures.

⁹⁰¹ Anecdotal evidence: Major Howard Davies in conversation with the writer, in 2000. The story is told that when General Frederick Coutts' ADC, a Lieut-Colonel, was succeeded in office by a Captain, the General was mortified to find that the new man was not supplied with a hand-towel, a staff-rank perk. The General gave the captain his own official towel and brought one from home for his own use... The rule remained.

⁹⁰² *The Staff Review*, October 1930, pp.340 and 353.

⁹⁰³ Mary Morris, op.cit., p.48. claimed pre-war, but she evidently hadn't seen the Minute of 1948 setting the allowances of male and female Probationary-Lieutenants at £1.17.0d and £1.14.0d respectively. Cited in *The Salvationist*, 12 July 2003.)

A continuing sense of grievance is however evidenced by a letter from Major Fay Lewis (British Territory) who joined in a 1988 exchange on the plight of officer wives. "As I look at the role of female officers in our movement, I feel that in spite of the fact that our General is unmarried, the people who have suffered most are the single officers. I am becoming increasingly convinced that there will gradually be no place for us, unless it is to fulfil the 'demeaning roles'." (An earlier correspondent had so characterised the work of "typist and filing clerk.")⁹⁰⁴

With concern mounting that the single woman leader was an endangered species, targeting or positive discrimination was floated by some as a solution. An *Officer* editorial in July 1984 suggested that "a positive bias towards female ministry is needed among those who make appointments and policy at every level, if the opposite tendency, which has to some extent developed, is to be addressed. And they need to make an honest assessment across the whole range of useful characteristics, and not just concentrate on those male-oriented qualities which have been traditionally regarded as essential to leadership and more or less exclusive to men."⁹⁰⁵

Eva Burrows, whose election as General some hoped would signal a move in this direction, actually opposed the appointment of any "statutory woman" on Boards and Councils. Rather than tokenism she said that women "have to take their place by reason of their gifts and abilities."⁹⁰⁶ Despite this she directed Territories to promote women to leadership and laid it down that each Territory should have at least one single woman Lieutenant Colonel. Pears says that "Territories, however,

⁹⁰⁴ *The Officer*, October 1998, p.422.

⁹⁰⁵ *The Officer*, July 1984, p.291.

⁹⁰⁶ Henry Gariepy, *General of God's Army*, Wheaton Illinois, Victor Books, 1993, p.204. A *propos* Burrows' role, Captain Christine Clement noted that "Mrs Thatcher has been Britain's Prime Minister for 10 years, but is there a woman in the cabinet?" (*The Officer*, January, 1990, p.32.) Burrows was criticised by some for being insufficiently pro-active on behalf of women. (Pears, Thesis, "Towards a theology", p.63.) Bishop Penny Jamieson's comment is apt, however: "The fundamental question for women in positions of power is whether the culture of these institutions is so intractable and seductive that they become themselves taken over and remade in an old likeness, taking on the characteristics of those who held that power before them..." (Penny Jamieson, *Living at the Edge*, p.32.)

rarely complied, or in some cases responded with token appointments or promotions.”⁹⁰⁷ However, Captain Donna Ames, in a 1996 series of perceptive articles on “Changing Women’s Roles”, felt that Minutes issued in the previous year were beginning make a difference.⁹⁰⁸ Her articles drew a mixed response, with Captain Allister du Plessis cautioning that cultural factors in some territories made the application of such policies difficult and Major Cecil Waters drawing attention to legal repercussions and counterproductive consequences of affirmative action for minorities in the USA.⁹⁰⁹

In recent times Commissioner Kay Rader challenged the prejudices of assembled Salvationist leaders: “Perhaps even within this company of international leaders there are those who oppose this definite view held by The Salvation Army regarding its policy of equality between the sexes, married and single, in ministry and leadership.” She also stated that “Although women in the Army enjoy the privilege of rank and, in most cases, an avenue of service, we must admit that they are working within a system which is for all intents and purposes, predominantly patriarchal. If women officers are to become equal partners in the business of running the Army, we may be called upon to remove what one author refers to as ‘patriarchal shackles’.”⁹¹⁰

To balance these examples, it should be recognised that the Salvation Army’s precept and practice, however flawed, of gender equality has been a significant factor in improving the respect accorded to women officers in patriarchal, third world countries.⁹¹¹

⁹⁰⁷ Richard Pears, Thesis, “Towards a Theology”, p.63.

⁹⁰⁸ Donna Ames, in *The Officer*, December 1996, pp.549-50.

⁹⁰⁹ *The Officer*, January 1997, p.46-7; February 1997, p.93.

⁹¹⁰ Kay Rader, “Women in Ministry”, an address to the International Council of Leaders, Melbourne, 12-20 March, 1998, pp.5,6. Heritage Centre Archives.

⁹¹¹ Commissioner Shaw Clifton, drawing on his experience of working in Pakistan, in conversation with the writer, May, 2004. [Sociologist Lorraine V. Aragon writes of Sulawesi in Indonesia, “European Protestant missionaries partly succeeded in their attempts to alter marriage patterns, household relations, and naming practices according to an idealized European model. While these transformations by the mission and colonial state might be said to generally undermine aspects of the indigenous status of](#)

Being Equally Yoked

It is necessary to note at this point in the outline of the practical theology which has informed the conduct of The Salvation Army, that quite soon officers were permitted to marry only other officers. (In this, the Army had been anticipated by the Bible Christians, a West Country Methodist splinter group founded by William O'Bryan in 1815, whose female preachers could marry only other preachers.⁹¹²) With the decline in the number of single women officers in the course of the twentieth century, the role and situation of married women officers has become the focus of attention so far as gender equality in the Army is concerned. We need to step back and trace the history of this practice before going further.

In the early days of the Christian Mission, although we have seen that some married women took a leadership role, it was not expected that wives of Evangelists would automatically join their husbands up front. "Mrs Garner, 'a sweet though mouse-like nature, was totally incapable of commanding anyone,' Mrs Beadle 'was little more than a domestic servant to her husband,' Mrs Clare was 'a good woman but entirely taken up with the affairs of her home'."⁹¹³

Later, in the transition period from Mission to Army, before the training system for married people or the commissioning procedure became formalised, it seems to have been the case that women married by men officers automatically became officers. (Or rather, "officers' wives".) When Sergeant Marianne Parkyn of Torquay married George

women, the Salvation Army subsequently created a novel set of career opportunities that specifically favored women. Young girls no longer were destined exclusively to become dry rice farmers and mothers but some could aspire to be educated and trained as hospital aides, nurses, teachers, or even ministers—that is, Salvation Army officer wives." (<http://www.aasianst.org/absts/1999abst/SE/se-115.htm>)

⁹¹² John Coutts, *The Salvationist*, 27 May 2000, p.7.

⁹¹³ Quoted by Hubert Boardman in *The Officer*, November 1972, pp.517-8. (Unfortunately, thirty years later Boardman was not able to tell me where he found this felicitous quote.)

Scott Railton in 1884, she became Mrs Commissioner Railton.⁹¹⁴ Until the mid-1880's, wives of married entrants were given the choice of coming into training or remaining at home during the training period.⁹¹⁵

The 1886 *Orders and Regulations*, under the general heading of "The Social Relationships of the F.O.", included the following:

Before being received as an Officer the following engagement is made by every F.O.:-

(a) Not to marry anyone who is not a Soldier in The Army. [*Choice was apparently not yet restricted to those who were already officers, though a later paragraph does require the soldier's willingness to become an officer.*]

(b) To abstain from courting for at least twelve months.

(c) Not to do any courting with any Soldier in the Corps in which he may be stationed. [*It is possible that this forward-looking prohibition was as much to do with maintaining internal discipline as with keeping appropriate personal boundaries.*]

(d) Not to make any engagement without first giving information to Headquarters. [*Later versions required obtaining permission, not merely informing Headquarters – a policy reversed only quite recently.*]⁹¹⁶

The argument then follows that since an officer's life is wholly given over to the work of the Army, "it must be indispensable that he shall select a wife having the same convictions... especially in a path requiring so much self-sacrifice and toil... Further, to marry one outside The Army would probably mean leaving it... This must be seen to be most unfair and dishonourable. The Army cannot afford to pay the expenses and expend the labour and time of its Staff Officers in training men and women unless they agree to every arrangement which seems likely to secure them for its future service."⁹¹⁷

The Orders and Regulations warned Female Officers particularly, to be very careful in this matter, seeing that to marry other than an Officer removes them from a position of great usefulness and honour, such as they will probably never have the opportunity of attaining

⁹¹⁴ Bernard Watson, *Soldier Saint*, London, 1970, p.76.

⁹¹⁵ J.J.R. Redstone, *An Ex-Captain's Experience of The Salvation Army*, London, Christian Commonwealth Publishing Coy., 1888, 2nd edn., pp.8-9. Married men Candidates were asked if they could, while away being trained, support their wife if she chose not to be trained.

⁹¹⁶ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, p.52.

⁹¹⁷ *ibid.*, p.53.

again... lest...she should enter into relationships which would drag her down from this honourable and Christ like career to spend the remainder of her life in looking back on what she has sacrificed, with bitter regret, if not with absolute despair.⁹¹⁸

The paternalistic role of the organisation is explicitly defended: "Many Officers are so young and inexperienced that they require some older person to give them counsel in such matters."⁹¹⁹ Salvation Army marriage practices, like everything else about the organisation, were the subject of much speculation and rumour. Catherine Booth felt obliged to respond to

the slanderous assertion that we are opposed to marriages amongst our officers!... In judging our instructions, however, on this point, please bear in mind that we have, I should think, 200 women officers not more than twenty, and perhaps as many men of the same age, and you will see the absolute necessity, for their own sakes, for some oversight with respect to engagements. I believe the Wesleyans refuse to accept a candidate for the ministry if he is engaged, and do not allow their young ministers to marry until their four years probation has expired. How awful this must be in the eyes of our critics!⁹²⁰

A revision to the Regulations, 2nd August 1887, restricted both men and women to engagement either to other officers or to soldiers suitable for officership and willing to enter training.⁹²¹ In the words of Colonel Lawrence Hay, "It seems likely that the reasons were administrative: changes of appointment could more easily be made if married officers had officer spouses. This administrative factor is still one of the major justifications given, yet, in the hierarchy of Christian values, administrative convenience must surely rank very near the bottom!"⁹²² On the other hand, the burden of this thesis is that the whole polity and history of The Salvation Army illustrates that practical measures soon become sacralised and fairly resistant to further adaptation.

⁹¹⁸ *ibid.*, p.55.

⁹¹⁹ *ibid.*, p.54.

⁹²⁰ Catherine Booth, *Church and State*, p.91 – although from the statistics the statement belongs to the early 1880's when the address was given.

⁹²¹ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, London, 1888, Supplement, p.122.

⁹²² Lawrence Hay, "Restrictive Marriage Regulations", in *The Officer*, October 1999, p.26.

A correspondent to *The Officer* in 1915 asked why officers had to marry officers. Why not let the men officers marry soldiers? (He was obviously indifferent to the plight of single women officers wanting husbands.) Colonel James Whiller, Assistant Field Secretary, equally indifferent, gave the standard answer that the officer's partner was not only his wife but also his fellow leader.⁹²³

The *Appointments of Officers* 1883 list gives the names of 723 men and 746 women officers. As Horridge points out, there were many more women officers than acknowledged in this way, because a fifth of the men were married and although their wives were expected to work as officers in their corps, they were not listed separately.⁹²⁴ Until 1970 the New Zealand *Disposition of Forces*, the annual publication listing appointments and officers, gave only the husband's name. If he were married, this would be followed by an x, and a number denoting how many children "on strength" – that is, still living at home with their parents, who therefore received an additional allowance for their maintenance. In fact wives of THQ married men officers remained x's until 1976. When statistical summaries of officers were given in the *Disposition of Forces* (until 1974) by rank, wives were not included but enumerated at the end as "staff officers' wives" and "officers' wives".⁹²⁵ Advice of promotion, Farewell Orders and Marching Orders (to leave an appointment and proceed to another) were issued to the husband only.

Clearly the Army was not totally emancipated from the usual expectations of society; normally the husband's calling was presumed to have priority, and a woman officer, in marrying, lost her independent officer-status. In Horridge's words, "The loss of women officers' rights when marrying contradicts the constant statement regarding equality".⁹²⁶

⁹²³ *The Officer*, July 1915, p.445.

⁹²⁴ Glenn K. Horridge, *Origins*, p.80.

⁹²⁵ Until recent years higher ranks were designated "staff ranks". The 1974 New Zealand *Disposition* figures for all officers (active and retired) were Lt.-Commissioner 1, Colonel 1, Lt.-Colonel 21, Brigadier 78, Discontinued ranks 74, Major 97, Captain 98, Lieutenant 17, Wives and Widows 175.

⁹²⁶ Glenn K. Horridge, *op.cit.*, p.81.

Commissioner Kay Rader, in an essay on the role of women in the Army, quotes Rebecca Merrill Groothuis as sourcing this practice in English common law as described by William Blackstone. In his 1765 commentary Blackstone upheld the “civil death” of women who married.

By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in law; that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during her marriage, or at least, is consolidated into that of her husband under whose wing, protection and cover she performs everything. Even as he owned his slaves, so a man owned his wife.⁹²⁷

The Founder himself had expressed concern at this mindset, evident in his lifetime. In 1888, addressing a meeting in Exeter Hall, William Booth said, “We have a problem. When two officers marry, by some strange mistake in our organisation, the woman doesn’t count.”⁹²⁸ However Booth did nothing to ensure that it did not happen beyond exhorting his senior officers to value the work of married women officers. In his 1900 letter to senior leaders he urged,

Let us maintain it with a jealous regard for the sacred rights of every woman, whether married or single, to the free and full exercise of all her gifts in the glorious work of the Salvation Army. To this end – Let women have the fullest opportunity to work. Let them be promoted in harmony with their ability and worthiness. Let women be treated as equal with men in all the social relations of life. Let consideration be shown to the Mothers of young children. Bear in mind that after a few years, the circumstances of such women will allow them to come to the front with almost as much freedom as before marriage, and that they will likely take their places in the fight with greatly increased love and wisdom, and, consequently, with greatly enlarged influence and power.⁹²⁹

No structural provision was made to ensure this happened, however. Bramwell Booth in his turn struggled apparently in vain against the cultural norm. A letter to a Territorial Commander in 1924 instructs him,

⁹²⁷ Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, “Women Caught in the Conflict”, quoted by Kay F. Rader, “Keeping the Dream Alive”, in *Terms of Empowerment: Salvation Army Women in Ministry*, West Nyack NY, 2001, p.86.

⁹²⁸ Quoted by Mrs Commissioner Pauline Hunter in a paper read to the 1984 International Conference of Leaders, Berlin, (Conference Papers, Heritage Centre Archives.) from *The War Cry*, 12 May 1888. (Reference sourced from citation in *The Salvationist*, 22 November 2003, p.15.)

⁹²⁹ William Booth, *Letter to Commissioners and Territorial Commanders*, London, 1900, pp.25-6.

Do not fail me with the women. I look anxiously for the War Cry reports about their work... it is not only a principle with us, but it is a very strong personal desire on my own part that the women of the Army should be kept to the front; and that the married women should be made to feel that their responsibilities are not all dissolved in those of their husbands when they marry.⁹³⁰

Some notable exceptions still only tended to prove the rule. In the case of Captain Rachel Agar's betrothal to William Ebdon, and their joint appointment to open a Corps at Northampton in 1879, William Booth agreed to the marriage only on the condition that Rachel should be first in the partnership so far as Salvation Army officership was concerned.⁹³¹ When Major and Mrs Simmonds "opened fire" in South Africa in 1883, it would appear that Mrs Simmonds, a talented evangelist, spearheaded the work, while her husband operated in a less prominent role.⁹³² Another example was that of Brigadier Hedwig Haartmann, a Finnish officer serving as Provincial Commander for German-speaking Switzerland when she married her ADC, Staff Captain Franz von Tavel. They hyphenated their names but retained their ranks and roles. Alas the lady died soon afterwards, in 1892.⁹³³ Booth's own married daughters, of course all retained or received their own Ruritanian ranks and shared joint commands when they hyphenated their names with those of their husbands.⁹³⁴

⁹³⁰ Catherine Bramwell-Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.197.

⁹³¹ Robert Sandall, *History*, 2, p.37.

⁹³² Philip Escott, Thesis, "Church Growth Theories", p.53. Mrs Simmonds was described as "Queen Boadicea in a heavenly chariot", according to Brian Tuck, *Salvation Safari*, Johannesburg (1985) 2nd edit. 1993, p.10.)

⁹³³ Mildred Duff, *Hedwig Von Haartman*, London, 1904.

⁹³⁴ Catherine (Mrs Booth-Clibborn) was the "Marechale"; Emma (Mrs Booth-Tucker), the "Consul"; Evangeline styled herself the "Commander" for over thirty years until her election as General in 1934. (The 1908 *Year Book* entry for the USA has "Territorial Commander, Miss Eva Booth.") Of the boys, Herbert was the "Commandant" and Ballington the "Marshal". Only the younger, Lucy (Mrs Booth-Hellberg), was ranked a mere Commissioner. Bramwell, the eldest, never had a rank until he became General in 1912, being simply "Mr Bramwell" as in a Victorian family firm, or, "The Chief". His wife Florence was "Mrs Booth" until she became "Mrs General Booth", although William Booth had made her a Commissioner in 1888 (*The Year Book*, 1958, p.7.)

The resolution of the tension between the assumptions behind the framework of officer marriage and the movement of societal expectations occupied the whole of the twentieth century, and the process is not by any means complete. Florence Booth claimed that “the work and influence of women in The Salvation Army is not confined to unmarried women... The work of married women, though often more indirect and unseen, has been of as great, and even of greater importance.”⁹³⁵ It had to be indirect because after marriage the actual appointment would be their husband’s. Commissioner Karl Larsson cautioned women officers from running into marriage too soon because “Some of our best and most promising women, who have a good head and a good heart, and who as single officers would go far and occupy important positions, enter into marriages which hinder their development and circumscribe their sphere of work.”⁹³⁶

Officers’ wives’ officership was merged with that of their husbands. The husband received the appointments and the promotions; the wife just tagged along. A Memorandum from the Territorial Commander in New Zealand as late as December 1963, on “Officer Commission and Promotion Certificate”, reiterated the position (perhaps it was beginning to be questioned). “Husband to receive promotion certificate for each promotion up to and including the rank of Brigadier. Wife to receive no promotion certificate: she takes her husband’s rank.”⁹³⁷ The Regulations provided that when widowed, an officer-wife “if, or when, she has served the required number of years as an officer... will receive rank in her own

⁹³⁵ *The Field Officer*, March 1913, p.122.

⁹³⁶ *The Officer’s Review*, Sept-Oct 1939, p.479. General Burrows is reported to have responded acidly to inappropriate questioning by a maladroit colonel in a TV chat-show-style interview in a public gathering. The unfortunate man had asked how it was that someone so attractive and able had never married. Burrows drew his attention to the regulation that restricted officers to marrying only other officers. This meant that often very able women married men much inferior to themselves in ability. “Take your wife, for example, Colonel...”

⁹³⁷ Memorandum in New Zealand Salvation Army Archives.

right, except where the husband held the rank of Lt.-Colonel or above, when the case will be reviewed by the Chief of the Staff.”⁹³⁸ The husband also received the allowance, augmented appropriately if he had a wife and family to support.

The system worked well for many people. Frederick Coutts described it in his memoirs as

this unique form of service in which husband and wife work as one. Brigadier A. may be appointed divisional commander for the Cumbrian division, and Commissioner B. to be the territorial commander for Westralia, but Captain and Mrs C. will be sent to take charge of the corps at Middletown. This turns out to be not only for the good of the work but for the good of their marriage as well, insofar as they share not merely their leisure – which is all many husbands and wives can do – but their vocation also. Both have accepted the same calling. Both are trained for that calling. All that Captain does Mrs. Captain can do as well. She does not sit in the congregation but shares with her husband the Salvation Army equivalent of the pulpit – the platform. Captain will rejoice that Mrs. Captain is no cipher. Mrs. Captain will rejoice that she is no dumb piece of platform decoration...⁹³⁹

By the 1970's the relationship between officer husbands and wives was being described as a “joint covenant”, although the actual term was not used in regulations. The *Orders and Regulations* were amended to this effect in 1981: “In marriage an officer's consecration is joined with that of the chosen partner and the united consecrations become one just as do husband and wife become ‘one flesh’ (Mark 10:8)”.⁹⁴⁰ Mrs Commissioner Hilda Cox, wife of the Chief of the Staff, in a 1990 article on “Married Women's Officer-role Within The Salvation Army”, found the concept of a “joint covenant” “puzzling and unhelpful”, and “only useful if we were able to envisage a complete and secure possibility of role-sharing or equality.”

⁹³⁸ Minute by The Chief of the Staff, 1977/IA/4 amending O's & R's 1974. Vol.2, Part 7, Chap. III, Sect. 4. When Colonel Harry Goffin, a New Zealander retired in Australia, died, his younger second wife/widow, having been a Mrs Colonel, resumed active service with the rank of Major.

⁹³⁹ Frederick Coutts, *No Continuing City*, London, 1976, pp.34-35. (John Coutts recalled that his mother did not accept the “subsidiary role assigned to [married] women at divisional and territorial level”, citing Florence Booth's leadership of the British Territory. General Coutts apparently retorted, “That was an experiment that has not been repeated.” *The Salvationist*, 10 May 2003, p.5.)

⁹⁴⁰ Minute by The Chief of the Staff, 1981/IA/7 amending O's&R's 1974, Vol.2, Part 5, Sect. 3.

Mrs Cox, in the article referred to, admitted that “the equality policy within our midst has been... implemented with a mixture of success and failure,” and that she had been “bewildered, perplexed and not a little frustrated by its interpretation.” She noted the danger of spiritual abuse: “The emphasis placed on a ‘spiritual commitment’ must never be used to force anyone into simply conforming to any situation, especially to one only partly understood, or to push anyone ‘aside’ into a non-existent channel.” However, she also believed that women had to come to terms with the Army’s administrative structure as a cultural given, and learn to work for equality within it.⁹⁴¹

Mrs Major Margaret Hay (New Zealand) rejoined with the affirmation that “principles are sacred; structures and roles are not.” She drew attention to the way in which the principle of equality had been eroded in successive editions of the *Orders and Regulations for Officers*. The 1900 edition had named gender equality as “one of the leading principles upon which the Army is based.” The 1925 edition dropped the word “leading”. The 1974 edition omitted the whole section on the position of women, “stressing instead the supportive role of the ‘officer-wife’.” Hay also took up Cox’s cue on “the exploitation of spiritual commitment to reinforce a reactionary social climate and bar women from the exercise of real authority.” She believed that “given the will, structures can be transformed.”⁹⁴²

The official assumption of male control continued to be reflected in *The Orders and Regulations for Officers* as late as the 1987 edition which, in the section devoted to “The officer and his wife” included the words, “In most appointments... an officer-wife should assist her husband. He is of course, responsible, but she should interest herself and, as opportunity permits, take her full share in every phase of the work

⁹⁴¹ *The Officer*, September 1990, pp.408-12, 415.

⁹⁴² *The Officer*, February 1991, pp.70-1.

under his direction...⁹⁴³ Major John Coutts commented, *a propos* the 1974 edition,

In seventh-century England, the blood-money for killing a churl was, of course, only half that payable for killing an earl. For a Welshman, of course, it was lower still. In seventeenth century Scotland, the children of miners were, of course, placed in life-long bondage to the pits at their baptism. In nineteenth-century America, Booker T. Washington was, of course, refused admission to College because he was black, while in Britain Catherine Booth came under fire for preaching. Of course – she was a woman.⁹⁴⁴

Alas, the offending phrase persisted until the 1997 edition.⁹⁴⁵

The matter of the role and status of married women officers (including those widowed or divorced) generated a great deal of discussion in the final third of the twentieth century. Mrs General Marie Wahlstrom noted in 1984 that “there is a good deal of uncertainty and dissatisfaction among women officers, both married and single, with regard to their place and position in the Army.”⁹⁴⁶ Looking for letters and articles on this subject, I found 50 in *The Officer* between 1972 and 1996 and 15 in *The Salvationist* between 1990 and 1996. It seemed that the pressure on the traditional structure was steadily increasing and this no doubt contributed to the progressive modifications and reforms that have been instituted over the past few years.

Correspondents addressed a variety of themes. Some were concerned with the officer as a wife and mother, and juggling those

⁹⁴³ *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army*, London, 1974, Part 5, Section 3, para. 4, p.77.

⁹⁴⁴ *The Officer*, December 1974, p.562.

⁹⁴⁵ From 1987 comes an apparently unembarrassed admission in an Australian ecumenical publication: “In the case of married couples, it is the man who receives the appointment. In some situations (mainly headquarters) the wife may receive a separate appointment but it is subordinate to that of her husband.” (Captain David Perry, in William Tabbernee (Ed.) *Ministry in Australian Churches*. p.107.)

⁹⁴⁶ Address to the International Conference of Leaders, Berlin 1984. (Heritage Centre Archives.)

responsibilities with ministry.⁹⁴⁷ Some dealt with the nature of the officer husband-wife partnership.⁹⁴⁸

Some correspondents revisited the scriptural basis of Salvation Army practice. Major Howard Davies (Australia), for example, responded to Mrs Major Margaret Hay's argument from Salvation Army tradition and "sacrosanct principles"⁹⁴⁹ by expressing unease and suggesting that many officer-wives held back from exercising their ministry out of "scripturally-based reservations."⁹⁵⁰ He was supported by some correspondents and denounced by others.

Other reactionary concerns were also referred to. Major Miriam Vinti (IHQ) asked how practical could a regulation be that allowed complete independence of career to man and wife? "How would a man accept the promotion of his wife to a Commissioner and Territorial Commander, while he remained a Major in his wife's Headquarters?"⁹⁵¹ Lt.-Colonel Arthur Thompson believed that "if some husbands would find it intolerable to be in a lesser role than their wives, then lessons may have to be learned from the world, where this painful adjustment is taking place."⁹⁵²

For some, a serious problem in the existing structure was the waste of human resources, desperately needed by an Army stretched for personnel. Brigadier Lawrence Weggery (New Zealand) discovered from the Orders and Regulations that a wife "can in fact 'in certain circumstances' be entrusted by headquarters with some definite responsibility distinct from that of her husband," and urged that "ways will

⁹⁴⁷ e.g. Mrs Major Franklyn Thomas (West Indies), *The Officer*, December 1981, pp.560-562, 555.

⁹⁴⁸ e.g. Captain and Mrs Martin and Linda Howe (UK) in "The New Man", *The Officer*, April 1993, pp.170-2.

⁹⁴⁹ *The Officer*, February 1991, pp.70-1.

⁹⁵⁰ *The Officer*, July 1991, p.325. See also November 1991, pp.491-4, and November 1996, pp.515-7.

⁹⁵¹ *ibid.*, February 1975, p.78.

⁹⁵² *ibid.*, October 1984, p.460.

be found to encourage the officer-wife... to move out of her supernumerary position and undertake leadership in her own right.”⁹⁵³

Lt.- Colonel Arthur Thompson regretted that “whilst the autocratic command structure was designed to produce quicker decision-making our leaders at almost every level seemed to be locked in a kind of paralysis because of ... prejudice and tradition... Without doubt, if we are not to be guilty of poor stewardship of our leadership resources, the time must soon come for the Army to move purposefully towards using our best talent most wisely, whether it be male or female, single or married.”⁹⁵⁴ Captain Geoffrey Parkin similarly condemned “the possible waste of a valuable resource, the loss of personal fulfilment and the potential strain between husband and wife.”⁹⁵⁵

Against this, Major Patricia Yon discovered in the 1990's that 60% of married women officers surveyed in the UK “were to some degree satisfied to be appointed with their spouse... Some women would be vehemently opposed to the prospect of sacrificing this privilege.”⁹⁵⁶

Others again expressed strong feelings about the situation of widowed and particularly separated or divorced officers. *The Orders and Regulations* confirmed that the “Officer’s wife is herself an Officer... Should she become a widow, she is still an Officer... The widow of an officer may be appointed directly to another department or section of service and thereby be considered a widow on Active Service...She may be appointed as an employee...”⁹⁵⁷ However this was all a matter of discretion and it had not been uncommon for widowed women officers to be given no option other than premature retirement. Mrs Major Harry Parkinson, whose husband died in his 40's in 1942 while in command of

⁹⁵³ *ibid.*, January 1972, pp.36-7.

⁹⁵⁴ *ibid.* October 1984, pp.459-61.

⁹⁵⁵ *The Officer*, June 1988, pp.268-9.

⁹⁵⁶ Patricia Yon, *Areas of Stress and Conflict in the Lives of Married Women in Ministry Within The Salvation Army*, p.36. Unpublished MA (Counselling) dissertation, University of Keele, 1991-93.Heritage Centre Archives.

⁹⁵⁷ *Orders and Regulations for Officers*, London, 1930, Part ix, Chap. VIII, Sect. 2, p.486.

Wellington City Corps in New Zealand, brought up her family on a small pension and spent over 50 years in retirement. Some however stuck it out and a few reached or maintained executive roles.⁹⁵⁸

The situation of officers who suffered the breakdown of their marriage was perhaps worse, as both parties had to resign their officership regardless of where the “fault”, if any, lay. Those who chose could reapply for acceptance as officers at a later date. Captain Mrs Miriam Fredericksen (IHQ) described the dynamics of such service⁹⁵⁹, as did “Eunice”, who wrote, “I know what it feels like to be made to feel ‘second-class’ because of something on which you had no influence... I know what it means to experience personal rejection and public humiliation.”⁹⁶⁰

The administrative structure whereby the wives of Corps, Divisional and Territorial leaders automatically assumed responsibility for the “women’s work” and women’s organisations, also came under fire. Mrs Lt-Colonel Emily Fritz (USA) believed that “the whole concept of the women’s service department has outlived its usefulness... Salvation Army women may be better served if the women’s service departments were absorbed into mainline administration. In the USA this would free a lot of officer-wives now stationed on divisional and territorial headquarters to be reassigned to appointments matching their special gifts.”⁹⁶¹ Lt.-Colonel Mary Elvin (Caribbean) also denounced this “Army within an Army”. “To concentrate so much time, effort and personnel upon one

⁹⁵⁸ Lt.-Colonel Mrs Phyllis Taylor, widowed in 1928, became a Commissioner and leader of Women’s Social Work in Great Britain before marrying the twice-widowed General Albert Orsborn in 1946. Brigadier Mrs Annie Trounce, widowed in 1918, became a Lt.-Commissioner and Territorial Commander in Southern India. Her daughter Muriel, was widowed in 1960, her husband Colonel Victor Thompson having been Territorial Commander in both Ceylon and Rhodesia. She was offered and declined a Territorial Command in India where they had served, and was left “trimming bonnets in the Trade Department” until her own retirement. (Told to Lieut. Patricia Cruickshank in 1971.) Mrs Colonel Violet Stobart, however, also widowed in 1960, took over her late husband’s role as Territorial Commander in Ceylon (perhaps inspired by Mrs Bandaranaike?) and retired from the command of Switzerland as a Lt.-Commissioner.

⁹⁵⁹ *The Officer*, September 1981, pp.418-20, 426.

⁹⁶⁰ *ibid.*, December 1991, pp.546-9.

⁹⁶¹ *ibid.*, December 1988, pp.496-7.

aspect of the ministry will inevitably produce substantial results in that one aspect... but it often leads to a serious imbalance in both church attendance and in membership.”⁹⁶²

The majority of correspondents however dealt with some aspect of the way in which married women officers felt that their ministry had been diminished or held in less regard once they married. The extent to which married women officers were able to maintain their ministry depended to some extent on the kind of work in which their husbands were engaged. In the case of married women Corps Officers, there was a pastoral role in which they could be fully absorbed along with their husbands. Responsibility for the pastoral care of women and children, often along with the leadership of particular women’s groups, usually devolved upon officer-wives. The degree to which they shared public work, such as meeting leadership and preaching, depended on their individual capabilities, the dynamics of the marriage, family responsibilities and sometimes the expectations of the Corps. “In one Corps she is kept from the hall kitchen, it being unthinkable that she should leave the word of God and serve tables; in another... everyone goes home and leaves her with the dishes.”⁹⁶³

The organisation sometimes failed to recognise their work. A correspondent in 1919 took issue with the

boast of The Salvation Army that women in its ranks are on an equality with men. I do not think that is wholly true... There are more women than men in our ranks, and many of them possess brains, education and godliness which qualifies them to occupy responsible positions. The married women officers might receive more recognition than they do. At the last Congress I attended not one married woman was asked to speak or pray. I know of one DC who sent out Christmas gifts to officers in his Division, and in the case of a married couple who had a young Lieutenant as an assistant, there was a remembrance to the Lieutenant and to the Officer in Charge, but the letter conveying Christmas greetings was addressed to “Adjutant Blank and Lieutenant So-and-so”. The poor wife was not even wished a happy Christmas. It was not the gift that mattered but the utter ignoring of a woman who did an equal part of the platform work, a fair share of the visitation and all of the clerical work, so as to free her husband for the demands of outside Corps work. I do not

⁹⁶² *ibid.*, November 1996, pp.518-20.

⁹⁶³ Editorial comment in *The Officer*, September-October 1960, p.358.

think an officer's wife should be treated as though she were a sort of upper servant...⁹⁶⁴

Such voices were not heard very often until much later in the century. When the debate then flared up, some expressed surprise. Retired officer, Mrs Major Ruth Saunders (UK) recalled that on her marriage "everyone... naturally expected that I would really share the platform ministry"⁹⁶⁵, the visitation, the census board meetings, etc, with total equality, and I, and the officer-wives of the previous generation as well as my own, did do that."⁹⁶⁶ Some put the blame for loss of status on the wives themselves. Mrs Captain Katrina Thomas (British territory) wrote that "... a great many female married officers have allowed their spouses to be the commanding officer... I regard myself as a commanding officer and I expect to be treated as such." She allowed that there were moments of frustration – "e.g. letters for my attention addressed to my husband, a divisional commander refusing to discuss corps business with 'Mrs Captain'..."⁹⁶⁷

On the other hand, some were happy to take a back seat. Mrs Captain Arvilla Hostetler (USA Eastern) explained, "He is the Captain, the pastor, of the Corps. A church has one pastor but there may be many ministers. Our people are not likely to introduce me as their Captain. I am the Captain's wife... My role is not secondary but complementary. My husband and I are a team... My pastoral duties may be different from my husband's but they are no less important."⁹⁶⁸ Mrs Colonel May Holland (Retired, UK) admitted, "most of us accepted that when it came to marriage that our husbands were responsible for the decision making. There cannot be two Commanding Officers in one battalion. Personally that is how I wished it, and I was never brought into corps, Divisional

⁹⁶⁴ *The Officer*, April 1919, p.357.

⁹⁶⁵ "Platform ministry": Leading services and preaching.

⁹⁶⁶ *The Officer*, June 1993, pp.287-8.

⁹⁶⁷ *ibid.*, July 1989, pp.320-1.

⁹⁶⁸ *ibid.*, December 1981, pp.457-8.

Headquarters or Territorial Headquarters decision-making regarding any aspect of administration.”⁹⁶⁹ Mrs Captain Ruth Hampton (Australia) felt that “women in our Corps need an example of true motherhood, the joy of being a wife and the responsibility of being a home-keeper, as well as being a servant of God.”⁹⁷⁰ Lt.-Colonel John Gowans expressed regret that “some women officers have sold their birthright and retreated from any kind of public service altogether.”⁹⁷¹

In the case of social officers the wives’ roles perhaps depended more on the nature of the appointment. In some cases there was more than enough to do. My impression of my mother’s experience of being a social officer wife in institutional work between 1942 and 1962 is of unremitting toil at laundry, cooking, sewing, cleaning and supervision as occasion required, and responsibility as matron for large numbers of people. On the other hand, Mrs Major Gladys Ford of New Zealand wrote of arriving at an appointment where her husband was to be manager, only to be greeted by the non-Salvationist Assistant Manager with the comment, “There is no work here for you to do.”⁹⁷² She found plenty to do however.

It was the problem of unemployed staff wives, whose husbands had positions on Headquarters, which first aroused official notice however. Mrs Bramwell Booth, at the suggestion of Mrs Carpenter, decided in 1912 to set up what she called “The Bond of Service and Fellowship”. This was partly to provide pastoral care for the wives of staff officers, and also to find work for wives of Staff Officers on IHQ. This labour-exchange directed such wives to the needs in Corps, Social institutions and hospital visitation.⁹⁷³

⁹⁶⁹ *The Officer*, February 1975, p.81.

⁹⁷⁰ *ibid.*, December 1989, pp.567-8.

⁹⁷¹ *ibid.*, October 1984, p.449.

⁹⁷² *ibid.*, February 1985, p.81.

⁹⁷³ *ibid.*, July 1917, pp.395-8; Stella Carpenter, *Man of Peace*, p.198.

Perhaps this kind of thing was not to everyone's liking because from time to time chiding articles urged greater participation, noting "the danger of being the wife of a mandarin."⁹⁷⁴ Another writer, having referred to the "humble and unobtrusive opportunities for work with Home Leagues, the YP Corps, League of mercy, prison, hospital, common lodging house or saloon visitation," suggested that perhaps "such unobtrusive work does not attract them...", they "want to preserve the freedom from official responsibilities of a soldier while retaining the position, the honour, and the prerogatives of a staff officer!"⁹⁷⁵

Such official responses missed the point, that married women officers were increasingly feeling devalued by the lack of respect shown for their calling as officers. Even in the early years this must have been felt: in 1899 Captain Minnie Rowell wrote to her intended husband, George Lyndon Carpenter, of her fear of being reduced to being a housewife upon marriage. "I am practically marrying out of the work. What am I to do? Keep my house nice and once a week visit a hospital?"⁹⁷⁶ While this frustration was contained or had little opportunity for expression in earlier years, the comparative freedom of the official publications towards the end of the twentieth century permitted a clear picture to emerge. Mrs Captain Joan Hutson (New Zealand) wrote of the "prolonged period of soul-shock – a type of grief and mourning for their identity that must be felt to be believed" when "the husband receives a 'husband-only' appointment either at Headquarters or in social work."⁹⁷⁷ Mrs Major Gwennyth Redhead (UK) described how, twenty-five years earlier, upon her husband's appointment to the staff of the Officer Training College, she sat through an interview in which the Principal explained at length her husband's duties. "Finally... I plucked up courage

⁹⁷⁴ *ibid.*, June 1916, pp.419-22.

⁹⁷⁵ *The Staff Review*, January 1922, pp.110-11.

⁹⁷⁶ Stella Carpenter, *Man of Peace*, p.102. G. L. Carpenter became the fifth General of the Salvation Army in 1939. It is notable that he headed the International Headquarters entry in the *Yearbook* with "General and Mrs Carpenter". The only other General to have made this acknowledgement of his wife's role was Bramwell Booth.

⁹⁷⁷ *The Officer*, June 1975, p.273.

to ask, 'And my responsibilities?' Then came the sword-thrust deep into my heart, reducing my sense of self-worth to nil. 'It is not training college policy to provide officer-wives with official appointments.' I felt as if the word 'rejected' had been branded into my forehead for all the world to see."⁹⁷⁸ Mrs Major Joy Emmons of South America West put it like this: "When we were brought to headquarters and I was not listed in the dispo I was crushed. I did what I was asked to do... but felt like excess baggage."⁹⁷⁹ Another writer said she "felt as though I had been sacked... I felt hopeless, powerless and worthless... I felt as though I had been thrown on the scrapheap."⁹⁸⁰

The *Manual of Guidance for Staff Officers* included a short passage on "The Staff Officer's Wife".

It is not given to the wife of every Staff Officer to have specific or separate responsibilities. When such is the case, however, the husband will give encouragement to see that her duties are carried out without let or hindrance... Throughout the world, many Staff Officers' wives are a tower of strength to their husbands in a 'behind the scenes' ministry, as well as exercising an independent influence in the districts where they live or in the Corps where they are soldiers.⁹⁸¹

The wives of officers below staff rank serving on Headquarters presumably knew their place without being expressly instructed.

The Officer editorialised in 1984: "The crunch comes in specialist or headquarters appointments where the husband has a specific appointment which does not... include the wife, and where very often no effort is made to find her suitable and fulfilling work. She is often left to languish in a limbo of frustration and rejection in which she may (a) lose her sense of vocation... (b) Become satisfied with Martha tasks (by which the writer probably included the kind of work offered by the 'Bond of

⁹⁷⁸ *ibid.*, December 1991, p.561.

⁹⁷⁹ *ibid.*, October 1989, pp.436-7.

⁹⁸⁰ *ibid.*, July 1984, pp.295-6.

⁹⁸¹ *Manual of Guidance for Staff Officers*, London, pp.16-7. Undated, but copies in the New Zealand THQ Archives were issued, over the signature of the General, in 1969 and 1971. (One of the copies was issued to a single officer, Lt.-Colonel Jean Gould, a New Zealander serving in India.)

Service and Fellowship'). (c) Find some second-best fulfilment in agencies outside the Army, if such is available. None of these is a substitute for her officer vocation, and the organisation has an obligation to find really fulfilling service for every officer."⁹⁸²

Personal experience of this situation led at least one senior officer to begin attending to the problem. Colonel Gordon Swansbury, appointed Staff Secretary at IHQ, found that his own wife had no designated assignment "and there was no peace in our house until her importuning secured an opening in another department in which she has found complete job satisfaction." Swansbury discovered that a study group had been commissioned to investigate the position of officer-wives and had made recommendations. Accordingly he initiated individual letters of appointment for all officer-wives serving on IHQ and also for officer-wives who had found roles elsewhere though their husbands worked on IHQ. He made it standard practice for wives of all in-coming officers to be interviewed as to their preferred service. As he stated, this did not mean that the ideal had been reached – the wives' appointments were still secondary to their husbands' – but it was a start.⁹⁸³

Major Patricia Yon, surveying married women officers in the UK in the early 1990's, learned that 23% of respondents to her questionnaire reported that "they have their own named appointment, which is separate from and independent of their spouse." She suggested that "this possibly reflects the fact that recently policy changes have occurred which support the provision of enhanced professional opportunities for married women. However, being appointed independently is no guarantee of being given a job in any authentic sense."⁹⁸⁴ John Coutts had warned some years earlier that, "No improvement will come by tinkering with the system or by 'finding little jobs for the ladies'. We need here, as in other matters, real

⁹⁸² *The Officer*, July 1984, p.291.

⁹⁸³ *The Officer*, September 1984, pp.414-5.

⁹⁸⁴ Patricia Yon, Thesis, "Areas of Stress", p.35.

openness about such sensitive matters as jobs and job satisfaction, rank and status and, lastly, money and allowances.”⁹⁸⁵

So why was the general trend throughout most of the twentieth century towards a curtailment of woman's role in The Salvation Army? It could be argued that the situation did not actually deteriorate, but that women became more vocal in their objection to the status quo, and that this was made possible by more liberal opportunities for public debate. And it could also be pointed out that the gradual decline in the number of women in senior leadership was a consequence of the decline in the number of single women officers in general – the potential pool was smaller. That, however, does not explain why the organisation was so reluctant to give married women independent commands as it sometimes had in the early days of the movement. Unfortunately the gradual changes noted by Margaret Hay (p.332, above) in the Orders and Regulations suggest that the real reason was 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.

Steps to Reform

The steps were somewhat leaden. The subject was aired at successive Conferences of Commissioners and Territorial Leaders, which took place at rather irregular intervals of three to five years, but action was tardy. The 1971 Conference “recommended women being given a fuller representation in the top echelons of world leadership.”⁹⁸⁶ 1975 being International Woman's Year, wives of Commissioners were invited for the first time to be present at the International Conference. However

⁹⁸⁵ *The Officer*, July 1975, p.322.

⁹⁸⁶ *ibid.*, January 1972, p.36.

they were not included in every session but held their own parallel sessions, bringing their report to the final plenary session. Commissioner Kathleen Kendrick hoped “that it might be but the beginning of wider participation of women in the central councils of the Army”, and quoted a senior woman delegate as saying, “The idea that a woman’s place is in the home and that there she must stay – I resent it!”⁹⁸⁷

In 1979 a similar arrangement obtained. Debating the Equality of Men and Women Officers, Mrs Commissioner Harry Williams (IHQ) asked why the longstanding passage on the principle of equality had been omitted from the 1974 *Orders and Regulations*. However Commissioner Ernest Holz (USA) “pointed out the difficulties in connection with the over-emphasis of equality, specific appointments and designation.” The Minutes did not record what difficulties he meant, but “it was pointed out that what a woman officer seeks is the satisfaction of using her best in the Master’s Service.”⁹⁸⁸ It was also mentioned that women officers’ names were now included in the *Disposition of Forces* and in the *Official Gazette*.⁹⁸⁹ Previously only their husbands were named.

At the 1984 Conference in Berlin, wives were for the first time invited to participate as full delegates, and the Conference produced three recommendations affecting women in particular. (1) All gazetting should be for the couple and not for the husband alone (the 1979 statement must have been premature), (2) all correspondence concerning an officer couple should always be addressed to both, and (3) whenever possible the officer wife should be given her own appointment.⁹⁹⁰ Such Conferences could not enact decisions but only recommend to the General. However, under Burrows a further step was taken in that for the first time the wives of territorial commanders and chief secretaries were

⁹⁸⁷ *The Officer*, March 1976, pp.123-5.

⁹⁸⁸ Minutes of the International Conference of Leaders, 1979, p.90. (Heritage Centre Archives.)

⁹⁸⁹ The *Official Gazette* is the publishing of appointments, promotions etc., usually in *The War Cry* or other periodicals.

⁹⁹⁰ Minutes of the International Conference of Leaders, 1984. (Heritage Centre Archives.)

invited to participate in zonal conferences – a step which had been urged in 1984 by Mrs General Wahlstrom.

The background study material for the 1991 Conference, which asked if it “was time to speed up implementation of earlier recommendations”, suggested that the recommendations had not got much further. The 1991 appointment of a married woman as Training Principal in New Zealand (Mrs Major Margaret Hay), with her husband as a part-time member of her staff, was stated to have given impetus to the question.⁹⁹¹ It was also asked whether the concept of a joint-covenant for married officers was still a live issue – apparently the 1988 Conference had recommended that it remain in the expectation. The 1991 Conference decided to propose an International Commission to consider: (a) a review of the Orders and Regulations; (b) review of the position of Territorial President of Women’s Organisations; (c) separate appointments for married women; (d) the concept of joint-covenant; and (e) loss of officership in the event of marriage breakdown.⁹⁹² Such a Commission was in due course appointed by General Burrows, shortly before her retirement in 1993.

The 15-member commission chaired by Mrs Commissioner Rosemarie Fullarton presented its report in May 1994, with recommendations “based on the belief that men and women are equal in the sight of God, and that there is no theological conflict in the ministry of women in all spheres of service.” The ten recommendations covered the following areas:

- (1) official encouragement for the enrichment of officer family life; (2) revisions of sections of Orders and Regulations for Officers; (3) recognizing all officers by rank, Christian name and surname regardless of marital status; (4) upgrading the role and duties of the territorial president of women’s organizations; (5) equality of consideration to be given to the vocation of all officers at all levels of service, and in making

⁹⁹¹ A couple of years later, New Zealand also broke new ground with the appointment of a married woman, Lt.-Colonel Raeline Savage, as a Divisional Commander. Her husband meanwhile served as head of the Public Relations and Fundraising Department.

⁹⁹² Background study papers and Minutes of 1991 Conference. (Heritage Centre Archives.)

appointments; (6) every woman officer, married/single, to be seen as a resource and developed to her full potential; (7) attention given to the full use of skills and gifts of women officers at all levels of service, including boards and councils; (8) a new system for calculating allowances replacing the tenure of married men officers as the basis; (9) single women officers to have appointments of opportunity according to their gifts and abilities; (10) child care and domestic support to be available where family duties may affect the ministry of married and single officers.⁹⁹³

General-elect Bramwell Tillsley, interviewed by *New Frontier*, admitted, "We haven't done very well in giving married women officers the opportunity to develop fully the gifts God has given them... Too often the assignments of wives have been dictated by the assignment of their husbands."⁹⁹⁴ However Tillsley's term of office was cut short by ill-health in less than a year, and it was left to his successor, Paul Rader, to implement some changes recommended by the Commission. The new General's wife, Kay Rader, was a vigorous campaigner on women's issues so her husband's election heralded major steps forward. Rik Pears refers to her in his thesis as "a new champion."⁹⁹⁵

New Minutes affecting women's service took effect in mid-1995. Most of the Commission's proposals were actioned, although numbers 8 and 10 were a matter for territorial discretion, according to local conditions, and some were expressions of principle rather than specific changes to practice. The most obvious and major change, able to be implemented at once, was the recognition that "in the case of active officers, up to and including the rank of commissioner, each spouse holds their joint rank in his or her own right."⁹⁹⁶ Mrs Captain Jones became Captain Mary Jones, or, if she preferred, Captain (Mrs) Mary Jones. One of the downstream implications of this change was that all

⁹⁹³ Henry Gariepy, *History*, 8, pp.318-9.

⁹⁹⁴ *New Frontier*, 30 April 1993, p.6.

⁹⁹⁵ Richard Pears, Thesis, "Towards a Theology", p.66.

⁹⁹⁶ Minute of the Chief of the Staff, 1995/IA/20, dated 7th July, 1995. Curiously, this does not seem to have been made much of in the Army's press – I could find no reference to the change in the British *Salvationist* or in the New Zealand or Australian editions of the *War Cry*. Perhaps it was thought unwise to call attention to the fact that it was only just happening in 1995.

Commissioners' wives, now Commissioners in their own right, would become eligible for summons to the High Council and given a vote in the election of the next General. This increased female representation on that body at its next meeting from 10% to 37% - the male majority was maintained because the non-Commissioner Territorial Commanders were nearly all men, whose wives were not eligible to attend.⁹⁹⁷ Another even-handed change was that whereas previously a woman officer marrying a man holding a rank lower than her own assumed the husband's rank, now whichever spouse had the lower rank would take the same rank as his or her new partner.

Other elements in this reform package included individual appointments, equality of consideration being given to both spouses' vocations in the making of appointments, appointments of both spouses being announced simultaneously (instead of the wife's being tacked on as a later afterthought), individual personnel reviews and service record cards, and appropriate assessment, orientation and on-going training for women whose family responsibilities or husband's appointments had restricted their own development. It was also provided that "a married woman officer may be given the leadership role in a joint appointment where this is appropriate and the stability of the marriage and family is not placed at risk."⁹⁹⁸

⁹⁹⁷ Information courtesy of Colonel Laurence Hay.

⁹⁹⁸ Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 1995/IA/15. New Zealand has begun making such moves. In two cases where couples have been stationed at Aged Care Residential Centres, the wife has been designated the Manager, though the husband has also had some other off-site role, such as military chaplaincy. However in 2003 Captain Lynette Hutson was appointed National Manager of Addiction Services, thus becoming line manager for her husband, Captain Ian Hutson, who is Director of the Auckland Bridge Centre. In the meantime, the Philippines had already appointed Major Noveminda Tanedo as Divisional Commander for the Mindanao Division in 2000, while her husband, Major Wenjune Tanedo, served as Divisional Secretary, her second in command. Perhaps the political situation in the Philippines, with a woman President, smoothed the way for this appointment. Women take a significant role in Filipino society. (Information from Lt.-Colonel Pamela Hodge, who worked there for many years.) According to Shaw Clifton, the change was not wholly driven by principle in the United Kingdom; split allowances to avoid higher taxation were an element in giving separate appointments. Other formulae are being experimented with: in the Northern New England Division of the USA Eastern Territory, Major Janet Munn, wife of the Divisional Commander, was designated "Associate Divisional Commander" rather than the traditional "Divisional Director for Women's Organisations." (*Horizons*, Nov./Dec. 2003, p.15.)

In 1997 Rader took the further step of ruling that his wife would be ranked as a Commissioner. Hitherto the General's wife had been known as, for example, Mrs General Rader. While not binding on his successors in office, this more than brought international leadership into line with the new provision for all wives to hold their rank in their own right; it also fuelled "speculation that the time may come when other married officers will hold different ranks from their spouses."⁹⁹⁹ And such in fact proved to be the case. Within a few years some corps were intrigued by the fact that their married officer couples now wore different insignia, dependent upon their individual length of service. At Miramar, Wellington, for example, the married woman officer became Major Petrea Medland while her spouse remained Captain David Medland. In some countries cultural norms made this impracticable, and in territories embracing more than one country and culture the application of the new rule could cause embarrassment. Tonga for example is part of the New Zealand Territory and subject to New Zealand regulation, but Tongan Salvationists found it difficult to fathom why their Regional Commander should be Captain Garth Stevenson while his wife was Major Suzanne Stevenson.

A marker of the changes over these years was the way in which the official form of address for married women officers changed from, for example, "Mrs Lieutenant Murray Flagg", to "Mrs Lieutenant Murray (Deborah) Flagg", to "Mrs Captain Deborah Flagg", to "Major Deborah Flagg".¹⁰⁰⁰ The official designation changed from "officer-wife" (considered a great advance on "officer's wife")¹⁰⁰¹ to "married woman-officer" – although Captain Violet Smart wanted to know if men were now to be "married men-officers" as well. "No more labels, please!" she requested.¹⁰⁰²

⁹⁹⁹ *The Salvationist*, 30 August 1997, p.3.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Major Deborah Flagg in 'Softly Eclipsed', in *New Frontier*, 30 April 1997, pp.6-7, and in *The Officer*, October 1997, pp.12-7.

¹⁰⁰¹ *The Officer*, September-October 1960, p.358.

¹⁰⁰² *ibid.*, June 1992, pp.287-8.

Other anomalies remained in the new ranking system. Commissioned ranks up to and including Major depend on years of service; that of Lt.-Colonel and above are described as “conferred ranks” (once described as “staff ranks”), and go with certain senior administrative roles. The practice of individual ranks has not yet been extended to this level, except in the case of the General’s spouse. Major Vinti’s 1975 vision of a woman Commissioner with her spouse a major serving in her headquarters has not yet been realised. Dr John Coutts, still campaigning for the principle of equality, rained on the Army’s parade in 1998 by pointing out: “Now the wives of officers have gained their rank in their own right. This will certainly improve the gender balance at the High Council. But will the wives really be there in their own right? The new women commissioners have in fact been appointed by virtue of being married to their husbands. A ‘Mrs Major’ – no matter how well qualified – will not progress until her other half is promoted.”¹⁰⁰³ A recently retired married woman Commissioner said to me that despite their new rank and status the women leaders were clearly at a disadvantage in conference and council. They had not had the necessary opportunities for real leadership over the years and the experience that would have given greater credibility to their views. That would take a generation to establish.¹⁰⁰⁴

A curious piece of window-dressing in the 2003 Yearbook is that the entry for each Territory is now headed with the names of the Territorial Commander and spouse as “Territorial Leaders”, but so that there should be no mistake this is immediately followed by the name of the “Territorial Commander”. At this time, the latter name is always that of the male partner.

The developments described above were taken further by the International Commission on Officership and subsequent changes in regulations. However at this point it is appropriate to pause and take

¹⁰⁰³ *The Salvationist*, 28 March, 1998, p.7.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Commissioner Karen Thompson, in conversation with the writer, November 2002.

stock. The story of women's ministry within the Army really provides a sub-plot or counterpoint to the theme of this thesis – whether Salvation Army officers are really “clergy”. The issue for women, and particularly for married women, has been whether they were really “officers”. 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 superb *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 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.¹⁰⁰⁵

Lt. Colonel Barbara Robinson (Canada), reviewing Eason's book for *Word and Deed*, concluded, “The most disturbing aspect of this book... is that while Andrew Eason is a historian and *Women in God's Army* is a historical monograph, his book comes far too close to describing the contemporary Army practice for comfort. So read it – and shudder!”¹⁰⁰⁶

Major Karen Shakespeare also addressed the cultural factor in a theological reflection in the 2004 Report of the Gender Issues Commission in the United Kingdom.

Historically the culture of British society has supported a patriarchal model for the theology of gender. The assumptions of modernity

¹⁰⁰⁵ Andrew Mark Eason, *Women in God's Army*. Waterloo, Ontario, Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2003, p.152.

¹⁰⁰⁶ *Word and Deed*, November 2003, pp.90-3.

encouraged a gender separation in which men were seen to be logical, unemotional and suited to public life and leadership and women found their role in relational activities, most often in the home or in a 'caring' profession. The Salvation Army, whilst affirming the equality of all in doctrinal and policy statements, has in practice demonstrated a theology which privileges men and assumes an essentially different role for women, especially those who are married. In the post-modern world, which no longer accepts the assumptions of modern culture, there is a need to re-assess and possibly re-think our theological understanding of gender.¹⁰⁰⁷

Major Richard Munn (USA), writing on "Married Officer Leadership", while noting that the Army is positioned "to speak with some authority on the subject of dual clergy couples" and so "effectively poised to engage a culture that is increasingly faced with the familial and marital ramifications of two employed parents," goes on to say that,

While purporting egalitarian leadership... and advocating shared formal authority for men and women, the married officer leadership model often functions along quite traditional gender roles. Externally this is expressed through denominational polity with men consistently holding the dominant leadership positions. Internally it is expressed with the majority of officer couples indicating that the man is the 'spiritual head of the family'. Thus, while demonstrating much strength, the unique contribution of the married officer leadership model may not be fully maximised. The matter might be deficient theology.¹⁰⁰⁸

Munn goes on to take Priscilla and Aquila as "the quintessential dual clergy couple" and explores the principles found in the six Bible references to them as appropriate for officer couples' ministry.¹⁰⁰⁹ He suggests that the married officer leadership model is a unique strength of the Army and that "we seem unusually primed 'for such a time as this'."

It took a long time for the Christian ethic to bring about the cessation of gladiatorial contests and much longer for it to achieve the abolition of slavery. It was only towards the end of the 20th century that the mainstream Protestant Western Church began to bring its understanding of ordained ministry into line with its belief that in Christ

¹⁰⁰⁷ Quoted by Major Chick Yuill in "Nettles and Wineskins", the Frederick Coutts Memorial Lecture for 2004 at the College for Further Education, Sydney, and printed in the *Practical Theologian*, Vol. 2 No. 2, September 2004, pp.1-22.

¹⁰⁰⁸ *The Officer*, July/August 2004, pp.10-11.

¹⁰⁰⁹ Acts 18:2, 18, 26; Rom. 16:3; 2 Tim. 4:19; 1 Cor. 16:19.

there is neither male nor female.¹⁰¹⁰ The Salvation Army, having in some senses pioneered this direction, evidently lost its momentum fairly early in its history, while continuing to believe its own rhetoric, and has only recently begun to address the issues again.

¹⁰¹⁰ Galatians 3:28.

PART FOUR**THINGS THAT ARE SHAKEN, THINGS THAT REMAIN¹⁰¹¹**

¹⁰¹¹ Hebrews 12:27

CHAPTER NINE**THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON OFFICERSHIP**

*We cannot revive old factions
We cannot restore old policies
Or follow an antique drum.*

T.S. Eliot,
Little Gidding, Four Quartets

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.¹⁰¹² Twenty-three people were appointed to serve on the commission, representing a wide range of cultures, experience and age groups. Nearly a third were unmarried; eleven were women; three were non-officers.

The terms of reference reflected both the concerns of the Army’s leadership and the areas of debate within the ranks of officers in particular. These were in the main about essentially practical matters but inevitably carried theological implications. They were:

1. The strengthening and promoting of the ideal of lifetime service as an officer.
2. The possibility of short-term officer service, and, if such is considered viable, the practical and legal implications, including training, contract/covenant, ordinations, benefits and pensions.
3. Separate vocations for husbands and wives as an option from the time of entering officer training.
4. The continuation of the service of a married officer in cases where the spouse ceases to be an officer for such reason as misconduct, marital breakdown or illness, and possibly even ineffectiveness or lack of commitment.
5. The introduction of separate ranks for spouses.
6. Separate allowances for married officers.
7. Portable pensions for officers.
8. Administrative policies and regulations related to officers’ conditions of service, including those to do with marriage.

¹⁰¹² Norman Howe, “The International Commission on Officership, A Report”, *The Officer*, August 1999, p.19.

9. The possibility of the “tent-maker” concept, i.e. part-time secular employment by officers being considered in certain circumstances, in order to assist with the funding of the appointment.

Commissioner Norman Howe, the Commission’s chairman, noted that the real issues ran deeper, and concerned such questions as, “How is the Army best to engage in mission in the contemporary world?” and “What kind of leadership can best enable that mission endeavour?” Howe also admitted that there was “an inherent tension within the terms of reference”, particularly between the first two points, but regarded this as a positive tension.¹⁰¹³

The Commission met in October 1998 and February 1999, and submitted to the General an Interim Report containing 28 draft recommendations. Rader, who was nearing retirement, had copies of the Report distributed to all territories and commands, asking for responses to be made and received at International Headquarters by September 1999. 41 out of the Army’s 54 territories and commands responded, as did a number of individuals. A working party of six members of the Commission then prepared a final draft, which the full Commission reviewed and presented to the new General, John Gowans, in January 2000.

Introducing the Final Report, the Commission referred to the Biblical principles on which their work was based, and in particular to the mission of proclaiming the Gospel (Mark 1:14-15) and the prophetic role of those called to ministry (Matthew 10:7-8). It referred to the Spirit-led adaptability of the early Church as the basis of “a functional view of officership”. It also identified four factors foundational to its work. These were:

- That “officership is part of a wider resource of spiritual leadership...” and “ministry opportunity must be open to both officers and soldiers...”. Nevertheless officers have a particular function “to provide direction and spiritual, theological and practical resources to mobilize Salvationists for mission,” and “the

¹⁰¹³ Norman Howe, *ibid.*, p.19.

effectiveness of the mission would be seriously disadvantaged” without “dedicated, motivated and qualified officers who are willing to give sacrificial service.”

- That “Officership is the outworking of a covenant relationship between an individual and God”. The individual’s calling is tested by the Salvation Army, which “trains for spiritual leadership, acknowledges the ordination of the Holy Spirit and commissions to service.”
- That “Officership implies obligation by The Salvation Army as well as the officer...” and “this is much more about attitude than provision, and requires a shift from paternalism to partnership and from command to facilitation.”
- That “The mission context changes significantly from generation to generation and from place to place. These changes demand renewal and refocus in mission... a major challenge to a movement originally structured as a quasi-military and hierarchical system with international regulations.”¹⁰¹⁴

Gowans then took a step unprecedented in Salvation Army history, and in February 2000 circulated the Final Report to all 17,362 active and 8,113 retired officers in the world, asking for an expression of opinion (Agree, Somewhat agree, Somewhat disagree and Disagree) on each of the 28 recommendations.¹⁰¹⁵

In his covering letter, Gowans reserved his prerogative as General - “This is not a voting process by which the majority opinion absolves me from taking the hard decisions. It is a consultative process...” He wanted that process to be complete in time for the International Conference of Leaders scheduled for Atlanta in June, and therefore asked that responses be returned to the London-based MORI organisation (Market

¹⁰¹⁴ *ibid.*, pp.2-3.

¹⁰¹⁵ It is interesting that the questionnaire was given to *retired* officers as well as active. While this was a courtesy and gave the Army the benefit of their experience and the wisdom of age, it could also imply that officership was not seen as merely functional; that officers retained the *character* of officership even when no longer involved in the functions.

and Opinion Research International Ltd) by late May for computer processing. In the event a 50% return was received. A month later a summary and statistical analysis of the response was also made available to all officers in a letter from the Chief of the Staff.

All of the Commission's 28 recommendations were endorsed globally, most by a substantial margin. Six were supported by 90% of respondents, twelve by 80%, six by 70% and two by 50%. Of these last two, the one concerning 'tent-maker ministry' was supported by all zones except North America. The proposal that officers might be married to non-officers received a bare 50% support of respondents¹⁰¹⁶ but Africa, North America and South Asia (comprising the Indian subcontinent) disagreed.¹⁰¹⁷

By August 2000 Gowans had published his responses to the recommendations, along with his action plan for each. These ranged from immediate implementation to "acceptance in principle", sometimes with numerous qualifications and recognition that the extent or timing of implementation would depend on the circumstances and cultural milieux of particular territories. Many issues were left to territorial discretion and in some cases the objective was to be sought by means other than those suggested, but none were rejected out of hand.¹⁰¹⁸

By November a series of revisions to *Orders and Regulations for Officers*, giving effect to changes, had begun to appear. At the same time territories responded to Recommendation 28 by appointing their own task forces to work out how the international changes might be effected locally, and responses from these were due back at IHQ by December 2001. (By that time some of their deliberations had been pre-empted by the new regulations being promulgated from London, such as those concerning the ranks of auxiliary captain and lieutenant.)

To what extent do these findings and changes bear upon the matters at the heart of this thesis – the character of officership, and the

¹⁰¹⁶ That is, 25% of those polled.

¹⁰¹⁷ John Larsson, *Findings of the General's consultation with officers regarding the recommendations of the International Commission on Officership*, 24 June 2000.

¹⁰¹⁸ John Gowans, *The Recommendations of the International Commission on Officership: The General's Response and Action Plan*, 24 August 2000.

question of whether officership is perceived as a functional role or a clerical status? Most of the recommendations deal with “officer conditions”, the distinctive circumstances discussed in the chapter, “What manner of men – and women”. These included such areas as poverty, obedience, the role of women and spouse-relationships. 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. Regulations framed for Victorian times could not be expected to fit the needs of the twenty-first century; they had been stretched as far as possible but the time had come for structural adjustments. In so far as the character of officership is bound up with and even determined by such features, it is inevitably changing.

As far as the matters whose history has been traced in this thesis are concerned, we need to look at what happened to the recommendations affecting two areas in particular. Firstly, we consider the recommendations having to do with the role of women and the equality of their status with that of men officers. Recommendations 13, on allowances, 15, on women’s appointments, and 16, on the need for gender balance on Boards and Councils, are relevant here. Secondly, we look at those recommendations bearing directly on the status-function dichotomy we have observed through the Army’s (and the Church’s) history. Under this heading we could place numbers 8 and 9, to do with Covenant and Undertakings; number 18, on open-ended or short-term commissions; 22 on models of spiritual leadership; and 24 on tent-making ministry.

Concerning Women

Gowans agreed in principle to recommendation 13, that equal and separate allowances should be paid to both officer spouses, “on condition that they are not financially disadvantaged by the change, that it is culturally appropriate, and that the interests of single officers are

safeguarded.”¹⁰¹⁹ This would be a matter for individual territories to address. The United Kingdom had already begun doing this. New Zealand had long since worked out an arrangement with the Inland Revenue Department whereby 3/5 of the combined officer allowance was credited to the husband and 2/5 to the wife as this seemed to offer the best tax advantages. A New Zealand task force reporting in mid-2001 recommended a change as “we felt the separate payments would help to recognise the important concept of the individual officer, especially in relation to the ministry opportunity for women within the movement.” However it also wanted research to ensure the best possible tax advantage.¹⁰²⁰ A change to a 50/50 payment to spouses was made in New Zealand mid-2003.

Recommendation 15 reiterated the need to affirm women officers, whether married or single, by appointing them to positions commensurate with their gifts and experience. All Gowans could do about this was to accept the recommendation and encourage territories to keep the matter to the fore: territorial task forces should consider the findings of the 1993 Commission on the Ministry of Women Officers, territorial reviews by zonal international secretaries should address performance in this area, and Orders and Regulations for Territorial Commanders would give increased emphasis – and IHQ should set an example. Such exhortations had been made often enough before and soon forgotten; abstract objectives are difficult to quantify and therefore hard to monitor and enforce. The New Zealand task force suggested various areas in which the leadership could be proactive in implementing this recommendation.

¹⁰¹⁹ John Gowans, *The Recommendations of the International Commission on Officership; the General's Response and Action Plan*. 24 August 2000, p.14.

¹⁰²⁰ *Commission on Officership, NZ Task Force Findings*, Wellington, May 2001, pp.17-18. In the United States, the whole of the pay cheque for the couple is still made out to the husband and the wife is classed as a “volunteer” worker under an agreement with IRS made in 1957. (Unpublished paper by Major JoAnn Shade, “On Reconstructing a Monument”, August 2003, p.2. Copy in possession of the writer.) Recent attempts to change this have ended up in the too-hard basket at time of writing.

Number 16, concerning gender balance on planning and decision-making bodies, was also accepted and territories asked to implement it quickly. Tokenism was to be avoided. Perhaps such an objective could be quantified – but was not. Gowans contented himself with reiterating that it was now acceptable for spouses to serve on the same Boards and Councils – once not permitted – and with pointing out that the best way of achieving the aim was to ensure a gender balance amongst office holders. (Most such bodies had membership drawn from people holding specific related responsibilities.) The New Zealand task force supported, without offering suggestions for specific measures.

It could be said that as far as women's ministry is concerned, the Commission's proposals really followed on from the Rader reforms of the mid-1990's without adding very much that would specifically advance practical gender equality. In some territories the implications of the changes are still being explored. In the United Kingdom for example a commission was set up in 2003 to examine gender issues relating to the appointment, ministry and personal fulfilment of officers. Key points being considered are Gender issues relating to territorial structures, Cultural factors and Work/Life balance. Only by such serious exploration of practical problems will further progress be made.¹⁰²¹

Concerning the status of officership

The "inherent tension" Norman Howe had noted between the first and second of the commission's terms of reference reflected again the ambiguity of the Army's position regarding "status" and "function". If officership were seen in terms of (indelible?) priestly or clerical character, its concomitant would be the "ideal of lifetime service". On the other hand, if officership were simply functional, there would be no theological impediment to short-term officer service. In John Gowans' words, "The traditional understanding within the Army is that officership is a lifelong commitment. Those who set out on the path of officership do so with the

¹⁰²¹ *The Salvationist*, 12 April 2003, p.5.

intention of it being for life – though it is also informally understood and accepted that it may not work out that way for everyone.”¹⁰²²

As might be expected, the wording of the Covenant has usually expressed this ambiguity, implying a commitment to lifetime officership without explicitly stating it. Although the 1922 rubric used the expression “Life Covenant”, this was always represented as between the officer and God (“to love and serve Him supremely all my days”) rather than with the Army. Being “true to the Salvation Army and the principles represented by its flag” was a promise that could be fulfilled in service as a soldier, not necessarily as an officer only. The preamble to the version I signed in 1972 began, “Called by God to proclaim the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ as an officer of The Salvation Army...”, which could imply more strongly though still not necessarily insist that the lifelong covenant which followed would operate exclusively within the calling of officership.

The commission’s rewording in Recommendation 8 perhaps slightly tempered that assumption with the words, “Called by God to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ and to meet human need in his name, I dedicate myself to service as an officer of The Salvation Army.” (The decision to work out that calling within officership has become the officer’s decision rather than God’s imperative.) And where the seventies version concluded, “and, by God’s grace, to prove myself a worthy officer,” the commission favoured the more generic and ambiguous “and, by God’s grace, to be all that he has called me to be.”

It cannot be said therefore that the commission decisively fulfilled its mandate to “strengthen and promote the ideal of lifetime service as an officer.” Gowans accepted the proposed wording in principle but saw it as a draft capable of further amendment.

Recommendation 9, on the Undertakings, was notable in suggesting for the first time that officer and Army might have reciprocal obligations, while cautiously preserving the legal basis for clerical status. No signature is appended on behalf of the organisation, however, lest the

¹⁰²² John Gowans, *Recommendations*, p.16.

whole be construed as a contract. Gowans accepted the recommendation and said that a reviewing group would be appointed.

Recommendations 18, 19 and 20 dealt with aspects of 'open-ended' service by which the commission evidently meant service other than lifelong. While 19 and 20 referred to the pastoral and financial sequelae to resignation, 18 addressed the issue of intentionally short-term service. We have seen that Gowans himself had been a proponent of this idea for many years. (See p.269)

In his response to Recommendation 18, Gowans summarised the commission's choice as between, "(a) the concept of officership can be made more open-ended so that it formally allows for both short term and lifelong service, or, (b) whether we must think in terms of a parallel structure that exists alongside, but outside, of officership." The commission preferred the experimental testing of (a), which would have tipped the theological seesaw away from officership as a status and towards a simply functional definition. However, contrary to their recommendation and with no further consultation preceding its inauguration, Gowans opted for (b). He claimed that it had "the great advantage of leaving untouched the basic concept and structure of officership as it has been traditionally understood, and not seeking to merge two contrasting approaches – short-term and lifelong – within the one concept of officership."

Noting that the existing warrant officer auxiliary-captain and envoy systems already constituted "two parallel structures alongside commissioned officership," Gowans decided to supersede these with one new parallel structure, a new kind of lieutenancy.¹⁰²³ By maintaining the two-tier system, the non-commissioned second tier being for functional, short-term service, he preserved the possibility that the commissioned first tier enjoyed a different ministerial character or status from the second. In fact he might be said to have strengthened this assumption, in that the hybrid auxiliary-captain status was discontinued and the new lieutenancy was more explicitly a non-officer rank. Gowans therefore

¹⁰²³ John Gowans, *ibid.*, pp.16-7.

drew back from tipping the balance decisively in the direction of functional officership, and the time-honoured ambiguity was maintained. The essential features of the new system were:

- The rank of lieutenant would become a non-commissioned rank, while officers would in future be commissioned as captains.
- Lieutenants would provide spiritual leadership and service, and could be accepted at any age. Gowans intended the system to be available both for those who wished to commit to a finite number of years and those who set no specific time limit. However the regulations eventually settled on three-year terms, renewable if both the lieutenant and the Army agreed.¹⁰²⁴
- Lieutenants would serve under “officer conditions”, but, like the existing auxiliary captains, not be commissioned as officers.
- Lieutenants could move into commissioned officership once they had completed training requirements, which might be satisfied by flexible training rather than by the usual residential course, and would sign the officers’ undertakings and covenant when commissioned as captains.

Like officers, lieutenants “must be prepared to forgo all other occupations and accept total involvement in the branch of Army service to which they may be appointed.” The Minute also stipulates that lieutenants’ service will be a non-contractual relationship so far as legally possible in each territory... [they] will be asked to sign undertakings similar to, but different from, officers’ undertakings... [which] will reflect the spiritual non-contractual relationship with The Salvation Army.”¹⁰²⁵

While subject to the Orders and Regulations for Salvation Army Officers, lieutenants under the new system do not serve entirely under “officer conditions”, at least not in New Zealand. They receive salary supplements in lieu of the usual officer fringe benefits such as medical insurance and funded extra training. Furthermore, like envoys but unlike

¹⁰²⁴ John Larsson, Minute 2000/1A/13 from the Chief of the Staff, *Orders and Regulations for the Lieutenants System*, 1 May 2001, p.2.

¹⁰²⁵ John Larsson, *ibid.*, p.3.

auxiliary captains, should they later become officers their time as lieutenants will not be credited towards their officer service – a significant disadvantage in terms of retirement allowances or financial settlement which are calculated according to years of service. (Pension arrangements are a matter for territorial policy.) Unlike Envoys or Auxiliary Captains, they would revert to soldier status when leaving the service; there will be no retired Lieutenants.¹⁰²⁶

The upshot is that with this curiously hybrid rank, the Army continues to have a two-tier system of ranked leadership, performing identical ministry roles but with some regarded as officers and others not. This is not a priesthood/diaconate distinction.

The New Zealand task force supported Gowans in maintaining officership as a “vocational” service, and agreed that the new Lieutenancy model adequately provided for “open-ended” service where the individuals wished to maintain more lifestyle choice.

Recommendation 22 urged the development of other models of spiritual leadership – that is, other than officership. This responded to the reality that with fewer officers available in some territories (especially in Europe) and the expansion of work beyond available officer-leadership in others (especially in Africa), “positions traditionally held by officers can be occupied by soldiers with an equal sense of vocation.”¹⁰²⁷

Gowans, while endorsing this and urging comprehensive review by territorial task forces, concentrated his observations particularly on how local volunteer (“lay” – though he did not use that word) spiritual leadership might be strengthened. He did not refer to the increasing phenomenon of full-time, employed soldier-ministry, except by the provision of the lieutenant system already described. The paradoxical situation, that some people can do the ministry work of officers (such as being pastors) and be officers in everything but name, while other people can actually be officers in name while not engaged in any distinctively

¹⁰²⁶ *The Salvationist*, 19 May 2001, p.9. In New Zealand, Lieutenants have subsequently been brought more into line with “officer-conditions” of service, except that they are on individual employment contracts.

¹⁰²⁷ The International Commission on Officership, *Final Report*, London, 2000, p.16.

ministry role (being, for example accountants within the Army administrative structure), was not addressed. Such a situation clearly implies that officership is a status rather than a function dependent on a particular role.

The New Zealand task force, like the General, saw this recommendation in terms of spiritual leadership by the soldiery in a voluntary capacity, although they also posed the question “as to whether opportunity to demonstrate spiritual leadership within a Salvation Army community of faith should be restricted to those who were formally committed to soldiery.” This was not explored further, but did acknowledge the fact that an increasing number of New Zealand Salvationists and people willing to belong to a Salvationist community, including many who would and did provide significant local leadership, did not want to commit to soldiery.¹⁰²⁸ They saw their association in terms of the local congregation rather than the national, let alone international, body. This reference did acknowledge the fact that not just officership but also soldiery in the Army is in the midst of a crisis of identity and direction, at least in countries like New Zealand. The task force affirmed that they did “not see the officer as having priestly status or function above the soldier.”¹⁰²⁹

Recommendation 24, on “tent-maker” ministry,¹⁰³⁰ approached a similar problem from another direction and with a different outcome. “Tent-making” ministry resembles the “worker-priest” solution attempted and abandoned¹⁰³¹ in France after the Second World War, where clerical

¹⁰²⁸ My informal discussion with colleagues in Australia indicates that this post-modern local loyalty obtains there also, especially in respect of new “Corps plants”.

¹⁰²⁹ *Commission on Officership, NZ Task Force Findings*, pp.25-6.

¹⁰³⁰ See *A Tent-Making Ministry: Towards a More Flexible Form of Ministry*, Geneva, London and New York, World Council of Churches, 1962, and Francis, James and Francis, Leslie, *Tentmaking: Perspectives on Self-Supporting Ministry*. Leominster, Gracewing, 1998.

¹⁰³¹ Abandoned in part because it was less amenable to hierarchical control (See <http://home.vicnet.net.au/~cardoner/uniya/un5au12.txt>, and <http://catholiclabor.org/gen-art/loew.htm>). Equally relevant to the theme of this thesis is the “theological question of what a worker-priest had to offer in the workplace that a layman did not.” (See *Expository Times*, November 2000 Vol.112 No.2, pp.39-40: review of John Mantle’s

persons supported their ministerial vocation by secular employment, or the non-stipendiary priesthood increasingly common in the Anglican communion. Gowans realised that the “concept in relation to officership bristles with difficulties.” He led an organisation in which in some countries officers received full allowances in addition to state welfare support, while in others officers enjoyed neither – in some cases had to farm land to feed their children and sell the produce to pay for their education. Colonel David Edwards (Caribbean) in a paper given to the 1991 International Conference of Leaders, had recommended the worker priest concept because it was impossible economically in some countries to sustain full-time officership, which he described as a “ridiculous luxury”.¹⁰³² At the same time, the official *Orders and Regulations* define officers as “those who have relinquished secular employment ... so as to devote all their time and energies to the service of God and the people.”

Gowans therefore decided to leave the matter to territorial discretion, but to “hedge that acceptance with a number of qualifications and restrictions.”¹⁰³³ Here Gowans, while conceding that there were powerful and practical arguments in favour of “tent-making”, apparently attempted by these restrictions to hold a line opposite that logically required by his retention of the two-tier structure, so that commissioned officers ideally need to be engaged in full-time ministry, ensuring that officership can actually be seen as a matter of role or function (full-time ministry) rather than a matter of status.

The New Zealand task force also felt that the tent-maker concept “compromises the basis of officership in that an officer is set aside by the Church for ministry and removed from the need for secular employment.”

Britain's First Worker-Priests: Radical Ministry in a Post-War Setting. SCM, 2000. The concept of the worker-priest could be seen as essentially clericalist, dependent on the view that clergy have some special and necessary character; clergy doing the laity's work is the counterpoint to laity doing the clergy's work.

¹⁰³² Minutes of the 1991 International Conference of Leaders. (Heritage Centre Archives.)

¹⁰³³ John Gowans, *Recommendations*, pp.20-1.

They therefore recommended the concept “as particularly appropriate for non-officer soldiers.”¹⁰³⁴

By the most recent “official word”, therefore, ambiguity about the nature of officership has been perpetuated. John Gowans, the General regarded as most able to think outside the square, was nevertheless unable or unwilling to take the decisive step needed to commit the Army to an entirely functional concept of ministry. The organisation has not been able to escape trying to have it both ways.

Geoff Ryan, a Canadian officer, summed up the situation as follows:

When General Gowans, in response to the cry of the grassroots and through the International Commission on Officership, created new policies governing officership, he further muddled the waters. By giving freedom for local definition while retaining centralised control to a large degree, the General created a “push-me-pull-you” hybrid compromise. Individual territories have been allowed to progress with the redefinition of officership as they see fit and so the traditional homogeneity of officership has given way to a patchwork of localised definitions. It is somewhat akin to the effect that pluralism has had on religion – 50 years ago if you referred to “God” everyone more or less knew who you were talking about. That is not the case now. An officer in Canada or Bermuda means something different to an officer in the U.K.’ for starters...¹⁰³⁵

Against that conclusion, one could say that Gowans had little choice, and for two reasons. The first is that the international diversity of the Army is now such that one size no longer fits all. This was admitted by Commissioner Earle Maxwell, Chief of the Staff, at the 1998 International Conference of Leaders, when he said that “it is becoming increasingly difficult, from an IHQ point of view, to formulate international decisions, with their implied global relevance, that can then be comfortably implemented in every territory or command.”¹⁰³⁶ The second reason is that there has not for a long time been a consensus on the issue of the status of officers – any more than there was in fact any

¹⁰³⁴ *Commission on Officership, NZ Task Force Findings*, pp.26-7.

¹⁰³⁵ *Horizons*, July/August 2003, p.20.

¹⁰³⁶ *The Officer*, August 1998, p.5. C.f. Avery Dulles’ prediction concerning the post-Vatican II Catholic Church. “The internal pluralism in the church itself will be such that directives from on high will be variously applied in different regions, so that the top officers will not be able to control in detail what goes on at the local level.” (Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, New York, Image/Doubleday, (1974) 1978, p.208.)

consensus fifty years ago on the meaning of “God”. The whole burden of this thesis has been to show that the movement has been uncertain about this from comparatively early in its history. Perhaps this diversity of viewpoint has not been consciously geographically distributed, although it should also be remembered that the major proportion of contributions to *The Officer* originate from Europe, the U.K., the “Old Dominions” and the U.S.A. and so no longer necessarily represent majority opinion in the Army. Indeed the distribution of responses to the General’s questionnaire suggests that the Army in the developing world tends to be as conservative as other denominations in those areas.

CHAPTER TEN

CONCLUSIONS

*“Not I, some child, born in a marvellous year,
Will learn the trick of standing upright here.”*

Allen Curnow, *Attitudes for a New Zealand Poet* (iii).

This historical analysis of Salvation Army ministry has been in terms of the tension between function and status; between the view that members of the church differ only in that they have distinct roles, and the tradition that some enjoy a particular status by virtue of their ordination to one of those roles in particular.

It seems to me that The Salvation Army had three options regarding the question of ordination and 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 acknowledging itself to be something like an order or an *ecclesiola in ecclesia* rather than a "church" or "denomination". In this scenario, the Army, unlike Henry VIII's realm of England, could not be "an Empire... sufficient and meet of itself."¹⁰³⁷ While William Booth sometimes implied that this option was his intention, at least in the early days, especially when he did not wish to offend churchmen, or hoped for something from them, it is clear that he did not believe this to be the case. We have seen that negotiations with the Church of England in 1882 foundered on this point amongst others. For Booth it was not enough that his officers should be regarded as Deacons and Deaconesses, members of an inferior order.

¹⁰³⁷ Preamble to Act in Restraint of Appeals, 1533. (H. Bettenson: *Documents of the Christian Church*. Oxford, OUP, 1956, pp.306-7.)

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. There was no question of the Army wanting or being able to claim that its ministry was in the Apostolic Succession in a way that would satisfy the criteria of the Catholic, Orthodox or Anglican churches, so Brown’s ordination must have been conceived of in the sense that the churches of the Reformation and the free churches or dissenting groups have used it.

The history outlined in the introductory chapter suggests that this no man’s ground between having a priesthood and not having a priesthood is difficult to hold. Mascall for example quotes Paul Tillich struggling with coherence on this point. Tillich claimed that, “Protestantism demands a radical laicism. There are in Protestantism only laymen; the minister is a layman with a special function within the congregation; and, in addition to possessing certain personal qualities, he is qualified for the fulfilment of this function by a carefully regulated professional training. He is a non-layman solely by virtue of this training.”¹⁰³⁸ Professor Peter Munz of the History Department at Victoria University used to speak of the British Commonwealth as the imaginary empire you had when you stopped having an empire. Whatever you called it, it wasn’t really there: either you

¹⁰³⁸ Paul Tillich, *The Protestant Era*. London, Nisbet, 1951, ch.xi., cited by E.L. Mascall, *Recovery of Unity*, p.7.

had an empire or you had independent nations. (With the Commonwealth of course the tendency is away from Empire; with ministry roles the movement is towards priesthood.) Perhaps a closer analogy, in Brueggemann's schema, is that of the Davidic monarchy as an intermediate stage between the Israelite Amphictyony and the Solomonic Empire, between the Mosaic vision of an alternative community of free Israelites and regression to the power structures of oppression and exploitation. Brueggemann says that "...David, genius that he was, managed to have it both ways."¹⁰³⁹ Booth also tried to have it both ways, but whatever his intentions, officership came to be identified with an ambivalent form of clericalism. The point is that any kind of function gravitates towards status. The trick is to find a way of preventing that happening.

The way in which the Army has sought recognition for its ministry by attempting to graft on a soi-disant ordination might be analogous to the elders of Israel appealing to Samuel for a King, so that they "might be like the nations round about."¹⁰⁴⁰ Such a request rather loses its point when monarchies are elsewhere going out of fashion, and it is ironical that the Army's attempts to be more church-like have come at a time when the mainline denominations of the West have been entering a period of rapid decline. (Masked temporarily only by the rise of more conservative, evangelical and pentecostal groupings as some passengers on the Titanic scramble for those parts of the ship still above water.)¹⁰⁴¹

¹⁰³⁹ Walter Brueggemann, *Prophetic Imagination*, p.25.

¹⁰⁴⁰ 1 Samuel 8:5.

¹⁰⁴¹ Kevin Ward, in "Christendom, Clericalism, Church and Context", quotes church attendance figures in Australia declining from 40% in 1960 to 10% in 1999, with similar patterns in New Zealand, Canada and Great Britain. Even in USA there has been a decline from 49% in 1958 to 40% in 2000. Research in all these countries showed that where evangelical, pentecostal and charismatic churches were growing, around 90% of growth came from other conservative churches or from children of church members. "What has happened is merely a reconfiguration of existing church goers." (<http://www.presbyterian.org.nz/441.98.html>) A Barna report of 4 May 2004 shows an increase in the number of American non-church attenders from 39 million to 75 million

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 and a significant body of opinion within The Salvation Army still adheres to it. However, we have seen that the line was impossible to hold. 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 “all lay” ethos inherited from its radical Protestant antecedents.

Is this then simply a matter of semantics, without practical implications? Not if praxis is rooted in theology... and even such pragmatic steps as led to the present situation have depended on theological assumptions, albeit sometimes unconscious, and sometimes contradictory. This exploration of historical theology has been intended to help clarify the present situation and suggest that future developments ought to be premised on theological understanding. Against that, I concede that the history of the church shows that theology almost invariably follows practice – what works becomes orthodoxy, and theology is then adjusted to fit it. History also shows that once established, both doctrine and praxis become highly resistant to change. Change may eventually become possible, not because the theology has been shown to

1991-2004, a 92% increase; an increase in the percentage of “unchurched” adults from 21% to 34% of the population.

be inadequate but because it is no longer working successfully. The addictive disposition to denial may prevent this being conceded until the organisational journey has gone beyond the point of no return.¹⁰⁴²

This history illustrates that the Salvation Army has not been immune from the normal process whereby practical measures become set in concrete and functional roles sacralised, especially if reinforced by religious sanctions. The Founders had hoped it might be otherwise. Railton exulted that “

The Army has only escaped from the old ruts in which it would have stuck fast and been incapable of accomplishing its great work by desperate fighting against itself...” It had succeeded “because the General has had, from the first, a single eye, and that single eye will enable us, if necessary, to emancipate ourselves further still, will make it as easy to abandon Army customs, as the custom which prevailed before The Army, whenever it may be proved to our satisfaction that, by so doing, we should more rapidly or completely attain the one great end in view.”¹⁰⁴³

Were Railton's hopes not realised? If not, why not?

Firstly, as the initial, reforming, evangelical zeal fades and becomes institutionalised, more and more effort has to be expended on ensuring the survival of the institution. Generations derive from it their identity and sense of security, so that it becomes highly resistant to change. The “children of the regiment” tend to be maintainers rather than entrepreneurs like their forebears.¹⁰⁴⁴ At the local level the trauma associated with changing anything may be illustrated by a South African officer's anecdote of a soldier rising in a worship meeting to correct the new Commanding Officer, informing him that, “Here we always have the announcements

¹⁰⁴² In their book, *The Addictive Organisation*, (New York, Harper Collins, 1988) Anne Wilson Schaeff and Diane Fussell have drawn attention to the way in which the addictive behaviours of individuals tends to be projected on to and acted out by the whole organisation of which they are members. They specifically note the weakness of churches in this respect.

¹⁰⁴³ George Scott Railton, *Twenty-one Years*, p.93.

¹⁰⁴⁴ That is, those who stay. Bryan Wilson also comments that, “Conversionist sects have some difficulty in retaining their second generation, which is not in need of the (usually) rather emotional orientation of the sect...” (*Religion in Secular Society*, p.206)

after the collection.”¹⁰⁴⁵ Course corrections on the global scale are commensurately ponderous and slow – the Titanic’s rudder was too small to permit seriously agile manoeuvres. A bureaucracy created to facilitate action ends up by impeding it.

We are accustomed to seeing how the bright, progressive young corps officer can become the conservative Territorial Commander – Lord Acton lamented the same phenomenon in the history of Pius IX, bright hope of European liberalism in the 1840’s and darling of the reactionaries in the 1870’s. The more senior the responsibility, the more likely the officer is to become a prisoner of the machine, more regulated and with less freedom of action. The less future there remains to plan for, the more past there is to conserve... and the buck stops with the leader. The “Stockholm Syndrome”, named for the hostages in that city who came to love their captors, may also be a factor here. Slaves learn to love their chains, and it becomes difficult for them to see the world through free eyes. The institution is protected by the status of its functionaries. The bond of self-interest between them will always ensure that function assumes a status.

Secondly, at a more fundamental level, all these things are about the exercise of power and control – the subject of the Temptations in the Wilderness, and the default position of humanity – which always finds institutional expression. The Church, whether at the local or the international level, is not exempt from the political processes of human nature. While institutionalising power, the Army has been unable to institutionalise appropriate boundaries – other than that natural boundary described by Lenin in 1917: “The soldiers vote with their feet.”

¹⁰⁴⁵ Captain Jabulani Khoza of Johannesburg, speaking at the All-Africa Workshop for Training Officers held in Harare, January 1998.

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

- Firstly, clericalism fosters a spirit incompatible with the “servanthood” Jesus taught and modelled. As the opinions collected under the heading “The Dark Side of the Force”, below, illustrate, it is inimical to the kind of community Jesus appeared to call together.
- Secondly, clericalisation obscures and distorts the essential nature of the Church. By concentrating power and influence in the hands of a minority and thereby disempowering the great majority of members of the Church, it diminishes 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.

To summarise, clericalism is bad for Christians individually, bad for the Church collectively, and bad for the world in which the Church hopes to witness and minister. The following two sections attempt to argue and illustrate these assertions in more detail.

(1) The Dark Side of the Force

The military metaphor, for all its Biblical allusions and practical advantages, carried with it dangers from which the Army has not entirely escaped. Adolf Harnack warned that,

If the forms of the military estate are transferred to the higher religions, it appears that what is warlike is turned around and changed into its strict opposite or transformed into a mere symbol. But the form has its own logic and necessary consequences. At first unnoticeably, but soon ever more clearly, the warlike element which is accepted as a symbol ushers in the reality itself, and the ‘spiritual weapons of knighthood’ become carnal.¹⁰⁴⁶

¹⁰⁴⁶ Adolf Harnack, *Militia Christi*, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, (1905) 1981, p.32. (Cited in Walter Wink, *Engaging the Powers*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1992, p.291.)

While the Salvation Army has not gone all the way with the Knights Templar, the hierarchy of ranks has in the view of many Salvationists given permission for attitudes incompatible with the gospel. Robertson observes that, "Roman Catholicism, and some sects such as the Salvation Army, have developed elaborate bureaucratic apparatuses which appear to be particularly productive of status motivations *per se*... doctrine has been invoked to infuse the structure itself with religious significance."¹⁰⁴⁷

The founders early became aware of the danger of creating a monster. Railton wrote in 1881 of the creation of Divisions under "District Generals" (ordinarily taking the rank of major) the previous year, "I well remember our doubts and fears as to the effect of creating a superior rank in the system of district divisions..." though he concluded that "officers and people evidently love and delight in their Majors..."¹⁰⁴⁸ Perhaps twelve months were not long enough to see the longer view. By 1892 Bramwell was asking, "Are we not overdone with Staff... which in turn makes more Staff?"¹⁰⁴⁹ In 1894 he was complaining that there were too many staff on Headquarters, and that "the D.O.'s [Divisional Officers] are often much more separate from their F.O.'s than they ought to be. Class and caste grows with the growth of the military idea. Needs watching."¹⁰⁵⁰ Thirty years later he was still anxious about Divisional and Territorial leaders in that "they are open to special dangers in that they rise and grow powerful and sink into a kind of opulence..."¹⁰⁵¹

¹⁰⁴⁷ Roland Robertson, *The Sociological Interpretation of Religion*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1970, p.139.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Quoted by Victor Doughty in *The Officer*, August, 1974, pp.345-6.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Victor Doughty, *ibid*.

¹⁰⁵⁰ W. Bramwell Booth, letter of October 1894, in Catherine Bramwell Booth, *Bramwell Booth*, p.218.

¹⁰⁵¹ W. Bramwell Booth, letter to his wife, 27.4.24, *ibid*. p.437.

It must be admitted that regulations like that making staff officers more distinguishable from those of lower rank by ordering subordinates not to wear shoulder straps, accompanied by an admonition that disregard for rank “must be discontinued,” perhaps reinforced the very attitudes Bramwell did not want to encourage.¹⁰⁵² The elaboration of hierarchy and bureaucracy inevitably created a culture of caste.

William Booth was concerned about motivation rather than bureaucracy, but thought the toughness of the battle would be sufficient safeguard.

It is difficult to imagine how there could be in the labour of a Army officer any sufficient earthly inducement to lead anyone to desire it for its own sake. Still, the publicity, rank and power may be attractive to some. But, if these are all, the charm will of necessity soon wear out, and the devotion inspired by it will soon pass away...¹⁰⁵³

But by 1900 he was warning senior leaders,

Beware of flattery. Shut it out. Writers for our papers will sometimes seek to curry favour with their superiors by praising the natural ability displayed in their public performances and leading officers are occasionally influenced by the temptation to think that it is necessary for them to be praised... I do not believe a word of it... I am sure, also, that it injures the younger officers, by leading them to ask and expect for themselves the same adulation which, in too many cases, they will be unable to bear.¹⁰⁵⁴

Again, addressing staff officers in Conference in 1907, he spoke of the difficulties some officers had with promotion – “because their promotion is not as rapid as they think it should be, or as they think the promotion of other officers is... That is sometimes baldly styled ambition, and when that ambition is based on selfishness it is a very ruinous quality.”¹⁰⁵⁵

¹⁰⁵² Minute 44, October 3rd, 1888, quoted by Norman Murdoch, *Origins*, p.132.

¹⁰⁵³ *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers*, 1886, p.2.

¹⁰⁵⁴ William Booth, *Letter to Commissioners and Territorial Commanders*, London, 1900, pp.28-9.

¹⁰⁵⁵ William Booth, *Addresses to Staff Officers*, London, 1907, pp.24-5.

A “below stairs” opinion, so to speak, suggests that others shared Booth’s fears. Staff-Captain E. Kirk (surely ex-Staff-Captain) wrote,

It is a moot point as to whether the creation of so many distinctions in rank has not proved a greater curse than a blessing among us, and whether the course of things would not be infinitely smoother if ranks were abolished altogether, or at least, nearly so.” He also had a tilt at sycophancy: “Many (War Cry) reports of meetings, of the General’s and Mrs Booth’s in particular, are sometimes positively nauseating in the plenitude of their laudatory adjectives, and in the evident desire... to please the Army’s chiefs.¹⁰⁵⁶

Later writers have continued to sound similar warnings. Commissioner Samuel Logan Brengle wrote against the “diotrephesian spirit”.¹⁰⁵⁷ General Carpenter set up a Commission on Ranks and Promotions, identifying it as

a question sadly disturbing in its influence... Ranks are to serve the purposes of organisation... It was not in the Founder’s mind that they would ever come to be regarded as rewards for service to Christ, or as honours such as are sought in a secular organisation.¹⁰⁵⁸

General Albert Orsborn acknowledged to the 1949 Commissioners’ Conference that

dissatisfaction and decline... is blamed on our system of ranks, promotions, positions and differing salaries and retirements... that it has created envy and kindred evils and developed sycophancy, ingratiating, “wire-pulling”, favouritism, etc... It is a sad reflection that we are in character, in spirituality, unable to meet the strain of our own system¹⁰⁵⁹

The attraction of power and prestige is of course only part of the danger of a militaristic system. Other consequences, less observed, or at least unrecorded by the mainly senior administrators quoted above, include the loss of institutional memory with too rapid changes of

¹⁰⁵⁶ E. Kirk, *Unveiled: A Study of The Salvation Army from Within*, London, Dharma Press, Undated but from internal evidence about 1914-15, pp.57, 83.

¹⁰⁵⁷ *The Staff Review*, October 1930, pp.317-24. The reference is to 3 John 9.

¹⁰⁵⁸ *The Officers Review*, July-September 1944, pp.129-34.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Quoted by General Eric Wickberg in his address on “Movements for Reform” at the 1971 International Conference of Leaders, Minutes, p.9. (Heritage Centre Archives.)

leadership,¹⁰⁶⁰ and the effect of promotion system which allows senior officers to promote in their own image. This can reinforce the “Peter principle” (people rise to the level of their incompetence)¹⁰⁶¹ and the dominance (in Myers Briggs terms) of STJ personality types, better at managing than at leading.¹⁰⁶²

None of this is to say that The Salvation Army has been particularly worse than any other organisation or church in that human nature will find the means to exploit any structure for personal ends, but as Colonel Harry Williams reminded officers, “If all power corrupts, religious power corrupts most diabolically.”¹⁰⁶³ It does demonstrate that by adopting a military hierarchical system the founders exposed their followers to a heightened danger in this respect, and opened the farm gate a little wider for what Lear called “the great image of authority – a dog’s obeyed in office.”¹⁰⁶⁴ Having said that, there is no system above which it is impossible to rise, and a host of men and women have shone like lights in a naughty world.

(2) Power and Disempowerment

I summarised in the introductory chapter the way in which a clerical caste has always established or re-established a dominant role. For all intents and purposes it *is* the Church, with the rest of the *laos* serving either as passive audience for the clerical performers, or as supporting cast and extras. As Hendrik Kraemer concluded, “in raising today the lay issue in the Church, one raises at the same time the demand for a new

¹⁰⁶⁰ The average duration of appointment for Territorial Commanders in New Zealand since 1912 is less than four years. Hodder (1914-1923) was exceptional. Over the past 20 years, the average has been 3 years and 4 months.

¹⁰⁶¹ <http://www.bartleby.com/61/4/P0220400.html>.

¹⁰⁶² http://www.personalitypathways.com/type_inventory.html.

¹⁰⁶³ *The Officer*, August 1970, p.550.

¹⁰⁶⁴ William Shakespeare, *King Lear*, Act IV Scene vi.

ecclesiology...”¹⁰⁶⁵ The shallowness of the Salvation Army’s ecclesiology afforded it no defence against the clericalising process which rapidly vitiated its original lay genius. (Although one has to say that the richer theological heritage of many other Church bodies has proved equally ineffectual in this respect.)

Can it be argued that clericalisation has been accompanied by a decline in the Church’s effectiveness? Perhaps it depends on the measure used for “effectiveness”. Clearly the centuries in which the Church clericalised were also years in which it grew to become a significant world religion. The Salvation Army’s greatest growth areas today are in third world countries where rank and status seem more important, where its clericalist tendencies are most marked.¹⁰⁶⁶

On the other hand, Brunner drew attention to a contrary tendency in considering the early history of the Church: “The emergence of ecclesiastical rule and jurisdiction is coincided with the loss or weakening of the community’s messianic consciousness.”¹⁰⁶⁷ Yves Congar wrote of the end result of clericalism being that “the faithful got into the habit of receiving without activity, leaving to the clergy the charge of building up the Church – like citizens who leave the making of their country to the civil servants and officials, and the defence of it to the military.”¹⁰⁶⁸ The Indian Jesuit Kurien Kunnumpuram claims that “the clergy-laity divide and the

¹⁰⁶⁵ Hendrik Kraemer: *A Theology of the Laity*. London, Lutterworth, 1958, pp.48-9.

¹⁰⁶⁶ For growth, the Pakistan territory’s progress from 30,031 soldiers, 197 active officers, 107 Corps and 528 Societies in the 1995 *Yearbook*, to 48,121 soldiers, 277 active officers, 127 Corps and 561 Societies in the 2004 *Yearbook*. For clericalism: the abolition of the rank of Brigadier in 1972 drew such protests from India in particular that the Minute was withdrawn and one ‘phasing out’ the rank by retirements was substituted for it. Again, at prayers in the hall at the Territorial Headquarters in Lagos, Nigeria, officers are seated according to precedence, by rank. (Letter from Peter Dawson, New Zealand non-officer Salvationist serving in Nigeria, 2004.)

¹⁰⁶⁷ Emil Brunner, *Misunderstanding*, p.59.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, p.47. When I became Commanding Officer of the Wellington City Corps in 1988, a retired senior local officer gave me several pages of names of people who no longer attended the Corps. His expectation was that I would get them back. It did not occur to him that he might have been doing so.

consequent lack of power-sharing in the Church are largely responsible for the apathy and inertia that one notices in the bulk of the laity today.”¹⁰⁶⁹

Examples of this tendency can be cited. Methodist historians have linked the decline in the growth of Methodism in the USA in the 19th century with growing clericalism. “We think it instructive that Methodists began to slump at precisely the same time that their amateur clergy were replaced by professionals who claimed episcopal authority over their congregations.”¹⁰⁷⁰ A. D. Gilbert produces statistics showing how the decennial increase of membership per minister in the Wesleyan Church in Great Britain declined steadily from 93.7% in 1801 when there were 334 ministers to 12.6% in 1911 when there were 2,478 ministers. The reasons were of course various, but Gilbert does suggest that it was partly that “maintaining themselves, their families, and their homes, tended to divert preachers from the business of itinerant evangelism still expected of them by many laymen.” To that had to be added “the increasingly complex task of running a massive national association... The preachers more or less consistently displayed a willingness to accept reduced recruitment and even schism as a price for organisational consolidation under ministerial leadership.”¹⁰⁷¹

The Salvation Army stopped publishing its soldiership statistics as its growth in the United Kingdom faltered in the 1890’s and did not reveal them again until late in the following century.¹⁰⁷² Murdoch says that “Booth’s unpublished statistics were most significant. In the 1890 May meeting (voluntary societies published annual reports in May) at Exeter

¹⁰⁰³ Kurien Kunnumpuram, “Beyond the Clergy-Laity Divide”. 22 May 2000.
<http://www.sedos.org/english/kunnumpuram.html>.

¹⁰⁷⁰ Roger Finke and Rodney Starke, “How the Upstart Sects Won America: 1776-1850”, in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1989, 28 (1): p.42.

¹⁰⁷¹ A. D. Gilbert, *Religion and Society*, p.152,3,4.

¹⁰⁷² Figures for soldiers’ rolls reappeared in the *Yearbook* of 1995.

Hall Booth listed the number of officers and corps abroad but not the British totals, which had declined by fifty Corps since May 1889.”¹⁰⁷³ The number of British Corps declined from 1412 to 1211 between 1888 and 1894.¹⁰⁷⁴ In Escott’s words, growth in the British Isles “tailed off around 1890... Though some growth continued until the mid-1930’s it was slow. Since that point there has been almost constant decline.”¹⁰⁷⁵ Inglis comments that “the Army’s golden age had been those few years after 1880 when the excitement and energy of the people already enlisted were fanned by accounts of fresh successes won by shock tactics up and down England and abroad.”¹⁰⁷⁶ By the early twentieth century Salvation Army meeting places were attracting less spectacular attendances than in the 1880’s; Inner London Corps attendances were 53,591 on one Sunday in 1887, down to 22,402 in 1903.¹⁰⁷⁷ British *War Cry* sales, from a peak of 350,000 copies weekly in 1883, fell to under 290,000 in 1890.¹⁰⁷⁸ Official Census figures showed fewer Salvationists in the Southern (Australian) Command in 1901 than in 1891 and the Army’s share of total church attendance there declined between 1891 and 1896.¹⁰⁷⁹ In New Zealand the proportion of Salvationists reached a peak of 1.5% of the population in 1895 and declined slowly but steadily thereafter.¹⁰⁸⁰ By 1926 it was

¹⁰⁷³ Norman Murdoch, *Origins*, p133.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Norman Murdoch, *ibid.*, p.122.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Escott, Thesis, *Church Growth Theories*, p.335.

¹⁰⁷⁶ K.S. Inglis, *Churches and Working Classes*, p. 212.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Bryan Wilson in *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.101, cites K.S. Inglis, *Churches and Working Classes*, pp.196-197; Richard Mudie-Smith (Ed.), *The Religious Life of London*, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1904, pp.288-90.

¹⁰⁷⁸ K.S. Inglis, p.197, cites *The War Cry* of 17 May 1890.

¹⁰⁷⁹ H.R. Jackson, *Churches and People in Australia and New Zealand, 1860-1930*. Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, 1987, p.62.

¹⁰⁸⁰ New Zealand *War Cry*, 26 June 1965, p.9.

0.91% and by 1956, 0.65%.¹⁰⁸¹ As the movement institutionalised, and officership clericalised, it lost momentum.

This is not to argue that this was the only process going on, or that there was a direct cause and effect. Firstly, it would be difficult to establish whether clericalisation had led to a loss of zeal, or loss of zeal had been compensated for by a growing preoccupation with status, or whether each process fed the other. Secondly, the dynamics of an international organisation are much more complex than that; a host of historical, sociological and cultural factors are involved.

There is a paradox here: the military system, quite apart from the fact that it fitted Booth's autocratic temperament, was designed for rapid response, and is still officially justified in those terms.¹⁰⁸² The Army's first period of rapid growth followed its introduction. It caught the imagination for a time. My suggestion is that the concomitant burgeoning of hierarchical and bureaucratic attitudes came to exert a counter-influence. The reason for success contained the seeds of failure. The longer-term effects of autocracy and "sectarian totalitarianism" were to lose the loyalty of many of those hitherto enthusiastic, and to deter subsequent generations, more habituated to free thought and democracy, from joining.¹⁰⁸³

John Roxborough discusses "putting the... Tawney-Weber thesis in reverse" and positing that a church's organisational culture and roles and structures of leadership are derived from the political and economic ethos

¹⁰⁸¹ New Zealand census figures, quoted by T.G. Aitken in unpublished MA thesis, "Aspects of the History of The Salvation Army in New Zealand 1929-1963", VUW 1964, p.137.

¹⁰⁸² "We are the 'special forces unit' of his Church on earth." (Commissioner Israel Gaither in the 2004 *Yearbook*, p.3.

¹⁰⁸³ Commissioner Phil Needham commented, in conversation with the writer, April 8th 2004, that when the USA Western territory conducted a survey in 2001 to establish what Salvationists thought about the Army's handling of the Gay Rights issue, the feedback indicated that soldiers were angry not so much about the issue as about the fact that decisions had always been made on their behalf without their being consulted.

of its culture.¹⁰⁸⁴ (This has been noted in Chapter One in respect of the first few centuries of Church life.) Possibly the Salvation Army's current growth in the third world is because those societies, less individualistic, with a stronger culture of "belonging" and traditional respect for authority, have elements in common with Victorian British society, rendering them susceptible in turn to the attractions of firm and decisive leadership.

One hundred years ago the Army's franchise could easily be marketed around the globe. While it adapted effectively to indigenous culture in some places – Booth-Tucker's khavi¹⁰⁸⁵ shoulder cloth, dhoti and bare feet ensured its success in India¹⁰⁸⁶ – the momentum of Empire and of Western culture carried it through even when the results were less happy. What worked in England in the 1880's worked in most places. The irony is that while the formula is no longer working in Europe, England, or in the "Old Dominions", it is now working very well in the developing World. As noted, more than three quarters of the Army's strength is now found in Africa and Asia. The Army of the 19th century is alive and well in such places. I have seen and heard a 25-piece "brass" band fashioned entirely of bamboo playing early Salvation Army melodies in an Indonesian village accessible only on foot or by bullock cart.

There is a waiting list for officer training in such Territories.¹⁰⁸⁷ Officers in Southern Africa all take for granted that they are *umfundisi* (ministers) as much as their Episcopal or *vaPostori*¹⁰⁸⁸ colleagues and

¹⁰⁸⁴ John Roxborough, "Persistent Presbyterianism? Lay Leadership and the Future of a Reformed Christian tradition in the West." (<http://roxborough.com/missiology.htm>) 18/02/04. Dr Roxborough is Director of the School of Ministry, Knox College, Dunedin.

¹⁰⁸⁵ The colour of the red laterite soil, worn by holy men.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Frederick Booth-Tucker, *Muktifauj: Forty Years with The Salvation Army in India and Ceylon*. London, Marshall Brothers, [1923] p.78.

¹⁰⁸⁷ The 2004 *Yearbook* (p.190) records that in 2003 in Pakistan, 154 applications for officer training were received. 40 were accepted, the maximum that could be accommodated.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Members of the African Apostolic Church of Zimbabwe. (See "The Growth and

their soldiers recognise them as such. Fijian officers are naturally *talatala*,¹⁰⁸⁹ enjoying with other clergy an exalted status next to that of the chief. My experience at the International College for Officers in London in November 2002, of trying the ideas of this thesis out on a group of officers from around the world, suggests that the concept of officership as enjoying a significant status would be widely defended. Minna Kalstrom, corps officer from Finland and member of the International Commission on Officership, acknowledged that "unease with the authoritarian system is not universal. Different nations are at different stages on the modernisation-postmodernisation continuum and this becomes evident in the range of attitudes towards changing our system."¹⁰⁹⁰ Of course The Salvation Army is not alone in experiencing this third-world conservatism. Opposition to having women priests or homosexual bishops in the Anglican Communion is strongest in Africa and Asia (and Sydney...). Gerald Arbuckle, referring to the "Pre-Vatican II tribe" (writing as an anthropologist), notes that, "I rarely meet 'pure type' representatives of this tribal model in the Western World today, but they remain relatively common in parts of the Third World."¹⁰⁹¹

Having said that, there is no reason to suppose that the processes that have led to the present situation in the West will not also be operative

Significance of Shona Independent Churches" by M.L. Daneel, in M.F.C. Bourdillon (ed.) *Christianity South of the Zambezi* Vol. 2. Gwelo, Mambo Press, 1977, p.178. Daneel refers to independent churches' "well-differentiated and flexible hierarchies which allow for the majority of capable and adult members to hold office... With it goes a certain status in the in-group which often compensates for the lack of prestige or influence elsewhere." (p.184.) c.f. Roland Robertson's comment concerning the early Salvation Army, that "many Salvationists... were drawn from socially disadvantaged lower-middle-class, working class and destitute strata, and this in itself presented a strong incentive to achieve status *qua* status within the Army itself." (in Bryan Wilson, *Patterns of Sectarianism*, p.88.)

The *talatala* is "a consecrated church minister" (Ravuvu 1983:121). (<http://www.union.edu/PUBLIC/ANTDEPT/fiji99/sienkiewicz/sseth6.htm>)

¹⁰⁹⁰ Minna Karlstrom in "Time for Democracy?", *The Officer*, October 1999, p.17.

¹⁰⁹¹ Gerald Arbuckle SM, *From Chaos to Mission*, Collegeville MIN., The Liturgical Press, 1996, p.75.

to some degree elsewhere in the future. Arbuckle observes that, "Today's candidates for the religious life are confronted not by the characteristics of one of the preceding culture models (he has described Pre-modern, Modern, Post-Modern and Para-modern), but by all the models at the same time, even in the Third World, as a consequence of globalisation of the information media."¹⁰⁹² In another twenty or thirty years the march of the Third World Army may encounter obstacles similar to those with which we are familiar in Australasia. However, such an outcome cannot be predicted with any certainty so my concluding remarks, and any suggestions for changes, are therefore applicable only to the Armies of the West at this juncture.

Perhaps a formula taking into account the cultural factors could be designed. Certainly serious research needs to be done to see if hard data in any way supports the general hypothesis I have advanced in this section on very limited evidence. However I think the general argument stands, at least as societies become more individualistic in ethos, that the more power is concentrated in a minority of hands, the less enthusiastic and effective participation in the task can be expected from the majority. Expectation grows that the professionals will do everything.

If officership is inevitably enmeshed in these forces of sociology and psychology, or in thrall to such demons, depending on one's theological preference, what future for the officer role? How might the effect of clericalisation be mitigated? 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.

¹⁰⁹² Gerald Arbuckle, *ibid.*, pp.5,7.

1. The Officer's Vocation

While a hall-mark of the Protestant reformation was the acknowledgement that all vocations are equally God-given and God-glorifying, it is another indication of clerical reaction that in evangelical circles "the call" has been increasingly assumed to be pre-eminently to the Ministry. The chapter "What manner of men..." showed that the Army encouraged its members to respond to a call to officership, and "Putney Debates" that some officers represented their experience of the call as the reason they became, and remained, Salvation Army officers. While only one person of my acquaintance has described their call as an auditory experience, the majority of officers would probably still regard their commitment to the Army as a response to some sense of calling.

This has been less emphasised in recent times in this country – there has been some reticence about putting the hard word on young Salvationists¹⁰⁹³ who in their turn have been much less responsive when it has been. It has to be asked to what extent the earlier response level was conditioned by the expectations of the Salvation Army community of faith, and how far the decline in officer-vocations is indicative both of the post-modern mindset and of the wider choices now available. With so many ministry roles now open even within the Army, many prefer to respond to their sense of vocation in ways that leave them more in control of their lives and have no expectation of life-long service. Perhaps whereas the traditional acceptance of officer-conditions, obedience and appointability was seen as a sign of spirituality, more recent generations tend to believe that taking responsibility for discerning God's will for one's own life is a mark of Christian maturity.

¹⁰⁹³ John Townsend, in "Where have all the Leaders Gone? Officer Recruitment in The Salvation Army of Aotearoa New Zealand". (Unpublished M.Min. thesis for Melbourne College of Divinity, 1999) notes, "The *ecclesiastical call* was once a high priority in Army services especially on special occasions such as Candidate's Sunday and Youth Councils. However in recent years this style has lapsed because some salvationists considered that the appeal for leaders was too emotive and created undue guilt." (p.13.)

It has been mentioned that some attributed a decline in officer-morale to this employment of non-officers in roles formerly reserved to officers. Again, the phenomenon is not confined to The Salvation Army. Fr Timothy Radcliffe, Master General of the Dominicans 1992-2001, asking “Why is morale among priests so low?” included this same development amongst the reasons he offered. “In the USA 80% of people who are ministers in the Church are lay, and 80% of these lay people are women... The priest feels less special.”¹⁰⁹⁴ The ensuing identity crisis and evident low morale amongst the clergy again deters other people from taking up that vocation.

Given these developments, there would appear to be a choice of ways forward for vocation in The Salvation Army. One is the equivalent of what in the Catholic Church is described as the “restorationist” agenda, where it is seriously attempted to set the clock back to pre-Vatican II ways.¹⁰⁹⁵ This would involve renewed efforts to convince a new generation of Salvationists that they ought to commit themselves to life-long obedience to the organisation. We have observed that in some territories – UK for example – in recent years the numbers of people offering for officer-training have been roughly equalled by the numbers offering for auxiliary officership. Until the introduction of the new Lieutenancy system, these latter were usually second career, late-vocation people. Of these one might observe that, firstly, they were not by definition offering for life-long service, and secondly, that they belonged to a generation more willing to accept such conditions as “appointability”. The new Lieutenancy appears to be attracting, as well as these older candidates, equal numbers

¹⁰⁹⁴ Timothy Radcliffe, “Why is morale among priests so low?” Address to National Conference of Priests at Digby Stuart College, Roehampton, London, on 3 September 2002. (www.onlineopinion.com.au/2002/Nov02/Radcliffe.htm).

¹⁰⁹⁵ In Gerald Arbuckle's description, for those espousing the religious life this “was a tribal life governed by rigid hierarchical structures, detailed regulations regarding every aspect of daily living... the axiom being: ‘Keep the rule and the rule will keep you’.” Arbuckle, *Chaos to Mission*, pp.74-75.

of younger people for whom the short-term nature of the commitment (three years at a time) apparently compensates for the absence of longer-term benefits such as retirement packages. It is not yet clear that beating the antique drum will muster the same numbers of this generation for traditional officership.

An alternative way forward is the solution proposed by John Townsend in his thesis on the causes and extent of the dearth of ecclesial leadership in the Salvation Army: to increase the variety of options available to those who believe themselves called to serve God within The Salvation Army. "There are many models of ecclesial leadership both biblical and extra-biblical, that could challenge The Salvation Army to expand its base for leadership, rather than seeing the role primarily as the domain of a commanding officer."¹⁰⁹⁶

The renaming, in New Zealand, of the Territorial Candidates Board, which processes applications for officer training, as the Territorial Vocations Board, suggested the latter course was favoured. Its more recent reversion to the narrower "Candidates" nomenclature possibly indicates a swing back to the former approach, although the Board continues to process applications for ministry roles such as that of Youth Worker, in addition to those of candidates for officer-training. All of these stratagems however are skewed by the assumption that the business of the Church is the Church, and the most significant function of its officials is its preservation and advancement.

If there is any validity to the argument that status is ultimately inhibitive of function, there needs to be found a way of giving full value to the vocation of officership as one ministry option without by implication devaluing other vocations – either those which might be defined as "ministry" or those we choose, within the framework of an inappropriate dualism, to describe as "secular".

¹⁰⁹⁶ John Townsend, Thesis, "Where have all the leaders gone?", p.116.

2. The Officer's Roles in the Organisation

The chapter "Putney Debates" collects a variety of attempts to describe, define or clarify the role of the Officer within the organisation. Some assumed one of the conventional clergy roles in the modern church – that of leader, teacher, pastor, preacher, evangelist, and representative figure (or like the keystone of the arch) or a mix of all of these. Some saw all these as aspects of an equipping task, enabling other members of the Army to be Christ in the world.

Unfortunately, from the time charismatic leadership – where each person contributed their particular gifts and skills to the group as a whole – was superseded in the early church by the three-fold orders and monarchical episcopate, (that is, from the time function began giving way to status as the guiding principle) the Church has tended to expect its leaders individually to demonstrate all of the gifts, and has been correspondingly disappointed in them when they have not been able to deliver. Meanwhile the gifts of other members of the church have tended to atrophy.

The majority of contributors to the debate seemed to see officership pre-eminently in terms of "field" work (that is, to do with what might be described as parish, congregational or evangelical activities), closest to those tasks occupying the time of other clergy. However only about half of Salvation Army officers are found in such roles.¹⁰⁹⁷ An almost equal number are engaged in social or welfare activities and in administration,

¹⁰⁹⁷ In New Zealand, the 2003 Disposition of Forces gave 186 officers (or 54% of the total) engaged in Corps work compared with 95 (27%) in administration, and 66 (19%) in social and other roles. The majority of social workers are now non-officers.

as well as in a great variety of specialist roles.¹⁰⁹⁸ While some clergy of other denominations are also found in other than the traditional parish roles, this is an even more significant feature of Salvation Army officership – even though the fact was overlooked by many participants in this discussion. The tendency to ignore this “500lb gorilla in the lounge” illustrates how thoroughly the Army’s thinking has accommodated to a church ethos. Any theology of officership has to take account of this diversity of function.

The chapter, “Putney Debates” 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 Water’s dictum (pp.202-3) that officership is simply the way in which we choose to organise the Army; it has no sacred dimension in itself.

The organisation of the Army on the basis of the military metaphor would suggest that leadership is the chief function of officership. (Remembering, however, the Salvation Army, like any military support structure, includes numbers of people who hold ranks but whose function is to support and follow rather than to lead. Parkinson’s Law would suggest that their numbers rise in inverse proportion to the actual fighting engaged in.¹⁰⁹⁹) We could say that all officers are leaders, and that all leaders must be officers. This would be logical – in fact it would be my preferred solution – but it would require a revolution. In practice it would involve great numbers of officers being divested of their ranks, and the

¹⁰⁹⁸ The Army has a much more extensive bureaucracy than the majority of denominations. While the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand has a handful of full-time staff, the much smaller Salvation Army employs over one hundred people – officer and non-officer – at its Territorial Headquarters, beside those at its five Divisional Headquarters. (The comparison is not strictly “apples with apples” – Presbyterian Social Work is organised separately for example – but not without some validity.)

¹⁰⁹⁹ C. Northcote Parkinson, *Parkinson’s Law*, London, John Murray, 1958, p.11.

conferring of commissioned rank on the increasing number of people who are not presently officers but who serve in leadership roles.

If we admit that leadership is necessary, and that it has at least some loose connection with the officer role, or even if the course suggested above were followed, we would still need to ask how we might have leadership unattended by the abuse of power which all leadership risks, and which is especially hard to prevent in a hierarchical system. There has been increasing emphasis on the concept of “servant leadership” in Salvation Army writing.¹¹⁰⁰ As Timothy Ratcliffe observes, “the words tend to pull in opposite directions”¹¹⁰¹ but given that truth is often characterised by paradox¹¹⁰² this is no argument against trying. Certainly this would cohere with the concept of equipping as the central role of the officer-leader. It would also be consistent with the emerging trinitarian concept of ministry, where the relationship of the persons of the Trinity, “undivided in essence and co-equal in power of glory”,¹¹⁰³ is seen as a model for dynamic relationship within the church, as an alternative to the hierarchical model. Jurgan Moltman claims that the logical implication of a perichoretic understanding of the Trinity is that “the ecclesiastical structures that flow from a notion of Divine hierarchy, must give way to the horizontal structures of fellowship, equality and interdependence.”¹¹⁰⁴

¹¹⁰⁰ For example, the book, *Servants Together*, already discussed; Robert Street, *Servant Leadership: How to make it happen*, Sydney 2003; the recommendations of the International Spiritual Life Commission in Robert Street, *Called to be God's People*, London 1999 p.3; the *Final Report* of the International Commission on Officership, London, 2000, p.5; articles such as ‘The Servant Mind’ by Constance Bridge in *The Officer*, July/Aug 2003, p.36, or ‘Lessons on Being a Servant Leader’ by Pamela Hodge, in *The Officer*, October 2001, p.21. A training video produced for executive officers in the 1990’s was entitled ‘Servant Leadership’ though it dealt largely with management style.

¹¹⁰¹ Timothy Ratcliffe, ‘Clergy Morale’.

¹¹⁰² M. Scott Peck, quoted in Ferrell Irvine and Harold Hill: *The Twelve Steps, A Spiritual Journey, Workshop Manual*. Wellington, 2003, p.30.

¹¹⁰³ To quote Doctrine 3 of The Salvation Army’s Eleven Points of Doctrine.

¹¹⁰⁴ Quoted by Colin Hunter in *Supervised Theological Field Education: A Resource Manual*. Melbourne, Evangelical Theological Association. <http://mc2.vicnet.au/home/chunter/web/resource.html>. See also Miroslav Volf: *After Our*

However, that is a concept difficult to implement when the structures do not support it.

Despite recent emphasis noted on servant leadership in Army publications, the practical outcome of which has yet to be assessed, such words can so easily be used to legitimate a reality of another kind. The cynic would note that the ancient Papal title, Servant of the Servants of God, could long co-exist with ultramontaniam. Power is the shadow side of servant leadership, and must be recognised, faced up to and incorporated knowingly and with boundaries if it is not to usurp total control. Without structural safeguards, all talk of servanthood too easily becomes an instrument of spiritual abuse.¹¹⁰⁵ Hans Ruedi Weber's neat aphorism, that "Jesus transforms the love of power into the power of love,"¹¹⁰⁶ is reversed by clericalisation.

What kind of structures could ensure the successful practice of servant leadership? Political systems have usually incorporated checks and balances to prevent abuse of power.¹¹⁰⁷ In recent years there have been serious attempts to build more accountability into the structure of The Salvation Army,¹¹⁰⁸ but it would be helpful if ways could be found of

Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1997; Robin Greenwood, in "Ordering the Church for Working with God's Life in the World: Equal and differing callings", in *The Sign We Give*, Chelmsford, Matthew James, 1995; Colin Gunton, *The Promise of Trinitarian Theology*, 2nd edit. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1997; Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God for Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. San Francisco, Harper Collins, 1991.

¹¹⁰⁵ See, e.g., Ken Blue, *Healing Spiritual Abuse: How to break free from bad church experiences*. Downers Grove, Ill., InterVarsityPress, 1993.

¹¹⁰⁶ Hans Ruedi Weber, *Power, Focus for a Biblical Theology*. Geneva, WCC, 1989, p.167.

¹¹⁰⁷ Given that total abstinence from the drug of power is an impossibility where human association is concerned, structural checks and balances might serve as means of 'harm minimisation', a current tool in dealing with substance abuse. (See e.g. Single, E.: 'Defining Harm Reduction' in *Drug and Alcohol Review* 14 (1995), pp.287-90.)

¹¹⁰⁸ The Officer Development Review system has been greatly elaborated, in New Zealand along the lines of the secular management model provided by the Australian personnel consultants, Cockin and Brown.

making this flow both ways, so that those in the hierarchy owed a duty of transparency and accountability to those below them as well as to those above. The most recent changes to the Officer Undertakings have attempted to make explicit the organisation's obligations to its officers as well as the officers' duties to the organisation (without however a signature on behalf of the organisation as that would amount to a contract), but this does not address structural issues within the hierarchy. Sadly, the situation still obtains that occasionally people widely known to abuse power, having set foot on the escalator, continue to rise in influence and authority.

Over the years the structural measure most often urged has been "clearly defined consultative processes"¹¹⁰⁹ or some "forum for discussion"¹¹¹⁰ – the lack of which leads to frustration and anger (as Commissioner Phil Needham found, see footnote 1083 on p.386) or loss of interest (as Commissioner Kenneth Hodder observed, see p.294 above). While boards and councils have long since filled the vacuum left by the Founder's abolition of committees, and ad hoc consultations, commissions, quality improvement working parties and special forums have proliferated in recent years, no consistent attempt has been made to initiate structural reform along the lines suggested by Hodder in Chapter 6, except in so far as it is happening by default.¹¹¹¹

¹¹⁰⁹ For example, Major Aubrey Barfoot (Canada) in *The Officer*, August 1987, pp.347-8.

¹¹¹⁰ For example, Editorial in *Battlepoint*, Vol.1 No.1, September 1963.

¹¹¹¹ When responsible for In-Service Training in the New Zealand Territory in the 1990's, I had the opportunity of arranging an Executive Officers' Conference as a training event. I invited Gerard La Rooy, at that time a Heinz-Wattie executive and management guru to lead a workshop. Officers attending appeared delighted by the similarities between the corporate world and the Army's management and enthusiastic about "flatter structures." However, it all disappeared into a "black hole" back at the office. This was partly because the Territorial Commander was under farewell orders by the time the workshop took place. However, I was also informed later by the Chief Secretary that a succession of senior officers had subsequently come to him expressing misgivings that such ideas might be carried too far...

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”.¹¹¹² Just as early officer training sought to inculcate the Salvationist spirit, perhaps servant leadership modelling and conditioning should be more of a priority in officer-formation today. Such a priority would help tilt the balance towards the functional end of the continuum and away from that of status. Ken Booth’s words are relevant here:

Ordination is about apostolic leadership, and you cannot have apostolic leadership in the church without the risk of clericalisation; and the key to overcoming the risk lies in the recovery of the servant (the diaconal) nature of all ministry in the church, including the ministry of apostolic leadership.¹¹¹³

Both structural and attitudinal change is required for this to happen.

3. The Officer’s Covenant and Undertakings

The Undertakings signed by the officer, as we have seen, commit the individual to a number of conditions intended to ensure his or her full availability to the service. Amongst these the commitment to appointability has long been identified as defining the relationship with the organisation.

A useful analogy might be found in the Catholic Church’s insistence on celibacy for clergy. Over thirty years ago Ivan Illich pointed out that celibacy, protected by “two devices to control an evangelical charisma” – “the social and juridical organization of religious communities and the ritual celebration of vows” – served to maintain a “captive personnel force.” Noting the Pope’s insistence on retaining the institution in the face of growing discontent, Illich suggests, “I believe that the emergence of a new pastoral Church depends largely on compliance with his directive during our generation. His position helps assure the speedy

¹¹¹² 2 Cor. 1:24.

¹¹¹³ Ken Booth, *Something about Ordination*, p.2.

death of the clergy.”¹¹¹⁴ Those who see the decline in the numbers of candidates for officership in some Territories as arising from the reluctance of young Salvationists to serve under the conditions of officership, especially that of appointability, though keen to serve God in some capacity within the Army, might identify with Illich’s view.¹¹¹⁵

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 they have 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 New Zealand Territory’s Secretary for Personnel addressed this in a paper on “The Officer Rank Structure”. Referring to candidates for ministry, he says

those who were offering may meet all the criteria except...no distinct call to ministry (other than the call to evangelise, teach...) a life serving the church, shown in an unwillingness to be portable (I determine where I will serve) and maintaining a certain lifestyle (I agree the period and the financial return)...

When I discuss this with those involved with potential leaders, they challenge that there is any less of a call to ministry. What appears to be significant is the difficulty of submitting to a life serving within the Church. Debate ensues as to whether this is an element of post-modernism (I am arbiter of my calling) or an expression of Christian maturity in an individual taking responsibility under God. The result is an unwillingness to trust their lives in submitting to the authority of the Body of Christ as represented in the movement The Salvation Army. It is expressed in

¹¹¹⁴ Ivan Illich, “The Vanishing Clergyman,” (1967), reprinted in *Celebration of Awareness*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1976, pp.75-6.

¹¹¹⁵ In New Zealand training intakes have ranged from 5 to 11 over the past decade (not including Fiji and Tonga), against a replacement need of about 22-25 to maintain existing personnel levels. However the 2003 intake was 12 and 2004 was 13. Interestingly, the majority of candidates now are new to the Salvation Army rather than “children of the regiment”. The 2004 intake of cadets for training in the United Kingdom was 20. 30 years ago it was about 100. 70 years ago, 300.

terms of a distrust of “Leadership” or “the movement” to safely handle the life that is being entrusted to it.¹¹¹⁶

Just as celibacy – enjoined on the priesthood for only the second half of Christian history after all – was in part a practical measure intended to meet a particular temporary and local need, and not of the essence of clerical life, so “adaptation of measures” (Catherine Booth’s phrase) could require the Salvation Army to abandon appointability today. It is of course reluctant to do so, just as the Pope is determined to retain celibacy even although it is widely seen as a serious impediment to vocations to the priesthood. While this clinging to past policies is partly for logistical and management convenience, in both cases it is probable, as Illich suggests, that it is also to do with control. Anyone working in the addictions field will recognise that we always prefer the pain we have to the perceived pain of changing, and will go to any lengths to maintain our habit.¹¹¹⁷

The other main feature 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. A vigorous rearguard action against any change is to be expected. In the paper quoted above Lt. Colonel Wilfred Arnold claimed that

this non-contractual “religious” relationship is vital to the protection of the ability of the Church (The Salvation Army) to invoke moral and religious beliefs as the code of conduct for its ministers. If this was not so then the “church” would be subject to other generic “human rights” that would not

¹¹¹⁶ Wilfred Arnold, “The Officer Rank Structure”. Paper circulated to officers in New Zealand, dated 27 March, 2001, p.4.

¹¹¹⁷ The Catholic Diocese of Auckland (NZ), faced with rising attendance at Mass but falling number of celebrants, recently announced plans for consolidating the availability of Mass in a handful of churches, leaving many other parishes having to arrange transport for those wishing to attend. The *Dominion Post* of 13th October 2003 (p.A4), reported similar arrangements being made in the Wellington Archdiocese, where 47 parishes were being grouped in 15 parochial districts. With the average age of parish priests in the late 50’s, this cannot be other than an interim arrangement. Training of lay parish leadership is, however, well advanced.

allow it to hold to its specific beliefs and behavioural standards. It is therefore imperative that... the engagement of people in pastoral ministry be on officer terms and conditions and not be allowed to erode over time or proliferate into wage or salary employment contracts.¹¹¹⁸

It is likely that the non-contractual basis of clerical engagement will come under increasing pressure in modern secular societies – falling into the same category as tax-exemption for churches. A recent Australian High Court decision concluded, at the end of a series of appeals, that

it can no longer be assumed, or presumed, that a minister is not an employee when exercising “spiritual duties” for a church group – rather, each case will have to be judged upon its own facts to determine whether it was the intention of the parties that there will be a legally binding (and thus enforceable) relationship between them, or whether the relationship was not one of that character.¹¹¹⁹

The Army’s Undertakings are still sufficiently explicit in that respect to maintain the status quo in common law jurisdictions, but the trend is clear. In the United Kingdom the process has been advanced by a protracted dispute between an Anglican priest and his diocese, and its referral to the European Parliament on the grounds that UK law discriminated against clergy.¹¹²⁰ The Interim Report of the Archbishops’ Council’s Review of Clergy Terms of Service in July 2003 recommended, amongst other things, that “the rights conferred by section 23 of the Employment Relations Act 1999 are seen as good practice and should be granted to clergy...;” that “clergy should have the rights conferred by section 23 not just in practice but in law; and ” that “clergy should have access to Employment Tribunals....” It was recognised that giving clergy these rights “does not necessarily require them to have contracts of

¹¹¹⁸ Wilfred Arnold, op.cit. p.6.

¹¹¹⁹ Archbishop Spyridon Ermogenous versus the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia Inc [2002] HCA8; 7th March 2002.
www.codea.com.au/partnersarticles/PJP/ministers%20can%20be%20employees.htm 5th April 2003.

¹¹²⁰ www.cwmission.org.uk/features/default.cfm?FeatureID=981 Council for World Mission webpage, 28th November 2002.

employment... Other possible models also need to be considered.”¹¹²¹ While this referred only to clergy of the established church, the Clergy and Church Workers Section of Amicus Union came out strongly for a system “applicable across denominations and faith.”¹¹²² A non-officer Salvationist employed in a ministry role in the United Kingdom expressed the expectation that, “... employment law in the UK will demand major changes in the nature of officers’ contracts with the organisation...Officers will become closer to employees in their length of tenure, nature of payment and relationship to the organisation.”¹¹²³ It has already been noted that the employment of non-officers in roles hitherto reserved for officers has raised the question of legal implications – an officer also performing those roles might also now be regarded as an employee. Relinquishing the “employed by God” status would negate any defence against such a claim.

Commissioner Israel Gaither, Chief of the Staff, told the 2004 International Conference of Leaders that “some nations see leaders as contracted employees while others acknowledge and respect the covenanted relationship that embraces our calling.”¹¹²⁴ However, this “covenanted relationship”, which describes the “employed by God” status, is really an anachronism left over from Theodosian polity. The relationship between covenant and employment might now be compared with that of religious and civil marriage. These are viewed as identical by some and as distinct by others, but the state recognises only the latter.¹¹²⁵ In practice

¹¹²¹ GS1518 – Archbishops’ Council: Ministry Division – Review of Clergy Terms of Service: Interim Report, July 2003.

¹¹²² The Union’s Response to GS1518, 28 October 2003.
www.3rdsect.../cgi?db=default&uid=default&ID=243&view_records=1&ww=.

¹¹²³ Russell Rook, letter to the writer, dated 21 November 2003.

¹¹²⁴ *The Officer*, September–October 2004, p.8.

¹¹²⁵ Ironically, it is reported that some Canadian officers, concerned at moves to legalise

people relinquish clerical roles as readily as they forsake the married state. In the case of clerical orders, to which the Army aspires, the special status has somehow been allowed to remain, serving mainly to buttress the power of the ecclesiastical institution over against its functionaries and negate their civil rights. We need to distinguish between civil contract, which relates to law, and covenant, which is of grace. All Christians, clergy or not, participate in covenant – and Salvation Army soldiers, whether officers or not, specifically sign a covenant. The law cannot prescribe for that relationship.

If it were possible, without sacrificing the integrity of the Army's beliefs and life-style, for officers to be employees, so that there were uniform terms of engagement for all the organisation's personnel, this would help chip away at one of the foundations of "status" of officers. (The other – the very obvious hierarchical ranking structure – would probably have to be lived with as an inevitable concomitant of the military metaphor, and means sought to keep it in check – the "harm minimisation" strategy.¹¹²⁶) Putting this together with the suggestion that officership and leadership might be more closely identified, we would have the following scenario

- Anyone in leadership would be an officer, regardless of his or her terms of engagement.

same-sex marriage, "are preparing to forgo the privilege of serving as agents of the state, and offer only to conduct religious marriages (i.e. marriages that have no standing in law), on the grounds that what the state is defining as marriage is too much at variance from what their church/synagogue/mosque (sic) understands by marriage." (Posting on the Salvation Army International Moral and Social Issues discussion webpage, 25 September 2004, by Dr James Read, Director of the Salvation Army Ethics Centre, Canada.

¹¹²⁶ General Gowans' recent reform of the rank structure failed to satisfy the majority of British and Australasian officers who voted for "captain" to be the only rank other than General – the Third World is still enamoured of rank – but he did manage to greatly restrict the incidence of Colonels. The ranks of Lt.-Colonel and Colonel are now to be reserved for those serving as Chief Secretary, Officer Commanding, Territorial Commander or as senior IHQ administrators.

- Officers would be employees like anyone else, with no covenant other than that of a soldier.

That would put an end to the two-tier structure in which some officers are more equal than others, and also to the anomaly whereby a soldier can be the leader and focal representative of the Army in a whole community, while an officer of senior rank may be a book-keeper at a DHQ. It would mean that both the institution and its functionaries would have to sacrifice something presently perceived as of value. The institution might have to give up some control, like appointability and the remaining apparatus of paternalism. The functionaries would have to abandon any pretensions to any kind of priesthood and any attempt to conform to the shibboleths of the churches.

If officership continues to be the most practical way to organise an Army, the question has to be whether the conditions under which leadership has been exercised remain appropriate to current and future circumstances. Most of the issues debated by the International Commission on Officership were of this kind, and we saw that given the Army's international diversity, General Gowans was unable to cut any Gordian knots – many were left to local discretion. Solutions too often give the impression of being rearguard actions in defence of as much of the status quo as can be salvaged; stages in a long retreat. Institutions find it difficult to be bold, and often face sabotage from within when they are.¹¹²⁷ Re-founding happens from below, but in a hierarchical structure institutional permission has to come from above.¹¹²⁸ Perhaps the Salvation Army can still do this.

¹¹²⁷ The experience of the Catholic Church over the past forty years, has felt to some like a sustained attempt to reverse the boldness of the Second Vatican Council. Cathy Molloy claimed that "efforts to encourage the role and vocation of the laity are frequently impeded, either by fear of particular clerics in the face of change they cannot cope with, or by instructions from Rome." "Church and Laity" in *The Way Supplement*, 101/2001, pp.111-2. (http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_1/Price.htm).

¹¹²⁸ According to Diarmuid O Murchu (in "An Historical Reflection on the Contemporary Renewal of Religious Life" in Supplement to *Doctrine and Life* Vol. 20 No. 85, quoted by Sr. Cecilia Cahill in "Woman of the Church" in *St. Mark's Review*, December 1980, pp.26-

Of the two questions posed by Ken Booth, mentioned at the conclusion of the first chapter, the second was about how, in giving structure to apostolic leadership, the tendency towards clericalism might be resisted. 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. But if institutionalisation is inevitable, the prophetic critique, the Trotskyist or Maoist permanent revolution, 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". The challenges facing the Church today are of the same order as the implications of global warming for the environment. The Salvation Army, with a history of ad hoc reactions and pragmatic measures, does not have a strong theological and ecclesiastical base on which to begin framing its response. Perhaps Hans Küng's words from forty years ago need to be revisited today:

There have been times in the history of the Church when it was theology's task to establish the structures of the Church. The task was a necessary one. Today the task of theology should be to lay bare the original structures that have been covered over in the changes wrought by time. This too is a necessary task.... It can be more satisfying to settle problems. But it is more fruitful to raise them, though admittedly it is more difficult. For whoever does

35) only about 10% of religious foundations make it through to "revitalisation" at the end of their life cycle. Cahill quotes Fitz and Cada, "Recovery of Religious Life" in *Review for Religious* Vol.34 No.5, September 1975, p.706, as claiming that the requisites for recovery are, "a transforming response to the signs of the times; a reappropriation of the founding charism; and a profound renewal of the life of prayer, faith and centredness in Christ."

not want simply to be helpless in face of antinomies may not content himself with routine movements. On occasion he must take it upon himself to execute an unusual and bold stroke in order to arrive at a good solution... the exigencies of the Church in the critical situation of this time...demand that this service... be performed soberly and with a sense of responsibility.¹¹²⁹

Suggestions for further research

I believe the theme of clericalisation to be of some significance. I have indicated that my primary endeavour has simply been to describe that process as happening within The Salvation Army. It should be possible both to dig deeper and fly higher than I have done here.

By that I mean, firstly, that in a number of places I have made suggestions or generalisations which need to be supported by sociological research. For example, there has not been any real investigation of the membership and support base of The Salvation Army in New Zealand. Simple transference from Great Britain to New Zealand of the received truth that the Army began amongst the working classes and then underwent "redemption and lift" does not do justice to the social patterns distinctive to New Zealand. I have suggested that taking soundings from Corps rolls and the occupations given in electoral rolls at intervals might begin to provide some information towards a more accurate account.

Again, the general hypothesis that "effectiveness is in inverse proportion to clericalisation" (pp.386-9) needs much more rigorous examination. Because the organisation is international it is necessary to be careful to avoid generalising about the Army as a whole on the basis of western observations. As I have suggested, the relationship between the British-derived international Salvation Army culture and local, national cultures could be explored in much more detail. The Army could provide a useful context for studying the phenomenon of Third World Conservatism.

¹¹²⁹ Hans Küng, *Structures of the Church*, p.352.

Secondly, there is the wider matter of clericalisation as a sociological process, applicable to faiths other than Christian and to social structures other than faith-derived. The raw materials I have quarried from this fairly narrow examination of Salvation Army history might well be useful for a more extensive survey and analysis of the subject, not confined to the Christian religion. Such a work might be able to support more general hypotheses about the sociology of religion.

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, not usually able to demonstrate the grace, space or pace (or range) of the Jaguars, but 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 those who seek to reawaken the radical passion of the 1880’s – witness an “Army-barmy” website, a “War College” in Vancouver (where trainees live, work and study in an inner-city slum ghetto), an on-line *Journal of Aggressive Christianity* (the title taken from a book by Catherine Booth), a fashion for “Roots” conventions.¹¹³⁰ An Australian observer notes that

¹¹³⁰ As the name suggests, these are conventions designed to motivate Salvationists to

Evidence of the weblike networking of emerging missional church within The Salvation Army can be found in the 614 phenomena; a series of church communities which began in inner city Toronto (Canada) in the late 1990's and now finds expression also in inner city Vancouver (Canada), Melbourne (Australia) and Manchester (United Kingdom). Melbourne 614 engages in meaningful ministry to the most underprivileged of the inner city whilst developing a relevant expression of church that is a mix of young people and the marginalised. Currently they are seeking to establish a special "Order:614" for young people who are "a group of passionate Christians who, for one year, will live and work together and be abandoned to the cause of winning the City of Melbourne for God..."¹¹³¹

Such activists have been described as "neo-primitive salvationists"¹¹³² and are likely to be increasingly influential in the Army of the future. They possibly demonstrate what Gerald Arbuckle calls "refounding" ("the process of returning to the founding experience of an organisation or group in order to rediscover and re-own the vision and driving energy of the pioneers.") as distinct from "renewal" ("a process of improving existing responses to problems").¹¹³³

The Salvation Army's hierarchy in the United Kingdom is experimenting with permission for its youthful enthusiasts to virtually start again, to rebrand the Army and do whatever it takes to refound it, creating possibly a parallel Army alongside the existing structure.¹¹³⁴ The leader of this enterprise, Russell Rook, writes that,

People often ask whether the new brand of The Salvation Army is led by lay people, lieutenants or officers? The answer is simply "yes"... I guess we are moving to the point where previous delineations of rank and file are

recover the original charism of the early Salvation Army.

¹¹³¹ Gregory Morgan, unpublished paper, "What are the impacts and implications of postmodernism and the emerging missional church for The Salvation Army?", 12.10.04.

¹¹³² 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.

¹¹³³ Gerald Arbuckle, *Chaos to Mission*, p.3.

¹¹³⁴ The movement is officially christened "ALOVE". *The Salvationist*, 2^h March 2004, pp.3-5, 3 April 2004, pp.5, 7. See also Mark Gadsden, *A New Model Army: New Expressions of Salvationism Within Youth Culture*. London, undated.
www.salvationarmy.org.uk/alove.

becoming redundant, aside from within our administrative purposes. I think the challenge for the priestly code in this, as oft repeated in history, is the vast cultural shift taking place in society means that many of our ordained brothers and sisters have been shaped, trained and programmed to work in a world that no longer exists and in forms of ministry that are no longer viable. The laity often avoid this problem because their status means that the real world is a more present reality, or at least a more recent memory...¹¹³⁵

Such a move, involving giving spiritual leadership to non-officers, is meeting resistance.¹¹³⁶ Whatever this will mean in practice, for the theme of this thesis it is significant that this is to some extent a non-officer movement, led by a non-officer – in church terms, a “lay” revival.

Is this a recovery of a “sectarian” ethos? Despite its sometimes “retro” language, the neo-primitive Salvationist is another kind of animal from Booth’s ragged street-fighters. A re-birthing Salvation Army, a post-modern generation in a post-Christian world, cannot be time-travellers, and cannot undo the intervening century. T.S. Eliot was right about the difficulty in following an antique drum. Future researchers might profitably compare and contrast the highly literate, highly educated ranks of these new forces with their forebears of the 1880’s.

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 not likely to be reported in the *War Cry* or listed in the *Disposition of Forces*. They are of that great company from every denomination who

¹¹³⁵ Russell Rook, op.cit.

¹¹³⁶ Major Chick Yuill, Divisional Commander UK Central North Division, letter to the writer, dated 27 October 2003. As Frost and Hirsch say, “Most established institutions will resist the movement ethos. It’s just too chaotic and uncontrollable for most institutions to handle. That is why most movements are ejected from the host organisation. This needn’t be the case but requires a definite commitment to permission-giving at high levels of organisational leadership to ensure that they are not.” Alan Frost, Michael Hirsch, *Shaping of Things to Come*, p.206.

have taken their faith with them when they have left the church.¹¹³⁷ 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. 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 like Willow Creek or Saddleback, or trying to implement the current gospel of “church growth” or “natural church growth” – or attempting to become a generic “community church”.¹¹³⁸ 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

¹¹³⁷ 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/>.

¹¹³⁸ 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*

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. 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, in David Pawson’s words, to “find out what the Holy Spirit is doing and join in.”¹¹³⁹

Your Community. Toronto ONT, 2000.

¹¹³⁹ David Pawson, freelance British ‘house-church’ leader, speaking in Queenstown, NZ in 1984.

APPENDICES

1.	Glossary of Salvation Army terms	ii
2.	Extract from the Minutes of the 1870 Christian Mission Conference	vii
3.	Ranks of The Salvation Army, 1878-2003	ix
4.	The Booth family	x
5.	Thomas Sutherland's commission, 1881	xi
6.	Elizabeth Herdman's commission, 1883	xii
7.	Judge Advocate General's Decision, USA 1917	xiii
8.	Extracts from Orders and Regulations for Officers, 2003	xv
9.	Recommendations of International Commission on Officership	xxxv
10.	Extracts from the MORI Report, 2000	xxxviii

Appendix 1: Glossary of Salvation Army terms

- Adherent:** A person who wishes to regard The Salvation Army as their 'church', without taking upon themselves the commitments involved in being a 'Soldier' (qv).
- Advisory Board:** A group of people with particular expertise or acumen, not usually Salvationists (qv), who advise the management of a social service operation or sometimes the commander of a Division(qv) or Territory (qv), assisting and supporting Army projects and fund-raising.
- Advisory Council of Salvation Army Laymen:** (ACSAL) A body of non-officer Salvationists called together to advise the Territorial Commander (qv).
- Advisory Council to the General:** Body established in 1947 to advise the General on policy and senior appointments. Made up of selected Commissioners appointed to serve for a set term of three years. Replaced by General's Consultative Council in 2001.
- Articles of Faith:** The '11 points' of Salvation Army Doctrine, professed by all soldiers. (See Appendix 8)
- Articles of War:** Also known as the 'Soldier's Covenant', signed by soldiers when enrolled, or 'sworn in', confessing personal salvation, adherence to Salvation Army beliefs, and committing to a Salvation Army life-style (see under Soldier).
- Auxiliary-Captain:** Warranted or non-commissioned rank in use between 1959 and present day for employed ministers with a 'late vocation'. Currently being phased out.(See appendix 3)
- Cadet:** Person in training for Salvation Army officership.
- Candidate:** A soldier who has been accepted for training as an officer.
- Captain:** Commissioned rank. (See appendix 3)
- Cartridge:** Weekly offering. Expression 'to fire a cartridge' part of the Army's military terminology.
- Census Board:** The body of senior 'local officers' (qv) of a Corps (qv), charged with maintaining the rolls.
- Chief of the Staff:** Senior executive officer at IHQ (qv), second in command to the General (qv).
- Chief Secretary:** (CS) Officer second in command of a Territory (qv). For smaller Territories, or Commands, a 'General Secretary'.

- Colonel:** A senior commissioned rank, now used only for Territorial Commanders and Chief Secretaries (qv) or for senior officials at IHQ (qv).
- Command:** Salvation Army term for a distinct geographical area, usually a country, with fewer than about 40 Corps (qv). There are historically-derived inconsistencies – Tanzania, with 60 Corps and 3,438 soldiers in 2003, is a Command, while France, with 28 Corps and 892 soldiers, is a 'Territory' (qv), which would normally denote a larger operation.
- Commanding Officer:** (CO) Usually the officer in charge of a Corps (qv).
- Commissioner:** Very senior commissioned rank. Holder is usually Territorial Commander (qv) or Head of Department at IHQ. Originally indicated person representing the General in some function, but early became a distinct rank. All Commissioners are members of the High Council (qv).
- Corps:** Small, local Salvation Army unit, equivalent to a parish.
- Corps Council:** Advisory group of senior Local officers (qv) and other people in a Corps, advising the Corps Commanding Officer (qv) on local policy and programme.
- Corps Secretary:** Local officer responsible for rolls and records and, with the Treasurer, for Corps finances.
- Corps Sergeant Major:** (CSM) Senior local officer, principal assistant to the Commanding Officer.
- Corps Treasurer:** Local officer responsible for finances of a Corps.
- Dedication:** Equivalent to infant baptism or Christening, without use of water. Does not denote reception into the church but is regarded as occasion for thanksgiving and opportunity for parents to make commitments regarding the child's upbringing in the faith.
- District:** Geographical administrative area, usually smaller or comprising fewer Corps than a Division, led by a District Officer. More common in 3rd world countries.
- Division:** Geographical area comprising a number of Corps, led by a Divisional Commander (qv). Equivalent of diocese in episcopal church polity.
- Divisional Commander:** (DC) Officer in charge of a Division (qv).
- Divisional Headquarters:** (DHQ) Office from which Division is administered.

- Envoy:** Non-commissioned officer, usually but not invariably, in Salvation Army employment, often without training.
- Field:** Generic term for evangelical operations, including Corps. Sometimes inclusive of the 'social work', and sometimes used as exclusive of or distinct from social or welfare operations.
- General:** International leader of The Salvation Army. Highest rank. Elected by the High Council (qv) for (currently) 5-year term, (or until reaching mandatory retirement age of 68) with possibility of extension for up to three years with support of Commissioners.
- General's Consultative Council:** Replacing the Advisory Council to the General (qv) in 2001, the GCC is composed of all officers qualified to attend a High Council, advising the General on matters of mission strategy and policy. Operates through a Lotus Notes database, with selected members also meeting quarterly at IHQ with the General in the chair. A committee of the GCC considers and recommends senior appointments and promotions.
- Hall:** Salvation Army meeting place. Often termed a Barracks in early days; later many terms such as Citadel, Fortress etc.
- High Council:** Gathering of all Commissioners, along with Territorial Commanders of the rank of Colonel, for the purpose of electing the General. Convened upon the General's retirement, or if a number of Commissioners requisition a High Council to determine the General's fitness for office, as happened in 1929.
- Holiness:** Salvationist belief, derived from Wesleyanism, in the possibility of instantaneous cleansing from inward sin. Also known as 'full salvation', 'blessing of a clean heart', 'sanctification' etc.
- Home League:** Local Salvation Army women's organisation.
- International Headquarters:** (IHQ) London-based Head office of the Army.
- International Conferences of Leaders:** Convened by the General on an ad hoc basis, but in recent years usually biennially. Consulted by the General on matters of strategy and mission, and attended by all Territorial Commanders, Officers Commanding and IHQ Commissioners.
- Junior Corps:** Sunday School, also known as Young People's Corps, under direction of the Young People's Sergeant Major, or YPSM.
- Junior Soldier:** Young person, from age of 9 upward, who signs a pledge, affirming faith and making promises regarding life-style.
- Lieutenant:** Formerly lowest commissioned rank; since 2001 a non-commissioned rank.

- Lieutenant Colonel:** A senior commissioned rank, since 2000 conferred only on Chief Secretaries (qv), Officers Commanding of Commands (qv), and senior IHQ officials.
- Local Officer:** (LO) Non-commissioned, 'lay' official of a Corps.
- Major:** Commissioned rank, currently attained after 15 years' service as an officer.
- Meeting:** A religious service. The Army employs no set form of liturgy, and extempore prayer and testimony are valued.
- Mercy Seat:** See Penitent Form.
- Minute:** The Army's legislative instrument. Administrative order issued by a senior officer – Chief of the Staff (qv) or Territorial Commander (qv) – for the direction of some Salvation Army operation or area of activity.
- Officer:** Full-time, commissioned (since 1978, 'ordained') worker in the Army. Regarded as equivalent to clergy.
- Orders and Regulations:** Rules governing Salvation Army operations.
- Outpost:** Small centre of work, subsidiary to a Corps (qv).
- Penitent Form:** Bench-like article of furniture usually found along the front of the 'platform' (qv) in a Salvation Army Hall (qv), at which people are invited to kneel and pray, or to make a personal commitment, or as an expression of conversion, usually at the conclusion of a meeting (qv).
- Platform:** Usually raised area at one end of a Hall (qv), from which a meeting (qv) is led or directed and sermon delivered.
- Promoted to Glory:** Deceased.
- Province:** A larger geographical administrative area perhaps comprising several Divisions, part constituent of a Territory (qv), led by a Provincial Commander. Seldom used in modern times.
- Recruit:** A person who has professed conversion and is undergoing instruction to prepare for enrolment as a soldier. (qv)
- Recruiting Sergeant:** Local Officer (qv) charged with care of converts and instruction of recruits.

- Region:** Small administrative grouping, comprising a number of Corps (qv), often pertaining to a national political unit. Fiji and Tonga are respectively Regions of the New Zealand, Fiji and Tonga Territory. Led by a Regional Commander.
- Salvationist:** A generic term for a member of The Salvation Army
- Social Work:** Welfare, rehabilitation work, relief for the needy and disadvantaged.
- Society:** A small sub-set of a Corps (qv), meeting in a distinct geographical location – similar to Outpost (qv).
- Soldier:** A person who has signed the Articles of War (qv) and been enrolled or 'sworn in' as a member of The Salvation Army. Must have professed conversion and accepted Salvation Army doctrines, and committed to a distinctive lifestyle involving not only normal Christian ethical standards but also abstinence from alcohol, tobacco, gambling and other than medically prescribed use of drugs.
- Song:** Hymn (Hence 'Song Book').
- Territorial Commander:** (TC) Officer in charge of a Territory (qv).
- Territorial Headquarters:** (THQ) Administrative office from which a Territory is directed.
- Territory:** Major geographical unit of command, which may comprise a country (such as Germany), part of a country (such as the USA Western Territory), or several countries (such as New Zealand, Fiji and Tonga).

Appendix 2: Extract from Minutes of the 1870 Conference of the Christian Mission

XIV Evangelists

1. Believing that some persons are especially called of God to do the work of evangelists, wherever a majority of an elders' meeting shall consider it advisable, they shall have the power to secure the labours of such persons for such period as they may consider will be conducive to the interests of society and promote the salvation of souls.

XV The Itinerant Preachers

1. The itinerant preachers are those who are wholly engaged in the Mission and who are Supported by the voluntary offerings of friends and of the Societies.
2. They shall be selected and engaged from time to time by the General Suptd.
3. They shall be of unquestionable piety, specially gifted for usefulness in our particular work and owned by God for the conversion of souls.
4. They shall in every instance be total abstainers, and shall neither smoke, use tobacco, nor take snuff, but be patterns to the society in dress and in all their personal and societal habits, and under no circumstances should they contract any debt.
5. They shall visit at least five hours every day except when engaged in other Mission business. At seven o'clock they shall if possible conduct an open air service and at eight one indoors. They shall not be expected to have any engagement for Saturday except the meeting in the evening.
6. They shall be responsible for the holding of all public services authorised by the Mission especially for the holding of open air services according to rule.
7. They shall keep a diary of the work done every day, stating the number of visits made with the names of the persons visited, the hours employed and the number of services held. A family visit comprehends the giving of religious instruction to the families of parties visited and praying with them whenever it can be done.
8. They shall be stationed and changed by the Genl. Supt. Or the stationing committee elected at each conference, according to the necessities of the Mission. The appointments shall be made generally for one year, and in no instance shall they exceed beyond two. In exceptional cases the appointments may be altered more frequently.
9. They shall not be members of any secret societies such as Odd Fellows etc.
10. They shall not take part in political meetings or parliamentary election.
11. They shall not traffic on their own account or on commission. They may sell the hymn books and other books published or authorised by the Mission.
12. They shall carefully read over all our rules at least once in six months.
13. They must examine all the accounts of the different funds at the Stations under their care and interest themselves in the spiritual, numerical and financial condition of each society.

14. They must prepare a report of the progress of the work of God at the Stations under their care for the editor of the magazine and forward it to him by the 12th of each month at the latest. Such reports must be brief and truthful. On no occasion or account must any statements be made that cannot be verified to any who may enquire respecting them.
15. They must see that all the schedules relative to the state of the societies are correctly filled up.
16. They must carefully enrol in a book kept for the purpose the names and addresses of all members of the society or societies under their charge.
17. They shall when possible renew the quarterly tickets in all classes, and take a ticket to each member unable to meet in class.
18. They shall take the oversight of the work of God throughout their respective stations, and seek to promote it to the utmost of their ability, considering themselves not the masters but the servants of all and in all things to do work for Christ as to prove themselves true ministers of the Gospel.
19. They shall interest themselves in the sale of the magazine, plans, hymn books, and all the Mission publications.
20. No preacher employed in this Mission shall attach or allow to be attached to his name the prefix Rev.d.
21. Before leaving the Mission a preacher shall give at least one calendar month's notice of his intention to do so.
22. Every person shall sign the following pledge before being accepted as a travelling preacher, or in any way as a paid worker! :-

I hereby declare that I have carefully read over the rules and doctrines of the Christian Mission and that I approve of the same; and I hereby solemnly pledge myself to keep the rules and preach the doctrines and as far as possible induce others to do the same. And if at any time I should for any cause whatever retire, or be separated from the Mission, I will not promote any strife, agitation, or other unpleasantness but quickly withdraw.

Appendix 3: Ranks of The Salvation Army 1878-2003

Current ranks shown in **bold**. Arrows show promotion routes at various times.

From early days, any rank above that of Captain was described as a 'staff rank'. However, as officers in field (including 'social') appointments sought recognition by rank, they were progressively admitted to higher ranks, with some created especially for them, while the lowest rank of 'staff' was progressively raised. Since 1947, promotion to ranks under 'staff' level – at that time under Brigadier – has depended on years of service. 'Commissioner' was not originally a rank but a role representing the General, which could be exercised by an officer of another rank such as Major or Colonel.

Appendix 4: The Booth Dynasty

(Showing officer family members)

* Marion, an invalid, held the honorary rank of Captain

** Miriam, also an invalid, was commissioned but did not serve in an appointment.

Appendix 5: Thomas Sutherland's Commission

Commission given to Thomas Sutherland when appointed to South Australia in 1881. (Australia Eastern Territory Archives.) Examples of the same form of commission, held in the Heritage Centre in London, are variously made out to holders to local officer commissions as Secretary, Treasurer, Sergeant etc.

Of interest is that the date given for the founding of The Salvation Army is that on which William Booth first preached in Mile End Waste, East London.

Appendix 6: Elizabeth Herdman's Commission

THE SALVATION ARMY
NEW ZEALAND
Divisional Head Quarters,
MORAY PLACE DUNEDIN
(Post Office Box 108)
3rd Sept 1919
HEAD-QUARTERS,
101, Queen Victoria Street,
London, E.C.

Private Letters to be so marked

cadet Herdman

Dear Sister

I am glad to inform
you that we have decided
to promote you to the rank
of captain
You are appointed to open
Port Chalmers on Sunday
next. September 9th
God abundantly bless you
Yours faithfully in the war
Geo Pollard
Major.

“Commission” issued to Elizabeth Herdman,
the woman officer appointed to open Port Chalmers
after three weeks of training.

Appendix 7: Judge Advocate General's Decision, USA, 1917¹

WAR DEPARTMENT
Office of the Judge Advocate General
WASHINGTON

GHL/GHL.

September 12th, 1917

MEMORANDUM for The Adjutant General:

Subject: Are Ministers of The Salvation Army eligible for appointment as Army Chaplains?

1. You have submitted the above question, and I have to inform you that it has been passed upon by this office under the date of May 24, 1917. You expressly request an opinion upon whether a chaplain of The Salvation Army is an ordained minister within the meaning of Section 1123.R.S.
2. The Special qualifications of an Army Chaplain are: that he shall be "a regularly ordained minister of some religious denomination," and his peculiar duties, as expressly prescribed, are "to hold appropriate religious services," and "perform appropriate religious burial services" for the command (1125 R.S.), and among the coloured regiments, the qualifications are to instruct the enlisted men in the common English branches (1124 R.S.). The New Army Act approved May 18, 1917, prescribes a positive exemption for "regular or duly ordained ministers of religious" (sec.4.). The essential question submitted involves the two following essentials:
 - (1) Is The Salvation Army a religious denomination?
 - (2) Are its ministers regularly ordained as such?
3. In the opinion of this office heretofore rendered upon this subject, it is substantially held that while the methods of worship of The Salvation Army, as well as its form of organization, differ from other religious organizations, that such departures are in no sense fundamental, nor do they justify distinguishing The Salvation Army as such; nor would they justify placing it in a different class from that which is usually accorded religious denominations. It is true that The Salvation Army is a great religious organization with world-wide scope, purpose and power, and in my opinion there is no reason or authority for putting this organization and its Officers outside of the statutes in question when those statutes are fairly construed and applied. The organization and essential government of The Salvation Army are of a quasi military character, and it may be said that its "general" corresponds to the supreme head, or that of its "commissioned officers" corresponds to the ministers and priests of various grades in other religious organizations; and that its "corps" corresponds to the church and its "soldiers" to the members of the ordinary religious denominations. From a careful examination of the subject, it appears that the "officers" (ministers) are trained, prepared and qualified according to a prescribed standard, and with certain ceremonies, are ordained (commissioned) by those in authority for the functions prescribed for them. The members, usually denominated soldiers, are employed in other vocations and contribute to the support of the work from their individual means. The members subscribe to the

¹ Quoted from Don Pitt, Pilgrim's Progress: 20th Century. The Story of Salvation Army Officership. New York, 1950, pp.29-30.

Confession of Faith, and a code of discipline is contained in the Orders and Regulations which they are pledged to obey. Each

Corps (Church) is under the control of a commanding officer (minister) who has generally one Lieutenant (assistant) and sometimes more. There are numerous minor officers who may be said to be of the non-commissioned grade, but all the commissioned officers receive their support from the work, and are subject to change from one corps to another according to the orders of their superiors.

- 4 It has been further held by this office that while The Salvation Army may fall short of the technical ecclesiastical and theological requirements, that it, nevertheless, measures up to the substantial requirements of the law, for the reason that any religion is entitled to respect and the protection of the law, provided, it be a sincere, conscientious means of worshipping God; and that in this government there are no preferred denominations, because our fundamental policies do not permit us to discriminate among the various churches and orders. In fact, there can be no doubt of the sincere religious purpose of The Salvation Army. Its definite undertaking is to bring a great mass of people not reached through the churches, to a realization of their duty to their Maker; and its creed and articles of faith appear to be sufficiently orthodox, if orthodoxy is required. The mere fact that it holds its religious meetings outside of churches and cathedrals furnishes no grounds for doubting its spiritual aims, and rather, in fact, emphasizes its ultimate plan to make itself acceptable to the lowly, the indifferent, and the religiously disinclined. It can truly be said of the organization that it aims to take God's message to that large class of people whose "spiritual hunger" does not move them to go to the "houses of Worship" to satisfy their inward longing and to partake of the divine message. In a word, its motto is "We take those to God who will not come to Him."

- 5 In the course of the opinion of this office of May 24, 1917, it was, among other things, expressly said:

"It seems that The Salvation Army is a world-wide religious organization, with followers in great numbers, property in generous measure, and doing great good. It has a distinct legal existence; a recognized creed and form of worship; a definite and distinct ecclesiastical government; a formal code of doctrine and discipline; a distinct religious history; a membership not associated with any other church or denomination; a complete organization, with officers ministering to their congregations, ordained by a system of selection after completing prescribed courses of study. In common with other churches, it has literature of its own; established places of religious worship; regular congregations; regular religious services; a Sunday-school for the religious instruction of the young, and schools for the preparation of its ministers. The functions of its ministers seem to be similar to those of the clergy of any other church. In addition to conducting religious services upon stated occasions, they perform marriage ceremonies, bury the dead, christen (dedicate) children, console the bereaved and advise and instruct members of their congregations."

- 6 It is, therefore, the opinion of this office that The Salvation Army possesses all the elements required for a religious denomination; and that its ministers are regularly ordained within the meaning of the statutes.

(signed) G.T. Ansell

Acting Judge Advocate General

Appendix 8: Extracts from on-line Orders and Regulations, 2003

Concerning

- The Salvation Army, Character and Purpose
- Structure
- Constitution
- Doctrines
- Officership
- Officer's Covenant
- Officers' Undertakings
- The Officers in Relation to the Army

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 1

The Salvation Army: Character and Purpose

Date Composed:- 18/07/1997

Date Modified:-

1. **The Salvation Army defined.** The Salvation Army is a movement composed of people who know their sins forgiven, and who are united in love to God and people for the common purpose of bringing others to Jesus Christ.

2. **Its purpose - Salvation.** The word 'salvation' indicates the purpose of the movement: namely, to persuade all people to accept the salvation provided for them in Christ and submit to God the Father as their supreme ruler. Such a commitment involves embracing God's laws and rendering loving service whenever opportunity arises.

3. **Its character - an Army.** The word 'Army' indicates that the movement is a fighting force, constantly at war with the powers of evil, and also that, in certain features of its structure and government, it resembles a military force.

4. **Official name.** The official name of the movement is 'The Salvation Army'. Its exclusive right to this name is, in many countries, recognised by law.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 5

The Salvation Army: Structure

Date Composed:- 18/07/1997

Date Modified:- 19/04/2002

Section 1. Soldiers

Section 2. Adherents

Section 3. Organisation

Section 1. Soldiers

1. Conditions of soldiership. The Salvation Army is composed of people who, having experienced forgiveness of sins and conversion by divine power, are enlisted under its banner as soldiers fighting for God and souls. Before enrolment as senior soldiers they serve for a time either as adherents, recruits or junior soldiers, sign *articles of war* (also referred to as the *soldiers' covenant*), and are publicly sworn-in.

2. Articles of war summarised. In signing articles of war (which are fully set out in *Chosen to be a Soldier (O&R for Soldiers of The Salvation Army)*) prospective soldiers make declarations with respect to:

- (a) Experience. They have accepted Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord.
- (b) Belief. They affirm their belief in the Bible as the word of God and accept The Salvation Army's articles of faith (see *Chapter III*).
- (c) Commitment. They will be responsive to the Holy Spirit and seek to grow in grace. They will make the values of the Kingdom of God the standard for personal living, showing Christian integrity in deeds, maintaining Christian ideals in relationships and upholding the sanctity of marriage and family life.
- (d) Conduct. They will be faithful stewards of all that God has given to them. They will abstain from the use of all intoxicating drink, tobacco and non-medical use of addictive drugs, gambling, pornography, the occult and all harmful activities. They will be active in God's work both in sharing the gospel and serving the needy, and will contribute financially to this work. They will be true to the principles and spirit of The Salvation Army in times of popularity or persecution.
- (e) Desire for soldiership. They state that they desire to fulfil their membership of the Christian Church as soldiers of The Salvation Army, being convinced that this is what the love of Christ requires of them. They sign the articles of war of their own free will.

3. The regulations for soldiers. Soldiers are expected to study and act in accordance with *Chosen to be a Soldier (O&R for Soldiers of The Salvation Army)*, which should be read before enrolment. Officers concerned with the making and swearing-in of soldiers are responsible for seeing that this is done.

4. Officers are also soldiers. Officers and local officers are also soldiers and are expected to identify themselves actively with corps operations.

Section 2. Adherents

1. Definition. An adherent of The Salvation Army is a person who identifies with the mission of the Army, supports its work, and regards The Salvation Army as his or her place of worship.

2. Conditions. An adherent will be a person of good standing, 14 years of age or over, who meets the definition of adherency given above, and who is not an active member of any other religious body. Adherents may differ from one another in the stages they have reached in their personal spiritual journeys, both at the point when they become adherents and thereafter.

3. Acceptance. Applications for adherency are considered by the Pastoral Care Council (see *O&R for Pastoral Care Councils*, Section 10). When a person has been accepted by the PCC his or her name will be entered on the adherents' roll, and an official certificate issued by the corps officer. This certificate, which will include The Salvation Army mission statement, should be presented in a simple ceremony (see *Salvation Army Ceremonies*, Chapter 2, Section 4).

4. Soldiership. Adherents who come to acknowledge Jesus Christ as their personal Lord and Saviour should be encouraged to express their faith and commitment through soldiership. Such adherents should attend recruits' classes, but their names may be transferred direct from the adherents' to the soldiers' roll after they sign the soldiers' covenant.

Section 3. Organisation

1. Chief constituents of organisation. Important sections of the Army's organisation are corps/centres, divisions or districts and territories or commands.

2. Corps. A corps* is a company of Salvation Army junior and senior soldiers, recruits and adherents who meet together under the care and direction of a commanding officer or other officially appointed person. A corps usually has a building or buildings in which it meets and it operates within a particular area.

*For information concerning the structure and work of a corps, see *Chosen to be a Soldier* (O&R for Soldiers of The Salvation Army), also *O&R for Corps Officers*.

3. Division or district. A division or district comprises a group of corps/centres. Leadership is given by a divisional commander, divisional officer or district officer.

4. Territory or command. A territory or command consists of a defined geographical area under the direction of a territorial commander or officer commanding.

5. Responsible to IHQ. Territories and commands are responsible to IHQ.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 2

The Salvation Army: Constitution

Date Composed:- 18/07/1997

Date Modified:-

1. Historical development of the Army's constitution. The Christian Mission, as our Movement was named, prior to it being called The Salvation Army, had a number of constitutional documents which were approved by its annual conference and executed by the General Superintendent. The last of these was the first Foundation Deed of The Salvation Army. This was the 1878 Deed Poll usually referred to as the Deed of Constitution. On 31 July 1980 the following documents were in force:

- (a) Deed Poll executed by William Booth on 7 August 1878 and known as the Deed of Constitution. It was later endorsed with a Memorandum noting the change of name to The Salvation Army;
- (b) Supplemental Deed executed by William Booth on 26 July 1904;
- (c) The Salvation Army Act 1931;
- (d) Deed Poll executed by General Frederick Coutts on 14 July 1965; and
- (e) The Salvation Army Act, 1968.

2. The present constitution. On 1 August 1980 The Salvation Army Act 1980 came into force. It made a number of changes to the Constitution as follows:

- (a) The General of The Salvation Army was made a Corporation Sole with perpetual succession and a Corporate Seal;
- (b) The Salvation Army Trustee Company which had been the Custodian Trustee of Army property in the United Kingdom and of some property elsewhere, by the Act became the Ordinary Trustee with full powers of management thus relieving the General of a heavy burden of routine work;
- (c) The Army was given power to make changes in its own Constitution without the need to apply for the approval of the UK Parliament;
- (d) Certain enlarged powers of investment and management of Trust funds were granted to The Salvation Army Trustee Company;
- (e) Minor changes were made to the procedure for electing the General;
- (f) Some procedures which had been in practice in the past were given statutory authority; and
- (g) The Deeds Poll referred to in paragraph 1 above were revoked and most of the two previous Acts repealed. Apart from some minor provisions of the Acts

of 1931 and 1968, the principal terms of the Army's Constitution are now to be found in one document, namely The Salvation Army Act 1980.

3. The Salvation Army's social work. Although the Army's social work is a direct offshoot of its evangelism, in the UK it was made a separate operation by virtue of a Deed executed by the Founder at a public meeting on 30 January 1891. Originally called the Darkest England Scheme it is now referred to as the Social Trust Deed. In the UK and some other countries, social work remains subject to a separate trust, although the work has in practice been largely integrated with other Army operations in many cases. In the UK the Trust Deed of 1891 remains in force, although an amendment was made to it on 26 March 1969.

4. Unincorporated association. The Army itself has in the United Kingdom, as in many other countries, no separate legal existence. To use the technical terminology, it is an 'unincorporated association'.

5. The trust. An international trust was established on 21 September 1990 to further the international work of the Army and, in particular, the work of IHQ. The trustee of the trust is The Salvation Army International Trustee Company, incorporated 7 September 1990. On 1 November 1990 the United Kingdom Territory was established.

6. Constitutions outside the United Kingdom. In many countries, particularly those with close ties to Britain, The Salvation Army constitution in the UK still represents the 'parent constitution'. It also acts as a temporary constitution in many places when the Army is pioneering its work and before an indigenous constitution can be established. In some countries with a suitable legal system the UK model is adopted although this is not always so.

7. The General. The General occupies a unique place in the constitution of the Army in most countries. In some, this is described as a Corporation Sole (as in the UK), in others as a Registered Trustee. There are also countries where the authority of the General is required for the appointment of principal office-holders. The General personally commissions and appoints every territorial commander and officer commanding. The authority of the General is necessary for many other appointments.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 3

The Salvation Army: Doctrines

Date Composed:- 18/07/1997

Date Modified:-

The doctrines held and taught by The Salvation Army are set forth in the Deed of Constitution of 1878 (see *Chapter II, Paragraph 1(a)* of this Part) and were confirmed in The Salvation Army Act 1980. All Salvationists affirm:

The doctrines stated.

1. We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God; and that they only constitute the divine rule of Christian faith and practice.
2. We believe that there is only one God, who is infinitely perfect - the Creator, Preserver and Governor of all things - and who is the only proper object of religious worship.
3. We believe that there are three persons in the Godhead - the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost - undivided in essence and co-equal in power and glory.
4. We believe that in the person of Jesus Christ the divine and human natures are united; so that he is truly and properly God, and truly and properly man.
5. We believe that our first parents were created in a state of innocence but, by their disobedience, they lost their purity and happiness; and that in consequence of their fall all men have become sinners, totally depraved, and as such are justly exposed to the wrath of God.
6. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ has, by his suffering and death, made an atonement for the whole world, so that whosoever will may be saved.
7. We believe that repentance toward God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit are necessary to salvation.
8. We believe that we are justified by grace, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and that he that believeth hath the witness in himself.
9. We believe that continuance in a state of salvation depends upon continued obedient faith in Christ.
10. We believe that it is the privilege of all believers to be 'wholly sanctified', and that their 'whole spirit and soul and body' may 'be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ' (1 Thessalonians 5:23).
11. We believe in the immortality of the soul; in the resurrection of the body; in the general judgement at the end of the world; in the eternal happiness of the righteous; and in the endless punishment of the wicked.

The officer's duty. Officers are required to study, accept and teach the Army doctrines, as set forth in the foregoing statement and in *The Salvation Army Handbook of Doctrine*.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 7

The Salvation Army: Officers

Date Composed:- 18/07/1997

Date Modified:- 31/05/2002

Section 1. General statements

Section 2. Training

Section 3. Ranks

Section 4. Commissions

Section 1. General Statements

1. **Definition.** The officers of the Army are men and women who, in response to a divine call:

- (a) have left other pursuits and occupations;
- (b) have consecrated their lives to the service of God and the people;
- (c) have satisfactorily completed a course of training;
- (d) have been commissioned;
- (e) are - unless retired - engaged in full time service in the Army's ranks.

2. **Candidates.** Candidates for officership must be suitable as regards health, age, spiritual experience, character, education and ability.

3. **Auxiliary-Captains.** Auxiliary-captains may be given the opportunity of attaining substantive status as officers (see *O&R for Auxiliary-Captains*).

4. **Undertakings with the Army.** All who are accepted for officership must enter into certain undertakings with the Army (see *Volume 0 Introductory matter, Chapter 5* of these *O&R*). The text of the undertakings is included in the application form signed by candidates for officership. The formal undertakings document is signed in duplicate immediately prior to commissioning, with one copy being retained by the signatory.

5. **Association with secret society.** A person accepted for officership may not be a member of any secret society, neither may an officer join any such society.

6. Divorced persons and officership.

- (a) No person who has at any time been a party to proceedings for divorce, annulment of marriage or legal separation may be accepted for training or service as an officer in The Salvation Army before the officer review board has made a recommendation to the TC in respect of the marital situation.
- (b) Persons who have had more than one divorce will not normally be considered for officership. However, in exceptional circumstances, the

officer review board may consider an application where the number of divorces does not exceed two. Legally separated persons cannot become officers.

- (c) No divorced person can commence officer training until at least one year has elapsed from the date of the final decree. Where such person has remarried, no application for officership shall be considered until that marriage has existed for at least one year.

7. Residential rights. A candidates board may accept for training only candidates who have permanent residential rights within the borders of its territory.

8. Home territory. The territory which accepts a candidate for officership is the 'home territory' when that person becomes an officer. This holds true regardless of where the training takes place.

9. Home territory's obligations. In accepting a candidate for officership a territory is obligated to:

- (a) appoint the officer (subject to IHQ decision in respect of appointments outside the home territory);
- (b) secure eligibility for state pension and other benefits, where such exist;
- (c) provide accommodation and allowances (active/retired) according to the territorial schedule.

10. Home territory of a married woman officer. A married woman officer takes the home territory of her husband (if that is different from her own) but may elect to revert to her original home territory in the event of her husband's promotion to Glory.

11. Homeland furlough for married women officers. A woman officer who as a consequence of her marriage is required to change home territory, and who is not serving in her original home territory and is not subject to an approved inter-territorial arrangement, will be eligible for homeland furlough in her original home territory according to the provisions set out in *Orders and Regulations Governing Reinforcement and Secondment Service*, Chapter 2, Section 4. If she is not serving as a reinforcement officer, the length of term and of homeland furlough will be as for seconded officers. Transport costs will be paid by the officer's territory of service or, in the case of supported territories unable to do so, as arranged by IHQ.

Section 2. Training

1. Training – a condition of officership. Completion of the requisite officer training programme and attainment of the *Certificate of Salvation Army Officer Training* is a condition of officership (see *Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers*).

- (a) Those in training are known as cadets or cadet-lieutenants.

- (b) Training normally includes a residential period at an Army training college or school for officers' training.
 - (c) At territorial discretion, the training programme for some cadets may be individually tailored to match the needs, qualifications and life experience of the cadet. Such training may be a mixture of residential, 'in-service', and distance learning, and may vary in length and content.
 - (d) The *Certificate of Salvation Army Officer Training*, signed by the territorial commander, is awarded in recognition of the cadet having fulfilled, by whatever method of training, the requirements of officer training as set out in *Orders and Regulations for the Training of Salvation Army Officers*.
2. **Chief features.** Training includes the development of spiritual life, character and the mind. Instruction is given in many subjects, among them Bible, doctrine, Salvation Army studies, pastoral ministry, platform ministry, church and society, evangelism, church growth and cross-cultural ministry.
3. **Where trained.** Cadets are trained in their own territory where facilities for this exist. Arrangements may be made for training elsewhere.
4. **Pre-training and post-commissioning studies.** Training for officership, whether residential or by any other method, is normally preceded by a preparatory study course and is followed by an extended period during which the new officer continues studies in accordance with Part 7, Chapter 1, Section 3 of these O&R.
5. **In-service training.** In exceptional circumstances a cadet may be appointed before completion of the period of training. Commissioning with the rank of captain will then take place on the satisfactory completion of officer training (see Section 4, paragraph 1 of this chapter).
6. **Cadet-lieutenant.** Lieutenants who have given a minimum of three years' service as lieutenants, and who enter residential training, take the title cadet-lieutenant and retain lieutenants' rank badges during training.

Section 3. Ranks

1. **Officers.** Officers hold one of the following ranks:
- (a) Captain
 - (b) Major
 - (c) Lieutenant-Colonel
 - (d) Colonel
 - (e) Commissioner
 - (f) General.
2. **Same ranks in all branches.** The ranks held by officers are the same in all branches of the service in all parts of the world (see also *Part 7, Chapter 1, Section 2* of these regulations).

Section 4. Commissions

1. **All officers commissioned.** Every cadet receives a commission as an officer with the rank of captain on the satisfactory completion of training.
2. **Officers' commissions.** The commissions of officers are issued on behalf of the General, usually by the TC of the territory where they were trained.
3. **Cancelling of commissions.** A commission may be cancelled only by the person who issued it, or by an officer occupying the same position in succession, or by some other duly authorised officer.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Introductory, Chapter 4**Covenant Signed by an Officer of The Salvation Army**

Date Composed:- 03/10/2001

Date Modified:-

MY COVENANT**CALLED BY GOD**

to proclaim the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ
as an officer of The Salvation Army,

I BIND MYSELF TO HIM IN THIS SOLEMN COVENANT:

to love and serve him supremely all my days,

to live to win souls and make their salvation
the first purpose of my life,

to care for the poor, feed the hungry, clothe the naked,
love the unlovable, and befriend those who have no friends,

to maintain the doctrines and principles of The Salvation Army,
and, by God's grace, to prove myself a worthy officer.

Done in the strength of my Lord and Saviour, and in the presence of
[the following wording to be adapted to local circumstances]
the Territorial Commander, training college officers and fellow cadets.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Introductory, Chapter 5

Undertakings Entered Into by an Officer of The Salvation Army

Date Composed:- 23/07/1997

Date Modified:-

The relationship between The Salvation Army and its officers is sacred. This needs to be cherished and preserved as a means of achieving God-given common spiritual purposes. Therefore, in addition to the promises made on becoming a soldier and those in the officers' covenant, a Salvationist is commissioned and ordained as an officer on condition that the following promises and declarations are made:

1. In response to the call of God, I give myself of my own free will to be an officer of The Salvation Army and to engage in its ministry. As an officer I acknowledge that the fundamental nature of my relationship to the Army and of the Army to me is spiritual.
2. I understand and agree that there is no contract of service or of employment nor any other legal relationship between the Army and me. Accordingly the Army shall have no legal claims upon me nor I upon the Army.
3. I understand and agree that although I may expect to receive, and every attempt will be made to provide, allowances according to an official scale no allowance is guaranteed to me. I accept that any such allowance is not a wage, salary, reward or payment for services rendered but is a means of freeing me from the need to engage in secular employment.
4. I will observe the orders and regulations of The Salvation Army as issued from time to time. I recognise that the Army seeks to create and administer orders and regulations in a manner consistent with Christian principles.
5. I declare my belief in the truths of the doctrines of The Salvation Army. I will teach them faithfully and will seek to make my life a reflection of those truths.
6. I will look to my leaders in the Army to be sensitive to the guidance of God in giving me appointments and responsibilities. I will accept the direction of my leaders under the appointments system knowing that they will try to place me where I can best advance the cause of Jesus Christ. I will faithfully fulfil all the requirements of my appointments to the best of my ability.
7. I will trust my leaders in the Army to provide me with opportunities for personal development in order to enhance my service and its effectiveness. I will use responsibly and wisely all such opportunities, accepting that my leaders have a duty to encourage me, enlarging my vision of all I can become in Christ.
8. I will expect my leaders to evaluate periodically my progress and personal effectiveness in ministry. I acknowledge that I am accountable to them under God for the mature and proper discharge of my duties. I will accept and act upon formal recommendations for my improvement, knowing that persistent ineffectiveness as an officer could lead to the termination of my service.
9. Unless clearly authorised by my leaders in accordance with orders and regulations, I will not engage in secular employment, paid or unpaid, knowing that I have committed all my days and hours to Salvation Army officer mission and ministry.

10. I will respond wholeheartedly to efforts by my leaders to encourage me in the use and development of my creative abilities. I agree to place any such abilities at the disposal of the Army for the furtherance of its mission, and in accordance with orders and regulations.
11. I will not seek or encourage any presentation, gift or testimonial to myself, or use my position as a Salvation Army officer for personal gain.
12. I undertake to account for all monies and other assets entrusted to me and to keep and make available for inspection and audit purposes all records, accepting my responsibilities as a Christian steward of the resources placed under my control.
13. I will conform to the Army's requirements regarding the wearing of uniform.
14. Supported by the pastoral care and respect of my leaders, I will seek to be a worthy minister of Christ's gospel and officer of the Army. I will avoid in word and action anything likely to injure the body of Christ or that part of it which is The Salvation Army.

ORDERS AND REGULATIONS FOR OFFICERS: Volume 2, Part 7, Chapter 1

An Officer in Relation to the Army

Date Composed:- 18/07/1997

Date Modified:- 17/01/2003

Section 1. General statements

Section 2. Ranks and promotions

Section 3. The post-commissioning system

Section 4. Development

Section 5. Appointments

Section 6. Financial arrangements

Section 1. General Statements

1. Opportunity and obligation. Officership in the Army provides a unique opportunity for service to God and the people. Such opportunity is, of course, accompanied by an obligation to seek always the furtherance of the Army's great purposes, in loyalty to its aims, doctrines and principles, and in a spirit of self-denying dedication.

2. Continuity of officership. Officers can expect to be retained in their position so long as they maintain a character worthy of a Salvation Army officer, adhere to their undertakings and are faithful and competent in the duties assigned to them.

3. Active service. The active service of an officer is reckoned from the date of commissioning and, in this respect, the two-year session will be regarded as the standard training period. In territories where a shortened period of training is approved, cadets will leave the training college, or school for officer training, as cadet-lieutenants and be commissioned as officers one year later. The active service of those officers commissioned between January 1962 and December 1972 is reckoned as having commenced at the end of the first year of training.

4. Regulation uniform. Regulation uniform as approved for the territory must be worn by officers when on duty (see *Volume One, Part 1, Chapter IV, Paragraph 2* of these regulations). No officer is permitted to vary the authorised uniform in any way.

5. Litigation. The undertaking not to say or do anything to injure The Salvation Army or reflect unfavourably upon its integrity and purpose (see the *Undertakings* in the *Introductory matter* to these *O&R, Paragraph 14*), requires that an officer will not vexatiously or frivolously institute litigation against The Salvation Army, or against a fellow salvationist.

6. Change of home territory in exceptional circumstances. In exceptional circumstances officers may be permitted to change home territory. The following will not be considered exceptional circumstances for the purposes of this regulation:

- educational benefits for either the officer or his/her children;
- immigration;
- financial gain;
- retirement benefits;
- appointment security.

- (a) Applications addressed to the TC of the current home territory will be referred to the officer review board for recommendation.
- (b) Each application, together with the recommendation of the TC and the separate recommendation of the officer review board, will be forwarded to IHQ for consideration. Should the zonal IS give provisional approval to the application, it will be passed, through the regular channels, to the proposed new home territory.
- (c) If acceptable in principle to the receiving territory, all aspects of the transfer, including travel costs, health insurance, eligibility for state benefits, retirement provision and immigration requirements, will be negotiated between the two territories before a joint submission is made to the CoS for final decision. Evidence of formal approval by the finance council (and, where applicable, pension board) of each territory will be required.
- (d) If final approval is given, the receiving territory will, with immediate effect, become the home territory of the officer, and will fulfill in respect of the officer the obligations of home territories as set out in these regulations, *Volume 2, Part 1, Chapter 7, Section 1, paragraph 9*.

For the retirement of an officer couple in the former home territory of the wife, see *Volume 2, Part 7, Chapter 3, Section 3, paragraph 5* of these regulations.

Section 2. Ranks and Promotions

1. Commissioning and promotion. On satisfactory completion of officer training, a cadet or cadet-lieutenant is commissioned with the rank of captain. Subsequent promotion will be in accordance with the regulations operative at the time. An officer's uniform must bear the insignia of the rank held.

2. Ranks based on years of service. The ranks of captain and major recognise length of service. In the case of married officers the ranks are held individually according to the number of years each has served. Before being eligible for promotion to the rank of major, a captain must have served 15 years as a commissioned officer except as provided for in paragraph 4 below.

3. Conferred ranks. The ranks of lieutenant-colonel, colonel and commissioner are conferred by the General. In the case of married officers each spouse holds the rank in his or her own right. Conferred ranks are normally linked with appointments held. At the discretion of the General, the rank of lieutenant-colonel may be conferred on officers commanding, chief secretaries and territorial commanders and their spouses. The ranks of colonel and commissioner may be conferred on territorial commanders, international secretaries, and other senior international leaders and their spouses.

4. General's prerogative. The General reserves the right to promote an officer to higher rank at any time where the interests of the Army require it.

Section 3. The Post-Commissioning System

1. **The term explained.** The term 'post-commissioning' refers to the concluding phase of a five-year directed study course covering candidateship, cadetship and early officership.
2. **Approved course of study.** On completion of the standard training session every officer must undertake the approved course of study, of not less than two years, as outlined by the appropriate education department.
3. **Correspondence course.** A cadet who is appointed early from the training college or after a shorter session will be required to complete the training programme satisfactorily by correspondence or other means before being eligible to receive the *Certificate of Salvation Army Officer Training* and be commissioned as an officer. The post-commissioning course will commence at that point.
4. **Completion of post-commissioning course.** The post-commissioning study course must be completed before the five-year review.
5. **Adequate time for study essential.** Officers are urged to continue a programme of regular directed studies under the guidance of the appropriate territorial department. Commanding officers must allow, and officers stationed alone must plan for adequate time for self-improvement.

Section 4. Development

1. **Development of officers.** Enterprising, knowledgeable and skilled officers, who are thoroughly grounded in the principles, spirit and methods of the Army, and who have a glowing spiritual life and a strong sense of mission, are essential to furthering the work of the Army.
2. **Development opportunities.** The Army will therefore seek to provide development opportunities to enhance the service of officers, re-affirm their sense of mission, enrich their spiritual life, develop their abilities, widen their experience, and affirm their value. Such development opportunities may, where practicable and where resources allow, include:
 - (a) Attendance at councils, conferences and events, such as Brengle Institutes and others, designed for the development of spiritual life;
 - (b) Exposure to different forms of Army service and, where possible, attendance at inter-territorial and international Army events and conferences;
 - (c) Participation in divisional and territorial advisory and decision making bodies;
 - (d) Ministry and personal development counselling;
 - (e) Officer exchanges between territories;
 - (f) Secondment to other ministries (eg chaplaincy);
 - (g) Continuing education courses;
 - (h) Study tours, study leave, study grants;

- (i) Mentoring and coaching programmes;
- (j) Experience of cross-cultural ministries.

3. **Shared evaluations.** All officers shall regularly be given opportunity for shared evaluations of their work and development with a view to their personal improvement and increased capacity for service.

4. **Development potential.** By means of the shared evaluation and other contact with leaders, the development potential and training needs of each officer will be discussed and appropriate action taken, not only for the enhancement of the Army's ministry but also for the fulfilment and sense of worth of the individual.

5. **Five-year review.** Officers can expect that about five years after their commissioning a more formal and extensive evaluation will be undertaken, possibly in a residential setting, that will include addressing the question of continuation in officer service.

Section 5. Appointments

1. **How arranged.** In the planning of appointments, an officer may expect leaders to

- (a) seek the guidance of God in an endeavour to ensure that the best interests of both the officer and the Army are served;
- (b) consider the officer's character, gifts, skills, personal and family circumstances, and suitability for the proposed appointment.

2. **Equality of consideration.** Equality of consideration will be given to the vocation of all officers. In the case of married officer couples, the skills, gifts and circumstances of both husband and wife will be considered when making appointments and the appointments of both officers will be issued simultaneously.

3. **Service record.** A service record will be kept for each officer and this will be regularly updated. The service record will include basic information such as training and commissioning dates, appointments, gifts, qualifications and health and family details. Service records are available for inspection on request by the officer concerned.

4. **Right attitude toward appointment.** An officer should endeavour to maintain a constant spirit of commitment and, believing in the over-ruling providence of God, accept such changes of appointment as considered advisable by leaders, even though on some occasions difficulty or disappointment may be involved.

5. **Acceptance of appointment.** A new appointment should be received in a spirit of prayerful rededication and, despite any prejudicial information regarding appointment or predecessor, the officer should enter and continue in the appointment, assured that 'in all things God works for the good of those who love him' (Romans 8:28, *NIV*).

6. **Absence from appointment.** Officers should not be absent from their appointment without the agreement of their immediate leader.

7. Fields of service. Officers led to offer for some specific field of service or for service in a territory in need of reinforcement officers should make this known in writing to their immediate leader.

Section 6. Financial Arrangements

1. Provision for basic needs. An officer voluntarily undertakes to work for God, in Salvation Army service, without guaranteed financial provision of any kind. However, the Army seeks to make provision for an allowance (as distinct from a wage or salary) sufficient for basic needs and in accordance with an official scale which is periodically adjusted in each territory. Arrangements for the payment of an allowance are not made on a commercial or legal basis, nor paid as a reward for services rendered. Such service for the salvation of the world, rendered in response to the call of God, cannot be subject to any material compensation. Rather is the allowance given to relieve an officer of the need to engage in secular employment, and for the purpose of freeing those who have consecrated the whole of their time and energies to Christ in this way from the need to earn a livelihood.

2. Official scale. The basic allowance will be on the same scale for officers of a territory regardless of the appointment or qualifications which they hold. The years of service of the longer-serving spouse will be used as a calculating base for allowances for married officers.

3. Quarters. In addition to a direct allowance an officer is provided with either Salvation Army-owned accommodation or given a rent allowance to cover alternative accommodation.

4. Implications of buying or owning a house. When an officer builds or purchases a house for personal use, no special consideration can be given to the officer concerned with regard to future appointments. Officers owning their own houses are fully responsible for all the expenses incurred.

5. No unauthorised remuneration. An officer may not supplement official allowances by engaging in any trade, profession or money-making occupation.

6. Remuneration to SA funds. Any remuneration received from special service rendered by an officer in the community or from secondment to some other organisation or agency must be paid into Salvation Army funds.

7. No gifts to be solicited. In accordance with Salvation Army principle, an officer will not solicit or knowingly encourage any presentation or any gift or testimonial, or use the officership position for personal gain.

8. What legacies are permitted. The offer or promise of personal legacies is to be resisted other than when from the following sources:

- (a) Legacies made by relatives, whether related to the officer by blood, adoption or by marriage;
- (b) Legacies through family friendships not arising from the legatee's officership;

- (c) Legacies from personal friends, where such friendships existed prior to training for officership;
- (d) Legacies from one officer to another arising out of a long friendship;
- (e) Legacies to officers or their dependants who are incapacitated for work by reason of physical disability.

If personal legacies, other than those listed in (a) to (e) above, are received, they should be paid into Army funds.

9. Widows, widowers, divorced persons. Widows, widowers and divorced persons entering training, reaccepted for officership, or accepted for auxiliary-captaincy, will in all respects such as allowances and accommodation be regarded as single persons. If they have children, children's allowances, according to territorial scale, will be granted when officership is attained.

10. Widow's, widower's allowance. An officer whose spouse is promoted to Glory will continue to receive the married allowance for a period of 12 months. Thereafter the allowance will be as for a single officer of the same years of service.

11. Termination grant. An officer who resigns or is dismissed will receive a termination grant. The provision of such grant will be in accordance with territorial policy as approved by IHQ.

12. 'Tent-maker' ministry. At territorial discretion, in exceptional circumstances, designated officers may be allowed by the territorial commander to engage in part-time paid secular employment in order to further the Army's mission. The following conditions will be observed:

- (a) 'Tent-maker' ministry must be understood in the light of Scripture (Acts 18:3, 1 Corinthians 9:8-18) as a self-denying means of sustaining spiritual ministry. It in no way diminishes the 'tent-maker's' calling to officership, or changes his or her relationship with the Army through the undertakings entered into by officers of The Salvation Army. Nor does it alter the fundamental definition of officers of The Salvation Army as 'soldiers who have relinquished secular employment in response to a spiritual calling, so as to devote all their time and energies to the service of God and the people' (see *Volume 1, Part 1, Chapter 1, paragraph 1* of these O&R).
- (b) 'Tent-maker' ministry is only to be considered in exceptional circumstances, for example in connection with new openings or programmes, or where there is no possibility of the officer being adequately supported by a congregation or receiving other regular income.
- (c) 'Tent-making' must be part-time so that the officer is able to function and minister in his or her officer role.
- (d) The 'tent-making' officer must be fully convinced in his or her own conscience of the rightness of the arrangement, and be willing to undertake it. The choice of employment will be made by the officer in consultation with his or her immediate leader.

- (e) In the spirit of 'tent-making' ministry, all remuneration received by the 'tent-making' officer shall be paid into Army funds, with the officer drawing his or her official allowance in the usual way. However, where employment law, taxation rules or any other circumstances do not permit this to happen, other arrangements may be made, but always on the basis that the allowance received by the officer does not exceed the official allowance. Where applicable, the level of allowance may be adjusted to allow for tax implications.
- (f) The situation of officers engaged in 'tent-making' ministry will be kept under continual review, for their sake and for the sake of the ministry. 'Tent-making' officers must not be put under unreasonable pressure - from their leaders, their congregation, and the conflicting demands of their responsibilities. Nor must a concept intended to be an exceptional, temporary and voluntarily agreed way of furthering the Army's mission be allowed to become a permanent or imposed norm.

Appendix 9: Recommendations of the International Commission on Officership, January 2000

- 1 We recommend that territories continue to move away from authoritarian models of command and develop consultative models of leadership. Such models will be characterised by:
 - consistency with gospel values
 - servant leadership
 - cultural relevance
 - flexibility
 - increased and wider participation
 - mutual accountability.
- 2 We recommend that territories continue to plan for the development of all their spiritual leaders, such planning to include:
 - creating a learning climate
 - shared evaluation
 - flexible training
 - continuing education
- 3 We recommend that IHQ convene an international leadership development symposium to formulate a strategy for the ongoing training of leaders for a global army.
- 4 We recommend that territories incorporate ongoing orientation in cross-cultural ministry into their leadership training and working practices in order to develop culturally sensitive models of leadership.
- 5 We recommend that membership of planning and decision-making bodies reflect a greater mix of generations.
- 6 We recommend that competent officers be appointed to positions of executive responsibility irrespective of age or years of service.
- 7 We recommend that the development opportunities listed below be included in *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army...*
 - (a) Consultation in respect to appointments
 - (b) Participation in divisional and territorial decision making bodies
 - (c) Ministry and personal development counselling
 - (d) Officer exchanges between territories
 - (e) Training opportunities
 - (f) Secondment to other ministries (e.g. chaplaincy, para-church organisation)
 - (g) Study tours, study leave, study grants
 - (h) Sabbaticals
 - (i) Appropriate provision of long service leave
 - (j) Pastoral support (e.g. pastoral care officers, mentoring, coaching programmes, reconciliation processes).

- 8 We recommend:
 - That the content of the Officers' Covenant be consistent worldwide
 - That the Covenant be amended to strengthen the concept of life-long dedication to God.
 - That it be more directly related to the Army's international mission statement.
- 9 We recommend the appointment of a broad-based group consisting of Officers and legal practitioners to review the officers' undertakings with The Salvation Army, addressing the following:
 - Simplification of the document
 - Clarification of its intent
 - The possibility of including reciprocal obligations of the Army to its Officers without jeopardising its legal position.
- 10 We recommend that *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army* be amended to allow an officer to remain in officership after marrying an auxiliary-captain, cadet or accepted candidate.
- 11 We recommend the *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army* be amended to allow, in exceptional circumstances, and with the recommendation of the officer review board, a married officer to continue in officership when the spouse can no longer remain an officer. The officer review board must ensure that the exceptional circumstances are unrelated to personal gain, personal convenience, or lack of commitment. The recommendations of the officer review board, together with those of the territorial commander, must be forwarded to IHQ for final decision by the Chief of the Staff.
- 12 We recommend that, in the matter of the marriage of officers to non-officers, territories be given the option of either:
 - presenting a territorial policy proposal, or
 - presenting individual cases to IHQ for consideration by the Chief of the Staff.
- 13 We recommend that each married officer be paid a separate and equal allowance.
- 14 We recommend that *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army*, Volume 2, Part 5, Chapter 1, paragraph 2, requiring officers to obtain HQ permission to become engaged, be replaced, except where cultural norms dictate otherwise, by a requirement to inform, and that paragraph 3 (Disparity in age) and paragraph 6 (Permission to marry) be deleted.
- 15 We recommend that territories affirm the ministry of women officers by appointing them to positions commensurate with their gifts and experience.
- 16 We recommend that territories seek a gender balance in the membership of planning and decision-making bodies.

- 17 We recommend the affirmation of single officers, with continued consideration being given to their particular needs and equal opportunity for leadership placement.
- 18 We recommend that territories be allowed to accept and test the concept of open-ended officer service in consultation with IHQ.
- 19 We recommend that each territory implement a personnel policy that acknowledges the value and dignity due to an officer who resigns, and provides the appropriate pastoral support.
- 20 We recommend the territories make provision for a termination grant to be given to an officer who resigns.
- 21 We recommend that the present age restrictions in relation to eligibility for officership be revised, the rank of auxiliary captain discontinued, and a flexible training programme be developed.
- 22 We recommend that territories review current and develop new models of spiritual leadership.
- 23 We recommend that territories develop an appointing process which included consultation with the centres as well as with the officers, within the overall requirements of the mission.
- 24 We recommend that the Army recognise the benefits of 'tent-maker' ministry, and permits such an arrangement at territorial discretion.
- 25 We recommend that there be a review of the officer rank system taking into account the preferred options presented above (in the Rationale provided), being
 - Retain present system, or with minor modifications
 - All officers with rank of captain apart from General
 - All ranks (except General) based on years of service
- 26 We recommend that, at territorial discretion, a system of portable pensions or an equivalent scheme be implemented.
- 27 We recommend that the General establish a small standing commission to offer guidance on theological, policy and procedural matters arising from this report, and in relation to ongoing officer service in The Salvation Army.
- 28 We recommend that each territory establish a broadly based task force to review the documentation produced by this Commission and guide the TC on implementation of its recommendations.¹

¹ Final Report and the General's Consultation with Officers, London, 2000, pp.5-20.

Appendix 10: Extracts from the MORI Report

Findings of the General's Consultation with Officers Regarding the Recommendations of the International Commission on Officership, May 2000²

Response Rate

12,653 forms were received by MORI (Market and Opinion Research international Ltd.), representing a global response of 50%. 653 forms arrived too late for analysis in time for the International Conference of Leaders, and the survey is therefore based on 12,000 responses.

The response rate, geographical zone by geographical zone was as follows:

Africa	56%
East Asia	54%
South Pacific	52%
North America	50%
Latin America and Caribbean	42%
Europe – United Kingdom	41%
Europe – Continental	39%
South Asia (Indian sub-continent)	34%

Of the 12,000 responses, the number of forms received from each geographical zone (expressed as a percentage of all responses) was as follows:

North America	30%
Africa	16%
South Asia	11%
South Pacific	11%
Europe – United Kingdom	10%
Europe – Continental	9%
East Asia	8%
Latin America and Caribbean	4%

Personal details		Rank		Appointment		Age Bracket	
	%		%		%		%
Male	44	Aux/Captain	3	Corps	51	20-29	5
Female	51	Lieutenant	12	Social	9	30-39	21
Married	65	Captain	35	CS/DC/HOD	8	40-49	26
Single	11	Major	39	HQ/Other	16	50-59	20
		Lt.-Colonel	6			60 & over	27
		Colonel	2				
		Commissioner	1				
Active / Retired		Active	74%	Retired	23%		

² Circular to all officers by Commissioner John Larsson, Chief of the Staff, 24th June 2000

Findings of the consultation

In round terms the results were as follows:

Six of the recommendations were endorsed by 9 out of every 10 respondents.

These are the recommendations dealing with leadership development, women's ministry – appointments, single officers, cultural relevance, strengthening and enriching of officer service, and the recommendation that the rank system be reviewed. These recommendations were endorsed globally and individually by all zones.

Twelve of the recommendations were endorsed by 8 out of every 10 respondents.

These were the recommendations dealing with leadership models and structures, the officer's covenant and undertaking, appointing younger leaders to decision-making bodies, women's ministry – membership of boards and councils, international and territorial commissions for ongoing work on officership issues, support if an officer resigns, an international symposium regarding leadership development, other models of spiritual leadership, portable pensions, and the appointing process. These recommendations were endorsed globally and individually by all zones.

Six of the recommendations were endorsed by 7 out of every 10 respondents.

These are the recommendations dealing with marriage regulations – engagement, partner moving into officership and allowances, revision of age requirements for officer service, termination grant, appointing younger leaders to executive responsibility. These recommendations were endorsed globally and individually by all zones.

Two recommendations were endorsed by 6 out of every 10 respondents. The first of these is the recommendation dealing with marriage regulations – spouse moving out of officership. This was endorsed globally and individually by all zones, but the retired officers in South Asia expressed reservations. The second recommendation deals with the concept of officership not necessarily being a life-time commitment. This was endorsed globally and individually by all zones.

Two recommendations were endorsed by 5 out of every 10 respondents. The first of these – the recommendation that territories be permitted to experiment with the 'tent maker' concept – received a global 'agree' response of 53%, all zones endorsing the recommendation except North America.

The second recommendation – that territories be given the option of officers being married to non-officers – received a global 'agree' response of 50%, with 43% disagreeing. There were some zonal variations. Africa, North America, and South Asia disagreed. With this recommendation there was also a difference of view between active and retired officers. Globally, 52% of active officers agreed and 41% disagreed. Globally, 43% of retired officers agreed and 47% disagreed.

In summary all of the 28 recommendations were endorsed globally – most of them by a substantial margin. In the case of the two recommendations that received the lowest margin of support, one zone disagreed about the first, and three zones disagreed about the second.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

(Specifically by or about The Salvation Army)

Published**Salvation Army periodicals**

Battlepoint: (New Zealand, unofficial quarterly, 1963-1988)

Full Salvation: (Australia, weekly, 1880's-1890's)

Horizons: (Canada, bi-monthly, 1980's –)

Impact: (Australia, unofficial quarterly, 1970's)

Magazine: (British SA Students' Fellowship quarterly, 1955 –1970's)

New Frontier: (USA Western, weekly, 1984 –)

New Soldiers: (USA, unofficial quarterly, 1965-67)

The Army Scene: (Hong Kong, quarterly 2003 –)

The Christian Mission Magazine: (London, monthly, 1870-1878)

The Local Officer: (London, 1890's-1900's)

The Field Officer: (London, monthly, 1900 –1913)

The Officer (London, monthly, 1893 -1899, 1913 -1931,
1950 –2003, bi-monthly since February 1998)

The Officer's Review: (London, monthly, sometimes bi-monthly or quarterly
during and after World War II, 1932 –1949)

The Practical Theologian: (Sydney, bi-annual, 2003 -)

The Salvationist: (London, monthly, 1879)

The Salvation Army Year Book: (London, annual)

The Staff Review: (London bi-monthly, 1921-1931)

The War Cry: (London, and various international editions, weekly, 1880 –)
References in the text are to the London, "International", *War Cry*
unless otherwise indicated.

The Salvationist. (London, weekly, 1984 –)

Word and Deed (USA, bi-annual, 1998 –)

Salvation Army Official Statements

Orders and Regulations

Chosen to be a Soldier (Orders and Regulations for Soldiers). London, 1987.

Manual of Guidance for Staff Officers. London, Undated.

Orders and Regulations of The Salvation Army, London 1878.

Orders and Regulations for Field Officers, 1886.

Orders and Regulations for Field Officers, 1888.

Orders and Regulations for Staff Officers of The Salvation Army in the United Kingdom. London, 1895.

Orders and Regulations for Corps Councils, 1959.

Orders and Regulations for Officers, London, 1930.

Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army. London, 1974.

Orders and Regulations for Corps Officers, 1976.

The Why and Wherefore of The Salvation Army Regulations. London, [1896].

Doctrinal Statements

Doctrines and Discipline of The Salvation Army, London, 1881.

Handbook of Doctrine. London, 1923.

Handbook of Doctrine. London, 1940.

Handbook of Doctrine. London, 1969.

One Faith One Church: The Salvation Army's Response to Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. London, 1990.

Salvation Story. London, 1998.

Salvation Story, Study Guide. London, 1999.

The Doctrine We Adorn. London, 1982.

The Salvation Army Directory, No II, London 1900.

International Doctrine Council: *Servants Together*. London, 2002.

Bibliographies

Moyles, R.G.: *A Bibliography of Salvation Army Literature in English (1865-1987)*. Lewiston/Queenston, Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.

The Salvation Army Book Catalogue, International Archives and Research Centre, London. September, 1985.

Bibliography of Books and Pamphlets published by or about The Salvation Army. Wellington, The Salvation Army Officer Training College, 1984.

Other official Salvation Army publications

The Salvation War. An annual publication giving narrative accounts of Salvation Army activities, along with a balance sheet and statistical summary. 1881-1885.

The Salvation Army Year Book. Since 1906 an annual report on The Salvation Army internationally, published by International Headquarters, London.

The Disposition of Forces. A directory of Salvation Army appointments and personnel, published annually for internal circulation only in each Salvation Army Territory.

Salvation Army books

(The following books were published by, for or about The Salvation Army, including those written by Salvationists or former Salvationists but not published by the Army. Where a publisher is not indicated, the Army is the publisher.

Anon. editor: *Another Harvest of the Years*. London, 1975.

Begbie, Harold: *Life of William Booth, Founder of The Salvation Army*, London, Macmillan, 1920.

Booth, Catherine: *Aggressive Christianity*. London, 1880.

Popular Christianity. London, 1887.

Practical Religion. London 4th edn. 1891.

The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church and State.
London, 1889.

Booth, Catherine Bramwell:- *Bramwell Booth*. London, Rich & Cowan, 1932.

Catherine Booth. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1970.

Booth, Emma, and Booth, Herbert: *Called Out, and What Comes of It*. London, [1887?].

Booth, Florence: *Powers of Salvation Army Officers*. London,[1928].

Wanted – An Elite. London, [1928].

Booth, Maud B.: *Beneath Two Flags*. New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1889.

Booth, William: *Addresses to Staff Officers*. London, 1907.

In Darkest England, And the Way Out. London, 1890.

International Congress Addresses. London, 1904.

Religion for Everyday. London, 1902.

Salvation Soldiery. London, 1889.

Booth, William Bramwell: *Echoes and Memories*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, (1928) 2nd edn. 1977.

General Booth's Journal 1921-22. London 1925.

Servants of All. London, 1899.

Talks With Officers. London, 1921.

These Fifty Years. London, Cassell, 1929.

Booth-Tucker, Frederick: *The Life of Catherine Booth*. London, 1892.

- Muktifauj: Forty Years With The Salvation Army in India and Ceylon.* London, Marshall Brothers [1923].
- Bradwell, Cyril: *Fight the Good Fight.* Wellington, Reed, 1983.
- Touched With Splendour.* Wellington, Flag Pub., 2003.
- Brown, Arnold: *The Gate and the Light.* Toronto, Bookwright, 1984.
- Brown, Fred: *Secular Evangelism.* London, SCM, 1970.
- “Caractacus”: *The Question of Questions.* London, SW Partridge, 1882.
- Carpenter, Minnie Lindsay: *William Booth.* London, 1942.
- Carpenter, Stella: *A Man of Peace in a World of War.* Montville, Qld, Privately published, 1993.
- Clifton, Shaw: *Who Are These Salvationists?* Alexandria VA, 1999.
- Collier, Richard: *The General Next to God.* London, Collins, 1965.
- Coutts, John: *The Salvationists.* London, Mowbrays, 1977.
- Coutts, Frederick L.: *In Good Company.* London, 1980.
- The Better Fight (The History of The Salvation Army, Vol.6).* London, Hodder, 1973.
- The Weapons of Goodwill (The History of The Salvation Army, Vol.7),* London, Hodder, 1986.
- Clark, William: *Samuel Logan Brengle.* London, Hodder, 1980.
- [Dean, Harry]: *The Sacraments: the Salvationist’s Viewpoint.* London, 1960.
(Published anonymously, ‘By Authority of the General’)
- Duff, Mildred: *Hedwig Von Hartman,* London, 1904.
- Duncan, Denis: *Here is My Hand.* London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1977.
- Eason, Andrew Mark: *Women in God’s Army: Gender and Equality in the Early Salvation Army.* Waterloo ON, Wilfred Laurier University Press, 2003.
- Ervine, St John: *God’s Soldier, General William Booth.* London, Heinemann, 1934.

Friederichs, Hulda: *The Romance of The Salvation Army*. London, Cassell, 1907.

Friederichs, Hulda et. al. (Anon. editor): *The Life of General Booth*, London, Nelson, [1912?].

Gariepy, Henry: *The History of The Salvation Army, Vol.8*. Atlanta Ga., 2000.

General of God's Army. Wheaton Ill., Victor Books, 1993.

de Gasparin, Comtesse Agenor: *Read and Judge The (So-Called) Salvation Army*, London, Griffiths and Farran, 1883.

Gowans, John: *There's a Boy Here*. London 2002.

Green, Roger J.: *Catherine Booth*. Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Books, 1996.

War on Two Fronts: The Redemptive Theology of William Booth. Atlanta Ga., 1989.

Haggard, H. Rider: *Regeneration*. London, Longmans Green, 1910.

Hattersley, Roy: *Blood and Fire: William and Catherine Booth and Their Salvation Army*. London, Little, Brown & Co., 1999.

Horridge, Glenn K.: *The Salvation Army, Origins and Early Days, 1865-1900*. Godalming, Ammonite Books, 1993.

Hutson, Joan: *As for Me and My House: A salute to early Salvation Army families of Gisborne, 1886 to 1952*. Wellington, Flag Publications, 2004.

Kenyon, Albert: *In High Esteem*. London, 1969.

Kew, Clifford: *Closer Communion: The Sacraments in Scripture and Tradition*. London, 1980.

Kitching, Wilfred: *Soldier of Salvation*. London, 1963.

Larson, Flora: *My Best Men are Women*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1974.

Mckenzie, F.A.: *The Clash of the Cymbals*. New York, Bretano's, 1929.

McKinley, Edward H.: *Marching to Glory: The History of The Salvation Army in the United States of America, 1880-1980*. San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1980.

2nd Edition, (expanded), 1995.

- Metcalf, William: *The Salvationist and the Sacraments*. London, 1965.
- Moyles, Gordon R.: *Blood and Fire in Canada: A History of The Salvation Army in the Dominion, 1882-1976*. Toronto, Peter Martin Associates, 1977.
- Murdoch, Norman S.: *The Origins of The Salvation Army*. Knoxville, University of Tennessee Press, 1994.
- Frank Smith: Salvation Socialist*. Alexandria VA, 2003.
- Needham, Philip: *Community in Mission: A Salvationist Ecclesiology*. London, 1987.
- Nichol, Alex M.: *General Booth and The Salvation Army*. London, Herbert & Daniel, 1910.
- "Norah Marks": *Facts About The Salvation Army*. Chicago, Rand McNally, 1889.
- "One of the Scholars": *A School of the Prophets*. London, 1901.
- Pitt, Don: *Pilgrim's Progress: 20th Century. The Story of Salvation Army Officership*. New York, Salvation Army National Research Bureau, 1950.
- Prescott, P.: *The Salvation Army, The Secret of Its Success: A Message to the Churches*. London, Commonwealth Publishing Company, 1891.
- Rader, Kay: "Keeping the Dream Alive", in *Terms of Empowerment: Salvation Army Women in Ministry*. West Nyack NY, 2001.
- Railton, George Scott: *Twenty-One Years Salvation Army*. London, 1886.
- Heathen England*, London, S.W. Partridge, 2nd ed. 1878.
- General Booth*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1912.
- Redstone, J.J.R.: *An Ex-Captain's Experience of The Salvation Army*. London, Christian Commonwealth Publishing Coy., 2nd ed. 1888.
- Rhemick, John: *A New People of God: A Study in Salvationism*. Des Plaines Ill, 1993.
- Rightmire, R. David: *Sacraments and The Salvation Army: Pneumatological Foundations*. Metuchen NJ, The Scarecrow Press, 1990.
- Ryan, Geoff: *Sowing Dragons: Essays in Neo-Salvationism*. Toronto, 2001.

Sandall, Robert: *The History of The Salvation Army Vol. 1*. London, Nelson, 1947.

The History of The Salvation Army Vol.2. London, Nelson, 1950.

The History of The Salvation Army Vol.3. London, Nelson, 1955.

Smith, Frank: *All About The Salvation Army*. New York, 1885.

Smith, Gypsy: *Gypsy Smith, His Life and Work, by Himself*. London, Privately published, 1903.

Street, Robert: *Called to be God's People*. London 1999.

Sumner, Abner: ("An Ex-Staff Officer, A.S."): *The New Papacy: behind the Scenes in The Salvation Army*, Toronto, Albert Britnell, 1889.

Trout, Margaret: *The General Was a Lady*. Nashville, A.J. Holman, 1980.

Waldron, John (Comp.): *The Salvation Army and the Churches*. New York, 1986.

Wall, Phil: *I'll Fight: Holiness at War*. Tonbridge, Sovereign World, 1998.

Wallis, Humphrey: *Commissioner Cadman*. London, 1928.

Watson, Bernard: *Soldier Saint. George Scott Railton: William Booth's First Lieutenant*. London, Hodder, 1970.

A Hundred Years' War: The Salvation Army 1865-1965.
London, Hodder, 1964.

Wiggins, Arch.: *The History of The Salvation Army, Vol.4*. London, Nelson, 1964.

The History of The Salvation Army, Vol.5. London, Nelson, 1968.

Williams, Harry: *Booth-Tucker – William Booth's First Gentleman*. London, Hodder, 1980.

Winston, Diane: *Red Hot and Righteous: The Urban Religion of The Salvation Army*. Cambridge MASS, Harvard UP, 1999.

Wisbey, Herbert A. Jnr: *History of the Volunteers of America*. Chicago, VOA, 1954.

Soldiers Without Swords: A History of The Salvation Army in the United States. New York, Macmillan, 1955.

Wiseman, Clarence: *A Burning in My Bones.* Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1979.

Pamphlets

Anon.: *The Role of the Corps Officer in the United States of America: Guidelines for CO's in the USA.* Approved by the Commissioners' Conference, USA. October, 1972.

Anon.: *The Training of Salvation Army Officers.* London, 1927.

Bell, Frank: *The Fight for the Flag.* Sydney, Privately Circulated, 1948.

Coutts, Frederick: *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church,* London, 1978.

Articles in non-Salvation Army newspapers and periodicals

Murdoch, Norman S.: "Wesleyan Influence on William and Catherine Booth", in *Wesleyan theological Journal*, Vol. 20, No. 2, Fall 1985.

"Evangelical Sources of Salvation Army Doctrine", in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, July 1987.

"The Salvation Army and the Church of England 1882-83" in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, March 1986.

"The Salvation Army's U.S. Arrival", in *Ohio Academy of History Newsletter*, May, 1987.

Walker, P.J.: "Proclaiming Women's Right to Preach", in *Harvard Divinity Bulletin* 1994.

Unpublished

Salvation Army Reports

Minutes of Meetings (*All found in IHQ Archives or Heritage Centre, London.*)

Advisory Council to the General, Recommendation 2043, IHQ Archives.

Reports and Recommendations of the 1958 International Conference of Commissioners.

Minutes of the 1969 Commissioners' Conference.
Report on the 1969 Commissioner's Conference.

Minutes of the 1971 International Council of Leaders.

Minutes of the 1979 International Conference of Leaders.

Minutes of the 1984 International Conference of Leaders.

Minutes of the 1988 International Leaders' Conference.

Conference Implementation Committee, Minute 1, 1988 ICL.

1991 International Conference of Leaders, Background Papers.

Findings of the Commission Appointed to Review the Relationship with the World Council of Churches, January 1980.

Miscellaneous official statements and circulars

Booth, William: *Letter to Commissioners and Territorial Commanders*, London 1900.

Commission on Officership, New Zealand Task Force Findings. Wellington, 2001.

Disposition of Forces for New Zealand (Annual directory of Salvation Army appointments and incumbents) 1913 - .

Gowans, John: *The Recommendations of the International Commission on Officership: The General's Response and Action Plan*. London, 2000.

Larsson, John: *Findings of the General's consultation with officers regarding the recommendations of the International Commission on Officership*. London 2000.

The International Commission on Officership: *Final Report*. London, 2000.

Monographs and papers, published and unpublished

Arnold, Wilfred: "The Officer Rank Structure". Paper dated 27th March 2001, circulated to officers in New Zealand by Personnel Section, THQ.

Cleary, John: "Chosen to be a Soldier". Paper presented 2002 at College of Further Education, Sydney.

Clifton, Shaw: "What on Earth is Neo-Primitive Salvationism?" The Frederick Coutts Memorial Lecture 2003, given at the Sydney Officer Training College, 31st July 2003.

Cooper, Ian: "A Theology of Salvation Army Officership". Heritage Centre Archives, London.

Hodder, Kenneth: "The Development and Use of Lay Leaders Within the Decision-Making Processes of The Salvation Army". Paper given at the 1995 International Conference of Leaders.

Jamieson, C.J.: "Status of Officers". An Opinion provided for The Salvation Army in New Zealand by Bell Gully Buddle Weir, October 1992.

Kunz, Victor: "The Salvation Army – Its Origin, Spirit and Work", 1947. Translated typescript in the Heritage Centre Archives.

Mason, Robert: "The Salvation Army and the Sacraments", 1997. Submission to the International Spiritual life Commission. NZ SA Archives.

Murdoch, Norman S.: "Suzie Forest Swift (1862-1916)". Copy held by writer.

"In Darkest Africa: Martyrdom and Resistance to Colonialism in Rhodesia". Revision of a paper given to Ohio Academy of History, April 2002. Copy held by writer.

Rader, Kay: "Women in Ministry". Address to the 1998 International Conference of Leaders. Heritage Centre Archives.

Scott-Howman, Andrew: "Status of Officers in The Salvation Army". Memorandum provided for The Salvation Army in New Zealand by Bell Gully, October 2003.

Smith, Peter: "Current and Future Legal Issues". Paper for 1998 International Conference of Leaders. Heritage Centre Archives.

Taylor, David: "Army, Order or Church? An attempt to locate the Salvation Army within the wider family of churches and to consider the implications of this position." Paper read at United Kingdom Theological Symposium, July 2004.

Wahlstrom, Marie: "The Place and Position of the Woman Officer in The Salvation Army". Paper read at the 1984 International Conference of Leaders. Heritage Centre Archives.

Wickberg, Eric: "Movements for Reform". Address to the 1971 International Conference of Leaders. Heritage Centre Archives.

Yuill, Chick: "Nettles and Wineskins", the Frederick Coutts Memorial Lecture for 2004 at the College for Further Education, Sydney, and printed in the *Practical Theologian*, Vol. 2 No. 2, September 2004.

Official Minutes

Minute 44, October 3rd 1888.

Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 1972/IA/3.

Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 1977/IA/4.

Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 1981/IA/7.

Minutes of the Chief of the Staff, 1995/IA/15, 20.

Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 2000/1A/13.

Minute by the Chief of the Staff, 2001/1A/09.

NZ Minute PAO 1202.

NZ Minute ACE 0585.

Theses

Aitken, Thomas Gordon: "Aspects of the History of The Salvation Army in New Zealand 1929-1963: A Study in Adjustment". MA thesis, VUW 1964.

Bradwell, Cyril R.: "An Outline History of The Salvation Army in New Zealand". MA Thesis, Canterbury College, University of NZ, 1950.

Clifton, Shaw: "The Salvation Army's Actions and Attitudes in War Time 1889-1945". PhD dissertation for King's College, London, 1989.

Escott, Phillip: "Church Growth Theories and The Salvation Army in The United Kingdom". PhD thesis, University of Stirling, 1996.

Morris, Mary: "Female Ministry, Equality and the Salvation Army". Undated Dissertation for Oak Hill Theological College, London. (SA Heritage Centre Archives.)

Pears, Richard: "Towards a Theology of Salvation Army Officership; An Examination of Officer Ministry in the United Kingdom". Thesis for MTheol. in Applied Theology, Oxford, 1996.

Townsend, John: "Where Have all the Leaders Gone? Officer Recruitment in The Salvation Army of Aotearoa New Zealand". Research project for M.Ministry, Melbourne College of Divinity, 2000.

Yon, Patricia: "Areas of Stress and Conflict and Conflict in the Lives of Married Women in Ministry within The Salvation Army". Dissertation for MA (Counselling), University of Keele, 1993.

SECONDARY SOURCES

(General background information and material not relating specifically to The Salvation Army.)

Published

Books

Anderson, Ray S. (Ed.): *Theological Foundations for Ministry*. Edinburgh/Grand Rapids, T&T Clark/Eerdmans, 1979.

Arbuckle, Gerald A.: *From Chaos to Mission: Refounding Religious Life Formation*. Collegeville, Min., The Liturgical Press, 1996.

- Barnett, James Monroe: *The Diaconate: A Full and Equal Order*. Valley Forge, Penn, Trinity Press International, Revised edn. 1995.
- Bettenson, Herbert (Ed.): *Documents of the Christian Church*, Oxford, OUP, 1956.
- Borg, Marcus and Wright, N. T.: *The Meaning of Jesus: Two Visions*. San Francisco, Harper, 1999.
- Bourdillon, M.F.C. (Ed.): *Christianity South of the Zambezi*, Vol. 2. Gwelo, Mambo Press, 1977.
- Brueggemann, Walter: *The Prophetic Imagination*. Minneapolis MN, Fortress Press, 2nd edit. 2001.
- Brunner, Emil: *The Christian Doctrine of the Church, Faith and the Consummation*. (Dogmatics Vol III). London, Lutterworth, 1962.
- The Misunderstanding of the Church*. London, Lutterworth, 1952.
- von Campenhausen, Hans: *Tradition and Life in the Early Church*. London, Collins, 1968.
- Chadwick, Henry: *The Early Church*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1967.
- Chadwick, Owen: *The Reformation*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1964.
- Colless, Brian and Donovan, Peter: *Religion in New Zealand Society*. Palmerston North, The Dunmore Press, 2nd ed. 1985.
- Collins, John N. *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*. London, Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Congar, Yves: *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*. London, Bloomsbury, 1957.
- Cooke, Bernard: *Ministry to Word and Sacraments*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1976.
- Cross, F.L. (Ed.): *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Oxford, OUP, 1957.
- Crossan, John Dominic: *The Birth of Christianity*. San Francisco, Harper, 1999.
- Davis, Charles: *A Question of Conscience*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1967.

- Deanesly, Margaret: *The History of the Medieval Church 590-1500*. London, Methuen (1925) 1979.
- Dulles, Avery: *Models of the Church*. New York, Doubleday, 1974.
- Flannery, Austin (Ed.): *Vatican II, The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*. Collegeville Min., Liturgical Press, 1975.
- Frost, Michael and Hirsch, Alan: *The Shaping of Things to Come*. Peabody MASS, Hendrikson, 2003.
- Gilbert, A.D.: *Religion and Society in Industrial England: Church, Chapel and Social Change 1740-1914*. London, Longman, 1976.
- Gunton, Colin E. and Hardy, Daniel W. (Ed.): *On Being the Church: Essays on the Christian Community*. Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1989.
- Haag, Herbert: *Clergy and Laity*. London, Burns and Oates, 1998.
- Hall, Christine and Hannaford, Robert (Ed.): *Order and Ministry*. Leominster, Gracewing, 1996.
- Hammond, J.L. & Barbara: *Lord Shaftesbury*, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 4th ed. 1939.
- Hanson, Richard: *Christian Priesthood Examined*. London, Lutterworth, 1979.
- Hennessey, Paul K. (ed.): *A Concert of Charisms: Ordained Ministry in the Religious Life*. New York, Paulist Press, 1997.
- Hunter, George III: *To Spread the Power*. Nashville, Abingdon, 1987.
- Illich, Ivan: *Celebration of Awareness*, Harmondsworth, Penguin 1976.
- Inglis, Robert: *Churches and Working Classes in Victorian England*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
- Jackson, H.R.: *Churches and People in Australia and New Zealand, 1860-1930*. Allen & Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, 1987.
- Jamieson, Alan: *A Churchless Faith*. Wellington, Garside, 2000.
- Called Again: In and Beyond the Deserts of Faith*. Wellington, Garside, 2004.

Jamieson, Penny: *Living at the Edge: Sacrament and Solidarity in Leadership*. London, Mowbray, 1997.

Knowles, Brett: *New Life: A History of the New Life Churches of New Zealand 1942-1979*. Dunedin, Third Millennium Publishing, 1999.

The History of a New Zealand Pentecostal Movement. Lewiston, Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.

Knox, Ronald: *Enthusiasm*. Oxford, OUP, 1950.

Kraemer, Hendrik: *A Theology of the Laity*. London, Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Kung, Hans: *The Church*. London, Search Press, 1968.

Structures of the Church. London, Burns & Oates, 1965.

Macquarrie, John: *Principles of Christian Theology*. London, SCM 1966.

Martin, David: *A Sociology of English Religion*. London, SCM, 1967.

Mascall, E.L.: *The Recovery of Unity: A Theological Approach*. London, Longmans, 1958.

Moltman, Jürgen: *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*. London, SCM, 1981.

Neill, Stephen: *Men of Unity*. London, SCM, 1960.

Neuner J. and Dupuis J.: *The Christian Faith: The Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*. Bangalore, Theolog. Pub. in India, 3rd edn. 1978.

O'Dea, T.F.: *The Sociology of Religion*, Upper Saddle River NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Plumb, J.H.: *England in the Eighteenth Century*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1950.

Pollock, J. C.: *Moody Without Sankey*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1963.

Rack, Henry D: *Reasonable Enthusiast: John Wesley and the Rise of Methodism*. Abingdon, Nashville, 2nd edn. 1993.

Reuthen, Rosemary and McLaughlin, Eleanor: *Women of Spirit: Female Leadership in the Jewish and Christian Tradition*. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1979

- Roberts, John H: *Thinking Theologically in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Paihia, Colcom Press, 2000.
- Robertson, Roland: *The Sociological Interpretation of Religion*. Oxford, Blackwell, 1970
- Rowdon, Harold H. (Ed.): *Servants of God: Papers on the use of full-time workers in Brethren Churches*. Christian Brethren Research Journal No. 37. Exeter, Paternoster Press, 1986.
- Schaeff, Anne Wilson and Fassell, Diane: *The Addictive Organisation*, San Francisco, Harper, 1991.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward: *Ministry: A Case for Change*. London, SCM, 1981.
- The Church with a Human Face*. New York, Crossroad, 1985.
- Sine, Tom: *Mustard Seed Versus McWorld*. Crowborough, Monarch Books, 1999.
- Southern, R.W.: *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1972.
- Stacey, John: *About the Ministry*. London, Epworth, 1964.
- Tabbernee, William (Ed.): *Ministry in Australian Churches*. Melbourne, Joint Board of Christian Education, 1987.
- Torrance, T.F.: *Royal Priesthood: A Theology of Ordained Ministry*, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, (1955) 2nd ed. 1993.
- Trevett, Christine: *Montanism: Gender, Authority and the New Prophecy*. Cambridge, CUP, 1996.
- Volf, Miroslav: *After Our Likeness: The Church in the Image of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1998.
- Weber, Hans Ruedi: *Power. Focus for a Biblical Theology*. Geneva, WCC, 1989.
- Weidman, Judith L. (Ed.): *Women Ministers*. San Francisco, Harper & Row, 1981.
- Wiles, Maurice: *The Christian Fathers*. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1966.
- Williams, J. Rodman: *Renewal Theology: The Church, the Kingdom and Last*

Things. Grand Rapids, Mich., Zondervan, 1992.

Wilson, Bryan R.(Ed.): *Patterns of Sectarianism*. London, Heinemann, 1967.

Sects and Society: A Sociological Study of Three Religious Groups in Britain. London, Heinemann, 1961.

Wink, Walter: *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination*. Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1992.

Articles in Periodicals. (All website-sourced references have been accessed in the years 2002, 2003 or 2004.)

Cahill, Sr. Cecilia: "Woman of the Church" in *St. Mark's Review*, December 1980.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs: book review in *The Review of Communication*, 1, 2001.
(<http://www.natcom.org/pubs/ROC/one-two/campbell.htm>)

Finke, Roger and Starke, Rodney: "How the Upstart Sects Won America: 1776-1850", in *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 1989, 28 (1).

Glendon, Mary Ann: "The Hour of the Laity", in *First Things* 127, November 2002,
(<http://print.firstthings.com/ftissues/ft0211/articles/glendon.html>)

Kinsey, Frances: "Getting a Clue about the Fine Art of Pastoring". *Quaker Life*, September, 1998. (<http://www.furm.org/QL/issues/9809/kinsey.htm>)

Marshall, Chris: "Following Christ in Life: The Anabaptist-Mennonite Tradition". *Reality*, Issue 37, February/March 2000.

Martens, Larry: "Anabaptist Theology and Congregational Care". *Direction Journal*, Spring 1992, Vol. 21 No. 1.
(<http://www.directionjournal.org/article/?744>)

Molloy, Cathy: "Church and Laity" in *The Way Supplement*, 101/2001,
(http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_1/Price.htm)

Ormerod, Neil: "Mission and Ministry in the Wake of Vatican II", in *Australian Ejournal of Theology*
(http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_Ormerod.htm)

Packer, J.I.: "A Stunted Ecclesiology? The Theory and Practice of Evangelical Churchliness". *Touchstone*, December, 2003. Posted on
www.latimer.org.nz/morecomment.asp?ColD=13.

Piepkorn, Arthur Carl: "Plymouth Brethren". *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 41, 1970,. (<http://www.breuderbewegung.de/pdf/piepkorn.pdf>)

Ricca, Paolo: "Sect or Order? (Waldensians-Franciscans)". *Right to Dissent: Concilium*, October 1982.

R.W. Ward, "Established Churches, Free Churches, Religious Communities: Their Contemporary Social setting". *Expository Times*. Vol.106 No.4. January 1995.

Weber, Richard K.: "A History and Theology of Sharing Responsibility for the Church". *Spirituality Today*, Summer 1985, Vol. 37 No.2. (<http://www.spiritualitytoday.org/spir2day/853721weber.html>)

Pamphlets

Anon: *A Tent-Making Ministry: Towards a more flexible form of ministry*. London, World Council of Churches, 1962.

Monographs, articles and papers, Published and Unpublished

(All website-sourced references have been accessed in the years 2002, 2003 or 2004.)

Booth, Ken: "Something about Ordination". Paper read at a seminar arranged by the Ministry and Training Division of the Christchurch Diocese, held at Bishop Julius Hall, 31st July, 1999.

Clarke, Brian Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages: Circular to Marriage Celebrants, 28th February, 2003.

Department of Trade and Industry, United Kingdom: "Discussion Document on Employment Status in Relation to Statutory Employment Rights". URN 02/1085, July 2003.

Driscoll, Sister Martha: July 1999. (<http://www.ocso.org/martha-conf.html>).

Greenwood, Robin: "Ordering the Church for Working with God's Life in the World: Equal and Differing Callings". (www.ministry.ireland.anglican.org/articles/greenwood.rtf)

"History of the Franciscan Movement". (<http://198.62.75.1/www1/ofm/fra/FRAht01.html>)

- Kunnumpuram, Kurien: "Beyond the Clergy-Laity Divide".
(www.sedos.org/english/kunnumpuram.html) May 2000.
- Macy, Gary: "Who and How: Debates about Consecration in the Twelfth Century".
(http://naal-liturgy.org/Members/papers/Gary_macy.htm)
- McCallum, Dennis: "The Waldensian Movement From Waldo to Reformation".
(<http://www.xenos.org/essays/waldo1f.htm>)
- McGowan, Andrew: "Water in the Desert:: Wine, Water and the Eucharist in Tertullian and Cyprian".
(<http://divinity.library.vanderbilt.edu/burns/chroma/eucharist/euchMcGowan.html>)
- Palmer, Max: Circular for *Prepare/Enrich New Zealand*, July 2003.
- Price, Peter: "Vatican II: End of a Clerical Church?(1)", in *Australian Ejournal of Theology*, (http://dlibrary.acu.edu.au/research/theology/ejournal/aet_1Price.htm)
- Radcliffe, Timothy: "Why is Morale Among Priests So Low?" Paper given at the National Conference of Priests, at Digby Stuart College, London, 3rd September 2002. (www.onlineopinion.com.au/2002/Nov02/Radcliffe.htm).
- Roxborough, John: "Persistent Presbyterianism? Lay Leadership and the Future of a Reformed Christian tradition in the West".
(<http://www.roxborough.com/missiology.htm>),
- Salmon, John: "Is it Ordained?": Address at Wesley Dinner, Trinity College, Auckland, 24 May 1999. (Copy held by writer.)
- Stuempfle, Herman G.: "Theological and Biblical Perspectives on the Laity". Division of Ministry, Augsburg Fortress Press, 1987.
(http://www.elca.org/dm/midl/theol_biblical_persp_laity.pdf.)
- Taylor, David: "Army, Order or Church", Paper presented at United Kingdom Territory Theological Symposium 2004.
- Ward, Kevin: "Christendom, Clericalism, Church and Context",
(<http://www.presbyterian.org.nz/441.98.html>)
- Zaoui, Ahmed: "Clash of Civilisations: Myth or Reality?" Paper read at the University of Auckland, 19th October, 2004.

Church Statements, Christian Fathers, accessed from World Wide Web

Calvin, John: *Institutes of Religion*, Book 4, Ch. 3, Sect. 1.

(<http://www.smartlink.net/~douglas/calvin/bk4ch03.html#one.htm>)

Cyprian of Carthage: Letter 55.8.

(<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/pc/england/jwords/saltum.html>)

Cyprian of Carthage: Epistle 65.1.

(<http://www.auburn.edu/~allenkc/openhse/money.html>)

Didascalia Apostolorum, Bk 2,xxv.

(in <http://www.piney.com/DocAposConstitu.html#have>)

GS1518 – Archbishops' Council: Ministry Division – Review of Clergy Terms of Service: Interim Report, July 2003 (England).

Ignatius: Magnesians IV

(www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-01/anf0117.htm#P1486_261369)

Irenaeus: Adv. Haer., iv.8.3.

(www.ccel.org/fathers2/ANF-01/anf01-62.htm#P8629_2440260)

Luther, Martin: "An Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation", 1520. *Works of Martin Luther*. Philadelphia, A.J. Holman Coy., 1915.

(<http://www.iclnet.org/pub/resources/text/wittenberg/luther/web/nblty-04.html>)

New Code of Canon Law, 1983, Canon 207 #1, of the Roman Catholic Church.

(http://www.justiceforpriests.org/part_1_christs_faithful.htm)

Tertullian: Bap. 17. (www.piney.com/Tertullian-Baptism.html#P11686-3287159)

World Council of Churches: "Towards a Common Understanding of the Theological Concepts of Laity/Laos: The People of God". Consultation Statement, May 7-10, 1997.

(<http://www.wcccoe.org/wcc/what/education/statemnt.html>)

World Council of Churches: "Canberra Statement", adopted by the Seventh Assembly of the in 1991, (www.wcc-coe.org/wcc/what/faith/canb.html)