

JOURNAL OF AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY

JAC Online

Issue 123, October - November 2019

Copyright © 2019 Journal of Aggressive Christianity

In This Issue

JOURNAL OF AGGRESSIVE CHRISTIANITY

Issue 123, October - November 2019

Editorial Introduction *page 3*
Major Stephen Court

Volunteer Army (2002) *page 7*
Phil Hall

Volunteers Still Wanted – Needed – Necessary *page 12*
Phil Wall

Neo-Member - Wanting to belong, but resisting labels (2002) *page 15*
Jen X, and response by Kevin Slous

The Nascent Charter of Neo-Salvationism (2002) *page 23*
Captain Stephen Court

A Charter for Salvationism? *page 25*
Major Stephen Court

Christians Only Need Apply (2002) *page 28*
Captain John Norton

A Great Employment Opportunity *page 33*
Captain Kate Baudinette

Signs and Wonders (2002) *page 38*
Lt. Colonel Maxwell Ryan

Give Us A Day of Wonders *page 44*
Major Jennifer Hale

Red Hot Religion or Whitewashed Tombs? (2002) *page 46*
Aaron White

Existing Within the Tension *page 49*
Captain Vitali Sidorov

Editorial Introduction – New Horizons?

by Major Terence Hale, Guest Editor

The 2002 January-February issue of the *Horizons* magazine¹ had a cover that featured a repeating pattern of William Booth's face in alternating shades of purple, and a text box in the centred that defined the word "Neo-Salvationism²." I have kept a near pristine copy of that edition on my bookshelf for the past seventeen plus years. The reason I made such an effort to keep and maintain the magazine, and why the image and words of the front cover are so itched into my mind, is because it represents a transformational time in my life.

When that issue was released I was twenty-one years old and half way through my first year as a Salvation Army Officer. Those were heady days, for both myself and for certain parts of the Army, or at least that is how I remember them. I do know for sure that for me they were galvanizing days. There was a grass roots renewal and revival movement sweeping through the Army in those days and I had willfully abandoned myself to its cause. I drank the Kool-Aid and wanted every so badly to be on the leading edge of this wave of change.

These were the days of SAROOTS movement and conferences, the establishment of the 614 network, an insurgence of incarnational gap year mission programs, and calls to recapture the dream and vision of a Salvation Army that once was and was always meant to be. Colonel Ian Barr describes this moment in Army history as our participation in what was seen at that time as, the fourth wave of the moving of the Spirit across the global Church.

Yes, I was young and idealistic then, but I emerged from those days with conviction and vision. I was convinced that the Army was in a state of forward motion in regards to renewal and mission, and that victory in the Salvation War, through the ranks of the Army, was inevitable. Flash forward seventeen years to today and I am not as young but I fear I am no less idealistic. My conviction and vision holds. And so I was caused in recent days, when I happened again upon my near mint copy of the 2002 January-February issue of the *Horizons* Magazine, to look backward and take stock. Are we still moving forward? Have we slowed, stopped, or even worse regressed?

I think back over the years that have passed and so much has changed. Some heroes of those early days of my Officership have fallen to the wayside, while others continue, by the grace of the Spirit, to stand the test of time. And still others, have risen up as time has passed to take up the cause and continue to dare to dream. I think back over the years and I judge myself, not in a negative self-deprecating way, but in light of the

¹ *Horizons* was a Christian leadership magazine produced by the Editorial Department of the Canada & Bermuda Territory. No longer in circulation, the magazine was produced until the mid 2000's.

² The definition given for Neo-Salvationism was as follows: 1) A new type of Salvation Army expression and spirituality; 2) a radical recasting of the founding vision of mission; 3) A state of mild schizophrenia whereby the sufferer loves the original vision of The Salvation Army but is alienated by the present reality; 4) The only hope for the future?

revelation of God in my life, and ask myself if I have lived up to the knowledge and grace I have received. I know so much more now, I have seen so much more, I have lived so much more, but for me the need and call remain the same, I just appreciate it better now.

I look back and sometimes I wonder if the time, the moment, has passed; was that time, that movement, our one opportunity? Was that the door we, the Army, were to walk through? Because sometimes it feels and looks like we may have missed it. Sometimes I think, if those dynamic men and women of God who inspired my early years were not able to accomplish all I dreamed was possible, who am I to dare to dream even greater dreams? In an article by Major Stephen Court in this edition you will see him reference a picture that sits in his office of a recent General holding a t-shirt that is emblematic of the fervor and passion of those days seventeen years ago, but what he does not mention is that the picture sits in a broken frame. A large crack runs down the glass of the frame, splitting the picture in two. Is this a representation of dreams long broken, or a challenge from the Spirit to see how our Triune God promises to make beautiful things from brokenness?

In case you are wondering I'm hedging my bets and siding with God, I have seen far too much beauty emerge from brokenness to have a reason to believe that God is doing anything different from that now. You may also be wondering, based on my words above, if I think that there is something 'wrong' with The Salvation Army. The answer to that question, in its simplest form, is no I don't think there is something 'wrong' with the Army. In fact I see no reason not to believe that the Army will continue as a part of the worldwide Church until Christ returns. The Army was birthed by God, and that is no small thing. Numerically, the Army is the largest it has ever been in its 150 plus years of existence. However, may God forgive us if we ever think status quo is the best offering that God deserves. The Army continues to do good and great Kingdom work, but our Kingdom best is always the next step beyond the last greatest thing God enabled us to accomplish. Reaching that next step requires dreamers, disturbers of the peace, and people of daring faith.

During a sermon in 1888, as certain Dr. Wild referenced The Salvation Army, he said, *"They are a church just as much as we are, and so God will in due time, no doubt, when they get up a little higher and become as proud as we are, call another into existence to rebuke the rest of us."* Has this word of prophecy come true? Has the time now come for us to take a different place within the Church and make way for others to do what we seem no longer to be able to do? Or, are we to lay hold of our original mantle?

The articles that follow are not about fixing anything some may see as being wrong or broken in the Army, they are about challenging ourselves to take stock of where we have been and where we are going. They are about considering what it might look like to accomplish our Kingdom best as The Salvation Army.

With great appreciation to the Editorial Department of The Canada & Bermuda Territory we are excited to be able to reprint several articles from that Horizons issue from 2002.

Following each of the articles you will find a response article that takes stock of where we are on the issues raised in the original article all these years later. For a couple of the articles we were able to get the original author to respond to their own original work. As you read each article and response it is our hope and prayer that the Spirit will speak strong and deep words into your life.

Perhaps there are yet some new horizons before us!

In this issue...

Phil Wall responds to his 30 something self, as he considers again the necessity of The Salvation Army being a volunteer Army. Discovering that nothing has changed, yet everything has changed, Phil tackles some hard questions and issues facing leadership development and recruitment of sold out warriors in the Army.

Kevin Slous, Territorial Director of Discipleship for the Canada & Bermuda Territory, responds to an article written under the pen name of Jen X, and wrestles with the challenges of Generation X in regards to some of the structures of the Army. Kevin has chosen to make his response more of a conversation with the original author (Jen X), and has placed his response directly into the original article.

Major Stephen Court expands on his original charter for Salvationism in his response to his article from 2002. In 2002 Stephen called on readers to carry out the charter of making invisible people visible, establishing our fellow humans as “people” people; all in the example of ancient Bible character Job. In his response his original challenge is reinforced by the challenge to stretch out the tent of Salvationism and invite in our brothers and sisters in Christ to join in this God ordained mandate.

Captain Kate Baudinette squares off with the main finding from John Norton’s 2002 article, arguing that The Salvation Army needs to make room for non-Christians to be employed within the Army. She calls on the reader to consider the potential impact of ‘people of peace’ on the work of the Kingdom, especially when they are surrounded and influenced by passionate believers. This well stated argument is contrasted against John Norton’s equally well stated case that the Army should only hire Christians as we seek to remain true to our Christocentric identity.

Major Jennifer Hale responds to Lt. Colonel Max Ryan’s article on the early charismatic beginnings of The Salvation Army. She joins him in his call for a recapturing of the spirit of those early days, outlining the need to give the Holy Spirit free reign in our worship, service, and mission.

Captain Vitali Sidorov offers his response to Aaron Whites article, *Red Hot Religion or White Washed Tombs?*, in the form of review of the original. In this Vitali draws us into the reality of what it means to have to live within the tension between mission and structure; essence and form.

Volunteer Army (2002)

By Phil Hall

Horizons – Jan-Feb 2002

When Bramwell Booth changed the name of our Movement, we both gained and lost something of value

Phil Wall is CSM at the Raynes Park Corps in London, England. He runs an AIDS charity at www.hopehiv.org, works as a missions consultant and heads a leadership development company called Signify at www.bsignificant.com

The air was thick with anticipation. As the Booths gazed at the advertising note of the newly-formed “Volunteer Army,” something began to stir in their spirits. There was a sense of holy disquiet as they considered the ill-fitting name.

“I’m not a volunteer. I’m a regular,” Bramwell uttered and moved his hand toward the page. The heavenly realms rang with angelic harmonies, the building began to shake. As Bramwell crossed out the word “volunteer” and wrote “salvation” in its place, a multitude of angels burst into the Hallelujah chorus!

I admit I’ve used considerable literary licence telling that story, but that was my childhood impression of this defining moment in Salvation Army history. Through this watershed event, it seems to me that we both gained and lost something of real value. We gained the understanding that we existed for the salvation of the world. The world for God became our clarion call, and around this passionate zeal for the lost, Salvationists have gathered ever since. But we also lost the emphasis that we are a volunteer Army. The vast majority of soldiers involved in the mission are volunteers, and in many ways so are the officers.

Within the military framework of recruitment there has always been a distinction between volunteer and conscript. How people are led and motivated is key to the effective operation of the war. I fear a leadership culture may have emerged in the Army that views officers and soldiers as conscripts, and leads them accordingly. It is a mindset that is costing us dearly.

Conscripts differ from volunteers in four important ways:

Volitionally—Conscription is enforced. Conscripts have no choice about joining an army, nor about their duties within it. Their motivation is typically low. Bitterness and resentment easily take root in their heart. Volunteers, on the other hand, have a choice. They count the cost and embrace hardship as part of the deal.

Enemy at the Gates is a recent Hollywood film about the siege of Stalingrad during the Second World War. It contrasts the motivations of the Russian conscripts from outlying areas with those who volunteered to defend their city. When the conscripts advanced against enemy positions, they were mown down by machine-gun fire. Many retreated,

only to be shot by their own officers for their cowardice. It was the volunteers who fought bravely, risking their lives to save their city.

The Salvation Army is truly a volunteer Movement. When we treat our people like conscripts, however, they seldom respond with enthusiasm. Conscripts function at a bare minimum and will desert at the first sign of conflict. When they are reprimanded for under-performance, they just move to a different corps. Sadly, their lack of commitment goes with them. A volunteer, on the other hand, is motivated by personal commitment to a spiritual covenant. Violate that and you lose everything.

Vocationally—Conscripts have no personal commitment to the war; volunteers fight because it fulfills their call or purpose in life. Change in culture has made the Army's traditional understanding of vocation difficult to maintain. My parents' generation of officers joined at a time where people expected to only have one "career" in life. Today, the norm is three or four major career shifts in a lifetime.

Officership needs to take this cultural shift more seriously in pondering how best to recruit and retain quality officers. Fixed-term contracts, as in the armed forces, would ensure that officers in the field could regularly review their commitment to the Army. If necessary, they could be freed up to help build the Kingdom in a different capacity. The "lifetime" call of officership was created in a different era by people with different expectations for life and service.

With many ministry options opening up to lay people, the "one route fits all" of officership is only one of a number of options for ministry. Increasing numbers of highly motivated young people are aspiring for "niche" ministry opportunities, such as youth pastors. Some see this as a threat to officership. But the reality is that lay ministry one of the most fruitful recruiting grounds for officership. In addition, lay ministry brings a healthy re-balancing of our view of vocation. Soldiers are finding a sense of call and purpose in a variety of fields.

Financially—When people are "conscripted" they often face limited financial options. A previous generation of officers often found themselves bound not only by covenant but also by finance. Those who came in from non-professional backgrounds and started families soon became dependant on the Army system for housing and provision. This was especially challenging when corps officers were entirely responsible for raising their own salary in the corps. Still today, many find themselves without options, not only because of their covenant but because of their financial limitations as well.

This is changing rapidly as more and more officers enter training college at a later stage in life. Many of them have left good paying jobs to which they could potentially return. How these new "volunteer officers with financial choices" are led is very important. A conscript with no financial choices can be bullied and pushed from pillar to post. The same cannot be true for those with financial independence.

As distasteful as this may sound, it is an important consideration in the frightening number of officers who leave in the first five years of service. Most don't leave because of money—it is normally a leadership issue—but they are *able* to leave because of their financial/professional capacity. They stay only because they voluntarily choose to, not because financially they have to.

Theologically—For me this is where our military metaphor confronts its greatest challenge. God loved this world so much that he gave his only Son to bring about its salvation. However, having sacrificed so much he still treats us as volunteers, wooing us by his Spirit to follow him and offer ourselves to his service in the world. Paul draws the helpful analogy of the Church as the “Bride of Christ”—even within the covenant of marriage, both partners are still volunteers to the relationship. God has chosen never to walk away from the covenant but he recognises that we always have that choice. He never violates this issue of freedom of choice—no church structure should ever try and dismiss it either.

Paul draws another helpful analogy in describing himself as a slave to his God. Bought at a huge price Paul voluntarily offers himself as a living sacrifice, a man with no rights in the service of the King. Here we find the paradox of free will. God the Father chooses to eternally see us as children who “voluntarily” choose to follow in his footsteps. We, however, are invited to take the role of the servant. People with no choices but to do God's will. Why? Because we voluntarily choose to do so.

Bramwell revisited

How then should we respond? Some may suggest that we go back—cross out Salvation and replace it once again with Volunteer. But a Movement that was raised up for the sake of the lost cannot lose its focus on salvation. Rather, I think there are ways that we can function as a highly effective volunteer Salvation Army if we consider the following three emphases.

Vision—Sacrifice is the fruit of dynamic vision. Without vision people and their armies perish. During the U.S. attack on Afghanistan, many thousands of Taliban fighters allegedly “swapped sides,” joining the Northern Alliance out of their disillusionment with their leadership.

The Salvation Army was built on the all consuming vision of a world needing to be won for God. The predominantly middle-class Christians who gathered around the Booths and became the Army's early leaders were captivated by this vision.

Today in mainland China young church planters have modules in their training courses on how to undergo torture and interrogation so as not to reveal the whereabouts of their fellow believers. Hundreds are on waiting lists for these courses, desperate to be equipped to learn how better to advance the Kingdom. We cannot “bribe” people into our colleges. Instead, we need to give them a new vision.

Many officers/soldiers joined up because of this vision and our current level of effectiveness where we are gaining ground is only as a result of your commitment to that vision. In many corps, however, understanding of and commitment to this vision is a constant challenge. Traditional Salvation Army activity too easily consumes most of our time and resources. In doing all this work “in” the Army we never get around to actually doing the work “of” the Army.

For many soldiers like myself, with all the pressures of work, family and life in general, we are only ever one decision away from becoming some kind of religious yuppie. We need to be on our faces regularly in prayer calling on God to persistently re-ignite the fire of vision within us. It is only a vision for the lost, the advancement of the Kingdom that draws us back to trying to keep the main thing the main thing—this is a choice we all voluntarily make.

Spirituality—I recently sat through a fascinating talk about the Kingdom vision of the Army for transforming the holistic state of humankind—body, mind and spirit. What I found strange was that there was no mention of the “engine” behind this vision. The “red hot” Salvationism that the Booths propagated was grounded theologically in the Holiness movement but experientially was very much what we would now call Pentecostal or charismatic.

The early missionaries returned from their brutal and often painful open airs and were desperate to meet with God to “patch them up” and send them back out. They traveled in prayer through the night, beseeching God on behalf of the lost and were extravagant and energized in their praise. To ignore this is to fail to understand much of the early Army dynamic. Its mission was carried on the wings of this spontaneous and explosive spirituality. A dynamic, energized and deep spirituality provides the soil for voluntary commitment of the kind that we so desperately need. The guardians of the status quo will oversee only the demise of this Movement—those who truly love it will recognize the need for change.

Leadership culture—I fear that in many places we have bought into a “conscript” mentality at both an institutional and local corps level. This is very difficult to change. The corporate world, which is where I spend most of my life now, is also struggling to come to terms with what I call the volunteer economy. Workers who know they have choices have to be “re-recruited” every day—they don’t have to work for you, they can get a good “package” anywhere. They demand respect, investment, consultation and a high degree of autonomy. These are not lazy people. Once they have bought in, they really do go to the wire for the organizations; however, they never forget they have a choice.

We need to continue to create a leadership culture that is focused on empowerment, service and consultation at every level. Like Father God we will need to treat our people like the volunteers they are, in the hope that in return they will commit to the mission.

Deep commitment is still common in the Army. Some of the young people I have worked with over the last few years are some of the most committed Christians I have ever met. Led appropriately they will lay down their lives for the cause and change their world. One "volunteer" is better than 10 pressed men. It is time to remember that we are and always will be a Volunteer Army.

Volunteers Still Wanted – Needed – Necessary

By Phil Wall

A response to 'Volunteer Army' by Phil Wall

In reading the article a few thoughts came to mind that I share in the hope that they are helpful and spark dialogue amongst us as a community seeking to faithfully follow Jesus. My first thought was, 'What an opinionated young man I was in those days'! My second thought is that in lots of ways nothing has changed and at the same time everything has changed. Many of the challenges I mention are still in evidence across particularly, though not exclusively, the Western world.

Leadership

We still struggle with Officer recruitment, though I believe it is different in much of the US where there is a very healthy recruitment from various indigenous communities and the economics are radically different. For most of the rest of the western world, Officership is in critical decline. With the war generation already retired, the boomer generation heading in that direction rapidly, those retiring vastly outnumber those joining officer ranks. Young people, raised with choice and options are just not embracing a 'life-long' mono-role, with research showing that the average young person may have over 10 different professional roles before their late 30's. Something dramatic has to change. We must resist the temptation to assume this as a 'lack of commitment', my experience suggests otherwise. For example I have been involved with a Student Missional movement over the years and over the last 3-4 years they have shifted from a central funding model for staff based in Universities and local churches to a self-funding model whereby each missional worker has to raise their own salary. In speaking with their leader he explained that although this transition had been difficult for some to embrace, they actually had an excess of people wanting to join and take on such self-funding roles, the organisation continues to thrive.

Many younger leaders who are deeply committed followers of Jesus, hunger for a life of missional living and view most inflexible religious structures like Officership as a hindrance to such a life. Their world view has been shaped by a digital mindset that is defined by agility and optionality which they would view as critical to effectiveness. Thus I still believe that we need to embrace some kind of fixed term system that allows flexibility and a route to leadership for talented and committed younger people who commit to Officership for a season before moving on to other missional/vocational roles. Inevitably some will stay long term and others join for a season later in life, I am just not convinced the current model is sustainable. I have a friend who used to serve in the British Special Forces and remember a throw away comment about their fixed term system, that it kept commitment healthy & robust because, *'when you are at war, the last thing you want standing next to you is someone who deep down doesn't want to be there'* – the parallel is somewhat scary for us.

Also in places like the UK our current model is not economically sustainable. The vast majority of our corps with serving officers are not self-supporting and a long way from being sustainable without mission support. This is important to retain for those urban and rural, hard to reach communities, that never can be self-supporting, but for those of us in the suburbs, something has to change. In addition to encouraging healthier giving, which is rarely a problem where folks have a missional heart, it may be that we need to consider 'bi-vocational' roles for officers, who lead a corps part time and have a salary paying role part time. This would need to shape curriculum at training colleges to prepare officers for a new missional 'tent making' strategy. This obviously raises lots of questions for many already over-burdened officers serving faithfully, but if we are to have a future that is sustainable economically we may well need to think creatively and reframe our model.

Theology/Spirituality

The Salvation Army is an increasingly diverse Army and with this shift comes beautiful breadth and numerous sub-cultures of Salvationism. Worship styles are highly eclectic, and with the ease of communication in our digital age such diversity will only increase. This has to be healthy and embraced as Corps planters shape their worship/missional styles to most effectively engage their target indigenous communities. With such diversity often comes fresh insights and applications of theological nuance and emphasis. One of the most positive developments over the last 20 years appears to be an increasing appetite amongst officer personnel for deeper theological / missiological study and reflection leading to some exciting developments in missional practice. For example, some of the thinking around Integrated Mission and application of the APEST methodology are leading to more focussed engagement in Corps and new missional contexts through Fresh Expressions and pioneer ministries. This seems to also frame some great responses to social justice, responding proactively to issues like Human Trafficking and the Refugee crisis on a local level. All this appears to be very positive and exciting developments. I do not know enough of the differing contexts but my sense is that accompanying this has also come a move away from the overt and powerful charismatic and intensely evangelical emphasis that is part of our heritage and gained fresh momentum in the 80 and 90's. Looking through my own prejudiced lens this concerns me, but some of the folks involved in this fresh movement are some of those I respect the most, so I need to trust that our great God has this covered.

As our world changes at ever increasing speed it is essential that we practice the discipline of theological reflection. As a community we must wrestle together before God how we should best respond to the challenges that many of these will throw at us both pastorally and ethically, ensuring that we model the life of Jesus to our world as opposed to blind adherence to man-made doctrine from a bygone age.

Vision

We are still a volunteer Army! The vast majority of Salvationists that have ever lived or ever will live, are volunteers. The trend I mentioned in the article of this also being

increasingly true amongst the officer class, many of whom come from professional backgrounds and thus retain 'choice', has only accelerated. Thus our need to lead in an intelligent and authoritative way, whilst embracing this new reality, I think is critical to inspire and retain our best and be seen as a viable destination for others going forward. I spend my life coaching senior corporate leaders, this trend is not only relevant in the church but is transforming how leadership and followership is expressed in corporate life and also in numerous forms of the elite military.

Of course, as anyone who has studied leadership will tell you, it is only where vision is lacking that leaders need most often to revert to coercion, power games or hierarchy, to direct their 'troops'. Where a powerful vision has embedded in the hearts and minds of passionate and committed men and women and they are led by leaders equally surrendered to the inspiring cause, such things are unnecessary. The only relevant and helpful hierarchy to be found amongst the truly dedicated, is that of the prioritisation of the mission in decision making and resource allocation – the Vision trumps all.

As I have re-read my words of 20 years ago, I have at times blushed at the 'certainty' I express over quite complex issues; that said, if you can't be overly confident and self-assured in your 30's when can you be? However, my overwhelming response to reading the thoughts from those years ago was, 'Lord God, do it again' – not do the arrogance or naivety, not a rerun of the events or the role that I once had, but Lord refresh again in my spirit the vision of that passion for the last, the least, and the lost. Cleanse me of any compromise, refresh me by Your life-giving Spirit, give me more courage, boldness, compassion. Draw me deeper so my life is fully surrendered to Your will and Your ways. It is that vision, and only that vision, that calls us to such a place of depth and devotion. Only that Vision can make any sense of The Salvation Army, only that Vision legitimises our continued existence. I am confident that it is only our shared surrender and commitment to that Vision, that will invite our great and gracious God, to bless and empower our efforts.

As my dear friend Ian Mayhew recently reminded me, *'Too often we value our words over our prayers'*, and so to ensure I don't do that here I finish with the prayer of one of my heroes of faith, the musician Keith Green:

"Lord kill me, slay me, burn me beyond recognition with your holiness."

May it be for all of us Volunteers...

Neo-Member - Wanting to belong, but resisting labels (2002)

Jen X, and response by Kevin Slous

Neo-Member - Wanting to belong, but resisting labels
by Jen X (*Horizons* – Jan-Feb 2002)

Jen X is a 31-year-old professional who is struggling to find her identity within the Christian community. Despite her aversion to “institutionalized religion,” she is actively involved in the Church.

A Delayed Response to Jen X
by Kevin Slous (2019)

The term Generation X is a label. However ... [it] is useful in that it serves as a descriptor of a generation that has emerged from a radically changed, postmodern society and that is being educated by people from a previous generation who were reared under the tenets of the modern age.

- Bettina Brown Lankard, *New Learning Strategies for Generation X*

Kevin...

As a Gen-Xer who has committed one's life to reaching, embracing and discipling those of the next generations, I'm immediately struck by the effort we so often give to categorize and identify a generation through a very narrow lens. And yet we continue to do this. Sometimes these labels get things right, and sometimes they don't because it's difficult for a fish to be aware of the water that surrounds it. As I read the above descriptor of Generation X, what strikes me is the assumption that this emergence “from a radically changed, postmodern society” has already taken place, and that “they are being educated by people from a previous generation who were reared under the tenets of the modern age.” Ironically, I think Generations Y and Z would describe our generation as coming from that same “modern age”. And with the rapid and ever-changing realities of our world, I would probably agree with them. We are not nearly as postmodern as what we thought we were when we were young, being a generation that needed to educate ourselves on what postmodernism really is. And yet, in our mid-20's and early 30's we—and I include myself—thought we had the answers to address the emerging world, course-correcting where we felt modernism had led us astray. I'm not as confident that we had all the answers then, and that our questions were much different than the generations that have come after us—and maybe even those that came before us in their own youth. But every generation must ask and answer their own questions—but not in a vacuum from generations before or after.

I hear much of my own questions, thinking and voice in what Jen X wrote in 2002. But my journey since then makes me reflect on these realities from a very different place almost 20 years later. I wonder if Jen X would see herself in my thoughts today, or if her line of thinking and reasoning continued to lead her in a very different direction?

Jen X...

So defines one aspect of my struggle with being a postmodern Christian in a predominantly modernist faith tradition. It also defines my struggle to “fit in” at The Salvation Army.

Kevin...

I can remember feeling like this. Was there a place for new thinking, for those who resonated with the heart of the Army while not wanting to conform simply to structure and form?

Jen X...

Any doubts about the era in which The Salvation Army was birthed should be laid to rest by a glimpse at song 30 in the songbook.

Kevin...

Song 30! Ha—yes! I remember a number in our generation facetiously referring to it as their “personal testimony”. I agree, it indicated the modern era characterizing the world the the Army was birthed in. Ironically, it didn’t find its way into the Songbook until that “new” edition. (I see it has been taken out again in the most recent version.) Maybe more than a representation of what age the Army was birthed in, it was more closely connected to a desire in the late 20th century to include what they thought was a contemporary hymn of sorts. In any case, I don’t think it made the connection intended—which to me at that time, was how I felt about a number of things the Army sought to do, and I think by reading your assessment of the age, perhaps you did as well.

Jen X...

The Salvation Army was birthed at a time when people believed in capitalism and progress, reason and individualism. The Salvation Army today exists in a very different world.

Kevin...

Yes, a different world and age. Although, I’m not sure that the core issues underlying what is predominant in any age are all that different. There is a dichotomy in today’s culture that was only beginning when we were younger: early observations of postmodern culture seemed to show a moving away from the ideologies you identified, however as postmodernism has continued to shape culture, it seems as if hyper-versions of these ideologies are actually what drive the postmodern shift. Rather than moving away from them, we are experiencing these taken to the extreme.

Jen X...

In his book Sowing Dragons: Essays in Neo-Salvationism, Geoff Ryan strikes at the heart of a postmodern generation. Recognizing the vagaries and complexities of

contemporary life, he has come to three firm convictions: not every problem has a solution, life is not fair and the question is not to ask “why?” but “what now?” Having learned to live with “mystery and paradox and a hundred unanswered questions and unsolvable problems,” he understands the realities of life in a radically changed, postmodern society, and attempts to interpret the abiding message of Salvationism in light of those realities.

Kevin...

I think it is always wise to interpret, not only the message of Salvationism, but of the gospel, in light of the realities of the current age. This has always been the impetus of incarnational ministry, and I believe was a key driving force at The Salvation Army's inception. May it continue to be in our day. While I agree with Ryan's first two convictions: that not every problem has a solution, and that life is not fair, I believe that we need to be asking both “what now?” and “why?” If we don't seek to understand why things are the way they are, (even though we may never fully know the answer), we are in danger of simply looking at present circumstances and responding to them in a reactionary manner. Possibly with an arrogance that assumes that because something is new or is seen through an emerging or culturally-accepted lens it must be the right course of action, rather than seeking to understand where we have been, what has brought us to where we are, and adapt with wisdom, understanding and faith to lead into the future. Ryan was a hero of many of our generation when *Sowing Dragons* was written. For some, I'm sure he still is. His questions and perspectives are certainly still challenging. I lament that we no longer hear or experience this voice and the challenges it could bring from within.

Jen X...

In the last few years, I have repeatedly been asked if I am a Salvationist. While previously I would have given an emphatic “no,” not wanting to be labelled nor to be locked into any one tradition, my unease with the label “Salvationist” has lessened over time. Nowadays when asked that question, my first instinct is to say “yes, but I'm not a soldier.” When I'm in a more talkative mood, I want to ask what it means to be a “Salvationist” before I say whether I am one. Neither of the first two answers will satisfy true Salvationists.

Kevin...

Interestingly, you never really seem to identify what you mean as “true Salvationists” here. If you mean Salvationists simply caught in traditionalism, then I would agree—your answers probably would not satisfy. I remember feeling similarly in my mid-20s, wondering what the purpose of the trappings of Salvationism were, and whether soldiership was even helpful when so many could be active members without committing to the organization. However, if by “true Salvationists” you mean what you identify as “warriors” below, then I think you are wrong. These kinds of responses are exactly those that engage the zeal of those who identify more with the battle than the form.

Jen X...

A short “no” usually ends the conversation. A “yes, but” has a similar effect. Asking what it means to be a Salvationist may be particularly appropriate in the 21st century, as Salvationists of all stripes, and indeed The Salvation Army itself, are asking profound questions about what it means to live in a “radically changed, postmodern society.”

As I think about my small “s” salvationism, and wrestle with my reluctance to become a capital “S” Soldier, I constantly ask myself what holds me back. What is it about salvationism that attracts me? What is it about Soldiership that repels me? I think Geoff Ryan sums it up well when he states: “The soldier relates to the army, with all its structures and hierarchies, traditions and practices. The warrior relates directly to the battle, his point of reference is the conflict and not so much the army in which he happens to serve.” I relate to the battle, but not to the Army.

Kevin...

I think some of the challenge we faced when we responded to questions of whether we were we Salvationists, or “what about soldiership?” were that these were being posed in an age when there seemed to be a simple equation of soldiership with membership. If that’s all soldiership is or was, then no wonder we, and many of our generation found it repelling. And the popular current within the Army of the day seemed to indicate that this is what soldiership was about, and that being a warrior was something else. As I spent many hours, in more recent years, reading early Army writings from the time of its inception, I now disagree. Being a soldier was being a warrior, was relating to the battle and allowing it to shape every aspect of one’s practice of faith, in community—and covenant—with others. This is what soldiership was, and, I believe, is still intended to be by true Salvationists. When we water soldiership down to less that is when we get tied up in “structures and hierarchies, traditions and practices.” Soldiership is not simply signing one’s name on the dotted line as a member of an organization (or “institution” as we found so unpalatable), is not simply a gateway to involvement in particular groups, should certainly not be a weapon to wield in a legalistic fashion, or expressed as an arrival at some spiritually elite plateau. Rather, soldiership is being covenanted with others—not only in a common local corps (body) community, but also globally, for the sake of seeing God’s redemptive plan reach every corner of life, personally and corporately. It is being covenanted with others who have chosen to practice their faith in a particular way for the sake of others. It is to be called to something bigger than oneself. Deeply personal, yes; deeply private, no.

Soldiers are in this together, accountable to each other to hold each other up and strengthen each other in the battle, knowing that each has covenanted to practice their faith within the larger unit in a particular way. This is not just about me and God, it’s me and God and all those who have chosen to partner together in the gospel in this way. This is not a declaration of allegiance to an institution, it is a covenant relationship among hundreds of thousands who share this same calling, not because it makes us better than others, but because it makes us better than what we might have been on our own. I do not practice my soldiership solely for my own sake, or just as a personal expression of my faith. My soldiership is corporate, with others, for the sake of others. It

took a number of years to come to this, but I believe this is what was and should be intended through soldiership—through one’s expression of “true Salvationism”, as you put it.

Jen X...

As I continue to live with this tension, I am reminded of the caricatures of my generation. Referred to as Generation X, the Lost Generation or postmoderns, we are often described as a generation that wants to belong without having to make a commitment.

Kevin...

I think we were. And I think it played over into how some of us led, and still lead, if we are given the opportunity.

Jen X...

When it comes to belonging, we are passionate and dedicated, yet we are also individualistic and resist labels and the pressure to conform. While the Army at its best is about transforming the world, there are also times when it tends toward conformity and control. This does not relate well to a generation committed to authenticity and individuality.

Kevin...

Here is an example of where our generation took what we felt we were moving away from (individualism) and ingrained it to the hyper-level. For a generation that claimed we were moving away from individualism, we had a tendency to promote it when it suited our personal inclinations. (And today’s popular culture has continued this even further.) We wanted to belong, but pushed against any boundary that gave definition to what that belonging entailed or looked like. I think we sometimes did that in detriment to our generation and the ones that followed our lead. I agree that when at our best, we Salvationists are about transforming the world, but we can often get bogged down in conformity and control. But sometimes, while being impatient, we need to recognize that some of what we are asked to conform to is initiated out of deep desire to fulfill the same calling. So, we should exercise levels of grace and patience so we can work together intergenerationally for that greater vision. “A generation committed to authenticity and individuality.”

This is a double-edged sword. Authenticity should be something we hold tightly and live by. But often this has come at the expense of our understanding and experience of holiness: “At least I’m being authentic and not pretending to be something I’m not,” sounds admirable, but forgets that our heritage of Methodism was partially developed in response to such thinking. Wesley’s “method” was about authentic holiness—not a “holier than thou” superiority but rather bands of people covenanted together to pursue holiness in the mess and struggles of daily living. I would rather we teach authentic holiness than simple authenticity any day, as it will continually point and drive us back to the cross where true transformation can take place. Authenticity on its own can ignore

transformation: “That’s just the way I am” which leads to a dangerous level of individualism. Of course, we each are uniquely shaped by God, and are wired in different ways. But we are to be conformed to the image of his Son. No one denomination has the corner on the market of what that looks like—the Army included. But to toss away all that each corporate part of the Body uniquely offers and is, is to deny what God has raised us each up to be.

Jen X...

When it comes to commitment, there is something static about Soldiership that may be foreign to Gen Xers, especially to those who grew up outside the Church.

Kevin...

I think the idea of soldiership in general is foreign to most in our generation and those coming behind. Perhaps it was more foreign than we assume in the early days of the Army as well. And I think that’s ok. (I didn’t always feel this way.) I think the idea of those who would covenant together to something greater than their individual selves for the sake of others and not for what they would personally benefit from such an arrangement is so foreign to our culture that it too is a double-edged sword. The first being that if lived out faithfully it will certainly turn heads and make people take notice. But conversely, when realized that this is a courageous call to submission, as is any faithful call and expression of the gospel, some will find the call too uncomfortable and would rather return to and live out their authentic individuality. I think those who encountered Jesus faced the same crisis of belief and action.

Jen X...

Anyone who reads about Generation X will know that many of us grew up in blended families. Our parents were more or less transient and our worlds were constantly changing. We learned to deal with constantly changing environments and to adapt to a variety of situations and ways of life. Asking Gen Xers to make a lifelong commitment to a particular institution often doesn’t work. As a generation of “latchkey kids,” sociologists say we have learned to fend for ourselves.

Kevin...

The emerging generations might not be the “latchkey kids” that many of our generation were, but in terms of fluidity, transience, ever-changing environments and adaptability, the generations after ours have us beat. The call to lifelong commitment continues to be a difficult one. But such is the call of discipleship. If we can see soldiership as an expression of discipleship, and its covenant as a tool to help give us a framework to live out and practice that discipleship, I think we need to call the courageous to step out-of-step with the dominant attitudes and practices of a generation in order to become the unique witness we are to be in our world. Believe me when I say that I used to share many of your thoughts and feelings, and would very likely have agreed with just about everything you said when this was written. But through these past nearly 20 years God has led me to a new place of strong conviction. One that asks that we reframe some of

what traditional Salvationists hold dear in order to recapture the essence of what the warrior soldiers of the past were aiming for in their world.

Jen X...

So how can the Army include my generation in its ranks? The answer, perhaps, is as Geoff Ryan says, "to celebrate the traditions of our Movement without succumbing to traditionalism, the passion of the mission without the pettiness of structure."

Kevin...

Absolutely. And we need to do this as effectively and efficiently as we mobilize disaster relief. It is immediately necessary and mission-critical.

Jen X...

The challenge is not to ask "why are you not a Solider?" but "what now?"

Kevin...

Again, I think we can ask both these questions. Both are necessary if we see the value of covenanted partners in the gospel who seek to live and practice a particular form of Christian faith (Salvationism) for the sake of others and to see the kingdom of God lived in the here and now. I believe that although not perfect in its design, soldiership can be an effective tool that helps us partner with God to see his redemptive plan accomplished through a CHRIST-centred, OTHERS-focused people.

Jen X...

As I reflect once again on what draws me to Salvationism, it is the enduring message, vision and mission which are just as valid for my generation as they were for my parents' or my grandparents' generation. An army of warriors, passionately committed to the battle for the hearts and minds of people everywhere, excites me. An army of Soldiers does not.

Kevin...

I couldn't agree more, particularly if soldiership is the anemic version you describe above. But I would rather see us reclaim what soldiership ought to be than throw it out. Certainly for my parents and grandparents generations (and for them personally) soldiership was about being "passionately committed to the battle for the hearts and minds of people everywhere." I think it still should be.

Jen X...

Can I be a Salvationist without buying into the cultural trappings of a generation of Salvationism that is not my own? Are there ways that I can minister within the Army without having to "fit the mould?" I believe the answer is a resounding "yes," but we must learn to live with mystery, paradox and unanswered questions.

Kevin...

I agree, but just because we need to learn to live with mystery, paradox and unanswered questions, it doesn't mean there are no answers to questions and that a compass isn't helpful in pointing us towards "true North". When we know and follow the Way, we shouldn't be afraid to say as Paul did, to "follow me as I follow the example of Christ." But we need to do that with humility, and constantly remind ourselves that in an ever-changing culture that is tossed on the waves of popular opinion, the methods that are most effective in reaching that culture need to be adaptable, while still ensuring they are anchored to the Truth found in Jesus alone. The core is essential; the trappings can change.

Being a covenant people is, I have come to believe, part of our core. It might not be popular, but if we are going to continue to be who God has called and raised us up to be, we shouldn't shy away from calling the courageous. Is it a call for everyone? A call to everyone—yes. A call for everyone—probably not. Is there a place for those who do not see themselves as soldiers to recognize themselves as Salvationists and take their active place within the Army? I certainly hope so. We need this to be so, because it's only as we journey together and appreciate who each of us are that we can be what God designs, because some who are not soldiers are probably more Salvationist than those soldiers who simply cling to a traditional mindset or expression of what they think that means.

Jen X...

Am I a Salvationist? Perhaps only God knows.

Kevin...

I think perhaps only He knows for each of us.

The Nascent Charter of Neo-Salvationism (2002)

By Captain Stephen Court
Horizons – Jan-Feb 2002

The life of Job shows how God turns “invisible” people into people with purpose

Captains Stephen Court together with his wife, Danielle Strickland, lead the Williams Lake Corps (2002) in B.C. They are self-styled “Primitive Salvationists” who disseminate resources to aid in the salvation war. Visit Stephen’s Web site at www.armybarmy.com.

A hush descended over the crowd. Each head turned to catch a glimpse of the chief. Waves of people parted in deference. Individual benedictions formed on people’s lips as they remembered how this man had rescued that family when the crop failed; how he had taken this one in after his parents died of the plague; how he undertook for that one after her husband died in battle; how he cared for those over there who made a meager living by begging; how he established a home to nurse several who were handicapped and ill; how he broke the fangs of the wicked man intent on robbing people of their land. Finally, clothed in righteousness, bedecked by justice, the chief arrived at the gate.

The preceding description is my interpretation of Job 29:7-17. No one is quite sure when chief Job lived and ruled in Uz. But this man of integrity left a legacy that continues to shine. Long before God granted us the law on stone, Job manifested the law written on his heart. He left for us an embryonic code for social justice, what I like call the nascent charter for “Neo-Salvationism.” Its proponents, the “Radical Army,” keep turning up through history to fight the “Wars of the Lord,” each generation in a different guise, but recognizable by the power of the Holy Spirit and two-fisted combination of revival and social justice.

Most of us know the popular tale of Job. We’ve heard about his patience and suffering. After disaster strikes Job and his family, he responds: “The Lord gave and the Lord has taken away; may the name of the Lord be praised” (Job 1:21). His wife is a little less magnanimous. Her advice is: “Curse God and die!” (2:9). His friends aren’t all that better, and for dozens of chapters we follow their conversation with Job. In the end, Job remains faithful. He defends his righteous lifestyle and outlines the essence of a transformed society (Job 31:16-40)

Ralph Neighbour Jr, in his popular *Arrival Kit*, explains that there are three kinds of people: “people” people, those we know and care about; “machine” people, those whose efforts benefit us; and “landscape” people, what I like to describe as the extras in the movie of my life. I would add a fourth kind of people: “invisible” people. Those who are “out of sight, out of mind.” They include the marginalized, the poor, the widow, the alien and the orphan.

The genius of the Gospel is that God wants to make invisible people into people people. Through Job, God took the widow and restored her honoured place in society. Through this willing servant, he took the hungry individual and succors her. Through this radical

warrior, he transformed an orphan into an heir. Through this obedient soldier, he made the alien a citizen. This is the Gospel, God's "big idea." God wants to transform invisible people into people people, people with purpose, people who belong.

This desire was mirrored in the lifestyle of a "blameless and upright" man who "feared God and shunned evil" (Job 1:1). Job's conduct and behaviour was scrupulous; his armour was without chink. He was so upright that God agreed to remove all protection from him, making him vulnerable to frontal assaults by Satan. But Job's goodness was ingrained within his character. He made people people out of invisible people. Job 31:16-40 recounts Job's social code. He did not deny the desires of the poor, nor did he let the widow's eyes grow weary. He reared the fatherless, guided the widow, fed the hungry, and clothed the naked. He did not turn to materialism or idolatry, nor did he exercise pride or envy.

Blessing accompanied his righteousness and social justice. After his ordeal, Job lived 140 years and watched this budding code of social conduct extend to bless his descendants to the fourth generation (see Job 42:16). His story lays the groundwork for our understanding of the consequences of revival in terms of social justice. Job made invisible people into people people. He proved that the face of the earth changes as the hearts of its people are transformed. Every revival reflects back to the truths God spoke to the heart of Job.

I believe that in every generation God has raised up his "Radical Army" to accomplish his purposes. The annals of history are punctuated with these "Wars of the Lord." Job's chapter is the first. As we search for a template for this generation's embodiment of the Radical Army, we are inexorably drawn to this great man. His life of compassion emerged naturally from his foundation of integrity. His impact is undeniable. His life set the tone for a society. His influence continues today. Job's legacy provides us with the nascent charter for Neo-Salvationism.

A Charter³ for Salvationism?⁴:

By Major Stephen Court

A response to 'The Nascent Charter of Neo-Salvationism' by Major Stephen Court

My initial reaction is Philippians 3:16 – “Only let us live up to what we have already attained.”⁵

The template is there.⁶ It's been there for thousands of years.⁷ It remains for us to actualize it.⁸

One observation under the surface of the original article is that is it not at all limited to the organization called The Salvation Army⁹. And this subtle truth may underscore our potential role in the completion of the great commission. Here's the argument:

We stick with the foundational prophecy of The Salvation Army through Catherine Booth, uttered at the farewell meeting of the invasion party, consisting of Rachel Evans, Clara Price, Mary Ann Coleman, Elizabeth Pearson, Annie Shaw, Emma Eliza Florence Morris, Emma Westbrook, and George Scott Railton, embarking for USA back in 1880, as reported in the February 21, 1880 edition of The War Cry, and still awaiting fulfillment:

The decree has gone forth that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ and that He shall reign, whose right it is, from the River to the ends of the earth. We shall win. It is only a question of time. I believe that this Movement shall inaugurate the final conquest of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We're convinced this is a true word. If it doesn't play out, that's on us. But it would truly be a miracle if this prophecy was fulfilled in uniforms waving flags and marching down main streets.¹⁰

³ A charter, according to Google, is, “a written grant by a country's legislative or sovereign power, by which a body such as a company, college, or city is founded and its rights and privileges defined.”

⁴ The original title had the prefix 'neo' added to align with the editor's philosophy. Our perspective was and remains one advocating a different strand, primitive salvationism (defined as charismatic-flavoured, mission-focussed heroism in definition-of.com).

⁵ And to note that the forthcoming book was re-titled, BE A HERO: The battle for social justice and mercy. Oh, and we're not captains anymore, having moved from Williams Lake to Vancouver and Melbourne and Edmonton and Los Angeles to Toronto. PSI morphed into Boundless. And so on. But JAC continues!

⁶ In the original article. If it is nascent, though – nascency – then we should be past the juvenescence stage. Does that locate us in adolescence? The answer to that question might help us understand the exigencies of the salvation war in this season.

⁷ Scholars can't agree on how many thousands, but that isn't a threat to the point.

⁸ Who is 'us'? Jump on down to footnotes 8 and 9 for one possible response.

⁹ I suspect most, if not all, by now, are convinced that a worldwide war executed by a supernatural evil fiend calls for a worldwide Army united behind the Omnipotent Eternal One.

¹⁰ This isn't so much lack of faith as recognition of prevailing societal trends and restrictions that will require more creativity and collaboration that some strict traditionalists may have imagined.

If not conventionally, how? ¹¹

The prophecy doesn't connote 7.7 billion conversions in Salvation Army open airs and meetings. ¹² A couple of words:

First - 'The movement' doesn't denote 'The Salvation Army'. It refers to the movement of salvationism. Granted, for most of its history, the two terms have been mostly synonymous in that salvationism ¹³ sat pretty much exclusively within The Salvation Army, the movement ¹⁴ existed within the organization.

Second - The key word here is the verb 'inaugurate': begin, introduce, mark the beginning or first public use of...

So, the promise or claim of the prophecy is that salvationism will mark the beginning of the final conquest.

And Salvationism – the movement - needn't (any longer?) be constrained by the boundaries of the organization. A lower-case salvationism, crystallizing in our generation, is 'opening tent pegs' ¹⁵ to include all who are captivated by the salvationist spiritual DNA ¹⁶ and captured by its mission.

Around the time of the original article, we were producing t-shirts with messages such as 'Poverty: to hell with it!' and 'Injustice: God damn it!' ¹⁷ Today, we're long sold out of that clothing. But on our good days salvationists are looking to marshal extraordinary prayer, muster anti-trafficking advocates, rally incarnational warriors, cheer on the extremely sacrificial warriors of Jesus, aiming at multiplying multiplying disciples multiplying multiplying bases. ¹⁸ We're also looking to learn from those Christians who

¹¹ The opposite of conventional is unorthodox or, more appropriately for our purposes, revolutionary. That's right – it all comes down to revolution: "a forcible overthrow of a government or social order, in favor of a new system" (Google definition), as we overthrow the reign of satan and restore the Kingdom of God.

¹² Though we're in favour of that, of course.

¹³ Minimally, the lower-case definition of the word on Google: religious teaching emphasizing the saving of the soul.

¹⁴ Here's the definition from Google: a group of people working together to advance their shared political, social, or artistic ideas.

¹⁵ An allusion to Isaiah 52:4 – "Make your tents larger! Spread out the tent pegs." (CEV)

¹⁶ What are sometimes called charisms – extraordinary powers given by Holy Spirit for the benefit of the people of God. Salvationism's specific charism? Blood and Fire; Go for souls (and go for the worst); Holiness Unto The Lord; Others... you get the idea.

¹⁷ There is a photo on an office desk where I'm typing with General Larsson holding up the 'poverty' t-shirt. The clothing is worn out, but the conviction remains.

¹⁸ That last clause is the multiplication maxim – salvos aim at multiplying multiplying disciples multiplying multiplying bases. Bases are 'base networks'. Army bases are a rebranding of SA societies (which exist in SA Year Books and at IHQ but in practice only in parts of Africa and the Indian subcontinent). Here's the simple formula: base = cells + hubs.

Cells are OPEN groups with various shapes and forms but in which people can encounter Jesus, the Gospel, the Kingdom, authentic Christian community, and more.

Hubs are CLOSED groups for discipleship, accountability, and spiritual guidance (they are the component group of the rule of life a handful of salvationists crafted called Infinitum (see the Infinitum app or InfinitumLife.com)). If you have cell groups undergirded by hubs, you've got a base.

Bases streamline salvationism. (the charism of salvationism exists within a base)

seem closest to having it 'down'¹⁹, looking to influence maximal numbers with salvationism DNA, looking to match up²⁰ each person we encounter with the Lord Jesus.

This is a big tent.

Do these exercises require Articles of War covenantal commitments²¹?

Or might the Salvationism Blessing include inviting all our brothers and sisters and cousins in the family of God into our great adventure to inaugurate the final conquest of our Lord Jesus Christ?

Is *this* a charter of Salvationism?

Bases are rapidly replicable. (the multiplication threshold is low – dependent on cell model)
Bases bypass bureaucracy. (don't require HQ approval, dedicated facility, vocational leader, operating budget)

Bases revitalize the revolution. (ground level practical multiplying discipleship)

In this model, Infinitum is an ingredient brand

(<https://www.forbes.com/sites/richardkestenbaum/2018/02/04/what-ingredient-brands-are-and-why-theyre-important/#51879ced7c36>). And it is in this role suggestive of how the fulfillment of the prophecy may look for salvationism.

¹⁹ That list is potentially quite long with various groups and agencies and movements having 'parts' of it 'down' – almost like parts of a body, optimized when they all work together in combination.

²⁰ An evangelist is a match-maker, introducing her friend Sue (and...) to her friend Jesus...

²¹ Answer? No. But, of course, neither do they exclude the community of the covenanted called The Salvation Army. Ideally, all 1.5+ million soldiers can include themselves in this number. The thing is, though, we aren't waiting for a thorough 'renewal' within the organization before we set out full blast to see our uniquely-expressed love of Jesus spread beyond our structural limits to others willing to be washed in the blood and fire. We're headed where we understand God to be leading and inviting all to follow, regardless of their different traditions or lack of covenant or sticky doctrinal issues.

Christians Only Need Apply (2002)

By Captain John Norton
Horizons – Jan-Feb 2002

Will Salvation Army employee hiring practices make us the next YMCA?

Captain John Norton recently returned to Canada after six years in Russia where he was involved in church planting and youth/candidates appointments. Currently he is at THQ researching social reform and justice issues.

In years gone by, Salvation Army employees were few and had little influence. Most held mundane jobs and worked as support staff to officers. Today, with nearly 12 employees for every one officer in the Canada and Bermuda Territory, one would be hard pressed to suggest that employees only serve a secondary role. Rather, whispers that officership might go the way of the dinosaur circulate. Whatever the future of officership, it can be said without qualification that employees are an integral part of contemporary Salvation Army mission and ministry. Many hold significant positions of leadership and influence. To what extent then should employees be owners of The Salvation Army's mission and purpose? To what extent are they part of the collective "we"?

Should we hire only Christians?

I would suggest that employees should be Christian. Consensus on this opinion is only possible if we agree on The Salvation Army's purpose. We need to ask ourselves: Why do we do what we do? What is our mission?

Let me give an example. The Salvation Army Broadview Village provides residential care for developmentally handicapped adults in Toronto. The Village began as a children's home and when the children grew up it became a home for adults. Is its purpose to provide only residential care, or also, as General Gowans has said, to "save souls, grow saints, and serve suffering humanity"? Can the Village fulfil one part of our wider mission, such as "serving," without also participating in "saving souls" and "growing saints"? I would suggest that authentic Salvation Army mission happens only when we fulfil our mission holistically. Therefore, the mission of the Village should be to offer whole salvation in an appropriate way for its clients. Providing residential care is only one aspect of its mission to the developmentally handicapped.

I would suggest that each Salvation Army unit must have as its purpose the fulfillment of the whole mission for which God raised up the Army. A unit that does not contain the whole mission is not a valid expression of the Army. In other words, a facility that is able to feed a thousand people a day but does not offer Christ as Saviour to its clients is not a valid expression of the Army. On the other hand, neither is a program that helps hundreds into a genuine conversion experience but ignores physical suffering and social problems in its community.

In relation to social services and mission, Commissioner Shaw Clifton in *Who Are These Salvationists?* writes: “When we allow our doctrine to determine the shape, style and emphasis of everything, including our pragmatic social programming ... we find that we come face-to-face with certain inescapable outcomes ... A prime example is seen in our counselling services. What sort of counseling do we offer? Because we are a church ... we have no mandate other than to undertake and offer to our clients counselling that is unambiguously and unashamedly Christian in ethos and content.”

If we hope to prevent a slide into secularization we need to begin looking more seriously at the purpose of our ministries. It follows that if we are to provide Christian ministries, we will need Christians to do the ministry. Only people who know the whole Gospel will be able to see how the whole Gospel applies to the practical questions of ministry in a secular reality.

It might be argued that a devout Jew or Hindu could bring moral integrity to a thrift store management position. Why shouldn't we hire this person? The answer lies in our mission. The purpose of a thrift store is more than making money for The Salvation Army or providing a necessary social service for the poor. The purpose of a thrift store is to participate in the mission of The Salvation Army to “save souls, grow saints, and serve suffering humanity.” The store may be engaged in the work of selling clothes and furniture, even making a profit, but this is not its purpose. Its mission is to bring salvation to people, clothing to cover the body and forgiveness to cover sin. The store may not be engaged in organizing religious meetings or doing evangelism in any overt way, but the employees of the store had better be ready to try to be Christ to their clients when they see a need. We cannot hire a devout Jew or Hindu, for example, not because we dislike Jews or Hindus or anyone who is not a Christian, but because these persons are not qualified for the job of doing Christian mission.

Our mission is Christocentric. Some non-Christians, whether of another religion or secular humanist perspective, may be able to support a form of salvation. They may even agree that salvation needs to be holistic, to include all of the person. But a non-Christian cannot promote Christ-centred salvation.

I am not suggesting that every program the Army operates needs to include evangelistic sermons and Bible study. We believe that salvation is all-encompassing, which might lead us to run child-care centres for working families or legal aid clinics for those who cannot afford to hire a lawyer. God meets people at their point of need and sometimes we in the Army have the privilege of being there at that point. We cannot separate the “serving” from the “saving souls”—everything is intertwined. It is impossible for us to consider a salvation that is limited to an inner new life in God, just as it is impossible to consider a social salvation apart from what must take place in the heart. We cannot have the serving salvation without the soul salvation. We need to write our mission statements to be clear about our theology, namely our belief in salvation that is holistic and not just the sum of individual parts.

We need to confront the discomfort we may feel with our mission. If not, we will never be able to match our ministries with our purposes. We might then become the YMCA of tomorrow, an organization in Canada that succumbed to a secularization process.

I am not suggesting that we hire only Salvationists. Most Salvation Army units would have difficulty finding enough qualified Salvationists to fill positions. More importantly, non-Salvationist Christians can with all integrity and without hesitation participate in our mission.

Can we hire only Christians?

If we conclude that we should hire only Christians, it does not mean that we legally can. Salvation Army leaders who accept that it would be best to hire only Christians often feel themselves unable to implement their beliefs. What can we do, based on the law?

Briefly, the answer is this: A Salvation Army unit (corps, centre, program, etc.) can establish a policy to hire only Christians if it ensures that its stated purpose is of a Christian character AND if the employee's positions, as documented in their job descriptions, are related to fulfillment of that purpose AND if the unit is consistent in its application of this policy.

Human rights legislation enacted in most provinces mirrors society's conviction that we live in a pluralistic community and that discrimination cannot be tolerated. However, human rights legislation may give freedom to the hiring policies of religious organizations if it can be shown that the purposes of the organization are fundamentally religious. In other words, it will not be found discriminatory to hire persons only of our religion if it can be shown that the employee's job is integral to the mission.

The Canadian Constitution guarantees us freedom of religion. We have the right to practise religion and the courts will uphold our right to organize ourselves as The Salvation Army and to pursue our religious purposes.

It was in Boston a few short years ago that the then Lt-Colonel Shaw Clifton tried the Massachusetts Experiment. He worked with his divisional staff and legal advisors to set in place a policy to hire only Christians where possible. Considering the legal situation in the United States, and the culture of The Salvation Army there, it was a daring move.

Commissioner Clifton's book deals with the difficult questions: How to get the leadership team in agreement on this issue? What are the legal ramifications? How to implement this new policy into an existing situation? What does this mean for existing employees who are not Christians? Read the Commissioner's own story in *Who Are These Salvationists?* (Crest Books, 1999, p.152-7).

If it can be done in Massachusetts, can it be done here? In Canada there have been a number of court cases on this subject. In 1999, in Manitoba, an employee was let go from her employ as an accounting clerk at Steinbach Bible College (Mennonite tradition)

after it became known that she was a practicing Mormon. The Manitoba Human Rights Commission's Board of Adjudication found in favour of the college. The presiding Judge wrote: "The requirement that the accounting clerk be of the Mennonite faith to work at SBC constitutes a *bona fide* and reasonable requirement or qualification for that employment or occupation." This case is interesting because the college argued successfully that its staff, even those in seemingly non-ministry positions such as an accounting clerk, needed to share in its religious beliefs because of the religious nature and purposes of the college. The case for the college was made stronger because it consistently applied its own internal policies to everyone equally, and asked all employees, before beginning their employment, to sign a statement of faith. The judge concluded that the complainant had not signed the statement of faith in good conscience.

If we are clear about the mission and purpose of a ministry unit, and tie written job descriptions clearly into that mission, we can make an argument for hiring Christians only. It can be argued that seemingly non-ministry positions, from computer technician to janitor, must also contribute to the mission of the organization especially when they encounter our "clients" (i.e. the general public) in their daily routine. If we can show that all positions are ministry positions, we can make a case for only hiring Christians. We need to begin, however, by ensuring that all positions of leadership are held by Christians. It is possible to ask employees to sign a statement of faith and lifestyle code.

How can we make the transition?

The greatest difficulty facing Salvation Army leaders is this: How do we get there from here? We have strayed far from the path of our mission in some cases, and therefore would have great difficulty in upholding before the courts an argument in defense of hiring only Christian employees. But we can move forward with care.

Salvation Army leaders should seek legal advice before considering a change in hiring policy. Our own legal advisors at THQ are available for assistance. Do ensure that a Christian lawyer is consulted, one who understands what you are trying to do and the motivation for it.

We need to give consideration to existing non-Christian employees. We would not want to violate their rights nor would we want to do anything that might show a lack of care or integrity. I think we have an obligation, growing out of our Christian mission and because of our decision to hire them in the first place, to show extra sensitivity to their situation. We agreed to hire them and, assuming their work is acceptable, they are owed our loyalty and care.

We need to give consideration to government funded jobs and programs. If we are locked into a funding project, we must fulfil our obligations. However, new projects and jobs need to be scrutinized to ensure that we are going to be able to uphold our mission integrity. We should refuse any government funding that will not allow us to hire only Christians or will not allow us to bring our holistic understanding of mission to our work.

Finally, we will not want to do away with employment opportunities for non-Christians that have traditionally proved fruitful in bringing people to Christ. For example, the practice of many ARCs hiring recovering alcoholics to drive trucks can be an important part of our mission to the holistic salvation of a particular individual. Many employees, especially when surrounded by a caring, Christian work community, have had conversion experiences. We would not want any hiring policy to restrict ministry opportunities from happening. When we hire a non-Christian employee we should have clear spiritual goals, usually only applied to temporary, non-leadership positions and where individuals will be surrounded in an explicitly Christian environment. Summer camp ministries are a good example of the opportunity for non-Christian employees to be influenced for Christ. This would be an exception to the rule.

I hope that some of these thoughts will provoke discussion and lead to change. I like to think of myself as a realist, so if you think hiring Christians is impossible, then I would like to know. Please write to me. I believe that there are three questions facing all Army leaders on this issue: *Should we* hire only Christian employees? *Can we* hire only Christians? And finally, *how can we* make the transition? It's up to you.

A Great Employment Opportunity

By Captain Kate Baudinette

A response to 'Christians Only Need Apply' by Captain Kate Baudinette

This article attempts to answer two questions. Firstly, in an Australian context, can The Salvation Army hire only Christian employees? Secondly, how do any legal restraints affect adherence to the missional strategies of Jesus and the apostles?

Australian Anti-Discrimination Legislation

Section 116 of the *Australian Constitution*, prohibits the Commonwealth from enacting legislation that stops 'the free exercise of any religion' (section 116). This does not represent an individual right to freedom of religion; it is only a restraint on Commonwealth government. The religious rights of the individual are protected under the anti-discrimination laws of each state (excluding New South Wales and South Australia). For example, Victoria prohibits discrimination on the grounds of religion under the *Equal Opportunity Act 2010* (Vic). However, the act also recognizes exceptions where discrimination may be justified in certain circumstances. Where an exception applies, discrimination is not against the law.

Under the Act religious organizations can discriminate against a person on the basis of their religion in certain circumstances, including when:

- (1) ordinating or appointing priests, ministers of religion or members of a religious order;
- (2) training or educating people seeking ordination or appointment as priests, ministers of religion or members of a religious order; and
- (3) selecting or appointing people to perform functions relating to, or participating in, any religious observance or practice.

Whether these exceptions provide the appropriate balance is a subject of regular debate. Some believe that there is too much scope for discrimination, particularly toward people from the LGBTQI community, while others say that there is too little scope for religious freedom.

Religious bodies and religious schools can discriminate on the basis of a person's religious belief or activity, sex, sexual orientation, lawful sexual activity, marital status, parental status or gender identity where the discrimination conforms to the doctrines, beliefs or principles of the religion or is reasonably necessary to avoid injury to the religious sensitivities of people who follow the religion.

The term 'reasonably necessary' requires an objective assessment of whether the discrimination is necessary. It is not enough for the organization to decide for themselves what is 'reasonably necessary;' rather, it is objectively decided by the law. And perhaps uncomfortably for religious organizations, the law enforces a differentiation between the sacred and the secular for the sake of equal opportunity. A religious

organization cannot make a decision to employ only Christians based solely on its status as a religious organization. Each role must be objectively assessed as to its function and effect.

It would seem obvious that Salvation Army Officers must be Christians and that those training to be Salvation Army Officers must also be Christians. There is no contention there. The case law relates to the third exception, where The Salvation Army would seek to employ an individual in any role other than a Salvation Army Officer.

There are the issues to consider:

- (1) Will the employee be required to perform functions relating to, or participating in, any religious observance or practice?
- (2) Does the discrimination conform to the doctrines, beliefs or principles of the religion?, or
- (3) Is the discrimination reasonably necessary to avoid injury to the religious sensitivities of people who follow the religion?

In *Walsh v St Vincent de Paul Society Queensland (No. 2)* [2008], the Queensland Anti-Discrimination tribunal held that the Society had discriminated on the grounds of religion, by requiring a person to be Catholic if they held the position of President. The complainant, a volunteer, was successful in the discrimination complaint because the employment role was not considered to have had sufficiently religious content – despite it being a leadership position with religious duties in an organization with spiritual aims.

In *Kerry Anne Hozack v The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints [1997] FCA*, the case concerned a married employee who entered a sexual relationship while not yet divorced. The ruling concluded that a receptionist was not “a position from which anyone would normally expect any particular leadership or example”, and so she should not have been dismissed.

Federally, a person who suffers discrimination in employment can make a complaint to the Australian Human Rights Commission, which will implement the International Labour Organization Convention (No 111) concerning Discrimination in respect of Employment and Occupation. Members to the convention undertake ‘to declare and pursue a national policy designed to promote, by methods appropriate to national conditions and practice, equality of opportunity and treatment in respect of employment and occupation, with a view to eliminating any discrimination in respect thereof.’ The definition of discrimination under the convention includes discrimination in relation to religion.

Over the last few years complaints to the Australian Human Rights Commission have included charges of discrimination in relation to an individual’s lack of a religious identity. Where there has been a breach and where conciliation fails, the commission may submit a report and recommendations to the Attorney-General, but these are non-binding.

In a 2015 example of the conciliation process the complainant claimed the respondent faith-based private secondary school withdrew an offer of a student-teacher placement when made aware that he did not hold the same religious beliefs. The school claimed it employed teachers with a range of religious beliefs. The school said there had been miscommunication and administrative errors in relation to the complainant's potential placement at the school. The complaint was resolved with an agreement that the school offer the complainant a student-teacher placement.

In summary, the cases demonstrate that in order for the exception to apply the function of the role must be strongly linked to religious observance or practice. As an exercise I have considered each of the positions at my current corps appointment and formed a view on whether the exception to anti-discrimination legislation would apply according to the case law:

Exception Applies:

- Children and Families Ministry Assistant
- Youth and Young Adults Ministry Assistant
- Ministry and Resources Administrator: Works very closely with the Corps Officers to prepare materials for worship and oversees the practical elements of worship

Contentious:

- Community Engagement Ministry Assistant: Arguably the exception applies. In our context the person in this role leads Bibles Studies and has leadership at a House Church. These elements would need to be stipulated in a position description for the exception to apply.
- Welfare Manager: Arguably the exception does not apply as there are many examples of non-Christian welfare managers at Corps. In our case the role does not currently involve any obvious religious observances or practices, although in the past it did include conducting a weekday chapel service. Again, any specific religious observances would need to be included in a position description.

Exception Does Not Apply:

- Business Manager
- Receptionist
- Administrative Assistant
- Financial Counselor
- Case Manager
- Facilities Coordinator

Should we only hire Christians?

Even if the law allows it, should The Salvation Army employ only Christians? John Norton (*Christians need only apply*) has argued that all employees of The Salvation Army should be Christian. His argument is based on General Gowans mission statement for The Salvation Army; to “save souls, grow saints, and serve suffering humanity.” Authentic Salvation Army mission, he states, only happens when all three occur in any given mission expression. I agree, but surely this does not depend on a Christian only workforce.

People of Peace

When Jesus sent out his disciples, he sent them to look for people of peace. It was a strategy that Jesus employed over and over again. We see it in Matthew 10 in the sending of the twelve and again in Luke 10 when Jesus sends out the seventy. Throughout the new testament the apostles looked for people of peace; people who would welcome them and receive them, who were open to them and their friendship, who were open to hearing what they had to say about Jesus, who were interested in and open to the lives the apostles lived as followers of Jesus and who were willing to assist or serve them and the mission in some way. These were people who wanted to make a contribution.

The Samaritan woman from John 4 is a striking example of a person of peace. Jesus, worn out with walking, sat down at a well in the noonday sun. A woman came to draw water and Jesus asked her to draw some water for him to drink. She served him, and then they struck up a conversation. They spoke about many things; about how it was possible to break down the barriers that usually divide people, about the source of life, about her home life, about true and proper worship and about the coming Messiah. When the disciples came back they were shocked; they couldn't believe that Jesus would spend time with a woman like her. They didn't say anything; they didn't have to. The woman got the message and left. When she got home she told the people of her village, "Come and see a man who knows all about me. Do you think he could be the Messiah?" Note that she wasn't sure yet about who Jesus was yet. But she had seen and heard enough that it was worth telling her family and neighbours. And when her family and neighbours heard her story they were intrigued and they went to find Jesus for themselves.

What a lesson for the disciples! Jesus and his disciples entered a city where there were many lost people and Jesus discovered this God-prepared woman who was ready and willing to reach this community. She received the messenger, the message and the mission and as a result almost the entire village came to follow Jesus.

Our corps runs a house church out of the local neighbourhood house in a low-socio economic pocket of the neighbourhood. The woman who runs the neighbourhood house is not a Christian, but she is intrigued by what we do and interested in our mission. There are about forty people who attend our house church and most of them have been sent by this woman. I have heard her speak to people about what we do. She tells people that she knows that we will welcome them, that it is like a family where people are cared for and that they can share meal with us every week. She even tells them that we are a church and that we share stories about Jesus. People come and see because they know her and they trust her. Like Lydia, she is a gatekeeper to a community. She has given us an office to use at the neighbourhood house and space to keep our materials. We don't pay for any of this. In the past two months we have enrolled seven new adherents, most of whom came to us through this woman of peace. She is not a Christian, but I would be thrilled if she applied for a job to work for The Salvation Army

because when I am with her I sense that she is not far from the kingdom of God (Mark 12:34).

Collaborate in Mission Areas

There have been many changes in The Salvation Army in Australia over the past couple of years as we have moved from two territories to one. One initiative is that each division has been further divided into Areas where our different Mission Expressions (corps and faith communities, social mission programs, mission enterprises, and chaplaincy services) come together to collaborate on local mission delivery strategies. A Salvation Army Officer is appointed as the Area Officer to facilitate the group. Representatives from each Mission Expression, Christians and non-Christians alike, come together to work on projects with the aim deliver a holistic mission addressing the physical, social and spiritual needs of individuals and communities. It is early days, but we are beginning to see the benefits. Something that has stood out to me in the Area I have been involved in is that there has been no antagonism toward the spiritual part of our mission from those who are not Christians. Instead there has been a willingness, on both sides, to listen and learn and pray together. It turns out that there have been people of peace in our midst all along; we just did not see them.

I wonder what would happen if instead of making a rule that we will not employ non-Christians, we had a strategy to employ people of peace? My experience tells me that they are all around us. People who are excited by the mission of The Salvation Army, who even when, like the Samaritan woman, they don't understand exactly who Jesus is, are willing to point others to him and who may someday find him for themselves.

Appendix

Here are some stories that demonstrate how the person of peace helped the early Christian mission:

- Mark 2 (Levi)
- Mark 5 (Demoniac)
- Luke 7:1-10 (The Centurion)
- Luke 19 (Zacchaeus)
- John 4:1-30 (The Samaritan Woman)
- Acts 8:26-40 (The Ethiopian Eunuch)
- Acts 10:9-11:1 (Cornelius)
- Acts 16:13-15 (Lydia)
- Acts 16:22-38 (The Philippian Jailer)
- Acts 18 (Crispus)

Signs and Wonders (2002)

By Lt. Colonel Maxwell Ryan
Horizons – Jan-Feb 2002

Revisiting The Salvation Army's charismatic beginnings

Lt-Colonel Maxwell Ryan has been a corps officer, editor-in-chief in Canada and the U.K., training principal in Ghana, national publicity co-ordinator and education secretary. In retirement he works as a hospital and prison chaplain, as well as a freelance editor and writer. He and his wife are active members of Weetamah Corps in Winnipeg.

The Salvation Army was born as a revival Movement. Early in its existence, however, Army leaders moved away from the signs and wonders that were part of the charismatic soil in which it was rooted. Today few people are aware that the Army, in its early days, was considered to be among the most flamboyant of religious movements. In practice if not in doctrine, the Army, with the signs and wonders that accompanied its beginnings, anticipated both the Pentecostal and the charismatic movements

From the Army's beginnings there has been tension between manifestations of the Holy Spirit and the Army's leadership. The leaders—usually godly and Spirit-filled—welcomed the blessings of this torrential life of the Spirit. But they were concerned how such a highly structured religious organization could continue to embrace those unpredictable manifestations of spiritual life.

Signs and wonders are defined as gifts which are ascribed to the Holy Spirit, such as speaking in tongues, exorcism, slaying in the Spirit, words of knowledge, prophecy, faith healing and ecstatic behaviour. The Army, as a child of Methodism, followed the growth pattern of its denominational parent in moving from unruly beginnings to a more staid approach to church life.

Church historian John Henry Kurtz described an American Methodist revival in the late 1700s: "Camp meetings are held by itinerant Methodist preachers. Day and night they pray, sing, preach and exhort; all the terrors of hell are evoked, the excitement increases with every moment; conflicts of repentance, commenced with sighs, sobs, groans, convulsions and spasms, make their appearance; divine grace is finally experienced; loud rejoicings, embraces and benedictions of the converts, mingle with the groanings of those still wrestling for grace at the anxious bench."

The similarity with early Canadian Salvationism has been noted by historian R. G. Moyles, who wrote of an Army meeting in the late 1800s: "If the mental agonies of the penitent have been terrible, the joy is also unbounded. They jump, dance, clap their hands, skip, run, throw their heads about without reserve in the ecstasies of their new-found salvation. In the front were groups of sisters dancing the new converts around, the brothers in immense groups skipping and dancing on the floor ... one [sister] jumped up, and it seemed to me that she wanted to fly; she bounded around and make no mistake. Everybody was dancing, jumping, singing, roaring, drumming happy."

Among the most knowledgeable early leaders of the Army was Bramwell Booth, his father's right-hand man from the first days of the Christian Mission. His knowledge of what happened at the beginnings of the Army was unparalleled. An interview with Bramwell was published in the April 1922 issue of *The Staff Review* with the headline, "Signs and wonders." Bramwell's words seem to foreshadow the Army's official position with regard to signs and wonders:

"The first instances of manifestation to which I was introduced were seen in the extraordinary presence of the Spirit of God. I have seen men in our meetings who were raving and blaspheming when the service began, suddenly broken down as though some physical power had laid them prostrate on the floor, and after a time of silence, weeping, and penitence, they were confessing their sins and imploring the mercy of God.

"In a certain number of cases we had remarkable descriptions of visions or revelations occurring during the period of unconsciousness ... There are also equally well-authenticated instances of healing by faith.

"In some of the Scandinavian countries we have had trouble owing to manifestations called the gift of tongues. We have to be suspicious of any voices or gifts which make men indisposed to bear the cross or seek the salvation of others; and although some of our own people have received the gift of tongues, we have almost invariably found that one of the consequences has been a disposition to withdraw from hard work for the blessing of others and from fearless testimony to the Saviour."

In the paragraph above, there is a glimmer of the initial official suspicion regarding speaking in tongues. Bramwell is referring to a split over glossolalia in the Norwegian church in 1907. The leader of this revival in Norway was Albert Lunde, who was converted in a Salvation Army meeting in Chicago. Pentecostalism was introduced to Finland around this time, with a Norwegian ex-Salvationist, G. O. Smidt, as leader.

Nearly 80 years later, evidence of the Army's attitude towards glossolalia was given by Jim Davidson, who spoke plainly of how he and his wife were given no alternative but to resign from officership because they spoke in tongues. He wrote of when they were Army missionaries in Hong Kong:

"The healing [of a Buddhist woman] came to the attention of our Salvation Army leaders, and Jean and I came under suspicion. They thanked God for her healing, but forbade our having any more to do with the gifts of the Spirit, and especially with speaking in tongues.

"We felt God telling us that we must no longer live under this prohibition. We told our leaders that after that term of missionary service was concluded we would exercise the gifts of the Spirit in our whole lives, including officership. Our leaders asked us to resign but we refused because what we intended doing did not transgress Salvation Army

doctrines. So our officership was terminated. We parted from our brethren in The Salvation Army with love and mutual respect.”

In the 1970s the Army in New Zealand suffered losses when the charismatic movement influenced some Salvationists. An official report submitted to Salvation Army leadership, *Report of the study group of the influence of the charismatic renewal movement on The Salvation Army in New Zealand*, said: “In keeping with the traditional practice of The Salvation Army, and because all Salvationists will want to pursue the ‘still more excellent way’ of a self-sacrificial way, officers will not engage in the public use of the gift of tongues, nor permit others to speak in tongues in Salvation Army meetings of any kind. This does not deny Salvationists the right to use the gift in their personal devotions.”

Before they commenced revival meetings in the East End of London, William and Catherine Booth spent several years as successful itinerant evangelists when thousands were converted. Their meetings were marked by signs and wonders. In his monumental three-volume biography of Catherine Booth, their son-in-law Frederick Booth-Tucker wrote:

“In the prayer meeting [in 1861] the rail was filled in a few minutes with great strong men, who cried aloud for mercy, some of them as though the pains of Hell had actually got hold of them. No one could be heard praying, and the cries and shouts of the penitents almost overpowered the singing ... A young woman went off into a kind of trance, which lasted for about an hour, and while her friends watched her she appeared to be conversing with some beings whom they could not behold. The conversation continued for some little time when the young woman said goodbye to her invisible communicants, waved her arms, and awoke.

“There can be little doubt that such special manifestations are permitted, in connection with powerful revivals as part of the signs and wonders with which God had promised to accompany the outpourings of his Holy Spirit. While it would doubtless be a mistake to seek for such manifestations, or to measure spiritual results by the frequency of their occurrence, nevertheless, when they do occur, they may be regarded as encouraging tokens of the divine presence.”

Army leadership was increasingly cautious of signs and wonders. In effect the Army’s approach was that even though one must not seek manifestations of the Spirit’s presence, if such blessings did come, they should be accepted, though with due caution.

William Booth was a Christian pragmatist. If signs and wonders would bring the people to hear the Gospel, and if they were the authentic work of the Holy Spirit, well, let them be! Army leaders were in touch with ordinary unchurched people. They knew at first-hand the sterility of contemporary worship and how small a place Christianity held in the hearts of common people. Author Richard Collier sets forth Booth’s philosophy:

“ ‘You see we have no reputation to lose’ was the reply of General William Booth to the friend who once asked him why the Army succeeded with such ease, where others failed. ‘As for you,’ he went on, ‘you can do nothing without considering what somebody will say whether within or without your own body; and while you are considering and hearing what somebody will say, life is going.’ Everybody has settled it that we are fools, if not a great deal worse. Therefore, we can go into a town, and do exactly what we think best, without taking the least notice of what anybody may say or wish. We have only to please God and get the people saved, and that is easily done.”

The Salvation Army’s mission of getting people saved and sanctified followed the Wesleyan tradition. Even signs and wonders had to be made to serve this larger two-fold purpose. In 1869 the Founder wrote:

“But how much more might be done had you all received this Pentecostal baptism in all its fullness. If every soul were inflamed, and every lip touched, and every mind illuminated, and every heart purified with the hallowed flame. God’s people in every direction would catch the fire, and sinners would fall on every side. Difficulties would vanish, devils be conquered, infidels believe, and the glory of God be displayed.”

In a painstakingly detailed survey of the Army’s first 35 years, historian Glenn Horridge came to the conclusion that The Salvation Army was definitely charismatic in its early days. He comments: “Contemporary evidence suggests the Movement to have been charismatic with shouting, lying prostrate on the ground, and leaping in the air being reported in 1882. Also practiced was ‘reveling on the floor in the glory’ and ‘jumping for Jesus.’ A report in 1878 said, ‘Big men, as well as women, fell to the ground, lay there for some time as if dead overwhelmed with the power from on high ... some laughed as well as cried for joy, and some of the younger evangelists might have been seen like lads at play, locked in one another’s arms, rolling each other over on the floor.’ ”

Some years before the Pentecostals would earn the sobriquet “holy rollers,” Salvationists were engaging freely in such activity. Horridge concludes: “The Army’s official position on charismatic meetings remained ambiguous although such activity was probably even more widespread than reported.”

The Army’s movement away from its charismatic beginnings affected its influence amongst Christians who had hoped that this display of power was a sign that God was doing something new in their time. As the Army began to turn away from these signs and wonders, it lost a number of Salvationists who later became pioneers in Pentecostal and revival movements, among them being Pentecostal pioneer Smith Wigglesworth.

Author J. Edwin Orr reports that some leaders of the 1904 Welsh revival were greatly influenced by The Salvation Army, which swept through the Welsh valleys with charismatic fervour. He writes: “The Welsh revival of 1904 may be traced to the chapel of the Rev Joseph Jenkins at New Quay, who was moved by the work of The Salvation Army. Also challenged by the virile evangelism of The Salvation Army was Rosina Davies, who held evangelistic missions in the Welsh valleys for a score of years, and exercised a fruitful ministry near Wrexham in 1904.”

A random sampling of Army publications reveals that charismatic experience, complete with signs and wonders yet in the Methodist holiness tradition, was a diminishing part of Salvation Army experience.

Australian Colonel John Dean was known as a healer and a fighter with the devil. He wrote in the 1920s: "A spiritual awakening stirred the town, crowds of souls were saved and sanctified, and the revival was accompanied by remarkable manifestations of the power of God, such as attended our early gathering in various parts of the Army world. Men and women fell beneath the power of God and remained in trances for varying periods; upon returning to consciousness they were filled with peace and joy, and by testimony and a life of holiness gave glory to God."

Prophecy was an integral part of early Army gatherings. From its very first days the Army was strident in its prophetic utterances about the wretched living conditions of the poor, and related systemic social ills. As well, early Army pioneer George Scott Railton reported on prophecy in the accepted charismatic sense.

Faith-healing has always had a place in Army ministry and worship. Gordon Moyles writes about early interest in faith-healing: "In some instances the articles in the *War Cry* by both converts and Army officers illustrated the still-undefined nature of Salvation Army beliefs. A strong proponent of 'faith-healing,' Mrs Booth wrote many defences of the practice in the early *War Cry*, and the editor entertained occasional testimonies to the salutary effect of faith-healing services. For a while it seemed as if this would become one of the Army's key beliefs. Eventually, however, it was abandoned both in practice and publications."

In a 1902 directive on faith-healing, William Booth deliberately distanced the Army from the Pentecostal belief that healing is in the Atonement, and that physical healing is a right for the Christian, further setting the Army on a path that would lead it to diverge from the direction taken by some charismatics in later years.

The relationship of signs and wonders to the Army is revealed by the contemporary Army's official—and non-official—response to such work of the Spirit.

During an Army church growth conference in the 1980s, the non-Salvationist conference speaker said the Lord wanted him to hold a healing service and to pray for any who wanted the infilling of the Holy Spirit. Even though it had a beneficial effect on the conference (some received healing), Army leaders told the speaker that The Salvation Army did not look favourably on anything in which signs and wonders played a part.

The effect upon the Army of this official non-participation in the charismatic movement and the disallowing of signs and wonders has been to separate this denomination from what God has been doing through the outpouring of the Spirit. Even though energy and

money are being poured into church growth programs, the freedom and joy in the Spirit that once characterized The Salvation Army is largely absent.

However, individual Salvationists have not been immune to the Spirit's activity. They have had to pay the price of keeping their activities and sympathies private, or of leaving the Army. It is ironic, though, that the worship choruses of the charismatic movement are widely used in Salvation Army meetings.

Many Salvationists pray fervently that as a younger generation of Salvation Army leaders reflect on the denomination's roots there will be a warm and repentant welcome to the refreshing and renewing winds of the Holy Spirit.

Give Us A Day of Wonders

By Major Jennifer Hale

A response to 'Signs and Wonders' by Major Jennifer Hale

It's interesting to read of Colonel Maxwell Ryan's account of the early charismatic beginnings of The Salvation Army. Certainly, in the Western World, those days are far behind us and I can't help but long for the Spirit of God to stir something of those charismatic fires in us again.

Have we lost the joy of our salvation? The Psalmist writes about that in his fervent prayer of confession recorded in Psalm 51. Have we forgotten what we have been saved from? It would appear so in many of The Salvation Army meetings that I have attended recently. Not only is there no dancing, or skipping or running as quoted in the Colonel's article but there is also little hand clapping, few hallelujah's can be heard, and not many hands are raised to God in worship in our very formal worship meetings. Perhaps we need to revisit the verses of Psalm 103 to remind us of the work of salvation that God through his son Jesus has wrought in our lives. The psalmist is reminding his own forgetful soul that the Lord forgives all sin; he is the healer of disease – disease of the body and more importantly the disease of a sin-sick soul. The psalmist continues to say that the Lord has redeemed his life from the pit and has crowned him with love and compassion. That's enough for me to shout and sing but he goes on even further to say that the Lord does not treat us as we deserve! Instead, he has removed our transgressions from us. What is an appropriate response to this amazing work of grace in our lives? I would say praise to the glory of God through our music, our singing, our fervent prayers for those who have not yet experience this great grace.

In my own officership, while I have not had much experience with the manifestations of the spirit, I can testify to the power of joy-filled worship and fervent prayer and preaching. In one of our first appointments, in a tiny Corps in Newfoundland, we would often get carried away with our joyful singing to the Lord. In the testimony time, saints would tell of the work of God in their lives, and after a passionately proclaimed message, soldiers would come to plead with God, praying in the spirit, for the salvation of those in the meeting who hadn't yet met Christ. Week after week, the tiny sanctuary was filled to capacity and the overflow was used, people were saved, fractured relationships were healed and restored, and our community knew that God was at work.

Perhaps we would do well to revisit the words of our founder as quoted in the article – “we have no reputation to lose ... we only have to please God and get the people saved, and that is easily done.”

It's disappointing to me to read of this intentional move away from the signs and wonders of the Spirit of God. What are any of our strategic plans or efforts without an infusion of the Spirit in them to bring them to life and make them productive.

I would echo Col. Ryan's prayer at the end of his article that there would be "a warm and repentant welcome to the refreshing and renewing winds of the Holy Spirit." While there may be varying attitudes toward signs and wonders, and there are discouraging stories from our more recent history of Army leadership's response to more flamboyant moves of the Spirit among the ranks, over the past nearly 20 years since the first article was written there seems to be an openness that did not always exist. Can we be the generation of Salvationists to grab fully the possibilities of the Spirit in our ranks?

Our theology closes no doors to fully exploring the full depths of the Spirit at work in creation. The Handbook of Doctrine reads, under the great heading of *The Holy Spirit is Free and Powerful*, "In Scripture the presence of the Spirit is sometimes made known by such manifestations as wind, fire, or the form of a dove. The language of Scripture suggests an element of mystery and sovereign freedom. The presence of the Spirit is both tangible and intangible, invisible and visible... the Holy Spirit achieves his will in unexpected and unpredictable ways."

In their book *Go For Souls!*, Frances Longino and Stephen Court remind us of the place of signs, wonders, and the powerful moving of the Spirit in our evangelistic efforts. Claiming the commission and promise of Mark 16:15-18, they remind us that Jesus said that signs and wonders would accompany our efforts to preach the Gospel to the entire world, and as a work of the Spirit they will both testify to the power of God and convict the lost of their sin (John 16:7-11).

Whether in worship, service, or mission, the power of the Spirit, in whatever form or manner He chooses to reveal Himself in, is to be sought after and relied on. Going back to the Handbook of Doctrine one more time we read, "Within the flow of the salvation story, the Holy Spirit, giver of life, guides and vitalizes our mission to live the story, to tell the story and to help others to make it their own."

I say "Spirit of God, do whatever is needed in this day and age in which we live, to make your Salvation Army an army of salvation once again!"

May our prayer be found in the words of Commissioner John Lawley, "Give us a day of wonders, Jehovah bare thine arm... Dear Saviour, richly bless us, baptize us more and more!"

"Will you not revive us again, that your people may rejoice in you? Show us your unfailing love, Lord, and grant us your salvation." – Psalm 85:6-7

Red Hot Religion or Whitewashed Tombs? (2002)

By Aaron White
Horizons – Jan-Feb 2002

Pharisees knew the *form* of their religion, but forgot about the *function*

Aaron White is a former member of the UK Mission Team and is currently a soldier at Project 614 in Toronto. He likes sunsets and long walks on the beach. E-mail Aaron at aaronziploc@yahoo.com

“While we are standing upon our dignity, whole generations have gone to hell.”
– Catherine Booth

Jesus loves me, this I know, for the Bible tells me so. It is assuredly the case that Jesus loves all humanity; there is nothing more certain in the Christian faith. Because of this conviction, we are sometimes guilty of imagining Jesus as a gentle, ethereal character, strangely European, wandering around in a clean white robe, with a lamb draped over his shoulder and laughing children trailing in his wake. This image is hard to reconcile with the Jesus who speaks to the Pharisees in the Gospels. Jesus loved the Pharisees, no doubt, but he did not seem to like them very much.

“Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites ... son[s] of hell ... blind fools ... you clean the outside of the cup and dish, but inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence ... you are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of dead men’s bones and everything unclean ... you snakes” (see Matthew 23).

What was it about the Pharisees that got under Jesus’ skin so much? Modern theologians and historians point out that the Pharisees have gotten a pretty bad rap. Their contemporaries did not consider them as evil, hypocritical and unmerciful as I remember my Sunday school teacher making them out to be. In fact, it has been suggested that of any group in first century Palestine the Pharisees were the most likely to agree with and support the message of Jesus. These were the religious folk, the good guys. In fact, if we are looking for a group to identify with in the Gospels, our closest counterparts may be the Pharisees, not the disciples. Like the Pharisees, we have been caretakers of the Word of God for a long time; we are respected in our communities; we try very hard to maintain our reputation; we all know how to play the “religious” game; and we have built up a set of traditions which are meant to be helpful, but which can very easily become a burden to ourselves and to those we are trying to lead.

These were the qualities of the Pharisees that so bothered Jesus. They had every advantage, they knew the Law, they had the correct doctrine, they should have been able to recognize the Messiah when they saw him. But the years had taken their toll. It was much easier to just appear holy than to actually be holy, to fulfil the letter of the Law instead of the spirit of the Law. The Pharisees had become experts at looking good, but

Jesus could see that they had fallen into the habit of worrying about the outside and neglecting the inside. They knew the *form* of their religion better than anyone, but they had forgotten about the *function*. The Pharisees were missing the whole point.

Fast forward roughly 2000 years to an ultra-traditional Salvation Army corps, with one of the best youth outreaches I have ever seen. I was taking part in a weekend mission there to support the YPSM, a middle-aged, completely un-hip mother of two, who had been successfully evangelizing non-churched youth in her community for 15 years. She was and is the ultimate *neo-salvationist*, to use a term coined by Captain Geoff Ryan. That is, she is absolutely committed to what was known in the early Salvation Army as “red-hot religion”: a passion for God, for holiness, and for the lost. She is well-versed in Salvation Army traditions, but not weighed down by *traditionalism*. She understands the Army’s purpose and mission, and she lives it out unflinchingly.

The first night we were at the corps over 100 young people showed up. The majority of them were “club kids”—teenagers who live for the fun of clubs, music, and usually the attendant pleasures of drugs, alcohol and sex. So this YPSM had us run a club that night, complete with loud music, lights, smoke, dancing, and a short, high-energy devotional. Not exactly your typical Salvation Army youth group pizza night. But to be honest, the teens didn’t come because of our little mission team, or even because we put on a good club; they came because of the trust they had for someone who unconditionally loved them and who was actually living out what she believed. Teenagers can spot hypocrisy over a mile away.

These club kids ended up hanging out with us for the whole weekend, following us around as we did street evangelism, shooting pool with us, and even coming to the Sunday morning and evening services. It was quite a visual contrast. The first 20 pews were filled with neatly pressed navy serge, white gloves and strict bonnets; the last pew was filled with nose rings, pink hair, baggy pants and Marilyn Manson T-shirts. At the end of the evening service, there was a challenge to accept Christ which, one assumed, was aimed pretty directly into the back pew. Three people did become Christians that night: two of the club kids ... and the corps sergeant major.

The CSM, in his own words, had never once in his life been truly challenged to accept Jesus as his Lord and Saviour. Yet he had attained the most influential lay position in a Salvation Army corps with a long and distinguished history. It may seem shocking, but it shouldn’t be. We all know how to play at being soldiers, how to say the right things, wear the right clothes, join the right activities, and by doing so, avoid uncomfortable questions about our spiritual lives.

I’m not saying that our traditions are bad; in fact, I find them extremely valuable. But, like any set of traditions, they *can* become far more important and central to our faith than they were ever meant to be, and they *can* become an effective shield against people knowing who we actually are.

William and Catherine Booth understood this, which is why they held no tradition to be sacred or inflexible. William Booth once wrote: “[The Salvation Army began] with a clean sheet of paper, wedded to no plan ... willing to take a leaf out of anybody’s book ... above all, to obey the direction of the Holy Spirit. We tried various methods and those that did not (work) we unhesitatingly threw overboard and adopted something else.” They did not want the Army to become just another denomination that would sink under the pressure of traditionalism, or that would allow its members to settle for the veneer of holiness and the appearance of good works. They wanted a flexible army that was burning in its pursuit of holiness and lost souls.

At this one corps I saw an example of these two extremes: a *neo-salvationist* sold out completely to the love of her Saviour and the mission of The Salvation Army; and a Pharisee who had been playing the game of Salvationism his entire life. An interesting end-note: the CSM and the YPSM are husband and wife.

As Catherine Booth wrote: “Show the world a real, living, self-sacrificing, hard-working, toiling, triumphing religion and the world will be influenced by it, but anything less they will turn around and spit upon.”

Existing Within the Tension

By Captain Vitali Sidorov

A response to 'Red Hot Religion or Whitewashed Tombs?' by Captain Vitali Sidorov

The main approach which Aaron White uses in his “making you think” article “Red Hot Religion or Whitewashed Tombs” is contradistinction. He reaches his goal not just by contrasting the different groups of people (Pharisees and Jesus, ultra-traditional salvationism and neo-salvationism, salvationists with “neatly pressed navy serge, white gloves and strict bonnets” and “non-churched youth with nose rings, pink hair, baggy pants and Marilyn Manson T-shirts” and even by opposing tradition based husband and mission oriented wife), but also by contrasting nearly philosophical concepts like “inside vs outside”, “clean vs unclean”, “to appear vs to be”, “letter of the law vs the spirit of the law”, “doctrine vs mission”, “form vs essence”.

It looks like every church, including The Salvation Army, is faced with this almost incessant battle between structure and mission; form and essence. There is no doubt that in order to be effective we have to have both portions in every pair, functioning fruitfully and respectively to each other. But it is not always possible, I would pessimistically add, most of the time it is not possible at all, so it becomes a challenge for both sides. The story as it progresses would always go the same way, if the structure starts to dominate; there is always a passionate wave of evangelists showing up. Where there is too much attention to the form and appearance, we would immediately see a prophet rising up, pointing out on our heart condition and the importance of essence and being.

At times this inability to cooperate and coexist brings a lot of disappointments, but it is also worth mentioning that the same battle, probably even more intense, takes place not on a church level but inside every follower of Christ. For instance, it is not always easy to be part of a structure and be focused on a mission at the same time and very often it causes inner ethical conflicts when you almost find yourself choosing between safe stagnation and risky action. However, blessed are those, and here I am tempted to create a new Beatitude, “Blessed is he who somehow manages to follow the tradition and feels fine as a part of the structure but still lives out what he believes and keeps the fire burning for the lost, for theirs is the Salvation Army how God intended it to be.”

Editor's Note:

We think that Vitali has raised a foundational challenge; how do we learn to exist with the tension between passion and procedure, or how he says it, “essence and form”?

This is more important than we may first realize. The resolution of this idea is key to being able to exist within movements as they age, and being able to deal with both disappointment and personal conviction. Wrestling with this challenge may just be the necessary catalyst for future dynamic growth within the Army and beyond.

Learning to live within this tension is what should enable the passionate, convicted, and visionary people, the kind of people needed to keep movements from succumbing to atrophy, to remain and be the needed catalytic influence.

This is a mature concept that may require maturity to accept and understand (I'm not sure if this editor could have grasped the importance of this 20 years ago). It is easy find new outlets for our passions and convictions, to move on to new structures that better fit, but far more challenging to remain and wrestle with the tension toward a greater outcome.

Dare we to dream what the possibilities could be for the Army if we can learn to live within the tension?