



A Publication of The Edwin Mellen Press

Word & Deed Mission Statement:

The purpose of the journal is to encourage and disseminate the thinking of Salvationists and other Christian colleagues on matters broadly related to the theology and ministry of The Salvation Army. The journal provides a means to understand topics central to the mission of The Salvation Army, integrating the Army's theology and ministry in response to Christ's command to love God and our neighbor.

Salvation Army Mission Statement:

The Salvation Army, an international movement, is an evangelical part of the universal Christian church. Its message is based on the Bible. Its ministry is motivated by the love of God. Its mission is to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ and to meet human needs in His name without discrimination.

Editorial Address:

All manuscripts, requests for style sheets and other correspondence should be addressed to Lt. Colonel Marlene Chase at The Salvation Army, National Headquarters, 615 Slaters Lane, Alexandria, VA 22313. Telephone (703) 684-5500. Fax: (703) 684-5539.

Editorial Policy:

Contributions related to the mission of the journal will be encouraged, and at times there will be a general call for papers related to specific subjects. The Salvation Army is not responsible for every view which may be expressed in this journal.

Editor in Chief: Marlene J. Chase

Co-Editors: Roger J. Green, Gordon College
Jonathan S. Raymond, William and Catherine Booth College

Editorial Board (1998-2001):

Elaine Becker	William Crabson	Terry Griffin
Vernon Jewett	Lee Lescano	Edith Pigford
John Rhemick	Robert Watson	

Abstracts/Indexing:

This journal is abstracted in the *Christian Periodical Index*, P.O. Box 4, Cedarville, OH 45314, and in *Religion Index One: Periodicals (RIO)*. All book reviews are indexed in *Index to Book Reviews in Religion (IBRR)*. The address for *RIO* and *IBRR* is American Theological Library Association, 820 Church Street, Evanston, IL 60201-5613.

Word & Deed

Vol. 2, No. 1
November 1999

ISBN 0-7734-7829-9
ISSN 1522-3426

Copyright © 1999 The Salvation Army. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

WORD & DEED

Vol. 2, No. 1

November 1999

<i>Editorial: The Salvation Army and the Body of Christ</i> Roger J. Green and Jonathan S. Raymond	1
<i>The Salvation Army—Ecclesia?</i> Earl Robinson	5
<i>Towards a Sociology of Salvationism</i> Bruce Power	17
<i>With Basin and Towel: A Corps Officer's Approach to Pastoral Care</i> Ray Harris	35
<i>An Examination of Ecclesiastical Authority in The Salvation Army</i> Vern Jewett	47
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
<i>Who Are These Salvationists? An Analysis for the 21st Century</i> by Shaw Clifton, reviewed by Donald E. Burke	66
<i>Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology</i> by Randy L. Maddox, reviewed by Jonathan S. Raymond	71

The Salvation Army and the Body of Christ

This journal was launched with the first volume dedicated to the doctrine which most clearly defines us as a people of God—the doctrine of holiness. However, that doctrine is worked out within a living tradition which is rooted in the body of Christ, the Church. In this issue and the one which follows we believe that it is necessary to take a look at ecclesiology as it is grounded in Biblical theology, and as we have understood that doctrine historically, especially as The Christian Mission evolved into The Salvation Army and took on a distinct denominational identity separate from other denominations.

The theology of William and Catherine Booth which guided the founding of The Christian Mission and then the Army was clearly defined in many areas, and expanded to take into account a broadening theological vision as the ministry of the Booths and their supporters moved through the 1860s and 1870s into the 1880s. The theological course which they set for us still provides the basis for our doctrinal life together throughout the world. This bears witness to the sound and enduring biblical and Wesleyan framework which was established for our theology.

However, we confess that the Booths did not give enough attention to the doctrine of the Church. This can be explained partially by the fact that they were committed postmillennialists who believed that they were commissioned by God to win the entire world for Him and establish the glorious millennium here on earth before the Lord's return. With such a pervasive theology it is understandable why one would not take the same time in developing a long-range theology of Church life when there were other pressing needs.

Both William and Catherine were usually rather pragmatic especially when speaking about the Army. However, sometimes their language demonstrated that they did not have settled views as to the precise nature of the Army. One example will illustrate this. Although usually referring to his ministers as officers, there were times when William Booth referred to them as clergymen and clergywomen, thus confusing the issue as to whether his newly formed group was an Army for spiritual warfare, a movement for salvation purposes, or a denomination called out by God from Methodism and establishing itself as a separate entity with ministers (officers), laity (soldiers), churches (corps), a creedal statement (the doctrines), and even initially the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper (which were dropped finally and fully in 1883).

We believe that the time has come for a more thorough discussion about this important matter. The articles selected for this issue provide a biblical, historical, and pastoral framework for such discussion. It is necessary, first, to establish a biblical understanding of what we mean by ecclesiology. Following that, the categories of sect/Church also help us toward a better understanding of who we are as a Christian Church and a registered charity, and provide critical historical background. Other articles in this issue also reflect the purpose of this journal as expressed in the title—*Word & Deed*. This journal is intended to set forth sound theology as a basis for our pastoral ministry, which we believe fulfills the command of our Lord to “‘Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.’ This is the first and greatest commandment. And the second is like it: ‘Love your neighbor as yourself.’ All the law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments” (Matthew 22:37-40). And where more appropriate to pursue with vigor and determination our pastoral ministry than in the context of the words of our Lord and a doctrine of the Church?

Salvationists around the world, both formally and informally, both implicitly and explicitly, are attempting to understand themselves as part of the body of Christ, as part of the Church universal. It is important that they be able to express that, especially when attempting to explain the uniqueness of the Army to their Christian friends and neighbors, or desiring the kind of recognition as members of the body of Christ afforded to other Christians. Indeed, it is our hope that these two issues will promote wholesome discussion of The Salvation Army's ecclesiology, much as the first two issues engaged the topic of our doctrine of holiness. To this end, we invite the readership to write to us about their responses to the contents of the journal. We

will publish responses in the future as space permits in a new section of each issue entitled "Forum."

The first paragraph of our international mission statement gives formal witness to our relationship to the Church when it states that "The Salvation Army, an international movement, is an evangelical part of the universal Christian church." We stand with this mission statement, and believe that further articulation of what we mean when we say that we are part of the body of Christ will enhance this statement. We pray that this issue and the issue which follows will provide thoughtful and prayerful progress toward such a self-understanding, not for our sakes alone but for the sake of the Church universal and to the glory of God. Let us all pray to that end.

RJG

JSR

The Salvation Army—*Ecclesia*?

Earl Robinson

The Greek term, which is most often translated as "church" in English versions of the New Testament, is the term *ecclesia*. This article will seek to address two questions: What is *ecclesia*, and to what extent is The Salvation Army *ecclesia*?

David Watson in his book *I Believe in the Church* points out that our English word "church" is derived not from the Greek *ecclesia* but rather from the Byzantine Greek *kurike* meaning "belonging to the Lord". The same derivation relates to the German *kirche*, Swedish *kyrka*, Slav *kerkov* and Scottish *kirk*. Several European languages do however derive their word for "church" from the Greek *ecclesi*—the Italian *chiesa*, the Latin *ecclesia* and the Welsh *eghwys*.

Whatever the derivation of the translated word for church, the concept of the Christian Church is scripturally related to the Greek New Testament term *ecclesia* in its contemporary first century setting and with its Old Testament background. If therefore we would wish to understand to what extent The Salvation Army is *ecclesia*, we must first seek to grasp the Scriptural concept of that term.

Earl Robinson is a colonel in The Salvation Army presently serving as the International Secretary for External Relations at International Headquarters. This paper was first presented as an introduction to the Catherine Booth Bible College symposium on "Salvation Army Ecclesiology," May 1987. The papers which follow, although revised and brought up-to-date, were originally presented at that symposium.

The Scriptural Concept of Ecclesia

Old Testament Background

In the Greek Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, the Hebrew word *qahal* is frequently translated *ecclesia* with the basic meaning of assembly. The word *qahal* is derived from the root *qal* which means "to call", with the term referring to those called to assemble together for a specific purpose. That purpose may be secular or political as in 2 Chronicles 6:3: "While the whole assembly of Israel (*qahal* Israel) was standing there, the king turned around and blessed them." The term may even be used of an "assembly of evildoers" as in Psalm 26:5. More often however, it is used of the people or nation assembled to hear the word of the Lord, as on the day the Israelites were gathered to hear the commandments of the Lord on Mount Sinai, with that day being referred to as the "day of assembly" (*yom qahal*-Deut. 9:10). *Qahal* is therefore the assembly or congregation of the Lord (*qahal Yahweh*-Deut. 23:2), gathered together to offer sacrifices to Him (Lev. 4:14), to worship Him (Ps. 107:32), to hear His word (Deut. 5:22).

The Septuagint Version uses *synagoge* rather than *ecclesia* to translate *qahal* in Leviticus 4:14 and Deuteronomy 5:22. This in itself may be significant, suggesting that the Jewish synagogue is the Old Testament Church or the forerunner leading to fulfillment in the New Testament Church. T.F. Torrance comments on this aspect of the use of *qahal* in the Old Testament in an article in the *Interpretation* journal on "The Israel of God":

Qahal denotes the Old Testament church actively engaged in God's purpose of revelation and salvation, that is, caught up in the mighty events whereby God intervenes redemptively in history, and involved in the forward thrust of the covenant toward final and universal fulfillment. *Qahal* is the community expecting eschatological redemption. In that sense it is appropriated in the New Testament to denote the community in which the covenant promises of God to Israel are fulfilled in Jesus Christ and in the pouring out of His Spirit. Far from being an offshoot of Israel, the Christian church is Israel gathered up in Jesus Christ who recapitulates in himself the historic-redemptive service of Israel and who, after fulfilling and transcending all its hopes, launches it out again in its servant-mission laden with the Word of reconciliation for all mankind.²

David Watson also suggests that the *qahal* or congregation or assembly of Israel is the Old Testament shadow of the New Testament Church and expands on particu-

lar aspects of God's summoning the congregation of Israel.³ The people of Israel were God's "called out" ones (Hos. 11:1ff) just as the Church of Christ is called out of the darkness of sin to be God's people (1 Pet. 2:9). They were "called for" a special relationship with Him, "called together" into a new community to experience God's miraculous power with each other, "called to" a new purpose as a people on the move towards the land of promise. "The church," as Watson quotes Leslie Newbigin, "is the pilgrim people of God. It is on the move in hastening to the ends of the earth to beseech all men to be reconciled to God, hastening to the end of time to meet its Lord who will gather all men in one."⁴

Gentile Setting

The term *ecclesia* also has a significant Gentile or Greek setting which adds to our understanding of its New Testament usage. The Greek term *ecclesia* derives from *ek* meaning "out of," and *kalein* meaning "to call," so that literally it means "the called out ones" or those called to an assembly, a meaning similar to that of the Old Testament Hebrew *qahal*.

Specifically in the secular Gentile setting, *ecclesia* referred first of all to the assembly of an array for battle,⁵ and later to the governing body of Greek cities consisting of all citizens who had not lost their civic rights. William Barclay indicates that in Athens the citizens or *ecclesia* met ten times in the year, and when they were due to meet, a herald would announce the meeting as an invitation for attendance and participation. He further points to two other items of interest. First, all of the meetings of the assembly began with prayer and sacrifice. And second, it was a true democracy where everyone had an equal right and duty to take part in directing the policy of the city.⁶ The *ecclētoi* or "called out ones" were therefore summoned by a herald to gather at an appointed place to transact the business of the cities and remedy any difficulties which may have been encountered. There is a reference to this secular legal assembly in Acts 19:32, 39-41, having to do with those who were pressing charges against Christians at Ephesus because they were deemed to be responsible for the loss of the silversmith business for those who made idols.

As applied to the New Testament Church, this Greek Gentile background to the term *ecclesia* may suggest the coming together of those who hear and respond to the invitation of the Herald, the invitation of God given in Jesus Christ. They are called out of the world, but they are also a company of God's people who are concerned for that world and who bathe that concern with prayer and self-sacrifice to bring solu-

tions to its problems.

The above of course is an exposition of the term in retrospect, since there is no documentation which would suggest that the early Church deliberately borrowed the term from the Gentiles and gave it this new meaning. The background to the word as used in the Christian community is more likely that derived from the Septuagint Old Testament use of *ecclesia* already referred to. The additional Greek Gentile perspective however adds to our understanding of the content of the term.

New Testament Usage

The New Testament writers chose *ecclesia* rather than *synagogue* to describe the new community of believers. Where the Greek word *synagogue* is used it usually refers to the Jewish building or congregation. *Ecclesia* on the other hand almost exclusively refers to the Christian Church (Acts 19:32, 39,41 being exceptions in which *ecclesia* is used of civil assemblies).

a) Varying Designations for *Ecclesia*

L. Berkhof in his text on *Systematic Theology* suggests the five most important uses of the term *ecclesia* in the New Testament.⁷

It refers most frequently to the local church, whether or not it is gathered for worship, much as we use the term today to refer to a community of believers who generally focus their programs in one location. Galatians 1:2 for example salutes "the churches in Galatia."

It also refers to what we today think of as a "house church," a group of believers who meet in a home for worship and study and prayer. 1 Corinthians 16:9 speaks of the church that meets at the house of Priscilla and Aquila. This is the church of two or three or more persons gathered for worship in the name of Jesus (Matt. 18:20).

A third usage is in Acts 9:31 where it occurs in the singular to denote the church throughout Judea, Galilee and Samaria. This apparently suggests a grouping of separate congregations which form a type of organizational or geographical unity. The parallel with a church as a denomination was certainly not in the mind of the New Testament writers, but there is some correspondence as well to the present day denomination made up of individual churches which form a unified grouping.

Fourthly, the word is used of the Church catholic or Church universal, the whole body of Christ throughout the world. In 1 Corinthians 12 for example when Paul speaks of the body of Christ he speaks of God appointing apostles and prophets "in the church" (1 Cor. 12:28).

And fifthly, Berkhof uses the term to signify the Church militant on earth and the Church triumphant in heaven, all who are united in Christ. This use is seen in the doxology of Ephesians 3:21: "to him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus throughout all generations, for ever and ever!"

Ecclesia can therefore refer to the Church at large or even a house church as representative of the total Christian community. The theology text, *God, Man and Salvation*, emphasizes this concept in referring to 1 Corinthians 1:2, "the church of God which is at Corinth:"

The church is not the sum of all the congregations. Each community, even a house church, represents the total community, the Church ... The Church in Corinth is not part of the community of God; rather it is the Church of God ... In Christ, there could be only one people of God, one *ecclesia*. Though expressed in local fellowships of believers, the Church remained always and simply "the Church of God."⁸

b) Other Descriptions of the Church

Descriptions of the Church of Jesus Christ other than *ecclesia* add to an understanding of the concept of the Church in the New Testament. It is the "body of Christ" (Eph. 1:23), pointing to its unity and community and to its being the manifestation of the Christ in the world of today, just as Christ revealed Himself in physical bodily form in the first century.

It is the "temple of the Holy Spirit" (1 Cor. 3:16), indwelt and directed and empowered by the Spirit of God within the Church as a whole and within its members individually (1 Cor. 6:19).

It is the bride whom Christ loved and for whom He gave His life that she might be made holy (Eph. 5: 25-27, 32).

It is the "pillar and foundation of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15), and as such defends the truth of God over against the enemies of that truth.

It is a spiritual house made up of living stones (1 Pet. 2:4-5), "a chosen people, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people belonging to God ... called out of darkness into his wonderful light" (1 Pet. 2:9).

The Salvation Army as Ecclesia

The question then remains: "To what extent is The Salvation Army *ecclesia*?" Could there be such a theological entity as a Salvation Army ecclesiology, or is the

term "The Salvation Army" incompatible with the term *ecclesiology*?

Our lack of precision in responding to this question may be considered to some extent to be part of our Wesleyan heritage. David Smith in *A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology* suggests that some contemporary Methodists question whether there is a Methodist ecclesiology.⁹ He points out that Wesley did not think of his followers as being incorporated into a separate church but rather forming a group of societies within the Anglican Church, an "ecclesiola in ecclesia, a little church within the church."¹⁰

Historical Context

That same ambiguity existed in the early days of The Salvation Army, and to some extent exists still.

General Clarence Wiseman in an article "Are we a Church?" refers to our founding as the East London Revival Mission and quotes the founder, William Booth, as saying, even after the change of name to The Salvation Army in 1878, "It was not my intention to create another sect ... we are not a church. We are an Army—an Army of Salvation."¹¹

At the 1904 International Congress in London, England, William Booth declared however, "The Army is part of the living Church of God—a great instrument of war in the world, engaged in deadly conflict with sin and fiends."¹²

The Second General of The Salvation Army, Bramwell Booth, followed up the founder's assertion in his book, *Echoes and Memories*:

There is one Church. Just as there was only one people of Israel, no matter how widely scattered, so there is only one spiritual Israel ... Of this, the Great Church of the Living God, we claim, and have ever claimed, that we of The Salvation Army are an integral part and element—a living fruit-bearing branch in the True Vine ... In this, we humbly but firmly claim that we are in no way inferior, either to the saints who have gone before, or—though remaining separate from them, even as one branch in the Vine is separate from another—to the saints of the present. We, no less than they, are called and chosen to sanctification of the Spirit and to the inheritance of eternal life. And our officers are, equally with them, ministers in the Church of God having received diversities of gifts, but the one Spirit—endowed by His Grace, assured of His guidance, confirmed by His word, and commissioned by the Holy Ghost to represent Him to the whole world.¹³

In spite of those declarations there was a remaining lack of clarity as to the relationship of The Salvation Army to the concept of church. General Albert Orsborn

said repeatedly during his office from 1946–1954, “We are not a church—we are a permanent mission to the unconverted.”¹⁴ *The Officer* magazine continued with articles such as that of Commissioner Hubert R. Scotney in 1969, “The Salvation Army is a Christian Mission,”¹⁵ although that article did not deny The Salvation Army was a Church but rather emphasized its nature as a “community of Christians motivated by a sense of mission.”¹⁶

In 1976 however, General Clarence Wiseman summarized his position as the international leader of The Salvation Army as follows:

It appears ... that we are a permanent mission to the unconverted and a caring social service movement; in some places we assume the features of a religious order. These various aspects exist within the God-given shape of the Army, the worldwide Army of Salvation! Can all these elements be subsumed under the generic designation “church”? With a few exceptions, I think most authorities would agree with us that the Army is part of the living Church of God—the Body of Christ. I believe also the Army can be truthfully described as a “church” in the more circumscribed, denominational sense of the word ... The Salvation Army is one of those churches whose members, born again of the Holy Spirit and obedient to the heavenly vision, constitute the great Church of God ... The precious companies of redeemed soldiers of God gathered together in Salvation Army corps give credence to the claim that we are both a church and a part of the universal Church.¹⁷

The Salvation Army’s annual Year book continues that declaration with the 1999 issue responding to the question, “What is The Salvation Army?” with the assertion, “The Salvation Army is an integral part of the Christian Church, although distinctive in government and practice.”¹⁸

Contemporary Images

The confusion as to whether or not The Salvation Army is a church still persists, particularly in the public’s perception of our movement, and even within the movement itself.

In pursuing studies towards a Doctor of Ministry degree at Fuller Theological Seminary in Pasadena, California, I was required to defend my thesis topic in front of my fellow students and the head of the theological program of the Doctor of Ministry program. The thesis topic was “Salvation Army Church Life in Canada—A Design for Renewal and Growth.” When I had concluded my verbal presentation, the faculty advisor, Dr. Ray Anderson, remarked, “But you are speaking of The Salvation Army as if it were a church!” “Yes, I replied, it is a church.” “Surely not a

church in the sense that it has worship services and the traditional components of a church, for I have not seen a place like that in The Salvation Army here," Dr. Anderson retorted. I then told this highly respected and knowledgeable Christian theologian that there was such a place of worship within a mile of Fuller Theological Seminary at Pasadena Tabernacle! I found that the majority in the class shared Dr. Anderson's perception that The Salvation Army was a social service agency rather than a church. And these were all ministers of churches in North America. The non-churchgoing person may be even more confused about the nature of our movement, with the social services image more predominant in their thinking than that of a religious organization.

Some brothers and sisters in Christ would question our authenticity as a church because of our nonobservance of the sacraments. Such a discussion took place at a theological seminary I attended in Halifax Nova Scotia before being a Salvation Army officer. I learned from a professor that there was dissension in one of the classes as to whether a person who had not been baptized with water could be considered a Christian. Some of the United Church of Canada candidates for the ministry in that class were suggesting that such was not possible, to which the theology professor asked, "What do you say then about Earl Robinson?" I am not sure that all members of the class would be convinced by that comment to regard The Salvation Army as a Christian church whose members are all bona fide Christians. The question did however cause some discussion as to whether observance of the sacraments is the primary test of church authenticity.

Within The Salvation Army itself there is discussion as to whether it is legitimate to call our corps community churches. In some territories of The Salvation Army the term "Church Growth" has been replaced by "Corps Growth" because of similar concerns. And I have heard Salvationists say, "But we are more than a church. We are an Army!" The assumption is that there is a "more than" to the ideal of our Lord for His church, His Body, on earth.

Scriptural Parallels

Again then we ask, "To what extent can The Salvation Army be considered 'church,'—*ecclesia*?" Is it more than *ecclesia*? Is it *ecclesia* at all?

These questions relate to one essential issue: is The Salvation Army *ecclesia* in the New Testament sense of that word with its Old Testament and Greek Gentile backgrounds? And to that question I would review details of the first section of this

paper and state the following:

The Salvation Army is and will be *ecclesia* as it—

- (i) is the people of God assembled to hear the Word of the Lord, to offer sacrifices unto Him, and to worship Him;
- (ii) is actively engaged in God's purposes of revelation and salvation;
- (iii) is a community in which the covenant promises of God to Israel are fulfilled in Jesus Christ and in the pouring out of His Spirit;
- (iv) is called out of the darkness of sin to be God's people;
- (v) is called for a special relationship with God in Christ;
- (vi) is called together into a new community of Christian love and fellowship to experience God's miraculous power with each other;
- (vii) is called to a new purpose as a people of God on the move towards the land of promise, the heavenly city, the New Jerusalem;
- (viii) is hastening to the ends of the earth to beseech all to be reconciled to God in the expectation of hastening to the end of time to meet her Lord;
- (ix) is an army called to battle against the forces of evil;
- (x) hears and responds to the invitation of God given in Jesus Christ to be called out of the world as a company of God's people who are concerned for the world, and who bathe that concern with prayer and self-sacrifice to bring solutions to its problems;
- (xi) is a local congregation set apart as a community of believers in Christ;
- (xii) is a group of believers who meet in homes for worship and study and prayer in the name of Jesus;
- (xiii) is a grouping of separate congregations which form an organizational or geographical unity;
- (xiv) is an integral part of the Church universal, the whole body of Christ throughout the world;
- (xv) is part of the Church militant on earth leading to the Church triumphant in heaven;
- (xvi) is the body of Christ, united in Christian community to manifest Christ in the world today;
- (xvii) is the temple of the Holy Spirit, indwelt and directed and empowered by the Spirit of God;
- (xviii) is the bride of Christ whom Christ loved and for whom He gave His life to make her holy;

(xix) is the pillar and foundation of the truth, defending the truth of God in matters such as moral decision making over against enemies of that truth;

(xx) is a spiritual house made up of living stones who are God's chosen and holy and royal priesthood, belonging to Him through having been brought from darkness to God's marvelous light.

Conclusion

Are we a people of God with those qualities? If we have not reached the ideal of every scriptural parallel, are we on the move towards those ideals? If so, The Salvation Army is *ecclesia*, the church of God. If so, there is a Salvation Army ecclesiology that is being shaped by God's Word. And that includes our being an Army of Salvation and a permanent mission to the unconverted.

It even includes our being a social services agency. That characteristic of our movement is part of manifesting Christ in the world of today and allowing the Church to work towards the advancement of the kingdom of God by giving the hungry something to eat, giving the thirsty something to drink, inviting the stranger in, providing clothing to those who need clothing, looking after the sick, visiting the prisoner,¹⁹ preaching good news to the poor, proclaiming freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, releasing the oppressed.²⁰ Peter Wagner calls this the cultural mandate of the Church of Christ:

Distribution of wealth, the balance of nature, marriage and the family, human government, keeping the peace, cultural integrity, liberation of the oppressed—these and other global responsibilities rightly fall within the cultural mandate. Since it is God's will that the human race live in *shalom*, those among them who have been born again into the kingdom and who purport to live under the Lordship of Jesus Christ are required to live lives that will provide *shalom* to the greatest extent possible.²¹

Ecclesia—called out of the power of sin to be the people of God communicating the message and power of God to a needy world. That is the Church of Jesus Christ. That is The Salvation Army!

'Tis the Army of salvation
 From the power of sin set free,
 Saved from fear and condemnation,
 Serving God with liberty.

'Tis the Army of salvation,
'Tis the Army of the Lord;
On to conquer every nation
With a mighty two-edged sword. ²²

Notes

1. David Watson, *I Believe in the Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978), p. 65.
2. T. F. Torrance, "The Israel of God", *Interpretation*, vol.10, no. 3 (July 1956), p. 306.
3. David Watson, *I Believe in the Church* pp. 66-72.
4. Leslic Newbigin, *The Household of God* (SCM Press, 1953), p. 25, as quoted by David Watson in *I Believe in the Church*, p. 74.
5. Colin Brown, ed., *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975-1978), 1: 291.
6. William Barclay, *A New Testament Wordbook* (London: SCM Press, 1955), p. 34.
7. L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), pp. 556-557.
8. W. T. Purkiser, Richard S. Taylor, Willard H Taylor, *God, Man and Salvation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1977), pp. 568-569.
9. David L Smith, "Ecclesiology: The Church, God's Redeemed People," in Charles W Carter, editor, *A Contemporary Wesleyan Theology*, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1983), 2:588.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 589
11. General Clarence Wiseman, "Are We a Church?", *The Officer*, Vol. XXVII, No. 10 (London: The Salvation Army International Headquarters, 1976), p. 435.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 436
13. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes and Memories*, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925), pp. 79 and 82.
14. General Clarence Wiseman, "Are We a Church?", p. 437.
15. *The Officer* (London: The Salvation Army International Headquarters, 1969), p. 452.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 454
17. General Clarence Wiseman, "Are we a Church?", pp. 438,439,441.
18. *The Salvation Army Year Book*, (London: The International Headquarters of The Salvation Army, 1998), p. 19.
19. Matthew 25:35-36
20. Luke 4:18
21. C. Peter Wagner, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel*, (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1981), p. 13.
22. *The Song Book of The Salvation Army*, (London: Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, Ltd., 1953), Song 707, verse 4 and chorus.

Towards a Sociology of Salvationism

Bruce Power

What kind of organization is The Salvation Army? When such a question is posed a variety of responses are elicited, whether the venue be a local corps context, an officers' gathering, a sociological forum, the local bar, or some other situation. It would seem everywhere one can find an opinion. What the Army "is" appears often to be constructed by experiences of the organization and the resultant perceptions. While this may at times be aggravating it is not particularly surprising. The Salvation Army in its multiform manifestations encounters people in many contexts. Yet, the question remains vexing to we Salvationists, who now, several generations removed from the founders of the movement, want to define our organizational and sociological parameters in a more cohesive and thoughtful manner. This is not to say that The Salvation Army has in any way been lacking in organizational capabilities, or that there is not a system of operations in place.¹ Nor would I suggest that there is no organizational principle which guides the daily manifestations of Army service throughout the world. Organization and procedures are certainly defined. What has been lacking is a formalized understanding of Salvation Army ecclesiology, and as an outgrowth of that conception, a sociological paradigm which the organization might utilize in its endeavors. Our operational procedures have been characterized more by a "sense" of what needed to be done than on a formal sociological construct. We have seen ourselves as "practitioners," not theoreticians.² The

Bruce Power is a Major in The Salvation Army serving on the staff of the Collega For Officer Training in Toronto, Ontario, Canada and Adjunct Professor of William and Catherine Booth College.

Army began as a pragmatic organization, formed because it was needed, and has remained described as such until the present. "With heart to God and hand to man," Salvationists have been more concerned with doing and being than describing or analyzing.³ Yet, to develop an ecclesiology we must now attempt to describe how we understand ourselves as part of the Church, and analyze how we arrive at such a model.

Salvationists have always argued that they are a part of the Church in a theological sense: "Of this, the Great Church of the Living God, we claim, and ever have claimed, that we of The Salvation Army are an integral part and element of a living fruitbearing branch in the True Vine."⁴

Along with this perception went the understanding that the Army was not another addition to the plethora of religious dissenters, even though its roots were in dissent. From the beginning this viewpoint was not acceptable to Army leadership. Yet, while there has been a desire not to be understood or to conceive of itself as merely a sect, or just another church or denomination, self definition has proved more difficult. Salvationists have typically avoided sociological labels, utilizing alternative terminology. Army literature avoids using the terms sect, church, or denomination in the sociological sense and employs terms such as "movement," "army," and "organization." The definition provided by Maud Booth is typical:

There are sects and denominations enough. This is an Army, a band of aggressive men and women warriors, whose work of saving and reclaiming the world must be done on entirely new lines to obtain the results, without which they would not dare to consider their work a success. These denominations have tried and have repeatedly confessed that they have failed in gaining the desired result, which has very often been not from want of good intentions, but from inefficacy of measures.⁵

Bramwell Booth defines the government of the Army without utilizing ecclesiological terminology when he declares:

We believe that our system for extending the knowledge and power of His gospel, and of nurturing and governing the believing people gathered into our ranks, is as truly and fully in harmony with the spirit set forth and the principles laid down by Jesus Christ and His apostles as those which have been adopted by our brethren of other times or other folds.⁶

This established identification of the Army with the theological understanding of the term "church" has thus been with us from the beginning. Perhaps the best recent summary of this viewpoint is that of Frederick Coutts:

Any definition of the Church must, therefore, be a New Testament definition where it is set out not in terms of ecclesiastical structure but of a spiritual relationship. Members of the Church are those who are "incorporate in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 1:1, NEB). This is the one thing needful. The Church is the whole of the worshipping, witnessing Christian community throughout the centuries into whatever groupings, large or small, accepted or persecuted, wealthy or poor, her members may have been structured in the past or are governed in the present.

What makes the people of God one people is not any form of organization, however venerable or however authoritative, but the grace of the one God and Father of all, the presence of the only Saviour, and the outworking of the one Spirit in the life of each believer.⁷

Thus a sharp distinction between theological and sociological usages of the term "church" has been made and maintained by the organization. While we have been comfortable applying the term to ourselves theologically, we have avoided such a sociological designation. The issue has been especially confused since the term utilized means different things in different contexts. Clarence Wiseman appears to have reflected on this very issue:

It appears, in the light of all that I have said, that we are a permanent mission to the unconverted and a caring social service movement; in some places we assume the features of a religious order. These various aspects exist within the God-given shape of an Army, the worldwide Army of Salvation! Can all these elements be subsumed under the generic designation church?

With a few exceptions, I think most authorities would agree with us that the Army is part of the living Church of God—the Body of Christ. I believe also the Army can be truthfully described as a "church" in the more circumscribed, denominational sense of the word.⁸

Although Wiseman applies the term "denomination" to the Army we are still confronted with a struggle to get past a generic term. In all of this we can sense a desire to identify what we are as well as to identify how the diverse elements which comprise The Salvation Army fit together. We have defined theologically and experientially⁹ that we are a "church," in the broadest sense of the term, while at the same time we have denied our being confined to such a definition when applied sociologically. The organization has quite effectively side stepped the sociological models until recent years. As sociologists and Salvationists have applied models to the organization, a growing discomfort with the lack of an ecclesiological statement has run in tandem with a sense of the inadequacy of the ideal types applied to the organization to describe the reality Salvationists know. Both "church" type and "sect"

type appear overly narrow for our purposes. It is the contention of this writer that the inadequacy of a standard sociological typology to provide a workable paradigm for the self-understanding of the movement compels us to attempt the development of a model which will function. We will begin by examining the purpose and function of ideal types, examining the traditional sociological models which have been applied to the Army. Our next task will be to outline a self-understanding of Army government. Finally, we will look at a new model.

Ideal types

Before we look at the ideal types applied to The Salvation Army we need to review the use and purpose of these paradigms. Ideal types are constructs which are proposed by historians and sociologists, and have no existence in reality, but exist only as "pure types." Max Weber conceptualized this system of looking at and analyzing reality to describe a process he observed in various forms of research.¹⁰ "The ideal type is thus the sum total of concepts which the specialist in the human sciences constructs purely for purposes of research."¹¹

While such models cannot completely represent reality, "because reality is infinite" and no model can "wholly reproduce the utter diversity of particular phenomena," the ideal type is useful for analysis of societies.¹² The intent then of utilizing a paradigm is that it clarifies and provides a structure for the realities we observe. For our purposes then, the ideal type we apply to The Salvation Army should enhance our understanding of the organization. The model should add clarity to our conceptualization of the movement.

The Current Models

The Salvation Army has most often been termed a "sect" by sociologists.¹³ Usually it is termed a "conversionist" sect, although a case could be made for its manifestation as a "holiness" sect as well.¹⁴ "Sects are ideological movements having as their explicit and declared aim the maintenance, and perhaps even the propagation of certain ideological positions."¹⁵

Roland Robertson has argued that the Army is an "established sect." His argument is that a transition from sect to denomination has only superficially taken place.¹⁶ While Robertson's work is perceptive and profitable in many ways, his adherence to the model of the established sect limits the usefulness of his analysis for understanding Salvationism. Robertson isolates three groupings within the modern Salvation

Army:

Three main strands of orientation may be isolated in contemporary Salvationism; ... Firstly, there is the old guard, which wishes to retain the traditional features of Salvationism, at whatever cost to its viability. This orientation to Salvationism is associational and communal, and the main concern is with the preservation of a familiar and total way of life. It is more or less unambiguously sectarian. Secondly, there are the acceptors, who wish to retain the basic outlines of Salvationism, but who are imbued with a pragmatic and somewhat neutral attitude to the wider society; this constitutes the least ambiguous denominational strand in contemporary Salvationism ... The final orientation is represented by the modernists, who are mainly concerned to revitalize the Army and reshape its identity in the context of modern social conditions ... In some respects this is a denominational tendency ...

At present there is evidence of a considerable number of strains within the Army, although most of them appear to be latent rather than manifest. One can find old-style fundamentalist Salvationism being practised in one locality, and an almost Free Church, indeed partly Anglican, version of Christianity advocated in another. Such variation makes apparent the complexities involved in any sociological analysis of The Salvation Army, for whilst it is most appropriate to regard the movement as an established sect, it is also in some respects an order within Anglicanism—this is certainly how some of the acceptors tend to see it.¹⁷

While this model is helpful in understanding certain aspects of Salvationism, there are serious problems with this analysis. Much of his argument is based on "official" positions, and on British examples.¹⁸ The latter point raises the question of the adequacy of all such parochial research in analyzing an international organization.

Our "persistence in sectarianism" amounts to this: conversion is still regarded as the qualification for membership, the insistence on higher than conventional ethics has been maintained, full commitment to the work is expected of Salvationists, the line between living religion and the world has not been altogether blurred, and so forth.¹⁹

A greater concern, however, is the fact that his definition of three "strands" within the modern Salvation Army defy his conclusions. Robertson describes the Army as having both sectarian and denominational polarities within its structure, and then is satisfied with the term "established sect" to categorize the whole.

Denomination

The term "denomination" has become the standard descriptive term for Ameri-

can religious organizations,²⁰ however, this type of term is not particularly helpful for analysis of the Army as a functional reality. While some Salvationists would find calling ourselves a denomination attractive, the term means little in terms of an ecclesiological or sociological conception of function and practice. As a label it appears to acknowledge that we are accepted and understood as "one of the churches in the community,"²¹ and hence, are established in society, but the term is far too generic to contain much specificity beyond that. The "denomination" has in many ways replaced the "church type" in sociological analysis, picking up many of the attributes that were characteristic of the national churches in the past.²²

Moyles argues in *The Blood and Fire in Canada* that the Army began as a sect and has become a denomination.²³ While much that Moyles points out is helpful, it appears to me that Moyles is overly concerned with making data "fit" the ideal type, and consequently to establish the Army as a "denomination" and as a "church" in the sociological sense of the term.²⁴ He argues that most new converts are middle-class, and that only a very few have entered from the social wing.²⁵ While these statements would represent some corps do they represent all? What of more "sectarian" centers? Furthermore, this conclusion is reached at the expense of the entire social "wing" of the organization. How can we consider this to be legitimate?²⁶ According to Moyles: "The corps has become just another residential church; its low-key evangelistic outreach is concentrated on its immediate neighborhood and directed towards inviting other suburbanites to its [activities]."²⁷ And while he notes that in Canada two-thirds of officer personnel are in noncorps work, he still does not address their function.²⁸ In spite of this he concludes:

The Army conforms to a majority of those criteria which prompt sociologists and church historians to label religious organizations "churches." Many Salvationists, in fact, without realizing the full significance of the term, like to think of their Army as a church. Ironically, Army officials, if they sincerely subscribe to their own formalized position, would prefer the organization to be much more sectarian than it is.²⁹

Perhaps it would be even more correct to say that they would like the two aspects of the one Army to be more integrated.³⁰

Self-understanding

Early definitions of The Salvation Army utilize the terms movement, organization, mission and Army, as we have seen, to describe the group structure. Theologi-

cally and experientially we have identified ourselves as a church, while sociologically we have avoided all typical designations. Also, we often find descriptions of function as a sort of definition:

We are a Salvation people—this is our speciality—getting saved and keeping saved, and then getting somebody else saved, and then getting saved ourselves more and more, until Full Salvation on earth makes the heaven within, which is finally perfected by the Full Salvation without, on the other side of the River.³¹

The following material appears to provide the basis for a “Salvationist” understanding of the organization’s origins:

The F[ield] O[fficer] should instruct his Soldiers in the history of The Army. He should tell them how it originated; that it was commenced by the General, in the year 1865. While conducting meetings in the East of London, he was led to compassionate the multitudes he saw around him, uncared for by any Religious Agency. The great mass of the population attended neither church nor chapel, but spent their Sabbaths in idleness, or business, or revelry; Drink, Sin, and the Devil having it all their own way. As the General looked upon these neglected, perishing crowds, the question occurred to him, “Cannot they be reached with Salvation?” He thought that there must be some method of carrying the truth home to them, and he decided to devote himself to the discovery and adoption of such methods as would be likely to bring these outcast classes to God. This decision, put in practice, and persevered in, resulted in the formation of The Salvation Army.³²

Along with this narrative is placed a statement concerning the “object” of the Army:

Every soldier should understand that the object of the Army is to induce all men to submit to God, embrace the salvation provided for them in Christ, obey God’s laws, and spend their lives in loving service for those about them, in order that they, too, may possess God’s favor both here and hereafter.³³

The closest any document has to an enunciation of an ecclesiological position that I have discovered is the statement which we will examine next. This elaboration of Salvation Army government has been revised several times. The version which I will quote in full is from 1927. This version slightly updates the language of earlier editions, and provides a basis for later redactions, while representing a positional statement which endured in almost pristine condition for fifty years.³⁴

1. Every Recruit and Soldier should have some knowledge of the manner in which The Army is governed. This will be the best method of preserving our Soldiers from the evil effects of misrepresentation and falsehood.³⁵

2. No pattern for the government of the Kingdom of Christ on earth is authoritatively laid down in the New Testament. Those who think otherwise, disagree seriously as to what that particular form of government is. The members of one denomination say that such form of government is of one kind, and the members of another say that it is something altogether different.

3. But even if it could be shown what the particular form of government practised by the early Christians was, it would still not mean that, because the Apostles and first converts to Christianity followed certain customs in the management of their religious assemblies, we are under Divine obligation to adopt the same.

4. But though a model government was not originated by God, and made binding upon His people through all the following ages, He has caused certain great principles to be plainly described in the Bible as fundamental to every form of government which has His approbation.

5. The government and practice of The Army is not only not opposed to these principles, but is in perfect harmony with them.

6. The government of The Army actually presents in its main features a strong resemblance to the government of the Jewish Church and nation, which we know was originated by God Himself: and in many features it presents a striking likeness to the system followed in the early Christian churches, as far as we know from New Testament and ancient history.

7. Certainly there is enough to prove that Paul was—in fact, if not in name—the General of The Salvation Army of that day, exercising a similar authority over the churches established by him to that exercised by the Head of The Salvation Army of today.³⁶

8. The government of The Army is also very much like the government of the family, where the father is the head, and his directions are the laws. This plan is not only of God's own making, but it has His special endorsement in His Word, which says: "Honour thy father and thy mother" (Eph. 6:2).³⁷

9. The government of the Army was not fashioned after any prepared plan, or copied from the pattern of any other organization, whether ancient or modern. The Founder of the Movement was guided from time to time by such light as he could obtain from:

- a) The principles and practices laid down in the Bible.
- b) The methods adopted by other religious leaders in the past.
- c) The daily teachings of Providence.
- d) The direct leading of the Holy Spirit.³⁸

10. Without any intention or imitation on the part of its' leaders, in the first

instance, The Army government has come to resemble that form of human government which has been proved to be best adapted for preserving order and ensuring aggression. All who have any practical acquaintance with the management of men, know that a military form of government is more prompt, forcible, and energetic than any other.³⁹

11. The Army form of government is also compatible with the largest amount of personal freedom, in combination with the greatest measure of strength. There is in The Army the fullest liberty to be good and to do good.⁴⁰ No religious organization ever existed on the face of the earth which combined to so large an extent the qualities of strength and freedom.

12. The government of The Army gives the best and most capable Soldiers opportunities of reaching positions of usefulness and power. To rise in The Army, a Soldier has only to prove himself proportionately good and capable. It is really the administration of government by the wisest and best.⁴¹

13. One of the essential principles of the system is its ability to adapt itself to all classes, characters, and conditions of men.

14. If the value and utility of a government be proved by its success in attaining the ends for which it is instituted, the unprecedented successes which have attended the career of The Army, taken alone, establish its claim to be considered not only wise and useful, but Divine.⁴²

The main points raised in the variants of this statement of Salvation Army government can be summarized as:

1. The Salvation Army is theologically a part of the Church, in the broader New Testament sense of the term.
2. Salvation remains a focal point of our lives and service.
3. The "Army" structure is intended to mobilize us for God.
4. Within the structure adaptability and freedom of expression remain key concepts.⁴³

Need for a new model

We have seen that while ideal types are not to be found in reality, their purpose is to help us more readily comprehend and systematize the world we are examining. The strengths and weaknesses of the types which have been used to categorize the Army have been outlined, as has the self-perception of the organization which appears in published forms. The models examined are helpful in part, yet remain inadequate to describe the whole. Reflecting on Robertson's paper, Tor Wahlstrom com-

mented: "It is Ariston's growing suspicion that the Army is most fittingly to be regarded, not as a church nor as a sect or anything else along that sociological dimension, but as an order within the Church."⁴⁴

The sense of the inadequacy of the paradigm supplied by Robertson is apparent in this comment.⁴⁵ Yet, can we define an "ideal type" which more adequately represents such diversity? I believe we can. In order to do this we need to realize that The Salvation Army in its diversity maintains and encourages both sectarian and denominational responses to religious life. This is a very positive factor in terms of ministry potential and organizational structure, if we utilize the forms to their fullest potential. Parallels to this structure can be seen most readily in medieval Catholicism which was structurally able to balance and maximize these tensions. Troeltsch maintains that the basis of this balance between church type and sect type was based on the five major factors.⁴⁶ These compare significantly to Salvationism. The correlations are as follows:

1. The social philosophy of both institutions emphasize the convergence of sacred and secular.
2. Both maintain a centralized system of establishing Church law and policy.
3. The Catholic Church maintains an internationalism which relies heavily on the fact that Catholicism is responsible for a unity of Western thought. The Salvation Army, while not responsible for such a phenomenon, utilizes fully the fact of such in its international functions.
4. The two institutions both allow national individuality, although the church is international.
5. A personal devotional life conducted in various manners can be absorbed under the umbrella of church policy.

These two religious responses are held together by centralized power, bureaucratic systems, and individual freedom.⁴⁷ While national identity and local diversity are tolerated and encouraged, limits are placed on real power by the Constitution of the Army.⁴⁸ Thus, conflicts within the organization can ultimately be resolved from above when dialogue fails. The loose outline of doctrine⁴⁹ and practice provides a structure allowing great diversity of expression, but encouraging unity of purpose.⁵⁰ Thus, the model I would propose would hold both sect and church type together within the one organization, through the power structures outlined. We might graph it simply as follows:

authority
sect.....church

Applications of this model

What does a new model which holds in tension denominational models with various forms of sectarian responses accomplish? I would like to suggest several positive aspects of the utilization of such a paradigm.

1) Such a model would prove useful to facilitate our understanding of various perspectives of religious behavior within Salvationism.

2) The classification into rough types of both social service and corps expressions of the Army would allow us to begin to understand the religious dynamic which is functioning in a particular context.

3) Classification of personnel, in terms of spiritual gifts, abilities, and religious "style" could enable more effective human resource management.

4) Such classification could allow for the "marriage" of styles when appointments are under consideration.

5) The model would allow the plotting of individual, congregational and institutional "points" on a continuum of practice.

6) Such an ability to analyze would assist us in maintaining the tension between sectarian and denominational approaches to Salvationism in creative and functional ways. This would be useful in avoiding both forms of extremism, and maintaining a creative balance.

7) Such a model would also allow us to gradually shift extremist positions back towards a more centralized position, by careful planning and personnel management.

8) Sectarianism provides an important balance to denominationalism by constantly recalling us to fundamentals. Various forms of sectarian response hold denominational interests accountable. This is an important function within an organization so closely linked to governmental and public support of its programs. In many ways, sectarian responses provide a voice of conscience.

9) Sectarian responses need to be maintained and encouraged to flourish, if we wish to maintain an evangelical presence within our social work. For many of our social work contexts a sectarian approach to religious expression is the most successful. The sectarian wing is most likely to increase the number of "converts" through

very traditional Salvation Army methods.

10) The denominational side of Salvationism provides education, support for second and third generations, develops public support and interest which allow us to undertake social service projects far beyond our strength and capacity without such support. This aspect of our Army helps create an open door into those parts of society where church growth principles are most likely to be utilized in an effective way. We also have an obligation to support the new "type" of Salvationist response to the gospel has created.

11) Such a model would also be useful as a professional tool in planning for new programs, and redeveloping existing facilities. Along with Church Growth methods, this approach could help to target new population groups for development of corps etc., while providing relevant and appropriate expressions of Salvationism. Particularly in cities, we could develop and use models in which we helped each other to function in appropriate ways to meet social and community needs and objectives.

I have proposed this model as a tool to enable The Salvation Army to more effectively utilize the structure which already appears to exist. While The Salvation Army contextualizes itself in many and varied ways, the importance of a unity of organizational vision and purpose cannot be underestimated. That we develop and function as "one" was a purpose of the Founder, to whom I surrender the final word.

It has been very gratifying to me of late to observe throughout our ranks the growth and strength of the idea that The Salvation Army is ONE ... By one Salvation Army I mean one body with the same head, the same government, the same laws, and substantially the same usages and methods. When I say substantially the same usages and methods, I mean that the principles of The Army must remain the same in whatever country it is established. There will not only be the liberty, but the necessity, to adapt its methods, so far as is consistent with truth and righteousness, to the character and habits of the people, the Salvation of whom it is there to bring about.⁵¹

Notes

1. The practical appeal of Army methods and their impact on society prompted negotiations between the Army and the Church of England, with a view to amalgamate. cf. Bramwell Booth: *Echoes and Memories* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1925), 59ff.; Harold Begbie: *The Life of General William Booth* 2 vols. (New York: Macmillan, 1920), 2:22ff.; Robert Sandall, *The History of The Salvation Army* (London: Nelson, 1950), 2:136-158. Orders and Regulations were prepared at a very early date which clearly detailed Army policy and procedures for each group within the body, and detailed numerous practical situations and the principles to be employed when confronted by such a situation. William Booth, *Orders and Regulations for Field Officers of The Salvation Army* (Revised to date) (London: Headquarters of the Salvation Army, 1891) includes instructions for dealing with "mutinies," "infidels," and "courtsmartial," as well as other more mundane matters.
2. The familiar account of how the converts of The Christian Mission were either not accepted by the churches or would not go to them is provided by Robert Sandall, *The History of The Salvation Army*, 1:66.
3. This familiar slogan seems to have been developed by the Army's Public Relations Department.
4. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes & Memories*, p. 65. Reprinted in John Waldron (ed.): *The Salvation Army and the Churches* (New York: Salvation Army, 1986), p. 28. Cf. *The Handbook of Doctrine* (London: International Headquarters, 1969) for a general discussion the theological meaning of the term "church" (70f.).
5. Maud Booth, *Beneath Two Flags* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1891), p. 271. Reprinted Waldron, *The Salvation Army and the Churches*, p. 40.
6. Bramwell Booth, *Echoes & Memories*, p. 67. Cf. Frederick Coutts, *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church* (London: International Headquarters, 1978), p. 8, who also quotes this passage.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 9. Reprinted in Waldron, *The Salvation Army and the Churches*, pp. 56f. The most recent *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers* states: "Unlike many Christian bodies, The Salvation Army has right from the beginning felt it necessary to emphasize the unity of the Church of Christ and to avoid anything that might encourage further division within Christianity. Instead of proclaiming itself as a church it has throughout its history stressed its wish to remain an integral part of that universal fellowship of Christian believers known as the Church of which Christ is the Head." (*Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army, Introduction*, page v.) "Chosen to be a Soldier" (London: International Headquarters, 1977), p. 64.
8. Clarence Wiseman, "Are We a Church?" *The Officer*, Vol. XXVII, No. 10 (London: The Salvation Army International Headquarters, 1976), p. 438. Reprinted Waldron, *The Salvation Army and the Churches*, p. 5. Earlier Albert Orsborn had attempted to address this very subject: "We are almost universally recognized as a religious denomination by governments, and for purposes of a national emergency—such as war services—or for convenience in designating our officers, they group us with the churches. That is as far as we wish to go in being known as a church. We are, and wish to remain, a Movement for the revival of religion, a permanent mission to the unconverted, one of the world's greatest missionary societies; but not an establishment, not a sect, not a church, except that we are a part of that body of Christ called The Church Militant and we shall be there, by His grace, with The Church Triumphant. Albert Orsborn: "The World Council of Churches," *The Officer* (March/April 1954). Reprinted in Waldron, *The Salvation Army and the Churches*, pp. 87ff.
9. Often the justification for Army beliefs and practices in the early years amounted to a scriptural basis combined with the "experiential" argument. In many cases the experiential argument was given at least as much weight as theological constructs received. Some excellent examples of this argument are developed in: *The Doctrines of the Salvation Army* (Toronto: Territorial Headquarters, 1892). The argument is used to verify Jesus as God (p. 8), assurance of salvation (pp. 53ff., p. 104), sanctification (p. 66, pp. 83ff.) backsliding (p. 86), and a "woman's right to preach" (p. 102). *The Handbook of Doctrine* (London: International Headquarters, 1969) downplays this aspect yet it still remains in some contexts as a portion of the argument (cf. 20, 80, 123ff., 130, 133ff., 182f.). Frederick Coutts writes: "We can speak with this freedom [regarding the sacraments] because we profoundly believe in, and are ever seeking to experience, the spiritual realities of which the sacraments are a sign." Coutts, *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church*, p. 18. Cf. John Coutts: *The Salvationists* (London: Mowbrays, 1977), p. 60, who notes that this characterizes the Army conception of holiness. N. Hardesty, L. Dayton, and D. Dayton, "Women in the Holiness Movement: Feminism in the Evangelical Tradition" in R. Ruether, R. and E. McLaughlin (eds.), *Women of Spirit* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979) describe the Holiness movement as having "a theology centred in experiential

rience" (p. 241). Finally, we should also note that this experiential component to theological thinking should be expected in a movement begun by a man who had "found his destiny." Cf. *The Salvation Army: Its Origin and Development* (London: Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, 1945), p. 8; Robert Sandall, *History*, 1:41-45.

10. By using this term, Weber did not intend to introduce a new conceptual tool. He merely intended to bring to full awareness what social scientists and historians had been doing when they used words like 'the economic man,' 'feudalism,' 'Gothic versus Romanesque architecture,' or 'kingship.' He felt that social scientists had the choice of using logically controlled and unambiguous conceptions, which are thus more removed from historical reality, or of using less precise concepts, which are more closely geared to the empirical world. Weber's interest in worldwide comparisons led him to consider extreme and 'pure cases.' ... The real meat of history would usually fall in between such extreme types" H. Gerth and C. Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford, 1958), pp. 59f. Cf. Raymond Aron, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1967), 2:206ff.; Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), pp. 601ff.

11. Julien Freund, *The Sociology of Max Weber* (New York: Vintage, 1969), p. 60.

12. *Ibid.*

13. A simple outline of the sect "type" might prove helpful at this point. O'Dea lists sect characteristics as follows:

"1. Separatism from the general society, and withdrawal from or defiance of the world and its institutions and values

2. Exclusiveness both in attitude and in social structure

3. Emphasis upon a conversion experience prior to membership

4. Voluntary joining

5. A spirit of regeneration

6. An attitude of ethical austerity, often of an ascetic nature"

T. O'Dea, *The Sociology of Religion* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p. 68. It is not possible within the scope of this paper to analyze and categorize phenomena occurring in Salvationism. On sectarianism cf. B. Wilson, "An Analysis of Sect Development," pp. 22-45 in B. Wilson (ed.), *Patterns of Sectarianism*: London: Heinemann, 1967; B. Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford, 1982), pp. 89-120; B. Wilson, "A Typology of Sects," pp. 361-383 in Roland Robertson (ed.), *Sociology of Religion* (Victoria: Penguin, 1969); B. Wilson: *Religion in Secular Society* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1969), pp. 207-263; E. Clark, *The Small Sects in America* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1937); J. Wach, *Sociology of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962).

14. Cf. B. Wilson, *Religious Sects* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1970), pp. 61-64 describes the Army as sharing the "extreme evangelicalism of the period," employing militarism as "an extended and colourful metaphor which captured the imagination of the working classes." Revival techniques, swift conversion, and the idea of conversion for all, are highlighted by Wilson as aspects of conversionist sects. R. Robertson: "The Salvation Army: The Persistence of Sectarianism," pp. 49-105 in *Patterns of Sectarianism*.

Wilson, "Typology" (365) describes the early Army as conversionist, arguing that when sects persist they "undergo processes of mutation" (p. 371). While formal structures remain, practices and attitudes change. H. Niebuhr: *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (Cleveland: Mcriidian, 1957) argued that this process usually resulted in the move of the sect back into the mainstream of denominational life.

15. B. Wilson, "Typology," p. 362.

16. Robertson, "Persistence," 49.

17. *Ibid.*

18. Cf. R. Moyles, *The Blood and Fire in Canada* (Toronto: Peter Martin, 1977), cf. 233.; and Frederick Coutts, *Bread for My Neighbour* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978) note errors in detail made by Robertson (15f.).

19. "Ariston", "More Sociology of Salvationism," *The Officer* (Dec. 1974), pp. 550-556. T. Wahlstrom used the pseudonym "Ariston." Cf. *The Officer* (Dec. 1974), pp. 571f.

20. Cf. Will Herberg, *Protestant—Catholic—Jew* (New York: Doubleday, 1960), pp. 84ff.; Sidney Mead, *The Lively Experiment* (New York: Harper, 1963), pp. 103ff.

21. The use of the term "community church" to describe our corps is symptomatic of this desire. The use of the term in this sense is illustrated in *The Salvation Army* (Manitoba Culture, Heritage and Recreation: Historic Resources, 1986), p. 1.

22. O'Dea, *Sociology* provides this summary:

"1. Membership in fact upon the basis of birth.

2. Administration of the formalized means of grace and their sociological and theological concomitants—hierarchy and dogma

3. Inclusiveness of social structure, often coinciding with geographical or ethnic boundaries

4. Orientation toward the conversion of all

5. The tendency to adjust to and compromise with the existing society and its values and institutions (68)."

23. Moyles has been highly influenced by H.R. Niebuhr (*Social Sources*) pp. 228ff. and does not critique the view that we have evolved in this way. He also thinks Robertson would conclude that the Army in Canada is an "established sect," although Moyles believes his methods are marred by an uncritical acceptance of stated Army practices as representative of reality (244). Moyles is also highly influenced by Robertson in his analysis of the patterns of Army history. His outline of the various phases of Army life correspond closely to the stages outlined by Robertson (Cf. Robertson, "The Persistence of Sectarianism," pp. 50f.).

24. Moyles, p. 229.

25. Ibid.

26. The importance of Army social work is noted by Moyles (230f.) but does not appear to influence his conclusions. One is compelled to ask ... why not?

27. Ibid., p. 239.

28. Ibid., p. 241.

29. Ibid., p. 244.

30. Cf. George Pollard, "A Review of the Social Work, and its Bearing Upon the General Work of The Salvation Army, With Some Suggestions As To Its Future," pp. 275-283 in *International Staff Council Addresses, 1904* (London: The Salvation Army Book Department, 1904). In this significant and prophetic article, Pollard outlines the already growing division between the two aspects of Salvation Army life, social work and corps, and calls for their reintegration. Yet much of this distinction also fits a church-sect dichotomy.

A significant restatement of some of the key concepts outlined by Pollard, as well as an approach to mission which attempts to truly integrate both aspects of Salvationism which we will outline (sect-denomination) was presented at a previous symposium by John Nelson in his unpublished paper "Salvation Army Missiology." Cf. P. Needham: "Toward a Re-integration of The Salvationist Mission," pp. 121-158 in John Waldron (ed.), *Creed and Deed* (Oakville: The Salvation Army, 1986).

31. William Booth, *Salvation Soldierly* (London: Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, n.d.) p. 11.

32. *Rules and Regulations for Field Officers* (1891), p. 296. Much of this text is repeated in various versions of "Orders and Regulations." Cf. *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers* (London: International Headquarters, 1927), pp. 106f.; *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers* (London: International Headquarters, 1950), p. 76. This particular narrative account does not appear in the newest editions of either *Orders and Regulations for officers or soldiers*. A similar narrative is provided in *Chosen to be A Soldier* (London: International Headquarters), pp. 1f..

33. *O&R Soldiers* (1950). Only minor variants from *O&R Officers* (1891), 296; *O&R Soldiers* (1927), p. 106. In *Chosen to be A Soldier* this has been moved to the introduction along with the narrative account of Army origins. The revision reads: "The salvation soldier must clearly understand the basic nature of the Movement of which he is a member. The Salvation Army is a fellowship of people who have accepted Jesus Christ as their personal Saviour and Lord and whose common aim is to induce others to subject themselves to the lordship of Christ," (p. 1). As we shall see, these two parts have been separated from their original placement with a description of Army government in this latest edition of *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers*. Similarly the newest edition of *Orders and Regulations for Officers of the Salvation Army* (London: International Headquarters, 1974) separates the statement of purpose from an account of Army government. It also provides a more elaborate statement of objectives:

1. The Salvation Army is a Movement composed of persons who know their sins forgiven, and who are united in love to God and man for the common purpose of bringing others to Jesus Christ.

2. The word 'salvation' indicates the purpose of the Movement; namely, to induce all men to submit to God, embrace the salvation provided for them in Christ, accept God the Father as their supreme ruler, obey His laws, and spend their lives in the loving service of those about them, thereby enjoying the favor of God both here and hereafter.

3. The word "army" indicates that the Movement is a fighting force, constantly at war with the powers of evil, and also that, in certain features of its constitution and government, it resembles

a military army.

4. The official name of the Movement is 'The Salvation Army.' Its exclusive right to this name is recognized by law. (Part 2, 1).

The newest version then presents a discussion of the Constitution of the Army, and lists the doctrines before discussing government (26).

34. This form is taken from *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers of The Salvation Army* (by The Founder) (London: International Headquarters, (Revised 1927), pp. 107-110. The wording is very slightly changed from the version which appears in *Rules and Regulations for Field Officers* (1891) pp. 300f. The same text also remains with some abbreviations in *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers of the Salvation Army* (by The Founder) (London: International Headquarters, (Revised 1950), pp. 76-78. The significantly revised portions of this text will appear in the footnotes. I will also provide a running commentary on the latest text which has been redacted from this statement: *Orders and Regulations for Officers of the Salvation Army* (Originally prepared by The Founder) London: International Headquarters, (Revised 1974) Part 2, 79.

Only through familiarity with the first versions of the document is it recognizable that certain phrases have been preserved in this edition. What is important is the longevity of the basic form and content of this statement regarding the government of The Salvation Army.

35. This statement remains constant in *O&R Soldiers* (1950). This becomes: "Definite knowledge of the manner in which the Army is governed, and a clear understanding of the principles underlying that government, should be possessed by every Salvationist" in *O&R for Officers* (1974).

36. *O&R Soldiers* (1950) reproduces numbers 2 through 5, but deletes numbers 6 and 7. Numbers 2 through 8 are deleted in *O&R for Officers* (1974) and replaced with:

"2. The Salvation Army is engaged in aggressive warfare against the power of evil, therefore, to be successful its action must be forceful, vigorous, prompt and decisive.

3. The vigour and force with which any movement can carry on its work is in proportion to the power and energy of its government. Hence the Army needs strong leadership" (p. 7).

37. *O&R Soldiers* (1950) renders this: "The government of the Army resembles that of the family, of which the father is the head. This plan is not only of God's own making but has His special blessing" (p. 77).

38. Minor modifications are made to this point. In our 1950 version of the document point d) becomes point a), with the rest shuffling down accordingly. The 1974 edition replaces "The daily teachings of Providence" with "Practical experience."

39. The 1974 version breaks this into two points (which it numbers 4 and 5), while the 1950 version retains almost without variance.

40. The 1950 version stops here in this statement. The 1974 version omits points 1114.

41. "The government of the Army gives every capable soldier an opportunity to reach a place of usefulness. A soldier who shows himself willing and capable will always find some duty by which he can further the work of the Kingdom" *O&R Soldiers* (1950).

42. The final point in the 1950 edition builds on the text of number 13, adding a second statement. "This is shown by the way in which men of varying talents, drawn from various walks of life, have all found within its ranks work suited to their particular capacity. The Army's system has thus justified itself in practice" (p. 78).

The format of the 1974 edition of *Orders and Regulations for Officers* splits the original document. In other versions, statements regarding "leadership and obedience" are placed elsewhere. Comparison of the second portion with points 1114 of the original version will demonstrate its role as source for the following:

1. The Army form of government combines freedom with strength.

a) There is in the Army the fullest liberty to be good and to do good.

b) At the same time, capable leadership produces promptitude and efficiency in action.

2. The government of the Army makes for unity and harmony.

a) It allows for consultation and deliberation at all levels.

b) It invests leaders with authority, the wise use of which enables them to stimulate numbers of people into acting together for the same end.

3. The government of the Army provides opportunity for all.

4. The government of The Salvation Army is easily understood.

5. The Army's system of government is adaptable, having proved suitable in widely differing circumstances (pp. 8f.).

43. *Chosen to be a Soldier* deviates from this earlier format quite distinctly yet the main ideas remain. We have already noted point 1 of the section on government in note 7. The remainder note the Army's position in relationship to other Christian bodies, our focus on salvation, and our mem-

bership in the "Universal Church" (p. 64). [From the beginning there has been a desire not to be at odds with fellow Christians. Cf. *O&R Officers* (1891), pp. 231-235; M. Booth, *Beneath Two Flags*, pp. 270-283.] The following point is somewhat unique: "For practical purposes The Salvation Army has increasingly come to be the church of its own people and of large sections of the people. It is therefore felt right and proper that the Army should take part in the endeavors to promote unity, understanding and practical cooperation between the various Christian bodies." (p. 64).

44. [Tor Wahlstrom] "Ariston," "More Sociology of Salvationism," *The Officer* p. 556.

45. The following two points are important to this understanding: a) Church/sect theories appear too limiting and are thus inadequate to describe the Army as a whole; b) Tensions of faith and practice within the organization both nationally and internationally are not adequately accounted for in such singular models.

46. Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, 2 vols., (New York: Harper, 1960), pp. 327f. Ralph Winter has also written a significant paper on this whole matter. Cf. R. Winter, "The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission," *Missiology* (January 1974), pp. 121-139, notes the importance both structures for the health of the Church as a whole. The Church Growth movement prefers to call these modalities (church structures) and sodalities (sect or mission structures). Peter Wagner, *Church Growth and the Whole Gospel* (San Francisco: Harper, 1981), esp. pp. 186ff.

47. It is significant that some of these very points are noted in Army statements of government. Also Cf. William Booth, "Organisation," pp. 21-41 in *International Staff Council Addresses, 1904*. Interesting observations regarding such an organizational structure are made in the following: J. Lynch, "Advantages and Drawbacks of a Centre of Communications in the Church: Historical Point of View," pp. 95-100 *Concilium 64* (New York: Herder, 1971); A. Greeley, "Advantages and Drawbacks of a Centre of Communications in the Church: Sociological Point of View," pp. 101-114 *Concilium 64*.

48. *The Salvation Army Act 1980* places ultimate power in the hands of the Administration.

49. Cf. Coutts, *Salvationists* pp. 6-17.

50. Medieval Catholicism flourished as a result of various types of sectarianism (reformist, conversionist, pietist, etc.). Cf. R. W. Southern, *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1970), pp. 214-360 provides an excellent historical overview. Winter, "The Two Structures of God's Redemptive Mission," pp. 127ff.

It is also interesting that very early this comparison was made. Cf. A. Sumner, *The New Papacy: Behind the Scenes in The Salvation Army, by an ExOfficer* (Toronto: Britnell, 1899).

51. William Booth. *The General's Letters, 1885* (London: International Headquarters, 1889), p. 51. (Reprinted from *The War Cry*, Jan. 24, 1885).

With Basin and Towel: A Corps Officer's Approach to Pastoral Care

Ray Harris

The Sunday morning worship concludes, and the corps officer moves to a position at the doors of the building. She engages, as she bids people farewell, in one of the most important moments of the week. She is building a bridge between the ordered world of worship to the disordered world of the coming week.

During the past ninety minutes, God's people have been brought into God's presence. Together they have walked through the drama of salvation, touched our traditions in symbol and sound, glimpsed the glory of being the people of God, and encountered the holy. In that period of time, the officer and his people have enjoyed order, beauty, rhythm and light. Now those same men and women, teens and children, begin to make their way through the doors into a world of disorder, dysfunction and darkness. Utilizing the imagery of Presbyterian architecture, Eugene Peterson depicts this moment: "In the chancel God's word ordered the hour of worship; in the narthex the sins of the congregation begin to write an agenda for a week of pastoral visitation and counsel, comfort and guidance. The transition is abrupt, violent, and difficult."¹

Thus, it is an important moment. As they pass by, the officers have an opportu-

Ray Harris is a Major in The Salvation Army serving as the Vice President and Academic Dean of William and Catherine Booth College, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

nity to invoke God's blessing as their people move into a world where a U.S. parent company has played unethical games with his smaller Canadian business firm; where she still struggles with the trauma of sexual abuse from childhood; where he faces the realities of retiring from work which has been his routine since age fourteen; where as a couple they face the premature death of a cystic-fibrosis child; where she courageously battles to sustain the roles of mother and professional teacher.

The task of accompanying these individuals into this world is the work of pastoral care. In this article, I will draw upon a "lived moment" in my life as a corps officer. The incident took place when my wife and I were officers of a corps in Winnipeg. In this work I will portray the moment, set it in context, and seek to offer some theological reflections in order to focus on the more distinctive nature of pastoral care.

The Lived Moment²

I received the telephone call early in the morning. A former officer associated with our corps had just received news that his nephew had been shot and critically wounded. His nephew was an officer in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Would I go and visit him in the hospital?

My first visit to the hospital was brief. Stan was barely conscious, and his condition was critical. However, I maintained contact with the victim, his wife and family until a gradual improvement took place. Because of hospital procedures and Stan's condition, it was seldom possible to have a lengthy conversation. Finally, after seven months of recuperation, the following conversation took place.

As I entered the room, I noticed Stan pull the covers up around his head. I wondered at the time if the room was cool, but it was a gesture that seemed unusual. We conversed for a few moments, then a nurse joined us in the room.

Ray: Hello Stan, it's Ray.

Stan: Hi.

Ray: It's good to see you again. Are you seeing any changes since we last talked?

Stan: Nope. Nothing. Nothing's changed.

Ray: I see one thing that's changed. You've got a new set of teeth.

Stan: Yeah. My wife lost the other plate.

Ray: Yes. I remember. She left them in a cup on the counter. That's a pretty full smile you've got now. You're just finishing breakfast now Stan. How's the ap-

petite coming along?

Stan: Slow but sure.

The nurse came in at this point and asked Stan if he wanted anything else. He said No, and she began to clean up his tray. Stan grimaced in pain.

Ray: Your leg seems to be hurting Stan.

Stan: Yeah. I have a blood clot. It's killing me. Been like this for six days now.

Ray: I'm sorry Stan. That's a long time. Is there anything I can do for you?

Stan: No.

Ray: Which leg is it Stan, your good one?

Stan: Yeah.

His pain was much more noticeable, and I put my hand on his shoulder. The nurse finished cleaning up his tray.

Ray: [To nurse] We have a patient in a lot of pain.

Nurse: [No response.]

Ray: How are you? How are you today?

Nurse: Oh, fine. I didn't realize you were speaking to me.

The nurse left and returned with another intravenous tube.

Stan: What's that for? I don't want any medication. It won't help.

Nurse: The tube has almost run out. It's just to get ready.

The nurse left the room, and there was a long pause.

Stan: Why!? Why does God do this to me? I can't stand the pain. No God would ever let this happen to me. I don't believe in him.

Ray: Stan, I feel for you. You're in a tremendous amount of pain. I'm sure God must feel a long way away at a moment like this.

Stan: I just feel like ending it all. I can't take it any longer.

Ray: You have felt as if you just want to give it up?

Stan: I can't stand it.

I began rubbing his shoulder.

Stan: Don't rub my shoulder. It hurts.

Ray: I'm sorry Stan. I really do feel for you. We can feel so helpless standing by you at a time like this.

Stan: Why? Why? Why? There can't be any God. Oh, it hurts. It hurts!

I stood for a moment, simply touching his shoulder.

Ray: Stan, I know God can seem so far away at a moment like this. But he shares your pain. He feels what you feel, and wants to be a part of this with you.

The nurse came into the room with a bedpan.

Nurse: I have work to do now. I'm going to have to ask you to leave.

Ray: Stan, I have to go now. But know that I think of you. I'll be back again.

[To the nurse] Thanks.

After months more of rehabilitation, Stan was released from this hospital, and returned to his home province. But the conversation and actions invite further reflection. I will do so in the manner of a "reflective practitioner," as one reflecting on ministry while engaged in it.³

The Traditions of Pastoral Care

My response to this officer of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police grew out of two traditions. First, I responded out of the tradition of The Salvation Army. The instinct of the early Salvationists was on target. Their witness gave rise to new professions of faith, but these new Christians could not be left to the hostile environments of East London. Evangelism must be followed up with some expression of caring, or the new shoots would perish.

The 1988 edition of *Orders and Regulations for Corps Officers* says that "Personal counselling is the essence of a corps officer's responsibility."⁴ Recent *Orders and Regulations for Officers* states the conviction that "An officer is responsible for giving pastoral care to both converted and unconverted alike."⁵ It is noted in the same volume that "every officer should develop skills in personal counselling, recognizing that this is an integral part of an officer's pastoral ministry."⁶ What is not always clear in our *Orders and Regulations* is whether pastoral care and counselling are the same. Is it assumed that my role as a corps officer is fulfilled if I master certain therapeutic techniques, and practise them in a hospital? This is not to downplay those skills; it is simply to ask if this is my primary role as a corps officer. Does pastoral care mean dressing up Carl Rogers in red, yellow and blue? Attentive listening is essential to care, but do I bring another perspective to this task?

These questions give rise to the other tradition out of which I responded in that moment, and that is the tradition of pastoral care itself. The church has embodied a long tradition of care. Some of its key figures—admittedly male!—have left their imprint on this tradition: Cyprian, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, Gregory, Luther, Calvin and Richard Baxter have all contributed to the church's understanding of pastoral care from within the tradition of the gospel. However, during the twentieth century, these voices were supplanted. Thomas Oden investigated their

role in contemporary pastoral care. He began by sampling representative nineteenth century pastoral writers, and noted their widespread use of these classical pastors. However, when he came to representative twentieth century pastoral writers, such as Clinebell, Tournier, Oates and Hiltner, he was shocked. Not one reference was made to those classical writings in pastoral care. In contrast, the same authors from this century made much use of Freud, Jung, Rogers and Fromm. Oden concluded from this that "the fundament of Christian pastoral care in its classical sense has at best been neglected and at worst polemicized. So Pastoral theology has become in many cases little more than a thoughtless mimic of the most current psychological trends."⁷

Just how this pastoral amnesia developed in the twentieth century is a complex issue. Gaylord Noyce has traced its development following the clinical training movement pioneered by Anton Boisen.⁸ Its strong emphasis on supervision helped pastors to develop their sense of empathy and drop their quick solutions. During the 1950s, Carl Rogers taught ministers to "follow the affect" with their listening, and not to introduce side roads. Seward Hiltner, another dominant voice at that time, defined pastoral counselling as "the attempt by a pastor to help people help themselves through the process of gaining understanding of their inner conflicts."⁹ Noyce expresses concern over the impact of Rogerian models of therapy in pastoral care: "An exaggerated deference to the most influential model of personal counselling may be undermining the ministry in hundreds of congregations today."¹⁰ As important as is empathic listening, Noyce and Oden want us to locate our distinctive expressions of care. Is the gospel finding expression through a corps officer who listens well, but does nothing more? What is the relationship of pastoral work to our other responsibilities as corps officers?

Ironically, just as these questions were being raised by Oden and Noyce, other voices sought to bring the pastoral care movement back to its center. And some of these came from more secular oriented psychologists themselves. One such person was Paul Pruyser, a director of the Menninger Clinic. In that role, Pruyser sought to bring pastors and counsellors together as a team. The results, in his view, were very one-sided: "the theologians sat at the feet of the psychiatric Gamaliels and seemed to like it, with only some occasional repartee."¹¹ Pruyser believes that ministers have a distinctive contribution to make, and views the diagnosis as the place to begin thinking about such distinctives. He contrasts the issue with two diagnoses of a nun who was hospitalized for mental illness.¹² The first is more pastoral: "She is in