

WORD & DEED

VOL. XVIII NO. 2



MAY 2016

A JOURNAL OF SALVATION ARMY
THEOLOGY & MINISTRY

**The Politics of Being Apolitical:
The Salvation Army and the Nazi Revolution**

**On We March: Salvationist Identity in the
Age of Nationalism and Imperialism**

Revisiting the Sociology of Salvationism



Salvation Army National Headquarters
Alexandria, VA, USA

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:

Manuscripts, requests for style sheets, and other correspondence should be addressed to:

Lieutenant Colonel Allen Satterlee
 The Salvation Army, National Headquarters
 615 Slaters Lane, Alexandria VA 22313
Phone: 703/684-5500 **Fax:** 703/684-5539
Email: allen.satterlee@usn.salvationarmy.org
Web: www.sanationalpublications.org

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 that may be expressed in this journal. Manuscripts should be approximately 12–15 pages, including endnotes. Please submit the following: 1) three hard copies of the manuscript with the author's name (with rank and appointment if an officer) on the cover page only. This ensures objectivity during the evaluation process. Only manuscripts without the author's name will be evaluated. The title of the article should appear at the top of the first page of the text, and the manuscript should utilize Word & Deed endnote guidelines. All Bible references should be from the New International Version. If another version is used throughout the article, indicate the version in the first textual reference only. If multiple versions are used, please indicate the version each time it changes; 2) a copy on a disk or CD, using Microsoft Word format; 3) a 100–word abstract of the article to be used at the discretion of the editor (e.g., on The Salvation Army's web page or in advertisements pertaining to the journal). Please note that neither the hard copies nor the disk will be returned to the author and that all manuscripts are subject to editorial review. Once articles have been selected for inclusion, the deadlines for submitting final material for the journal are March 1 and September 1. A style sheet is available upon request.

Editor-in-Chief: Allen Satterlee

Co-Editors: Roger J. Green, Professor, Gordon College
 Jonathan S. Raymond, President Emeritus and Senior Fellow,
 Trinity Western University

Editorial Board:	Amy Reardon	Jeffrey Smith	Donald Burke
	Young Sung Kim	Alan Harley	Roy Johnson
	Karen Shakespeare	Brian Jones	Stephen Banfield

Editorial Assistant: Erin Thibeau

Art Director: Roger O. Selvage Jr.

Vol. 18, No. 2

May 2016

ISSN 1522-3426

Cover Photograph, 614 Corps, Birmingham, AL, by Brian Wallace.

Word & Deed is indexed in the Christian Periodical Index and with EBSCO.

Copyright ©2016 by The Salvation Army. Printed in the USA. All rights reserved.

WORD & DEED



A JOURNAL OF SALVATION ARMY
THEOLOGY & MINISTRY

VOLUME XVIII · NUMBER 2

MAY 2016

Editorial — Looking Inward

Roger J. Green and Jonathan S. Raymond 1

*The Politics of Being Apolitical:
The Salvation Army and the Nazi Revolution*

Rebecca Carter-Chand 3

*On We March: Salvationist Identity in the Age
of Nationalism and Imperialism*

Nathan Miller 33

Revisiting the Sociology of Salvationism

Bruce Power 47

Book Review

JoAnn Shade 71

Looking Inward

Roger J. Green and Jonathan S. Raymond

Last year, we celebrated the 150th anniversary of The Salvation Army, born in July 1865 in East London. The anniversary presented the opportunity to assess who we are and what our vocation demands of us today. The articles in this issue of *Word & Deed* examine critical moments of our history. The three main essays were presented at the Army's session at the American Academy of Religion meetings in Atlanta, Georgia, in November 2015. President Don Burke and Professor Andrew Eason of Booth University College arranged this session.

The Salvation Army has survived tumultuous and challenging epochs, such as the Nazi regime in Hitler's Germany. In "The Politics of Being Apolitical: The Salvation Army and the Nazi Revolution" Professor Rebecca Carter-Chand of the University of Toronto discusses the role of the Army in Germany during that period, and provides a model for the kind of rich, thorough research national histories of the Army demand.

Nathan Miller of Asbury University authors "On We March: Salvationist Identity in the Age of Nationalism and Imperialism." Again, looking inward means finding our identity within particular cultures as well as embracing the identity of the Kingdom of God. What is especially interesting about the article is Miller's use of music to articulate his thesis.

Finally, Bruce Power explores the Army in relation to sect and church in "Revisiting the Sociology of Salvationism." Power draws on his service as a Salvation Army officer and his background as a scholar in this sociological analysis.

We are indebted to the writers behind this issue of *Word & Deed* for helping us to look inward to see who we are, and who we are in Christ. Looking inward is foundational to looking outward in mission to the world in which God has placed us as an Army and to which He calls us.

RJG

JSR

The Politics of Being Apolitical: The Salvation Army and the Nazi Revolution

Rebecca Carter-Chand

Introduction

When the Nazis came to power in 1933, the fate of the German Salvation Army (die Heilsarmee) was not a foregone conclusion.¹ Its relationship to National Socialism and its continued existence in the “new Germany” were contingent on internal and external factors, both arbitrary decisions and strategic plans. The organization was not shut down, as were some religious sects and foreign organizations. The government swiftly dissolved several small spiritual, esoteric, and philosophical groups.² But the Nazis dissolved very few of Germany’s established Christian minority groups. The Jehovah’s Witnesses were banned and their property confiscated between April and June 1933. They were specially targeted for persecution because of their refusal to give the Hitler salute or bear arms for the state. The reform movement of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, which had been founded during World War I, was disbanded in 1936, for the same reasons.³

Much like the main Protestant Church and the other Free Churches, the German Heilsarmee found common ground with many aspects of Nazism, especially notions of a strong state, national supremacy, so-called “traditional” family structures, and anti-Communism. Most Salvationists entered 1933 enthusiastically supporting Hitler and his vision for the future. Several factors contributed to the organiza-

Dr. Rebecca Carter-Chand is Special Assistant to the Wolfe Chair in Holocaust Studies and a course instructor in the Department of History and Anne Tanenbaum Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Toronto.

tion's limited compatibility with the methods and vision of National Socialism, namely the fact that the German Salvation Army had become a German version of its British parent organization and its German patriotism had solidified during World War I. The postwar reconstruction work and the goodwill it garnered in the 1920s through high-profile social work led to widespread admiration. It supported a socially conservative agenda and expressed anxieties about modernity in similar ways to other Germans. From Hitler's point of view, there were admirable aspects of The Salvation Army and little that was suspect about it. Given its social capital, there was no immediate need to alienate this group that appeared to be a willing participant in the *Volksgemeinschaft* (people's community). Yet there were limits to the Heilsarmee's support for and participation in the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Moreover, like the wider society, its members did not act as a monolith. Where these lines would be drawn was hotly contested in 1933 and the first months of 1934.

The following analysis begins with two questions: Why and how did the Heilsarmee "adjust" itself to National Socialism, and in what ways were the changes contested? The Salvation Army is analyzed not merely as a case study, or one more example to add to the growing body of scholarship exposing the extent of participation in National Socialism of Germany's church leaders, social workers, medical professionals, and charities.⁴ The Salvation Army was uniquely positioned in German society, occupying both insider and outsider status and receiving both public respect and bouts of suspicion about how it used all that money it solicited from the public. At first glance, it appears unlikely that The Salvation Army would survive at all in Nazi Germany: it was, after all, a self-proclaimed international organization that took orders from a parent organization in London, whose mission was to alleviate the suffering of the poor and social outcasts and to seek converts to its charismatic version of Christianity. Its methods were noisy, intrusive, and very public.

But while it was true that its international connections were problematic and its penchant for institutional autonomy inconvenient for the Nazis' coordination efforts, The Salvation Army continued to be malleable and pragmatic. Its priorities were institutional self-preservation, and for the entire Nazi period its leaders and members were overwhelmed with serious financial concerns. These concerns, in part, determined its willingness to accede to Nazi demands on its time, finances, and loyalty.

The Heilsarmee yearned for greater respect from public authorities and polit-

ical leaders. Historians of the Free Churches have argued that the groups like the German Baptists and Methodists sought to overcome a longstanding inferiority complex by over-emphasizing their patriotism—the same is absolutely true of The Salvation Army.⁵ It also sought acceptance from the wider culture because its very existence was sustained only through financial contributions from the public. It was this dependency on public donations that brought a sense of urgency to The Salvation Army's public dealings.⁶ Throughout the 1920s and early 1930s the Heilsarmee leadership engaged in a proactive and sustained public relations campaign that sought to embed the Heilsarmee's social work even more firmly in German society.

Most Salvationists believed it would be possible to retain both foreign connections and some measure of autonomy within Germany. After all, The Salvation Army had always tried to achieve this lofty goal: a combination of institutional autonomy, support for the government, a national identity, and international allegiance. But the Nazi government proved unwilling to go along with this constellation, and this time the stakes were much higher.

The Heilsarmee continued to maintain the illusion that its religious commitments allowed it be apolitical. They were not the only ones to claim that they were apolitical—the fact that many Germans employed this concept raises the question of what politics and being political really meant in Nazi Germany. For those in The Salvation Army, there were very specific parameters around political involvement: one could not belong to a political party, campaign for a candidate, or hold political meetings in a Salvation Army building. On the other hand, acts of patriotism, participation in civic and/or national events, and support for political leaders, were permitted. Participation in the Nazi-sponsored welfare projects seemed to be merely an extension of previous collaborative projects with the government.

The Heilsarmee and International Headquarters

In January 1933, the same month Hitler became chancellor, The Salvation Army International Headquarters appointed a new territorial commander of the German Salvation Army, replacing Bruno Friedrich (a German) with an Englishman. The nationality of the person holding the top leadership position had long been an area of contention—most territorial commanders had been

of British extraction.⁷ Many German Salvationists resented the British influence on their organization, which they viewed as oppressively autocratic and incongruous with their growing national identity.⁸

William Howard, the new territorial commander, faced a difficult situation in 1933.⁹ At the time, the second-in-command, Chief Secretary Henry Bowers, was also British, although he had served in Germany for twenty-three years. In May 1933, Bowers was reassigned out of Germany and a long-time German officer, Colonel Franz Stankuweit, replaced him as chief secretary. During this time, a number of officers came together secretly to plan an attempt to separate the Heilsarmee from the International Salvation Army. Inspired by the German Christian movement, they contacted the newly appointed Reich Bishop Ludwig Müller in the fall of 1933 and requested that the Heilsarmee come under the leadership and protection of the German Protestant Church.¹⁰ When their plans came to light, International Headquarters and Howard squashed the movement and swiftly implemented a personnel overhaul of officers across Germany.¹¹

Commander Howard tried to keep control of the Heilsarmee by affirming the German officers' desire to be part of Hitler's national revolution. In fact, he spent much of the year articulating the compatibility of The Salvation Army and the new Germany. His monthly circular letters to German officers indicate that Salvationist support for the Nazis was widespread in 1933. In December 1933, he wrote in his monthly circular that since he and his wife had been living among them "in this period of national awakening," he could appreciate their feelings. Although their main task was to be soldiers for Jesus Christ, he wrote, "We are pleased that fidelity to one does not exclude faithfulness to the other."¹²

Despite his attempts to assure German officers that The Salvation Army supported their participation in the Nazi revolution, Howard lasted only until March 1934, when he too was called back to England.¹³ Franz Stankuweit replaced Howard as territorial commander and another German officer, Johannes Hein, became the chief secretary. Both Stankuweit and Hein were conservative German nationalists who had fought in World War I and now supported Hitler.¹⁴ But they were also committed officers of the International Salvation Army and did not want to break apart from the worldwide organization.¹⁵ It was these two men who held the most influence over the Heilsarmee's policy and practice in the early years of the Nazi period.

In September 1935, the Salvation Army International Headquarters assert-

ed its authority again by sending Hein to tour Salvation Army activities in South America.¹⁶ He was subsequently given an assignment in Brazil and never served in Germany again. Stankuweit remained territorial commander until he died of a heart attack in April 1941. His lifelong ill health had prompted the International Headquarters to prepare for this possibility, which is why they got rid of Hein in 1935. Leadership in London wanted to replace Stankuweit with someone who had legitimacy in the eyes of the German Heilsarmee but who was a committed internationalist.¹⁷ The person they found was the German-born Johann Büsing, who had been converted and trained by the Swiss Salvation Army. Büsing replaced Hein as the second-in-command in September 1935 and took over as territorial commander when Stankuweit died in 1941. Max Gruner, who had been in charge of the Heilsarmee's publications and editor of *Der Kriegsruf*, became chief secretary. Both these men outlasted World War II and played a significant role in shaping the postwar narrative of the Heilsarmee in the Nazi period.¹⁸

International Headquarters also underwent changes in leadership in the 1930s. In September 1934, Evangeline Booth was elected General of The Salvation Army, a post she held until shortly after the outbreak of World War II. Booth was one of the daughters of the Founders and had extensive experience as the leader of the American branch of The Salvation Army. In 1896, she had successfully suppressed a breakaway Salvation Army group in the United States led by her brother Ballington Booth and his wife. She subsequently led the American Salvation Army during its involvement in World War I and post-war reconstruction work in Europe. During her years as General, she intervened many times on behalf of the Heilsarmee, petitioning the German Embassy in London and writing to Hitler himself.

Adjusting to National Socialism

In order to understand the full range of people's actions and reactions, processes of negotiation, and multifaceted motivations, it is crucial to avoid a mode of analysis that seeks to assign individuals and groups to binary categories of pro-Nazi versus anti-Nazi, rulers versus the ruled, or even fluid categories, as the perpetrator/victim/bystander matrix has come to be used.¹⁹ Tempting though it may be, it is not useful for the historian to assign people grades on

how they did in relation to commonly recognized markers, such as giving the Hitler salute or assisting Jews. Instead, the following analysis takes a careful look at how the Heilsarmee adjusted itself to National Socialism in the years before the war.²⁰ This framework focuses attention on the participatory nature of the *Volksgemeinschaft*, especially the inclusionary and exclusionary effects of the National Socialist People's Welfare Organization (NSV) and the Winter Aid program, in which the Heilsarmee was a major participant.

The remainder of this article examines a number of dynamics that characterized the Heilsarmee's relationship to National Socialism: institutional autonomy, financial dependence, ecclesiastical alignment, participation in public welfare projects, and defensive anti-Semitism. Framing the Heilsarmee's experience in this way, one can begin to make sense of the period and the complicated ways in which Germans, Christians, and internationalists adjusted to National Socialism.

Autonomy

The Heilsarmee retained its official institutional autonomy throughout the Nazi era. Ever since a Prussian criminal court ruling in 1900, the Heilsarmee had been recognized in Germany as a religious community, granting it protection against interference of worship.²¹ Neither it nor the Heilsarmee property company were ever dissolved or banned by the Nazis. Salvationists were not targeted for persecution simply for retaining their religious identity and practice. It did not protest the "coordination" of its youth groups in 1933 and it willingly participated in the NSV's Winter Relief and the summer Mother and Child program.

No official government policy was made on the Heilsarmee until the end of 1934. The timing of this decision coincided with a period in which Hitler was concerned with Germany's image abroad. On October 19, 1934, General Evangeline Booth sent a telegram to Hitler:

Please allow me to express my deepest appreciation and sincere gratitude for your conciliatory attitude toward The Salvation Army in Germany. The only reason for our existence lies in the alleviation of grief and sorrow and in the

healing of suffering. I wish that the members of The Salvation Army in Germany both individually and as a whole can participate in the efforts to create a better Germany.²²

General Booth's telegram seemed to have had its desired effect because shortly thereafter Hitler issued a personal directive sent to Gestapo stations across Germany that the Heilsarmee was not to be interfered with. Hitler wrote that he did not oppose the work of the Heilsarmee, "who have never been politically active"; also "for reasons of foreign policy," no action was to be taken against them.²³ This was in keeping with his strategic soft policy on other Christian minority groups that had strong ties in the Anglo-American world. Several of these religious groups were mobilized by the Nazi state through subtle means to promote the positive changes happening in Germany and to assuage any potential doubts about religious freedom under Hitler.²⁴

Members of the Heilsarmee were secure enough in their own membership in the *Volksgemeinschaft* that they pushed against encroachments on their autonomy and complained to the authorities when the Gestapo intruded arbitrarily. Most of these incidents had to do with the Heilsarmee's public presence and displaying competing symbols of identity in the form of flags, uniforms, and greetings. There are few Gestapo files on individual Salvationists, in part because the organization was not under any official ban.²⁵

There are plenty of secondhand reports of isolated Gestapo actions against the Heilsarmee. In 1935, the *Frankfurter Zeitung* printed a note that the district leader of the NSDAP had given a public warning to the local Heilsarmee in Württemberg because some members had refused to salute the swastika flag.²⁶ The Salvationists who had refused to salute the flag did so on their own initiative—the Heilsarmee used the Nazi flag alongside the Salvation Army flag throughout the Nazi period, displaying it in Salvation Army halls and carrying it in public marches.²⁷

Other inconsistent actions against the Heilsarmee included some local Gestapo stations prohibiting open-air services to take place and others allowing them as long as no newspapers were sold.²⁸ In the spring of 1939, the Gestapo thoroughly investigated a female Salvation Army officer in Düsseldorf after a neighbor reported her to the police. Hildegard Banse used her apartment for regular Salvation Army meetings and the disgruntled neighbor told the police

that on one particular day, instead of listening to a speech by Hitler on the radio, they made music and sang songs.²⁹ The “English-oriented” group was accused of believing in England’s victory and plotting revenge on Germany.

The Salvationists affected by these restrictions responded in the same ways that they had always dealt with restrictions. They petitioned for greater freedom in the public sphere and they used official channels to do so. They highlighted the innocuous nature of their proselytizing and the beneficial contribution their social work made to society. They, like many other Germans, had faith in Hitler’s fairness and justice; when government bureaucrats or the Gestapo did something they believed was unfair, they could say, “If only the Führer knew...”³⁰

The Heilsarmee sought to retain its autonomy in Nazi Germany but it realized early on that this would only be possible if it willingly submitted certain elements of itself to the process of *Gleichschaltung* (coordination, or bringing all aspects of society into line). Among the Nazis’ first coordination efforts were those directed at youth activities. The Heilsarmee had established children and youth organizations in the mid-1920s, including scouting groups for boys and girls. In 1933, the scouting groups along with other youth organizations were incorporated into the Hitler Youth and the League of German Girls.³¹ 1933 was the last year in which new cadets were trained at the Heilsarmee Training School in Berlin. Many young Salvationists who were potential candidates for officership did not pursue that path. Some remained as soldiers but the restrictions on youth work and cadet training caused the organization’s momentum to flag, and many left the organization all together.³²

Dependence

Institutional autonomy was maintained fairly easily but financial autonomy was at the root of much friction between the Heilsarmee and the Nazi government. For an organization that depended on donations, the promise of institutional autonomy was not enough for survival. In theory, the Heilsarmee could have simply scaled back its activities and worked within the new constraints of the Nazi government, but the Heilsarmee was already in serious financial trouble in 1933.

The German Salvation Army always had a troubled relationship with the

government in regards to its public presence and its fundraising practices. Even in the mid-1920s, when the Heilsarmee enjoyed widespread admiration, Salvationists still regarded their pursuits as a noble struggle against a world that rejected their message of salvation. They expected both the public and the authorities to be against them and they saw themselves as outsiders—a sort of modern day version of the unpopular Old Testament prophets.³³ When the Nazi government placed restrictions on public collections, it seemed to most Salvationists like an unfortunate continuation of previous government restrictions. The Salvationists' own explanations of the financial trouble facing the organization in the 1920s and 1930s points to their subjective understandings of the situation and how this motivated them to adjust themselves to life under National Socialism and push against it simultaneously.³⁴

After the Nazi Party took power in 1933 the regulations about public collections remained in effect. Special fundraising projects like Self-Denial Week and the Christmas kettles were not allowed, on the grounds that they interfered with the Nazi-sponsored Winter Relief program. A new law came into effect in November 1934—just before Hitler issued the directive to the Gestapo not to interfere with the Heilsarmee. The new law laid out the rules for public collections by religious and charitable organizations.³⁵ The law intended to further coordinate public collections, including, but not limited to, the Winter Relief campaign. It did not apply to collections taken during religious services or any collections undertaken by the NSDAP itself. The Heilsarmee had already received confirmation from the Party leadership that selling *Der Kriegsruf* (*The War Cry*) in public did not count as collecting since it was sold for a fixed price.³⁶

Only a few years prior, the Heilsarmee had requested that distribution of *Der Kriegsruf* be considered charity work; the fact that it could argue the opposite so easily illustrates the fine legal line the Heilsarmee was straddling. In the Heilsarmee's postwar narrative, the law was portrayed as an unprecedented break in government policy toward the Heilsarmee but, in actual effect, it was no more stringent than the Weimar government's rules had been. Coordinated through the Ministry for Church Affairs, the government forbade the Heilsarmee to hold its Christmas kettle campaign, regulated the specifics of public collections, did not allow collection boxes to accompany newspaper sales, and demanded to see the Heilsarmee's annual financial reports.³⁷ The

combined effect of restrictions on public collections and the financial burden of maintaining the mortgages and institutions made the Heilsarmee's already difficult financial situation even direr. It had difficulty paying the pensions for a number of retired officers.³⁸ By 1936, the organization was totally dependent financially on the International Headquarters in London.³⁹

In 1937, the topic of the Heilsarmee's collections and newspaper sales was raised once again at the very highest levels of the government. Heinrich Müller, the Gestapo operations chief, and Reinhard Heydrich, the head of the Security Police were both opposed to giving permission to the Heilsarmee for public collections. They brought the matter to Hitler and the Ministry of the Interior. They decided that the Heilsarmee would no longer be allowed to sell its newspaper in public under the same law that forbade public collections.⁴⁰ A letter of petition from Stankuweit to Hitler, reminding him of the organization's apolitical stance and long history of selling its newspaper in Germany, made no difference.⁴¹ Two months later, Stankuweit took an unprecedented step of giving Heilsarmee officers permission to take on paid work if necessary.⁴² As in other countries, Salvation Army officers were in full-time service to the organization and, until now, officership precluded them from earning income outside of the organization.

So by 1937, the Heilsarmee could no longer solicit donations in public, sell its newspaper, or hold its annual fundraising campaigns. It was compelled to expend much energy on activities for the NSV, and it struggled to manage continued operations of its institutions. A final restriction came into effect in February 1938, when the organization was no longer allowed to collect donations even during its religious services. The matter of financial independence was thus systematically encroached upon gradually in a series of laws and decisions that prevented the Heilsarmee from fundraising in ways it had traditionally done. But independence was also stripped away by the organization's gradual dependence on government support, brought about by financial problems that began before the Nazi period.

Alignment

Most German Salvationists supported Hitler, but in the same breath they maintained that it was possible and desirable to sustain their status in the

International Salvation Army. The Salvation Army had weathered international conflict before and it clung to the illusion that it was above politics and its members were able to coexist within any political system. This message was one of the most dearly held beliefs in the International Salvation Army community. However, it papered over currents of resentment among Salvationists in various European countries who thought British influence over their national territories was too strong and autocratic.⁴³ In the months following the Nazi seizure of power, a small number of German Salvationists saw an opportunity to break away from the London International Headquarters.

The separatist movement, which sometimes called itself the *Kampfbund deutscher Heilsarmeeoffiziere*, was made up of mid-level male officers, mainly from Hamburg, the Rhineland, and Westphalia. The officers involved in the separatist movement were enthusiastic National Socialists. They looked to the German Christians for inspiration and mimicked their language of a “manly church” and anti-Semitism, as well as the German Christians’ vision for the Church in the new Germany.⁴⁴ These officers saw an opportunity for patronage from the Nazis’ plan for a unified Reich Church.⁴⁵

The Heilsarmee’s financial situation made it impossible to consider leaving the international organization without coming under the leadership and protection of another body. Over the summer and fall of 1933, the leader of the separatist movement, Adolph Pahlke, secretly corresponded with Reich Bishop Ludwig Müller, and tried to convince him to accept the Heilsarmee into the Reich Church.⁴⁶ First, he and his comrades wanted the English leadership to leave and be replaced with Germans; second, they wanted to close a number of institutions and improve the organization’s finances; third, they wanted to change the methods by which the organization procured funds; and fourth, they wanted to work closely with the main Protestant church (in an unspecified relationship).⁴⁷ Pahlke pitched himself to the liaison between the two bodies.⁴⁸ He was fully aware of the risks he was taking by making these requests to Müller without the knowledge or approval of his superiors.⁴⁹

Despite their efforts to keep the negotiations secret, the separatist movement became known to the Heilsarmee National Headquarters at the end of September.⁵⁰ A few weeks later, the Territorial Headquarters announced a complete “reorganization” of the German Heilsarmee.⁵¹ The restructuring reassigned several officers in an attempt to deflate the separatist movement.

Pahlke was removed from his post as leader of the Northern Division and was subsequently dismissed from The Salvation Army altogether. Apart from Pahlke, most other officers involved in the separatist movement were not dismissed but merely reassigned within the organization. A number of these men—Tritschler, Petarus, Ebert, Bache, Claudi, and Quast—still wanted the Heilsarmee to become more closely aligned with a Nazi outlook and continued to push for changes.

The Salvationists who sought alignment with the Nazis also reveal the tensions they felt in the tumultuous months of *Gleichschaltung*. They saw the changes taking place in the German Protestant Church as an opportunity to solve a multifaceted problem: the English influence on their organization and the financial problems, which they blamed on the British (even though it International Headquarters was keeping their organization afloat financially). Letters and memos of the separatist movement express the fear and shame they felt at their organization's financial situation and irregular use of funds.

Participation

Beginning in 1933, the National Socialist People's Welfare (NSV) became a mediator and coordinator between public and private welfare. Along with the Nazi Party and its organizations, such as the German Labor Front (DAF) and Strength through Joy (KdF), the NSV served as the public guardian of *Volksgemeinschaft*.⁵² In the summer of 1933, various welfare organizations oriented on the political left were dissolved, as was the Central Welfare Office of German Jews. The Nondenominational Welfare Association was incorporated into the NSV and another Christian charity for workers voluntarily dissolved itself. Only four bodies remained as national welfare organizations: the Protestant Inner Mission, the Catholic Caritas, the German Red Cross, and the NSV. The Heilsarmee became an NSV-approved organization, along with seventeen other specialized voluntary organizations, including the welfare organization of the Seventh-Day Adventists and the German Association for the Blind. They reported directly to the *Hauptamt für Volkswohlfahrt*, retaining legal autonomy while working closely with the NSV.⁵³ In the Nazi Party Handbook, the Heilsarmee is listed on the organizational chart as one of these autonomous organizations under the purview of the NSV.

Because the NSV did not have the resources to provide welfare assistance in a comprehensive manner—nor did it want to—it relied on the continued activities of private welfare organizations like the Heilsarmee to provide relief for the poor and disadvantaged who were deemed to be part of the *Volksgemeinschaft*. In June 1933, the Nazi government sought to placate the fears of private religious charities by inviting closer cooperation and the promise to maintain private welfare activity.⁵⁴ The Heilsarmee participated in promoting and raising money for the NSV-organized Winter Relief Campaign, as it had done since the previous government in 1931 launched the voluntary program.⁵⁵ Coordination with the NSV was thus another continuity for the Heilsarmee in 1933 and '34, rather than a rupture.⁵⁶ It also participated in the NSV summer campaign Mother and Child, which raised money to send children on a rejuvenating holiday in the country.⁵⁷ Other charitable activities continued; distributing food baskets and serving meals to poor families or groups of children were now done in the service of the NSV.

For the Heilsarmee and the millions of Germans who joined the organization, the welfare activities of the NSV were among the most palatable elements of National Socialism and among the most prevalent features of everyday life. Membership in the NSV quickly grew from 100,000 members in 1933 to ten million by the outbreak of the war in 1939 (just over 15 percent of the Greater Germany population).⁵⁸ People participated in the NSV because welfare work seemed apolitical.⁵⁹ Those with moral or religious scruples about Nazism in general could at least support the NSV.

It is not entirely clear to what extent the Salvation Army International Headquarters knew about this official Nazi Party connection. One postwar report suggests that it knew very little. In 1947, the chief secretary received a letter from a British intelligence officer working on de-Nazification in Germany.⁶⁰ This intelligence officer had come across the Nazi Party Handbook and had seen that the Heilsarmee was listed as an approved NSV organization. The Chief of Staff was not surprised to learn this information, but his comments to the General indicate that they did not know this fact or many other details of the Heilsarmee's relationship to the Nazi government. "If this is really true," he wrote, "and it is possibly in part at least, then one can understand the Russian suspicion, at least of the present leadership."

Defense

A long-standing rumor in Victorian England portrayed William Booth as Jewish. In the 1880s and 1890s, when Booth had become a prominent public figure, he attracted both widespread admiration and criticism. Popular magazines published cartoons satirizing Booth's wealth and political connections, often employing anti-Semitic tropes.⁶¹ For instance, it was cartoonists often exaggerated the prominence of Booth's nose.⁶²

The anti-Semite Theodor Fritsch transferred the vaguely anti-Semitic discourse on William Booth and The Salvation Army in Victorian England to Germany. Fritsch first published his book of conspiratorial accusations and warnings, *Handbuch der Judenfrage*, in 1887 (also known as *The Anti-Semitic Catechism*).⁶³ The Nazi Party commissioned several new editions of the book during its rise to power. In October 1933, Heilsarmee leaders became distraught when they learned that Fritsch included The Salvation Army in his discussion of Christian churches and sects that had been influenced by Jews.⁶⁴

Fritsch wrote that he mistrusted all sects that had their headquarters abroad—especially if a movement's founder was Jewish or if it was under the leadership of a Jew. Such is the case, he wrote, of The Salvation Army. Not only was William Booth half-Jewish but his daughter, Evangeline Booth, reportedly said that she was proud of her heritage and that the Jewish blood of her grandmother was stronger than the English blood of her grandfather. Fritsch also claimed that John Wilkes Booth, Abraham Lincoln's assassin, was William Booth's brother, which was completely untrue. He wrote that the Heilsarmee had gotten rich from its charity work and that the German Heilsarmee retained only 30 percent of its earnings and sent 70 percent back to its headquarters in London.⁶⁵

The Heilsarmee responded promptly to these allegations by printing a rebuttal in *Der Kriegsruf*: "Mr. Theodor Fritsch was falsely informed about The Salvation Army."⁶⁶ They denied the claim about their Founder's association with John Wilkes Booth and in regards to Booth's alleged Jewishness, they equivocated, writing that this was the first time they had heard about it and Territorial Headquarters had not had time to look into it. In actual fact, the quotation from Evangeline Booth came from her visit to Berlin in 1930, during which she said in an address: "I am proud of the fact that Jewish blood flows

through my veins.” Benjamin Ebert, a member of the Heilsarmee separatist movement, wrote in 1936 that, even at the time, Booth’s statement “incensed many in certain circles” of the Heilsarmee and caused a stir among its friends.⁶⁷

The accusations in Fritsch’s book had concrete negative implications for the Heilsarmee. In 1933, the Bavarian state police used Fritsch’s accusations to combat The Salvation Army in Bavaria, a predominantly Catholic region, in which The Salvation Army was relatively weak. In Saxony, the Gestapo confiscated copies of the issue of *Der Kriegsruf* that contained The Salvation Army’s rebuttal to Fritsch. The Gestapo’s reasoning was that it made an “old fighter” (*Altkämpfer*) of the NSDAP look like a liar.⁶⁸ When Johannes Hein requested a personal meeting with Hitler for himself and Stankuweit at the end of 1934, he tried to appeal to Hitler’s sense of fairness, citing these actions as examples of unjust discrimination based on false information.⁶⁹ Unfortunately for The Salvation Army, factual accuracy was not as potent as the power of association. Because much of Nazi anti-Semitism was built around the idea of an international Jewish conspiracy, any international organization was vulnerable to these types of attacks. It is significant that Fritsch’s concern with The Salvation Army had nothing to do with its teachings on Jews or Judaism—it was based entirely on a purported “Jewish influence” as a result of the Founder’s alleged Jewishness.

Fritsch’s writings had limited impact in Germany; typical of anti-Semitic writers in the late nineteenth century, he had compiled a mass of truths, distorted truths, and outright fabrications. Some of it found popular appeal, but often the format was dry.⁷⁰ It took a creative hand to shape it and package it for a mass audience of the 1930s and 1940s. That person was Julius Streicher, who, in the fall of 1934, used Fritsch’s accusations about The Salvation Army to levy charges against the German Heilsarmee. In September, his newspaper, *Der Stürmer*, had printed a story claiming the Salvation Army Training College in London had hired a Jew to teach social work. Once again, the Heilsarmee’s response was not to question the relevance of such a tangential claim but rather to deny emphatically its truthfulness. There was no such person and the story was entirely false, the Heilsarmee wrote to *Der Stürmer* after the article appeared. Moreover, there was “not a single Heilsarmee officer of Jewish heritage serving in Germany.”⁷¹

The Salvation Army had never attracted very many Jewish converts in

Germany. Of the small number of Salvationists with a Jewish background, by 1933 nearly all were either already dead or had emigrated. Therefore we do not know how the organization would have dealt with the issue of excluding its Jewish members as other churches did. Correspondingly, it did not have very many members within its community whom it could assist. Captain Max Fuchs, who had written about his conversion experience, had been killed in World War I while serving at the front. Jacobo Kuttner (b. 1885), who had been an officer since 1910, had already left Germany in 1925. He and his wife were transferred to Argentina, where he remained until his death in 1949.⁷²

The Heilsarmee had Jewish donors and patrons in the Weimar period, as well as long-standing business relationships with several Jewish Germans, including the timber merchant David Stern in Cologne and Israel's Department Store at Alexanderplatz in Berlin.⁷³ Dr. Laura Turnau, a pediatrician and specialist in tuberculosis, had for many years taught social hygiene courses on a volunteer basis at the Salvation Army Training School in Berlin.⁷⁴ She also served as the physician for two Heilsarmee children's homes in Berlin, in addition to her other public health roles. As a practicing Christian, she became labeled a "non-Aryan Christian" in 1933 and left Germany for Switzerland.⁷⁵ The Heilsarmee had great respect for the Jewish doctor who ran the Salvation Army Maternity Home. Dr. David Pulvermacher was director and chief physician at the Maternity Home for 34 years, from its inauguration in 1898 until his death in 1932.⁷⁶ He published medical reports on obstetrics practices and maternal care in the facility and had brought The Salvation Army professional respect through his work.⁷⁷ Since Pulvermacher died in 1932, he too was spared Nazi persecution.

The Heilsarmee did not sever its ties with Jewish adherents, employees, or business associates after 1933. Adherents who found themselves personally affected by Nazi racial laws were very few in number. Anecdotal evidence suggests that they were not forced to leave the Heilsarmee and there is no indication that signs forbidding Jews entry were placed in front of Heilsarmee meeting rooms.⁷⁸ Supporters of the separatist movement routinely complained that the majority of the Heilsarmee was not anti-Semitic enough for their liking.⁷⁹ These critics said that the majority of officers refused to "go along with" the Nuremberg Laws on the basis that "the Jews are people too and in the Bible they are the 'chosen people.'"⁸⁰

A careful reading of the *Der Kriegsruf* reveals no vilifying of the Jews in the Passion narrative. This stands in contrast to the anti-Semitic elements of the story often emphasized by Protestants and Catholics. The front page of a May 1935 issue featured a story entitled “The heroic Jesus.”⁸¹ Strongly reminiscent of the gendered language used by the German Christians, the article retells the story of Jesus driving the moneychangers out of the temple, arguing that: “all too often Jesus is portrayed as soft and sweet (*weich und süß*) but the Bible paints a different picture of Jesus.”⁸² Another article from 1935 on the theme of hand washing (in a figurative sense) follows the Matthew gospel account rather than the Gospel of John in retelling the story of Jesus before Pilate.⁸³ The article refers to “the bloodthirsty crowd” who cried, “Crucify him!” There is no mention of “the Jews” at all, as is emphasized in John’s telling of the story. One can observe many articles in *Der Kriegsruf* after 1933 in which the editors could have easily incorporated anti-Semitic comments but did not.⁸⁴

The Salvation Army issued no public statement or instructions to its members regarding anti-Semitism, and there is no mention of the major events that codified anti-Semitism into German law and escalated persecution and violence (including the boycott on Jewish businesses in April 1933, the Nuremberg Laws in 1935, and the *Kristallnacht* pogrom of November 9, 1938). But that does not mean that individual Salvationists did not “try on” anti-Semitism, to use Peter Fritzsche’s phrase.⁸⁵ One can observe the tentative experimentation with anti-Semitism by some in the two Heilsarmee periodicals intended for internal consumption, *Der Offizier* and *Der Lokaloffizier*. It often took the form of reprinting an anti-Semitic quotation or “news item” from an outside source. Without affirming or commenting on the material, it kept the anti-Semitic claims at arm’s length while still reproducing them as fact. One such note found in *Der Lokaloffizier*, in April 1933, warned readers that it was a false assumption that Judaism was declining numerically in the world.⁸⁶ Instead, it claimed, Jewish population numbers had grown significantly in the past 30 years. The next issue of *Der Lokaloffizier* gave Jewish population numbers for several countries.⁸⁷ Again, no comment or stated purpose accompanied the information. The context was clear: cultural anxieties about population decline and degeneration from the 1920s were now viewed in light of Germany’s racial anxieties.

In November 1936, Benjamin Ebert, a former Heilsarmee officer and mem-

ber of the separatist movement, sent a letter and a two-page essay to the anti-Semitic newspaper *Der Stürmer*, “The Salvation Army and the Jewish Question.”⁸⁸ He wanted the newspaper to print his piece, as he thought people ought to be informed about The Salvation Army, since many people still gave donations to the organization. The most striking aspect of the piece is the Heilsarmee’s lack of Jewish connections. Here was a man with insider knowledge of the organization, determined to sully the reputation of the Heilsarmee by listing all of the Heilsarmee’s associations with Jews. The problem was, there were not very many of them. Included in his list of Jewish connections were general observations that most members of The Salvation Army had no scruples about buying from Jews and specific complaints about sour business deals with Jews. He took the time to retell a story about the head of the donations department, Arthur Grockocki, who supposedly wrote a letter to a man named “Herr Simon” in 1932.⁸⁹ Grockocki, under the impression that Herr Simon was Jewish, noted in his letter that the Democratic Party and the Social Democrats had nearly emerged victorious and that the Nazis had not gotten a majority. As it turned out, Herr Simon was not Jewish but a member of the Nazi party and wrote a strongly worded complaint to the Heilsarmee headquarters. This story, of seeming irrelevance to anyone in 1936, follows further accusations that high-ranking Heilsarmee officers had links to Freemasonry. Ebert’s piece shows just how few actual connections there were and also that he was not aware of the Salvationists who were providing assistance, shelter, and solidarity with Jews.

Evidence is scarce about how the individual Heilsarmee corps dealt with anti-Semitism after 1933.⁹⁰ Max Gruner, author of the Heilsarmee’s institutional history up to 1936, claims that the Heilsarmee never followed the government’s lead on anti-Semitism and never prevented Jews or those of Jewish descent from participating in religious services.⁹¹ Willi Kothe, who wrote another institutional account of the Heilsarmee in the Nazi and postwar periods, delicately stepped around the subject of the Heilsarmee’s own behavior vis-à-vis Jews. He cited Martin Niemöller’s protest against the Aryan Paragraph without explaining how the Heilsarmee dealt with Jews or converts from Judaism whom it employed.⁹²

Other veiled references suggested that German Salvationists retained their “international spirit.” Kothe described the separatist movement as a “minority group” that found no resonance among the majority of Salvationists.⁹³ Yet Kothe’s vague statements about how the Heilsarmee was “under the influence”

of National Socialist ideas and the propaganda machine are used to suggest that the Nazis duped the Heilsarmee—a widely accepted explanation in postwar Germany. “Small, uncomfortable details,” wrote Kothe, “were gladly accepted as inevitable growing pains which would soon be cured.”⁹⁴ Ida Gilbricht, in her unpublished memoir written sometime around 1975, reflected on the anti-Semitism of the 1930s: “In a strange way, one wanted the question of the Jews resolved and shied away from no acts of violence. What guilt was placed upon Germany because of it!”⁹⁵

There is no indication in any of the sources (at least those still in existence) that Jews were banned from membership or participation in the Heilsarmee. Gruner also makes the claim that when Jews attended meetings wearing the yellow Star of David on their clothing, Heilsarmee members “never made any trouble for them but rather helped them.”⁹⁶ The comment suggests that there were Jewish adherents attending Salvation Army meetings and that they were still doing so after September 1941, when wearing the yellow star on one’s clothing was made mandatory for Jews within Germany.

There is not enough evidence to assess how widespread this practice was, but we know it happened in at least one corps. Hildegard Banse (Boritzki after 1942, when she married Arthur Boritzki) left Düsseldorf after the outbreak of World War II to take over leadership of the Frankfurt corps, when Arthur Boritzki was called up for military duty.⁹⁷ In his absence, she admitted at least one Jew into the corps in an effort to protect that woman.⁹⁸ When the woman was ordered to appear for a transport in 1942, Banse accompanied her to the site and gave spiritual support. She then gave ongoing support and care for the woman’s children who had been left behind as *Mischlinge* (although it appears not as primary caregiver to the children).⁹⁹ According to her husband, she also helped a Jewish man named Professor Flech-Tebelius to flee to England.¹⁰⁰ Banse’s actions are the most significant known case of a German Salvationist individually assisting Jews during the Nazi period. Yet even the bare details of her efforts were not publicized for many years after the war. In brief autobiographical statements written in 1956 for their officer files at the International Headquarters in London, Arthur and Hildegard Banse remained vague and modest about their activities during the Nazi period.¹⁰¹

Conclusion

After 1933, the German Heilsarmee was confronted by the “taint” of Jewishness, through the rumored Jewishness of its Founder. Although it had very few real connections to Jews or Judaism, it found itself in a defensive position on the issue. The ways in which the Heilsarmee negotiated its place in the new Germany show how anti-Semitism was not an important part of its enthusiasm for Nazism. For many Salvationists—including the organization’s leaders—nationalism, *völkisch* ideology, anti-Bolshevism, Nazi foreign policy, and concerns about the body politic were all much more important reasons to support Hitler. They found common ground with Hitler on the topic of alcohol and approved of the Nazi book-burning event in 1933 as an opportunity to be rid of “trashy literature.” Perhaps it would make people more open to The Salvation Army’s own religious literature, they reasoned.¹⁰²

Throughout the Nazi period, a constant refrain repeated by both the Heilsarmee and the Nazi government was that The Salvation Army was apolitical. For The Salvation Army, not being politically active was a source of pride that stemmed from the organization’s commitment to the ideals of internationalism and the notion that religion was above politics. But it was also a defense strategy that Salvationists hoped would allow it to operate as an international non-governmental organization within multiple nation states that, at various times, experienced tense diplomatic relations and even war. Many Nazis, including Hitler himself, also viewed The Salvation Army as operating “outside the realm of politics,” thereby rendering it innocuous to the goals of National Socialism. But what did “politics” and “being politically active,” mean in the German and international contexts of the 1930s? As this article’s title conveys, there were a lot of politics involved in maintaining this apolitical identity.¹⁰³ Moreover, The Salvation Army’s apolitical identity was an illusion perpetuated for convenience on both sides. The totalizing effect of Nazism on German society and the public sphere meant that no individual or group could remain apolitical.

Endnotes

- ¹ I wish to acknowledge and thank the organizations whose funding made it possible for me to carry out research for this article: a Saul Kagan Fellowship in Advanced Holocaust Studies, awarded by the Claims Conference, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Holocaust Educational Foundation at Northwestern University, along with generous support from the University of Toronto. I also wish to thank the many Salvationists and Salvation Army archivists who offered assistance and support, in particular, the staff at the Salvation Army International Heritage Centre in London, and the late Major Christine Schollmeier, guardian of the Heilsarmee Archive in Hamburg.
- ² Ralf Melzer, “In the Eye of a Hurricane: German Freemasonry in the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich,” in *Freemasonry in Context: History, Ritual, Controversy*, ed. Arturo de Hoyos and S. Brent Morris (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2004), 163-176; and Helmut Neuberger, *Winkelmass und Hakenkreuz: die Freimauer und das Dritte Reich* (Munich: Herbig, 2001).
- ³ The subsequent Adventist splinter groups that continued to pop up were dissolved and forbidden, as well (in April 1937, December 1941, and January 1942). Johannes Hartlapp, *Siebenten-Tags-Adventisten im Nationalsozialismus: unter Berücksichtigung der geschichtlichen und theologischen Entwicklung in Deutschland von 1875 bis 1950* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht unipress, 2008); and Ernst Helmreich, *The German Churches under Hitler: Background, Struggle, and Epilogue* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press), 383 and 392.
- ⁴ Susan Benedict and Linda Shields, *Nurses in Nazi Germany: The Nazi ‘euthanasia’ Program* (London: Routledge, 2012); Robert P. Ericksen, *Complicity in the Holocaust: Churches and Universities in Nazi Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012); Robert P. Ericksen and Susannah Heschel, eds., *Betrayal: German Churches and the Holocaust* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999); Manfred Gailus and Hartmut Lehmann, eds., *Nationalprotestantische Mentalitäten: Konturen, Entwicklungslinien und Umbrüche eines Weltbildes* (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2005); Michael Geyer and Hartmut Lehmann, eds., *Religion und Nation, Nation und Religion: Beiträge zu einer unbewältigten Geschichte* (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2004); Melissa Kravetz, “Creating a Space in the Medical Profession: Female Physicians, Maternalism, and Eugenics Work in Weimar and Nazi Germany,” (PhD dissertation: University of Maryland, College Park, 2011); Michelle Mouton, *From Nurturing the Nation to Purifying the Volk: Weimar and Nazi Family Policy, 1918-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Christoph Sachsse, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland, Band 3: Der Wohlfahrtsstaat im Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1980); Paul Weindling, *Health, Race, and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- ⁵ Nicholas Railton, “German Free Churches and the Nazi Regime,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 49, 1 (January 1998): 102.

- ⁶ Daniel Heinz, ed., *Freikirchen und Juden im 'Dritten Reich': instrumentalisierte Heilsgeschichte, antisemitische Vorurteile und verdrängte Schuld* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht unipress, 2011). See also Rudolf Bauer, "Voluntarism, Nongovernmental Organizations, and Public Policy in the Third Reich," *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 19, 3 (1990): 201.
- ⁷ Terms and Conditions to the General from the German Salvation Army, July 9, 1915. Bundesarchiv, Berlin-Lichterfelde (hereafter: BA-B), R5101 Reichsministerium für die kirchlichen Angelegenheiten/Verschiedene einzelne Religionsgemeinschaften.
- ⁸ The German branch of The Salvation Army was not the only one to press for greater independence in this period. There were separatist movements in the 1920s within the Czech, Finnish, and Swiss Salvation Army branches; other national territories like Sweden and Holland experienced tensions with the London International Headquarters. Karl Ochsner, Hugo Homberger, and Paul Schiffman, *Die schweizerische Reformbewegung in der Heilsarmee 1926-1930* (St. Gallen: self-published pamphlet, 1930), Evangelisches Zentralarchiv (hereafter: EZA), 1/2975.
- ⁹ "Herzlich willkommen in Deutschland! Kommandeur und Frau Howard die neuen Leiter der Heilsarmee in Deutschland und Österreich," *Der Kriegsruf* (January 14, 1933), 1. He was a highly experienced leader in The Salvation Army, with over 45 years experience, including leadership positions in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.
- ¹⁰ Correspondence between Adolf Pahlke and Ludwig Müller, August to October 1933. EZA/1/2975.
- ¹¹ Reorganisation unseres Werkes," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 14, 1933), 3; "Reorganisation," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 21, 1933), 3; "Reorganisation," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 28, 1933), 3; and Monatsbrief des Kommandeurs (Howard), November 1933. Archiv der Heilsarmee (hereafter: AdH), Internal Documents.
- ¹² Monatsbrief des Kommandeurs (Howard), December 1933. AdH/Internal Documents.
- ¹³ "Wichtige Bekanntmachung und Abschiedsgrüße der Kommandeure," *Der Kriegsruf* (March 31, 1934), 3. These changes were covered in the British press as well. "Hitler and The Salvation Army," *News Chronicle* (February 17, 1934); "Salvation Army Change in Germany," *Daily Telegraph* (February 27, 1934); "Salvation Army in Germany. A German Commander to be Appointed," *Manchester Guardian* (February 28, 1934); and "Colonel Franz Stankuweit," *The Times* (March 19, 1934). Press clipping found in the Wiener Library, Press Archives.
- ¹⁴ Johannes Hein, "Communists and The Salvation Army," *The Staff Review* (XI, 4, October 1931), 335-343.
- ¹⁵ Franz Stankuweit, Satzungen der Heilsarmee: Zweck und Organisation der Bewegung, April 26, 1933. AdH/Internal Documents.
- ¹⁶ Johannes Hein to Otto Meissner, August 28, 1934. BA-B, R3901 Reichsarbeitsministerium, 9117 Die Heilsarmee. See also: "Zum Abschied des Chefsekretärs, Oberstleutnant Hein," *Der Kriegsruf* (September 28, 1935), 3.

- ¹⁷ Johann Büsing unpublished memoir, “The Battle for the Existence of The Salvation Army in Germany,” 1951, based on his recollections of his diary, which was destroyed in 1945 when the Heilsarmee headquarters was bombed. AdH/Büsing file.
- ¹⁸ Around 1950-51, Johann Büsing wrote his memories of the Nazi period, based on his diaries that were destroyed when the Heilsarmee National Headquarters in Berlin was bombed in 1945. His secretary later published a biography based on these memoirs. Hildegard Bleick, *Holy Defiance (The Story of Johann Büsing)* (London: Salvationist Pub. and Supplies, 1974), later published in German as *Heiliger Widerstand. Das Leben Johann Büsings, Leiter der Heilsarmee in Deutschland von 1935 bis 1947* (Lahr-Dinglingen, Germany: St.-Johannis-Druckerei C. Schweickhardt, 1980). Max Gruner published a two-volume institutional history of the Heilsarmee in Germany. Max Gruner, *Revolutionäres Christentum, Bd. 1, 1886-1914* (Berlin-Steglitz: Verlag der Heilsarmee, 1953), and *Revolutionäres Christentum, Bd. 2, 1914-1936* (Berlin-Steglitz: Verlag der Heilsarmee, 1954).
- ¹⁹ Martina Steber and Bernhard Gotto, eds., *Visions of Community in Nazi Germany: Social Engineering and Private Lives* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); and Claudia Koonz, *The Nazi Conscience* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2003).
- ²⁰ Peter Fritzsche’s concept of “adjusting” to National Socialism has been very useful for my analysis of The Salvation Army. Peter Fritzsche, *Life and Death in the Third Reich* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008), 8.
- ²¹ Strafsache gegen den Handlungsgehilfen Max Gosse in Elbing, October 5, 1900. BA-B/R901/38365. See also: Urteil des Reichsgerichts, zweiter Senat, October 5, 1900. Heilsarmee NHQ, Cologne, Accounting Department.
- ²² Memo to the Foreign Office, the Reich Ministry of the Interior, and the Labour Ministry. BA-B/R3901/9117. This telegram is also found in files at the Reich Chancellery. BA-B/R43/II/179.
- ²³ Memo to all Gestapo, December 8, 1934. AdH/General Correspondence. This same memo can also be found in Gestapo records in several jurisdictions in Germany. See, for example: BA-B/R58 Reichsicherheitshauptamt, Gestapo; LA-NRW/ RW18/ NR002/142; and Stadt Archiv Göppingen (hereafter: StA-G)/C227. See also: “Der Wille des Führers,” *Der Lokaloffizier* (November 1934), 336.
- ²⁴ The cooption of certain Free Churches with international connections and traditions of eschewing politics by the National Socialists was first observed by Nathaniel Micklem, Principle of Mansfield College, Oxford, and participant in at the 1937 Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State. Nathaniel Micklem, *National Socialism and the Roman Catholic Church, being an account of the conflict between the National Socialist government of Germany and the Roman Catholic Church 1933-1938* (Oxford, 1939), 50-52, as quoted in Railton, “German Free Churches,” 124.
- ²⁵ Heinz Boberach, *Berichte des SD und der Gestapo über Kirchen und Kirchenvolk in Deutschland, 1934-1944* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1971), 278, 326.

- ²⁶ “Kurze Meldungen,” *Frankfurter Zeitung* (August 15, 1935), 2.
- ²⁷ On institutional support versus individual resistance, see Michael Phayer, *The Catholic Church and the Holocaust* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).
- ²⁸ Büsing to the Ministry of the Interior, October 20, 1937. BA-B/R5101.
- ²⁹ Gestapo file on Hildegard Banse, June 1939. LA-NRW/RW58/60225.
- ³⁰ In 1934, Johannes Hein appealed to Otto Meissner at the Reich Chancellery: “...our efforts to represent our interests have failed so far, so we will just have to turn to the head of state himself to ask the Führer to give us protection, which he has promised for all those who wish to contribute to the restoration of Germany.” Hein to Meissner, August 28, 1934. BA-B/R3901/9117. See also: Fritzsche, *Life and Death*.
- ³¹ Gruner, 168; and Michael Kater, *Hitler Youth* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 21-22.
- ³² Hugo Wends, Heilsarmee NHQ. Report on the need for capital investment in the Heilsarmee by The Salvation Army, November 11, 1955. AdH/Internal Documents.
- ³³ “Heilsarmee und Karneval,” *Der Kriegsruf* (March 19, 1927), 5.
- ³⁴ In 1936 the Heilsarmee celebrated its 50th anniversary in Germany. As part of the celebrations, *Der Kriegsruf* commissioned several memoirs from Salvationists who had been involved in the early decades of Heilsarmee work. Many of these memoirs were published in condensed form in *Der Kriegsruf*. The narratives are remarkably consistent and emphasize arbitrary and prejudiced police restrictions on early Salvation Army efforts. They also emphasize the ubiquitous violence directed toward and in the midst of the Heilsarmee. The narratives, I argued in chapter one, should be read through the lens of police restrictions and violence of 1935/36, when they were written. See the series throughout 1936, “Jubiläumserinnerungen unserer Pioniere,” in *Der Kriegsruf*, including contributions by Brigadiere Schaufelberger, Kommandantin Ade, Oberstleutnant Treite, Kapitän Röhl, Oberstleutnant Schade, Hachtel, Sekretär Bornholdt, Brigadier Tebbe, Sekretär Steen, Oberst Rothstein, Sergeantmajor Restel, Sergeantmajor Sellhorn, Soldatin Schulz, Sergeantmajor Kleimon, Oberst Govaars, Sergeantmajor Kiesel, and Bußbanksergeant Storz.
- ³⁵ “Das Gesetz zur Regelung Öffentlicher Sammlungen,” *Völkischer Beobachter* (November 6, 1934), 1-2. *Reichsgesetzblatt 1934*, 1088.
- ³⁶ “Kriegsrufverkauf fällt nicht unter Sammelverbot,” *Der Kriegsruf* (September 1, 1934), 4.
- ³⁷ Correspondence between the Ministry for Church Affairs and the Heilsarmee. BA-B/R5101/Heilsarmee.
- ³⁸ Frau L. Puskeppel to Major and Frau Ebert, February 4, 1934. BA-B/R5101.
- ³⁹ Stankuweit to Reichsminister Kerrl, with a financial report, August 14, 1936. BA-B/R5101.
- ⁴⁰ Heydrich to the Ministry of the Interior, June 3, 1937. BA-B/R43/Heilsarmee.
- ⁴¹ Stankuweit to Hitler, July 20, 1937. BA-B/R5101. Booth to Ribbentrop, August 25, 1937. BA-B/R43.
- ⁴² Stankuweit to all Officers, September 2, 1937. AdH/Internal Documents.

- ⁴³ Die schweizerische Reformbewegung in der Heilsarmee, 1926-1930. EZA/1/2975.
- ⁴⁴ "Luther über Regierung und Volk," *Der Kriegsruf* (November 18, 1933), 2.
- ⁴⁵ Doris Bergen, *Twisted Cross: The German Christian Movement in the Third Reich* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996).
- ⁴⁶ This correspondence is found in the files at the EZA/1/2975.
- ⁴⁷ Pahlke to Müller, August 15, 1933. EZA/1/2975.
- ⁴⁸ Pahlke had the support of the others in the movement. Several officers wrote to Müller themselves endorsing Pahlke's leadership. EZA/1/2975.
- ⁴⁹ An officer forming a faction within the organization was cause for dismissal. See *Orders and Regulations for Officers*.
- ⁵⁰ Stankuweit to Pahlke, September 28, 1933, and Pahlke to Stankuweit, September 29, 1933. EZA/1/2975.
- ⁵¹ "Reorganisation unseres Werkes," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 14, 1933), 3; "Reorganisation," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 28, 1933), 3; and "Die Einteilung unserer neuen Bezirke," *Der Kriegsruf* (January 6, 1934), 3.
- ⁵² Armin Nolzen, "Moderne Gesellschaft und Organisation: Transformationen der NSDAP nach 1933," in *Interessen, Strukturen und Entscheidungsprozesse: für eine politische Kontextualisierung des Nationalsozialismus*, ed. Manfred Grieger, Christian Jansen, and Irmtrud Wojak (Essen: Klartext, 2010).
- ⁵³ *Organisationsbuch der NSDAP* (Munich, Der Reichsorganisationsleiter der NSDAP, 1943), 279. Thomas de Witt explains that the NSV, along with several other organizations, including the German Labour Front (DAF), formed a protective "outer ring" around the NSDAP, "while at the same time bridging the gap between the leadership and the people." The organization was legally independent but was controlled by an administrative department within the party that also functioned as the organization's central office. It was this *Hauptamt* to which the Heilsarmee reported. De Witt dissertation, 145. See also: Thomas de Witt, "The Economics and Politics of Welfare in the Third Reich," *Central European History* 11, 3 (1978): 256-278; Mark Alan Siegel, "The National Socialist People's Welfare Organization, 1933-1939," (PhD dissertation: University of Cincinnati, 1976).
- ⁵⁴ De Witt dissertation, 173. See also: Peter Hammerschmidt, *Die Wohlfahrtsverbände im NS-Staat: die NSV und die konfessionellen Verbände Caritas und Innere Mission im Gefüge der Wohlfahrtspflege des Nationalsozialismus* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 1999).
- ⁵⁵ Thomas de Witt, "The Struggle against Hunger and Cold: Winter Relief in Nazi Germany, 1933-1939," *Canadian Journal of History* 12, 3 (Feb. 1978): 363; and Florian Tennstedt, "Wohltat und Interesse. Das Winterhilfswerk des Deutschen Volkes: Die Weimarer Vorgeschichte und ihre Instrumentalisierung durch das NS-Regime," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 13, 2 (1987): 157-180.
- ⁵⁶ "Das große nationale Winterhilfswerk," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 7, 1933), 3; and

- “Nationale Winterhilfe und Heilsarmee,” *Der Lokaloffizier* (November 1933), 336.
- ⁵⁷ One advertisement for this program in *Der Kriegsruf* read, “Jeder kann helfen! Durch einen Gastplatz für ein erholungsbedürftiges Kind! (NSV)” *Der Kriegsruf* (July 10, 1937), 4.
- ⁵⁸ Vorländer, “NS-Volkswohlfahrt und Winterhilfswerk,” 342; de Witt, “The Nazi Party and Social Welfare,” 157.
- ⁵⁹ De Witt dissertation, 166.
- ⁶⁰ Adjutant H. Lee to J. Allen, March 15, 1947. IHC/CoS Correspondence. The comment about the Russian suspicion of the Heilsarmee’s leadership refers to the tense relationship between the Heilsarmee and the Soviet occupiers. In 1949 the Heilsarmee was completely banned in the Soviet Zone (and subsequently in East Germany). Otto Döring to Herr Hauptmann Jermolajew, April 25, 1949. Landesarchiv Berlin (hereafter: LA-Berlin), C Rep. 101-04, 24.
- ⁶¹ A few examples include: “Booth with money,” *Entr’acte*, 1882; “Booth. His Own Trumpeter,” *Punch* (December 27, 1882); “Doubling the Part,” *Punch* (November 22, 1890), 189; “The Salvation Army House of Commons,” *Punch*, March 26, 1892.
- ⁶² The anti-Semitic undertones, which were always built around notions of undeserved influence and money, were not a coincidence. At some point during William Booth’s lifetime, the belief emerged that his mother was Jewish. Several early biographers mention his Jewish roots, speculating that his mother’s maiden name, Moss, came from Moses and that her “strong hebraic features” suggested a Jewish background. See Frederick St. George de Lautour Booth-Tucker, *William Booth, the General of The Salvation Army* (New York: The Salvation Army Printing and Publishing House, 1898); and Harold Begbie, *The Life of General William Booth*, vol. 1 (New York: Macmillan, 1920), 17. The suggestion (though probably false) that Mary Moss’ father, Joseph Moss, may have been relatively well off, also added to the legend. Mary Moss was baptized as a Christian as an infant, as were her parents before her, and there is no indication in the baptismal records of any Jewish connection. I am grateful to Pamela J. Walker for sharing this information with me, based on her research of the Booth family. See Pamela Walker, *Pulling the Devil’s Kingdom Down: The Salvation Army in Victorian Britain* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001). It seems the main reason people thought Booth had a Jewish background was because of his physical appearance. The most recent biography of William Booth emphatically states that there is no evidence of Booth’s Jewishness. See Roger J. Green, *The Life & Ministry of William Booth: Founder of The Salvation Army* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 7.
- ⁶³ Theodor Fritsch, *Antisemiten-Katechismus: eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zum Verständniss der Judenfrage* (Leipzig: T. Fritsch, 1888).
- ⁶⁴ Theodor Fritsch, *Handbuch der Judenfrage: eine Zusammenstellung des wichtigsten Materials zur Beurteilung des jüdischen Volkes* (Leipzig: Hammer-Verlag, 1933), 269-270.
- ⁶⁵ Fritsch, 269-170.
- ⁶⁶ “Herr Theodor Fritsch was über die Heilsarmee falsch informiert,” *Der Kriegsruf* (October 21, 1933), 2.

- ⁶⁷ Ebert, "Heilsarmee und Judenfrage," November 2, 1936. BA-B/R5101.
- ⁶⁸ Johannes Hein to Otto Meissner, August 28, 1934. BA-B/R3901/9117.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰ Louis W. Bondy, *Racketeers of Hatred: Julius Streicher and the Jew-Baiters' International* (London: Newman Wolsey, 1946), 68-69.
- ⁷¹ "Ausbildung von Heilsarmee-Offizieren durch Wohlfahrtsdirektor Kahn?" *Der Kriegsruf* (December 8, 1934), 2.
- ⁷² Gruner, 216.
- ⁷³ Heilsarmee und Judenfrage, November 2, 1936. BA-B/R5101. See also: Gruner, 71-71; and Bruno Friedrich and Johannes Hein, *60 Jahre Heilsarmee Festschrift zum 5. Juli 1925* (Berlin: Verlag Heilsarmee, 1925), 32.
- ⁷⁴ Gruner, 170.
- ⁷⁵ Eduard Seidler, *Jüdische Kinderärzte 1933-1945: entrechtet, geflohen, ermordet* (Basel: Karger, 2007), 202.
- ⁷⁶ "In Memoriam Dr. med. et phil. D. Pulvermacher," *Der Kriegsruf* (August 13, 1932), 2.
- ⁷⁷ D. Pulvermacher, *Das Wöchnerinnenheim der Heilsarmee (1898-1913)* (Berlin: W. Herrmann, 1914); and D. Pulvermacher, *Bericht über die geburtshilflichen Leistungen im Jahre 1914* (Berlin: H. S. Hermann, 1915).
- ⁷⁸ This happened in some other Free Churches and Christian communities, including the Seventh-Day Adventists and Baptists. See Andrea Strübind, *Die unfreie Freikirche: der Bund der Baptistengemeinden im "Dritten Reich"* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991); and Johannes Hartlapp, *Siebenten-Tags-Adventisten im Nationalsozialismus: unter Berücksichtigung der geschichtlichen und theologischen Entwicklung in Deutschland von 1875 bis 1950* (Göttingen: V & R Unipress, 2008).
- ⁷⁹ Heilsarmee und Judenfrage. BA-B/R5101. Ebert to Stankuweit, November 3, 1936. BA-B/R3901/9117.
- ⁸⁰ Ebert, Report on the Heilsarmee, January 23, 1936. BA-B/R5101.
- ⁸¹ "Der heroische Jesus!" *Der Kriegsruf* (May 18, 1935), 1.
- ⁸² The narrative is found in all four synoptic gospels: Matthew 21:12-17; Mark 11:15-19; Luke 19:45-48; and John 2:13-16.
- ⁸³ "Vom Händewaschen," *Der Kriegsruf* (October 19, 1935), 2. See Matthew 27 and John 19.
- ⁸⁴ A few examples include, "Geld und Kapitalanlage," *Der Kriegsruf* (March 3, 1934), 1; "Die wichtigste Entscheidung für Zeit und Ewigkeit," *Der Kriegsruf* (April 4, 1936), 1.
- ⁸⁵ Peter Fritzsche, *Life and Death in the Third Reich*, 121.
- ⁸⁶ "Daß das Judentum in der Welt zahlenmäßig zurückgehe, ist eine falsche Annahme..." *Der Lokaloffizier* (April 1933).
- ⁸⁷ "Die Zahl der Juden," *Der Lokaloffizier* (June 1933).

- ⁸⁸ B. Ebert, "Heilsarmee und Judenfrage," November 02, 1936. BA-B/R5101.
- ⁸⁹ *ibid.*
- ⁹⁰ Relevant secondary works include: Manfred Gailus, *Kirchliche Amtshilfe: die Kirche und die Judenverfolgung im "Dritten Reich"* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008); Wolfgang Benz, *Solidarität und Hilfe für Juden während der NS-Zeit* (Berlin: Metropol, 1996); and John Michalczyk, *Confront!: Resistance in Nazi Germany* (New York: P. Lang, 2004).
- ⁹¹ Gruner, 170.
- ⁹² Willi Kothe, *Unterdrückt aber nicht umgekommen: Geschichte der Heilsarmee im Dritten Reich und den Jahren danach* (Lahr-Dinglingen: Verlag der St.-Johannis-Druckerei, 1985), 13.
- ⁹³ Kothe, 14.
- ⁹⁴ Kothe, 15.
- ⁹⁵ Ida Gilbricht memoir, c. 1975. AdH/Gilbricht memoir.
- ⁹⁶ Gruner, 170.
- ⁹⁷ Hildegard Banse Gestapo file. LA-NRW/RW58/60225.
- ⁹⁸ Arthur Boritzki to Adolf Diamant, September 4, 1987. AdH/Boritzki file. Adolf Diamant corresponded with Boritzki while researching his book on the Gestapo in Frankfurt. Adolf Diamant, *Gestapo Frankfurt a.M.: zur Geschichte einer verbrecherischen Organisation in den Jahren 1933-1945* (Frankfurt: A. Diamant, 1988), 162.
- ⁹⁹ Boritzki to Diamant, September 4, 1987.
- ¹⁰⁰ The identity of this man is still unclear. Diamant made a note that he was not Prof. Max Flech-Tebesius. Diamant handwritten note on correspondence between himself and Boritzki. AdH/Boritzki file.
- ¹⁰¹ Arthur and Hildegard Boritzki autobiographical statements. IHC/Officer Files/Boritzki.
- ¹⁰² "Kampf gegen Schundliteratur," *Der Lokaloffizier* (June 1933), 176. See also: "Alkohol und Kultur," *Der Offizier* (September-October 1934), 98.
- ¹⁰³ "Gleichschaltung," *Der Kriegsruf* (January 6, 1934), 2; "Gottes Volk in der Volksgemeinschaft," *Der Lokaloffizier* (November 1934), 331.

On We March: Salvationist Identity in the Age of Nationalism and Imperialism

Nathan Miller

When The Salvation Army¹ was founded in 1865 as the Christian Mission, it was fairly easy to understand and characterize. It was not substantially unlike other mission organizations, either in its form and structure or in its relationship to the larger society and culture. However, when this little mission reformed itself into an Army and sparked an international phenomenon it was also organized into something unfamiliar to other missions, organizations, or churches. As scholars have looked back on the origins of The Salvation Army, they have done so by applying various lenses for understanding the uniqueness of this arms-less army, these soldiers without swords.² They have been considered as a church and theologians have sought to explain and define its ecclesiology.³ They have been viewed in the context of marketing and its exchange with culture has been seen as a good in the market place.⁴ Likely the most prevailing lens for understanding the early Salvation Army has been its perception as a product of Victorian culture. Surprisingly, it has not been studied through the metaphor essential to its identity, when the best way to understand the early Salvation Army is through the lens of late-nineteenth century nationalism and imperialism; as an imperialist Army marching forward as the vanguard for the Kingdom of God. Furthermore, I will suggest that by exploring the music of Salvationists we can better understand how they related to and navigated American culture.

Nathan Miller is an assistant professor of musicology at Asbury University in Wilmore, Kentucky.

In the spring of 2015, Dr. Andrew Eason had an article published in *Word & Deed* entitled “‘We’re Marching on to Conquer All’: The Question of Imperialism in Early Salvation Army Music.”⁵ This question of imperialism in the early Army, not just in its music, is a good place to begin exploring what the early music of The Salvation Army in United States can tell us about the corporate and personal identity of Salvationists. In his paper, Dr. Eason corrects lazy scholarship by Barbara Harlow and Mia Carter in their book *Imperialism and Orientalism: A Documentary Sourcebook*.⁶ In their book Harlow and Carter use early Army songs as examples of religious affirmation of Victorian imperialism. This research is lazy because they failed to recognize that the Army songs cited were not understood in their appropriate context. For example, consider the following song:

Oh, tell us why you call yourselves an Army?
 Are you soldiers? Do you fight?—
 Oh, yes, we are the real Salvation Army,
 We are soldiers and we fight.
 Our Leader is the Lord of Hosts,
 ’Tis in His strength the Army boasts,
 We’ll drive the devil from these coasts—
 Trusting Jesus we shall win.

We’ll fight the fight for God and right,
 We never will give in;
 And trusting in the Saviour’s might,
 The Army’s bound to win.⁷

In response to this song being used as an example of implicit approval of British Imperialism, Eason protested strongly: “Songs of this nature hardly painted Britain as a model Christian nation, because, as Army members clearly recognized, the motherland had its fair share of devilish vices, from drunkenness and violence to prostitution and injustice.”⁸ One must recognize the coast from which the devil was to be driven in this song was that of the British Isles. Eason alludes to Catherine Booth’s pacifism and quotes from William Booth’s opposition to the Boer Wars in South Africa: “Remember, you stand in the place

of Christ, and are the friends of both Boers and Britons.” Eason suggests the Army was not guilty of the jingoism evident in the other sacred songs presented in this article. In fact, he goes to great lengths to separate the Army from the imperialism of the age. He states, “While there is some truth to this assertion [that hymns lent considerable weight and legitimacy to the expanding British Empire], the songs of one quintessentially Victorian body, The Salvation Army, suggest the need for a more qualified conclusion.”⁹ While Dr. Eason was certainly successful in correcting the missteps of Harlow and Carter, I think there may still be a more qualified conclusion—one that may consider imperialism and The Salvation Army through a different lens.

As opposed to separating a quintessentially Victorian Army from the imperialism of its age, we should consider separating an Imperial Army from the Victorianism of its time and place. Booth’s grand statement of equal solidarity with Britons and Boers is not so much an example of a stance against British imperialism, but a stance against British nationalism. Here Booth dis-identifies with Britons—his soldiers are not Britons, but the friends of Britons. They are not subjects of the queen but subjects of the Lord of hosts. By viewing the Army through the lens of nationalism and imperialism, by considering the founding of the Army as the formation of a nation, we might better understand how the Army conscribes what is arguably one of the most powerful movements of its time in establishing a manifestation of the Kingdom of God on earth. It enabled its members, soldiers, and citizens to undergo a dynamic shift in identity that would inform their understanding of the world and how they related to it.

The Victorian lens is a particularly difficult one through which to consider the Army’s development and growth because it carries so many connotations and expectations. It is simultaneously broad and specific. Noted Victorian scholar Francis O’Gorman, in the introduction to *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Culture*, sheds helpful light on the difficulty with this lens. He states:

The problems with “Victorian” are not hard to find. The adjective is parochial. It is monarchical, too—it suggests an aristocratic history rather than one about all classes and social divisions. It is plainly fortuitous rather than necessary: why

should the reign of a single constitutional monarch, albeit a long one, cover a period that was distinctive from what went before and what came after?¹⁰

In its broadest meaning, Victorian denotes the time period in the United Kingdom under the reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1901. In this sense, the Army beginnings are certainly Victorian. In a narrower sense, however, the Army's origins are quintessentially un-Victorian or, more directly, even anti-Victorian. While this might seem an aggressive statement now, it certainly would not have seemed an extraordinary statement to most Victorians. Victorian cultural critic Matthew Arnold labeled Salvationists as non-conformists and dissenters—a prevailing view of the early Army in Victorian England.¹¹ Comics, newspaper accounts, and even the Army's own testimonies confirm their position as outsiders in Victorian England.

Victorianism was characterized by a sense of superiority in British culture and education: cultural critics believed that, if made accessible, culture and education would lift the lower classes and races from their depravity and poverty. We see this manifested in many of the social programs in the East End of London and in missionary ventures across the globe. Victorians felt their superiority endowed them with a great responsibility, popularly known as “the white man's burden.” Refinement and propriety, and the disjuncture between things that were base and unacceptable and those that were good and worthy, were important Victorian ideals. It is understandable that upon a cursory glance one would associate Salvationist activity as emblematic of the Victorian ideal of social uplift, as do Harlow and Carter. However, upon more thorough inspection one recognizes that Salvationists stood against this Victorian worldview. For instance, when Henry Morton Stanley declared that Africa was dark, William Booth responded by proclaiming England dark.¹² As Dr. Eason defended the Army against the implication that its hymns offered tacit approval of the worst of British imperialism, he also presents evidence that the Army is not quintessentially Victorian, observing that the songs Harlow and Carter reference prove something quite different from their assumption. Eason makes the point most strongly when he concludes his article:

The Salvation Army may have been born in the heart of the English capital, but it was never captive to any one country or ideology. As careful analysis of its earliest hymns demonstrates, it sought, above all, to unite Christians everywhere in the global war against sin and human misery. This was not an imperial project, but indicative of the Great Commission.¹³

So, is the early Army in fact Victorian if one must qualify all the ways in which it doesn't conform to Victorian culture, ideals, and identity, or might there be a better lens through which to understand its activity, culture, and identity? There is a reason Harlow and Carter mistake the Army songs for British jingoism: they are jingoistic.¹⁴ You can suggest, like Eason and many others, that they are not imperial because they're not imploring the flying of the Union Jack over every land and sea, but that doesn't change the fact that these songs are calling for an army to invade and conquer. By considering The Salvation Army through the lens of nationalism and imperialism, we can better understand the Army's transnational success, the dynamic formation of soldier's identity and camaraderie, and especially how Salvationists interacted in the cultures and society in which they worked and ministered.

Nationalism and imperialism swept through the West and led, catastrophically, to World War I. During the late nineteenth century, Germany and Italy unified into monolithic nation-states and all European nations increased their standing armies. In the United States, for the first time, a sense of American nationalism arose after the civil war, particularly when in 1898, the country united after the USS *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor, sparking U.S. involvement in the Spanish-American War. Of particular interest is the fact that the rapid military buildup across Europe occurred at the same time as The Salvation Army's meteoric growth. Beyond the mirrored growth of European military armament and the rise of this arms-less army, Salvationists also perfectly embody other tenets of nationalism, which are clearly seen in many Salvationist songs of this time. Webster's dictionary defines nationalism as "a feeling that people have of being loyal to and proud of their country often with the belief that it is better and more important than other countries" and "a desire by a large group of people (such as people who share the same culture, history, language,

etc.) to form a separate and independent nation of their own.”

It is certainly true that Salvationists valued their soldiership above their national allegiances, and that they saw their involvement in The Salvation Army as their best and most important affiliation. Uniform-wearing, a distinctive language,¹⁵ and a shared history¹⁶ made Salvationists’ activity in the Army their primary cultural experience and one that clearly set them apart as Other.

Alexander Motyl outlined the circumstances in which new national identities are formed in the *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. He suggests:

The adoption of national identity in every case ... was a response to a fundamentally similar situation. It occurred because an influential group (or groups) was dissatisfied with its traditional identity as a result of a profound inconsistency between the definition of social order expressed in it and the experience of individual actors. ... Whatever the cause of the identity crisis, its structural manifestation was the same: anomie [defined by John J. Gerber and Linda M. Macionis as the “condition in which society provides little moral guidance to individuals”¹⁷]. ... The underlying ideas of nationality were shaped and modified in accordance with the situational constraints of the actors and the aspirations, frustrations, and interests which these constraints generated.

This anomie results in a society or societies reinterpreting identity, retaining elements that are deemed acceptable and removing elements deemed unacceptable, in order to create a unified community. This development may be the result of internal structural issues or the result of resentment by an existing group or groups towards other communities, especially foreign powers that are or are deemed to be controlling them.¹⁸

He further suggested anomie in societies cause disenfranchised groups to reinterpret their identity, discarding the unacceptable and reinterpreting the acceptable so as to create a new community. Feelings of newly developed national identity places deep importance on national symbols, flags, and

anthems. It is impossible to read through Salvationist war songs and not sense the deep importance placed on the flag. Viewing the Army through this lens is transformative in understanding how early Salvationists created a unified, transcontinental community. It sheds light on the transformation and development of their art, beginning by retaining and reinterpreting elements of the surrounding culture, then eventually by creating its own culture, art, symbols, and origin myths.

Considering the Army quintessentially Victorian is that the term carries with it a set of values and goals that are inconsistent with those stated by the Army. It has caused some scholars, such as Norman Murdoch, to declare the Army failed in its early endeavors in London's East End. His evaluation is built upon Victorian goals and ends; he indicts the Army for not revitalizing the East End's cultural malaise. William Booth and George Scott Railton consistently fought against assertions by those like Matthew Arnold that condemned them for not uplifting the downtrodden in the East End. Early Salvationists took a stance diametrically opposed to that of the Victorians. To early Salvationists, redemption did not look like middle-class Christendom. They were not attempting to reform the culture of the poor; instead, they fought to conquer it and claim it for the Kingdom of God. The songs, art, drama, clothing, and even the temples of the heathen masses, the music halls, could be redeemed and made holy. Holiness for these soldiers did not mean a journey out of poverty. Instead it often meant sanctification in their poverty. For middle-class girls drawn to the Army by its liberating stance on gender equality, it meant a throwing off of cultural respectability as they took on the dress of the impoverished. Murdoch recalls Railton's response to Matthew Arnold:

Railton advised, you should see the wildest East London character "born again of the Holy Ghost"; the most intelligent Belgravian [someone from central London] could not rise a step nearer God. While Railton's solution worked miracles with individuals, it did not succeed when Booth's mission applied it to the East End masses.¹⁹

Here it seems Murdoch has missed the point. This response is as much an indictment of the Belgravian as it is of the East End masses. Booth never imagined the East End as a shining “city on a hill,” but as the launching pad of the Kingdom of God. In the Darkest England scheme, the rescue shops were never intended to close in the East End. He didn’t imagine that the poverty and sin endemic to that area would be overturned. It seems he imagined that other poor sinners would take the place of those moved out to the farm and oversea colonies.

When looking at testimonies of early Salvationist converts one finds accounts of cultural uplift scant, however, accounts of transformational identity abound. In these testimonies, the convert undergoes a shift from an old identity to new one. New soldiers were often taken to the temples of their former life, where they would renounce who they were and testify to their new identity. This transformation would be seen tangibly in the newness of their uniform, comrades, identity, and purpose but not their circumstances. For instance, in his book *Practical Visionaries* Humphrey Wallis transcribes an open-air testimony of Charlie Ward, once known as “Charley the Boozer,” given outside the bar he used to frequent:

I’m only lettin’ every one as hears me know God picked me up out o’ the dust-’eap an’ the gutter, forgive my sins, an’ washed my soul in His Precious Blood. ‘Ere I stands outside the “Lion,” where they’ve had to chuck me out many a time. God bless the publican! God bless my ole chums what’s inside, an’ save ‘em, an’ bring ‘em to the Glory and Goodness what saves me—me, ole Charley the Gab, Charley the Boozer, Charley what hadn’t a coat to his back and was walkin’ on his uppers when The Salvation Army come here an’ showed him that Jesus loved him enough to save him. Oh, there ain’t none too bad for the Lord Jesus to save. ... God bless and save you! I’ve made a hash of all I wanted to say, but I’m willin’ to be a fool for Christ’s sake, an’ He can use any word, even poor ole Charley’s, to reach some poor feller’s heart. Amen.²⁰

Notice that this published account did not attempt to whitewash Charlie's poverty, nor did it suggest that he was no longer impoverished. Instead, it emphasized that salvation and identity transformation were not dependent on prerequisite goodness. In this way, Salvationists carefully navigated a relationship with the enemy, that set them inside and outside the culture they sought to conquer. Furthermore, it imparted a construct of transformational identity upon all those they encountered as both enemy and recruit. In the same way, the music halls—the strongholds of the enemy, the songs and styles, and other cultural elements—could become trophies of conquest and repurposed for the grand war. This is remarkably different than other Victorian Christian missions, which saw these cultural elements of dissenters as inherently and structurally evil.

The success of The Salvation Army in America serves as an example of the power of identity transformation in the lives of individual Salvationists. The Army's early years in the United States were fraught with mismanagement, fractured leadership, and unease with autocratic authority in London. However, Salvationists remained faithful to The Salvation Army through two significant schisms, not because of the actions of capable leaders, but because membership in The Salvation Army became the primary marker on their identity. More simply, they stayed faithful to The Salvation Army because they had become Salvationists. In the beginning of *Marching to Glory*, Edward McKinley vividly describes the moment Commissioner George Scott Railton commenced his humble invasion of America:

They came to launch a great crusade. By all odds, they should have failed on the spot, outright and finally. Led by an amiable eccentric, as single-minded as an arrow in flight (but who proved in the end to be as ill-fitted to this grand endeavor as he was to many smaller ones), were seven women so graceless that their leader referred to them affectionately as "half-a-dozen ignoramuses." This was the pioneer party of The Salvation Army. They struggled with a flag, luggage, and the other passengers down the gangplank of the steamer *Australia* at Castle Garden, New York City, on March 10, 1880, to claim America for God.²¹

This is an image of an invading Army, not of missionaries arriving in a heathen land or a failed organization looking for a more suitable marketplace, as Murdoch suggests. McKinley subtly and effectively points out some of the flaws that should have condemned this endeavor to failure.²² Railton's landing in New York recalls the images of explorers and conquistadores of 300 years prior, planting their flag and claiming the New World for God and their country. Unlike those explorers, Salvationists did not succeed because of superior armament, disease, deception, or deplorable practices, nor dynamic leadership or well-laid plans. In fact, its leadership on a national level was often poor and unstable, and international leaders consistently misread and misunderstood the unique requirements of the Army by local law and custom. The Salvation Army did not succeed because it was wanted and embraced. The Salvation Army succeeded in America because Salvationists, soldiers, and officers experienced a fundamental change in their identity. To them, this identity wasn't a mere metaphor, it was a reality: they were soldiers in an Army intent on conquering the world for God.

Oh, tell us why you call yourselves an Army?
Are you soldiers? Do you fight?—
Oh, yes, we are the real Salvation Army,
We are soldiers and we fight.
Our Leader is the Lord of Hosts,
'Tis in His strength the Army boasts,
We'll drive the devil from these coasts—
Trusting Jesus we shall win.

We'll fight the fight for God and right,
We never will give in;
And trusting in the Saviour's might,
The Army's bound to win.²³

Endnotes

- ¹ The trademark for The Salvation Army calls for the capitalization of the indefinite article.
- ² When one studies The Salvation Army, one is studying the activity of Salvationists. Because an army is at its core a collection of soldiers formed for a unified purpose, I will choose to most often speak of the army as “them,” as opposed to “it.”
- ³ Phil Needham, *Community in Mission: A Salvationist Ecclesiology*. London: International Headquarters of The Salvation Army, 1987.
- ⁴ Diane Winston, *Red-hot and Righteous: The Urban Religion of the Salvation Army*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- ⁵ Andrew Eason, “‘We’re Marching on to Conquer All’: The Question of Imperialism in Early Salvation Army Music.” *Word & Deed*, Vol. XVII No. 2, Alexandria, VA: Crest Books, 2015, 21-29.
- ⁶ Barbara Harlow and Mia Carter, *Imperialism and Orientalism: A Documentary Sourcebook*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- ⁷ William Booth, *Are you soldiers? Do you Fight?*, “Salvation Songs.” London, UK: The Salvation Army Book Department, 1911.
- ⁸ Eason, “We’re Marching on to Conquer All,” 25.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, 21.
- ¹⁰ Francis O’Gorman, *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian Culture*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010, 3.
- ¹¹ Matthew Arnold, and Stefan Collini. *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- ¹² In 1890, Henry M. Stanley published his book based on his travels in Africa, *In Darkest Africa*. Later that year, William Booth published his grand social work scheme, which was named in reference to Stanley’s book, *In Darkest England and the Way Out*. While this was certainly grand, it did not view Victorian society and culture as something to be emulated and shared.
- ¹³ Eason, “We’re Marching on to Conquer All,” 25, 29.
- ¹⁴ Jingoism is defined as the feelings and beliefs of people who think that their country is always right and who are in favor of aggressive acts against other countries.
- ¹⁵ The unique rebranding of all elements of religious life into military terminology created a sort of new language that separated Salvationists out from other churches. This language required translation to any “foreigner” who had no idea that, for instance, a knee drill was a prayer meeting.
- ¹⁶ This shared history transcended national boundaries as Salvationists shared and disseminated the origin story of the Booths’ founding of the Army and in their individual origin stories of their recruitment into the Army. In both scenarios the founding is understood to be at the will of divine impetus. These origins stories were perpetuated through personal testimonies and retellings, as well as in print through *The War Cry* and in numerous monographs.

- ¹⁷ Linda M. Gerber and John J. Macionis, *Sociology* (7th Canadian ed.). Toronto: Pearson Canada, 2010, 97.
- ¹⁸ Alexander J. Motyl, *Encyclopedia of Nationalism*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2001.
- ¹⁹ Norman H. Murdoch, *Origins of the Salvation Army*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994, 77-79.
- ²⁰ Humphrey Wallis and William Booth, *Practical Visionaries: Brief Sketches, Illustrating the Power and Spirit of Salvation Army Work amongst the Common People*. London, 1918.
- ²¹ Edward H. McKinley, *Marching to Glory: The History of the Salvation Army in the United States of America, 1880-1992*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995, 1.
- ²² It should be mentioned that the Army's first significant, and most lasting, endeavor in America was with Eliza Shirley and her family. While not the grand invasion of an eccentric commissioner and seven ignoramuses, the Shirley family established a stronghold in Philadelphia that became the foundation of the Army in America.
- ²³ William Booth, *Are you soldiers? Do you Fight?*, "Salvation Songs." London, UK: The Salvation Army Book Department, 1911.

Revisiting the Sociology of Salvationism

Bruce Power

As a presenter at a 1987 symposium on Salvation Army ecclesiology, I was tasked with considering the sociology of Salvationism. A version of that paper appeared in an issue of *Word & Deed* just over a decade later.¹ At that point little had changed in my approach to the topic. What has developed in the discussion since?²

The Salvation Army in its multiform manifestations encounters people in many contexts. My original study observed that, unsurprisingly, encounters with the organization typically determined an individual's view of the Army as a social and/or spiritual entity. Yet the question of identity remained vexing to Salvationists who, several generations removed from the founders of the movement, wanted to define organizational and sociological parameters in a more cohesive and thoughtful manner. The Salvation Army had not in any way been lacking in organizational capabilities or systems of operations to guide the daily manifestations of Army service throughout the world.³ Organization and procedures were and remain clearly defined. What had been lacking was 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 had been characterized more by a sense of what needed to be done than by a formal sociological construct. We had seen ourselves as practitioners, not theoreticians.⁴ The 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

Bruce Power, a retired major in The Salvation Army, is currently adjunct professor of biblical studies at Booth University College in Winnipeg, and an instructor of biblical studies at Tyndale University College in Toronto.

have been more concerned with doing and being than describing or analyzing.⁵ Yet by the century mark in our history the need to develop an ecclesiology describing and defining ourselves as part of the church was becoming critical.

Salvationists have always argued that they are a part of the Church in a theological sense: Bramwell Booth declared:

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—a living fruit-bearing branch in the True Vine.⁶

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. While from its inception Salvation Army leadership refused to conceive of itself as merely a sect, or just another church or denomination, self definition proved more difficult. Typically Salvationists avoided sociological and ecclesial labels, utilizing alternative terminology. Army literature avoided using the terms sect, church, or denomination and employed 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.⁷

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.⁸

This established identification of the Army with the theological understanding of the term “church” has thus been with us from the beginning, and is well articulated by Frederick Couetts:

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” (Ephesians 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.⁹

Thus the organization made and maintained a sharp distinction between theological and sociological usages of the term “church.” While we had been comfortable applying the term to ourselves theologically, we avoided such a sociological designation. The issue was especially confusing since the term church was utilized to mean 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 reli-

gious order. These various aspects exist within the God-given shape of an Army, the world-wide 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.¹⁰

Although Wiseman applied the term “denomination” to the Army we remained confronted with a struggle to get past a generic term. The question remained of how to fit together the diverse elements comprising The Salvation Army. We had defined theologically and experientially¹¹ that we are a church in the broadest sense of the term, while at the same time refusing to be confined by such a definition when applied sociologically. The organization had quite effectively sidestepped the sociological models until the 70s and 80s, when sociologists and Salvationists applied models to the organization.

And so we reached a point where two realities were intersecting, leading Salvationists to express a growing discomfort with the lack of an ecclesiological statement. While those concerned with social theory argued whether or not ideal types applied to the organization adequately described the reality Salvationists knew, the typical Salvationist appeared more concerned that they did not worship in a building called a church and that such a description never appeared in official publications.

Ideal Types

Before looking at the ideal types applied to The Salvation Army at the time, a brief review of the use and purpose of these paradigms is helpful. Ideal types are constructs which are proposed by historians and sociologists. They 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.¹² “The ideal type is thus the sum total of concepts which the specialist in the human sciences constructs purely for

purposes of research.”¹³

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.¹⁴ 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 clarify our conceptualization of the Movement.

Sect

The Salvation Army had most often been called a sect by sociologists.¹⁵ Usually termed a conversionist sect, a case could be made for its manifestation as a holiness sect as well.¹⁶ “Sects are ideological movements having as their explicit and declared aim the maintenance, and perhaps even the propagation of certain ideological positions.”¹⁷

Perhaps the most influential of these analyses was that of Roland Robertson, who argued that The Army is an established sect. His argument was that a transition from sect to denomination had only superficially taken place.¹⁸ 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 more broadly. Robertson isolated 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 practiced 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.¹⁹

While this model was helpful in understanding certain aspects of Salvationism, there were serious problems with this analysis. Much of Robertson's argument was based on "official" positions and on British examples.²⁰

The latter point raises the question of the adequacy of all such parochial research in analyzing an international organization. As T. Wahlström observed:

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.²¹

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

Denomination

The term “denomination” has become the standard descriptor for American religious organizations.²² However, it is not particularly helpful for analysis of the Army as a functional reality. While some Salvationists would find calling ourselves a denomination attractive, the word 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,”²³ and therefore 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.²⁴

Gordon Moyles presented an excellent example of the denominational argument in *The Blood and Fire in Canada*. Moyles contended that the Army began as a sect and became a denomination.²⁵ While much that Moyles pointed out was helpful, it appeared to me that Moyles was working with the burden of making data fit the ideal type to establish the Army as a denomination and a church in the sociological sense of the terms.²⁶ He argued that most new converts were middle class and only very few entered from the social wing.²⁷ Though these statements represented some corps, did they represent all? What of more sectarian centers? A major concern was that in order to fit this profile, the entire social wing of the organization was largely removed from consideration. How can we consider this to be legitimate?²⁸ 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].”²⁹ And while he noted that in Canada two-thirds of officer personnel are in non-corps work, he did not address their function.³⁰ 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.³¹

Perhaps, I noted at the time, it would be even more correct to say that they would like the two aspects of the one Army to be more integrated.³²

These two snapshots of Salvation Army religious expression led me to consider the question of self-identification in official Salvation Army publications prior to the 1987 symposium.

Self-Understanding

As we have seen, early definitions of The Salvation Army utilized the terms movement, organization, mission and Army to describe group structure. Theologically and experientially we had identified ourselves as a part of the universal church, while sociologically avoiding all typical designations. Often descriptions of function served 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.³³

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.³⁴

With this narrative is 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.³⁵

The closest document to an enunciation of an ecclesiological position I discovered was an elaboration of Salvation Army government minimally revised over a period of fifty years. The version quoted in full below 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.³⁶

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.
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.
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. vi.2).

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.

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.

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. 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.

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.

The main points raised in this statement of Salvation Army government can be summarized thusly: The Salvation Army is theologically a part of the Church, in the broader New Testament sense of the term; salvation remains a focal point of our lives and service; the Army structure is intended to mobilize us for God; within the structure adaptability and freedom of expression remain key concepts.

Since the initial symposium concerned with Salvation Army ecclesiology there have been many developments, and much further discussion on the self-designation of the organization.³⁷ It is not my purpose in this brief paper to review this development, but simply to observe that in most places and contexts in contemporary Salvationism the self-designation of church has become standard. While this is a primarily theological designation, it marks a major transition in the language used in official documents and self-understanding. I do not believe this eliminates the need to pursue a functional sociological model for the army as a church.

Revisiting a Proposed 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. Analytical models that must be forced to work are not ultimately helpful. Standard church/sect typologies appeared too limiting and

thus inadequate to describe the Army as a whole. In addition, tensions of faith and practice within the organization both nationally and internationally could not be adequately accounted for in such singular models.

The analysis to that point suggested that The Salvation Army in its diversity maintained and encouraged both sectarian and denominational responses to religious life. To define an ideal type which more adequately represented the religious experience of Salvationists a sociological model would need to embrace both types of religious expression. Over the course of our history such diversity of religious response had been a very positive factor in terms of ministry potential and had somehow usually been able to be embraced by our generic self descriptive terminology. But this had been done intuitively and had not been informed by any model. Was a useful model available?

Ernst Troeltsch observed that medieval Catholicism was structurally able to balance and maximize the value in these tensions. Troeltsch maintained that the basis of this balance between church type and sect type was based on the five major factors which compare significantly to Salvationism.³⁸ The co-relations 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.³⁹ While the Constitution of the Army tolerates and encourages national identity and local diversity, it places limits on real power.⁴⁰ Thus conflicts within the organization can ultimately be resolved from above when dialogue fails. The loose outline of doctrine⁴¹ and practice provides a structure allowing great diversity of expression but encouraging unity of purpose.⁴² Thus the model I proposed to best describe the functioning sociology of Salvationism described sect and church types within one organization, under a centralized authority. We might graph it simply as follows:

Authority
Sect ——— Church

Following this attempt to articulate a more functional sociology of Salvationism, the question of identifying The Salvation Army as a church has largely disappeared.⁴³ In the time after the 1987 symposium on ecclesiology, The Salvation Army worldwide seems to have become much more comfortable with an identity as a church in the theological sense. Is the need for a sociological paradigm even relevant? Is there still value in this proposed model to understand religious expression within the Army as a church?

To my knowledge, few have addressed in any way my observations concerning the sociology of Salvationism. Earl Robinson referenced the discussion as part of his paper for the second ecclesiology symposium. Andrew Eason correctly observed that, while I had proposed the model, I had not done any case studies to test its applicability, a matter he undertook in a paper published in 2003. Following his examination of “The Salvation Army in Late Victorian Britain,” he concludes:

A certain inflexibility arises, however, when sociological theory overshadows the interests of history. This has been true of the few studies on The Salvation Army and its world. Sociological treatments of the movement have been guided more by the assumption that mixed types ought to be avoided than by a close historical examination of all the evidence.

This presupposition, while at times only implicit, has ruled out in advance the possibility that the early Salvation Army might have been both sectarian and churchly. Such a strategy has been problematic, since it has overlooked disconfirming data. It has led to an oversimplified picture of an extremely complex religious organization. To describe the early Salvation Army as sectarian, even in a qualified sense, is to present only one side of the story. Labels such as “established sect” (Robertson) and “conversionist sect” (Wilson) are profoundly inadequate when attempting to understand this religious body. The tensions and inconsistencies in this organization’s attitude toward its late-Victorian world are overlooked when it is approached solely from a sectarian perspective.⁴⁴

The application of this new model presents challenges and possibilities, but given the clear engagement of The Salvation Army in internationalism and multiculturalism this would seem to present a helpful tool to map our varied religious expressions in what will hopefully remain a unified Salvationism. While national or regional profiles need to be developed, the model can offer insights to the development of unified mission within varied contexts.

Individualism and technology support both unity and diversity in new and constantly changing ways, and this is not likely to diminish in the future, but will almost certainly intensify. Models that help us understand the manner in which people interact with and experience their faith can help the organization strategize and implement effective relationships between varied components. In 1987 I suggested the following positive uses of the model of a mixed type under a centralized authority structure. Do these remain relevant?

Applications of This Model

1. Such a model would 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 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 could facilitate plotting of individual, congregational, and institutional points on a continuum of practice.
6. Such analysis could assist in maintaining the tension between sectarian and denominational approaches to Salvationism in creative and functional ways. This would be useful in avoiding 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, and develops public support and interest which allow us to undertake social service projects far beyond our strength and capacity without such support. This helps create an open door into the larger society where a denominational approach to religious expression is more effective. 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.

This model was proposed as a tool to enable The Salvation Army to more effectively utilize the structure which already appeared 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 surrendered 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.⁴⁵

The intervening years have confirmed to me that the authority structures of The Salvation Army can be used to mobilize and organize effectively, and at its best can facilitate the growth and development of the institution. On the other hand, top-down authority structures can be structures for the intentional or unintentional abuse of power. Where there is no local decision-making authority and succession planning, an administrative understanding of the religious profile of various ministry contexts is essential to ensure that transitions of leadership build on the existing religious ministry profile. Ignorance of this can lead to disastrous and unintended consequences. New leaders may understand themselves to have the authorization of the church to completely change the profile of a situation, leading local stakeholders few options other than suffering (in silence or otherwise), relocation, or in the worst case religious and spiritual disillusionment. The result can be a dismantling of the work that has progressed, and in times of decreasing denominational loyalty, the loss of people who had been involved or even enthusiastic to the Army's mission. In short, the power structures that can make the organization strong and flexible can unwittingly become its Achilles' heel. The development of a theological identity as a church has not, in my observation, eliminated the need to understand our sociological profile for the development of effective ministry strategies. While the basis for these brief observations is both anecdotal and parochial, they are based on the same considerations which inspired the original paper.⁴⁶

Endnotes

¹ Bruce Power. "Towards a Sociology of Salvationism," *Word & Deed* Vol. 2, No. 1 (November 1999) 17-33.

² The current paper reproduces the basic argument of the original paper in order to assess the current state of the question.

³ 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* (New York: Macmillan, 1920) Vol.2, 22ff. Sandall, R. *The History of The Salvation Army, Vol. II* (London: Nelson, 1950) 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).

- ⁴ 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, Vol. I* (London: Nelson, 1947) 66.
- ⁵ This familiar slogan seems to have been developed by the Army's Public Relations Department.
- ⁶ Bramwell Booth: *Echoes & Memories*, 65. Reprinted in John Waldron (ed.): *The Salvation Army and the Churches* (New York: Salvation Army, 1986) 28. Cf. *The Handbook of Doctrine* (London: International Headquarters, 1969) for a general discussion the theological meaning of the term "church" (70f).
- ⁷ Maud Booth: *Beneath Two Flags* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1891) 271. Reprinted Waldron: 40.
- ⁸ Bramwell Booth: *Echoes & Memories*, 67. Cf. Frederick Coutts: *The Salvation Army in Relation to the Church* (London: International Headquarters, 1978) 8, who also quotes this passage.
- ⁹ Coutts: 9. Reprinted in Waldron: 56f. "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) 64.
- ¹⁰ Clarence Wiseman: "Are We a Church?" *The Officer* (October 1976) 438. Reprinted Waldron: 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 Waldron: 87ff., 89.
- ¹¹ 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). This experiential component to theological thinking might 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) 8; Sandall: *History, Volume 1*, 41-45.

¹² “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 world-wide 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) 59f. Cf. Raymond Aron: *Main Currents in Sociological Thought* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1967) Vol.2, 206ff. Talcott Parsons: *The Structure of Social Action* (New York: Macmillan, 1968) 601ff.

¹³ Julien Freund: *The Sociology of Max Weber* (New York: Vintage, 1969) 60.

¹⁴ Freund: 60.

¹⁵ 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) 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,” 22-45 in B. Wilson (ed.): *Patterns of Sectarianism*: London: Heinemann, 1967); B. Wilson: *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford, 1982) 89-120; B. Wilson: “A Typology of Sects,” 361-383 in Roland Robertson (ed.): *Sociology of Religion* (Victoria: Penguin, 1969); B. Wilson: *Religion in Secular Society* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1969) 207-263; E. Clark: *The Small Sects in America* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1937); J. Wach: *Sociology of Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1962).

¹⁶ Cf. B. Wilson: *Religious Sects* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1970) 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,” 49-105 in *Patterns of Sectarianism* (London: Heinemann, 1967). Wilson: “Typology” (365) describes the early Army as conversionist, arguing that when sects persist they “undergo processes of mutation” (371). While formal structures remain, practices and attitudes change. H. Niebuhr: *The Social Sources of*

Denominationalism (Cleveland: Meridian, 1957) argued that this process usually resulted in the move of the sect back into the mainstream of denominational life.

¹⁷ B. Wilson: "Typology," 362.

¹⁸ Robertson: "Persistence," 49.

¹⁹ Robertson: 104f.

²⁰ 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.).

²¹ Ariston: "More Sociology of Salvationism," *The Officer* (Dec. 1974) 550-556. 551. T. Wahlström used the pseudonym "Ariston." Cf. *The Officer* (Dec. 1974) 571f.

²² Cf. Will Herberg: *Protestant — Catholic — Jew* (New York: Doubleday, 1960) 84ff.; Sidney Mead: *The Lively Experiment* (New York: Harper, 1963) 103ff.

²³ 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) 1.

²⁴ 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).

²⁵ Moyles has been highly influenced by H.R. Niebuhr (*Social Sources* 20, 75) 228ff. and does not critique the view that we have evolved in this way. He concluded Robertson would view the Army in Canada as an established sect, while recognizing Robertson's methods to be marred by an uncritical acceptance of stated Army practices as representative of reality (244). Still, Moyles followed Robertson in his analysis of the patterns of Army history. His outline of the various phases of Army life corresponds closely to the stages outlined by Robertson (Cf. Robertson: 50f.).

²⁶ Moyles: 229.

²⁷ Moyles: 229.

²⁸ While the importance of Army social work is noted by Moyles (230f.) it did not appear to influence his conclusions.

²⁹ Moyles: 239.

³⁰ Moyles: 241.

³¹ Moyles: 244.

³² 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," 275-283 in *International Staff Council Addresses. 1904* (London: The Salvation Army Book Department, 1904). In this significant and prophet-

ic 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 an earlier Booth College symposium by John Nelson in his unpublished paper "Salvation Army Missiology." Cf. P. Needham: "Toward a Re-Integration of The Salvationist Mission," 121-158 in John Waldron (ed.): *Creed and Deed* (Oakville: The Salvation Army, 1986).

- ³³ William Booth: *Salvation Soldierly* (London: Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, n.d.) 11.
- ³⁴ *Rules and Regulations for Field Officers* (1891) 296. Much of this text is repeated in various versions of "Orders and Regulations." Cf. *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers* (London: International Headquarters, 1927) 106f.; *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers* (London: International Headquarters, 1950) 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* (1977) 1f.
- ³⁵ *O&R Soldiers* (1950). Only minor variants from *O&R Officers* (1891) 296; *O&R Soldiers* (1927) 106. For further details of reworking of this text see Power, *Word & Deed 2* (1999) 17-33.
- ³⁶ This form is taken from *Orders and Regulations for Soldiers of The Salvation Army (by The Founder)* (London: International Headquarters, (Revised 1927) 107-110. The wording is very slightly changed from the version which appears in *Rules and Regulations for Field Officers* (1891) 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) 76-78. For what amounts to a text critical analysis of this document see Power, *Word & Deed 2* (1999) 17-33. The longevity of the basic form and content of this statement regarding the government of The Salvation Army is striking.
- ³⁷ See Earl Robinson. *People of God: Salvationist Ecclesiology*. 3-8, *Word & Deed*; Earl Robinson. "Salvationist Ecclesiology: Past, Present, and the Way Forward," 9-42, *Word & Deed 9* (2006).
- ³⁸ Ernst Troeltsch: *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (2 Volumes, New York: Harper, 1960) 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) 121-139), notes the importance both structures for the health of the Church as a whole. The Church Growth movement preferred 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. 186ff.
- ³⁹ It is significant that some of these very points are noted in Army statements of government. Also Cf. William Booth: "Organisation," 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," 95-100 in *Concilium* 64 (New York: Herder, 1971); A. Greeley: "Advantages and Drawbacks of a Centre of Communications in the Church: Sociological Point of View," 101-114 *Concilium* 64.

⁴⁰ *The Salvation Army Act 1980* places ultimate power in the hands of the Administration.

⁴¹ Cf. Coutts: *Salvationists* 6-17.

⁴² 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) 214-360 provides an excellent historical overview. Winter: 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 Ex-Officer* (Toronto: Britnell, 1899).

⁴³ Ironically, during this time period The Salvation Army was a founding member of The World Council of Churches, and withdrew from this relationship.

⁴⁴ Andrew M. Eason. "The Salvation Army in Late Victorian Britain: The Convergence of Church and Sect," 3-27, *Word & Deed* 5.2 (2003) "For contemporary church-sect theory to be effective, it needs to acknowledge that mixed typologies have their place in research. As this paper illustrates, even the single variable model in use since Benton Johnson—defining a group by examining its relationship to the wider world—can be used to produce mixed types. While this may be surprising to sociologists, who believe that a revised church-sect model overcomes mixed types, it is to be expected when historical concerns work in conjunction with sociological matters. Real life, whether situated in the past or located in the present, is filled with nuance and ambiguity. "Consequently, data rarely fit into only one category. Pure categorization is the product of abstraction. Mixed classification is the product of concrete reality. General categories remain useful vehicles for classifying data and discovering new relationships, but they are not mutually exclusive. A religious group can be both church-type and sect-type in nature" 20-21.

⁴⁵ William Booth: *The General's Letters, 1885* (London: International Headquarters, 1889) 51. (Reprinted from *The War Cry*, Jan. 24, 1885).

⁴⁶ While I continue to work extensively with social theory as an analytical tool in biblical studies, ancient near eastern and Greco-Roman studies, I am no longer actively working in the sociological analysis of contemporary religious groups. This paper represents retrospective musings on the topic.

Book Review

Reviewed by JoAnn Shade

Paul A. Rader with Kay F. Rader (edited by Stephen Court).
To Seize This Day of Salvation. London: Salvation Books, 2015.

Salvation Army leaders are often expected to “say a word” at any time or place. The new officer learns early to tuck a sermon outline in his or her Bible, and to be ready with a compelling story to address a social concern as needed. What is true for the corps officer in a small community is also true for the Salvation Army General. By the time a potential General reaches his or her first High Council nomination, the candidate is expected to have a clearly articulated position on doctrinal beliefs, mission perspectives, and the challenges faced by the Salvation Army around the world, and to communicate those ideas concisely.

General Paul A. Rader and Commissioner Kay F. Rader do just that in *To Seize This Day of Salvation*. They gift the contemporary reader with a rich view of their combined understanding of theological, missiological, and ecclesiastical issues as developed and expressed over the course of their lives. Their understanding of faith and culture was first formed in their childhoods, nurtured at Asbury College (now University), tested in the challenges of post-war Korea, and taught to others throughout their years of active officership and retirement. While most of the writings are General Rader’s, the voice and influence of Commissioner Kay Rader is strong throughout the book, as

JoAnn Shade is a retired major in The Salvation Army USA Eastern Territory. She lives in Ashland, Ohio.

the couple's partnership in mission extended to all aspects of their ministry.

To Seize This Day of Salvation is a collection of essays, speeches, and papers that have been prepared for various settings, rather than a book written with a specific outline in mind. Its editor, Major Stephen Court, has thoughtfully grouped writings with thematic and historical commonalities into sections: "Foundations," "Call to Arms," "Salvationist Distinctives," "Preparation for Mission," "Priorities in Mission," and "Passing the Baton." While the content of each section varies, themes such as discipleship, holiness, urgency of mission, and Salvation Army distinctives tie the book together.

In the foundational essays, Rader offers a personal credo that establishes his framework of faith, which gave direction to his vocation and mission. His call to arms combines his personal beliefs with his passionate vision for the future of The Salvation Army, particularly as expressed in his two nomination speeches for the office of General in 1993 and 1994. "We must advance," proclaimed Rader in 1994, "in a continuing renewal of faith and spiritual vigour, reflected in the vitality of our response to the world of God and its authority, and our capacity for sacrificial commitment."

In the section covering the distinctive aspects of The Salvation Army, the editor is careful to note that the collection is not a comprehensive outline. Yet the discussion of the Army's Wesleyan heritage, the legacy of officer women and egalitarian service, the call to sacramental living, and the strategic role of hope within ministry is powerful and reminds the reader of the value of these Salvation Army principles.

A particular essay, in the "Preparation for Mission" section, stands out. First presented in 2000 at Asbury Theological Seminary, "Holiness for Millennials: Reaching for Metaphors of Grace" is an instructive look at the Wesleyan Holiness tradition that sets the stage for an experience of holiness, "seen as real and relevant to ordinary earth-walkers whose hearts yet hunger and thirst for intimacy with a transcendent and holy God." Rader recognizes that "our age cries out for women and men of God whose lives stand in stark contrast to the gathering night, for those who live as 'children of light' against the dark, exposing by the very radiance of their lives the fruitless deeds of darkness." Yes, more effective teaching is needed on holiness, but this generation needs "those in whom the Word is flesh, believable witnesses to the

holiness which God purposes and we profess” even more.

A number of sentences leap off the page: “The Salvation Army is about persons—persons who embody its message and make the presence and compassion of Christ real in the most difficult of human circumstances”; “If we rise to the challenges that confront us in our rapidly changing world, we must be strong. Only a holy Army is strong in the power of his might. More important than strategies, systems, and structures is the quality of the force—the godliness of our people”; and “The experience [of holiness] is played out in the business of living—in the depth of our devotion, the purity of our love toward God and others, and the consistency of our walk as the Lord Jesus lives his life in us and through us and we are transformed into his image.”

The essays in *To Seize This Day of Salvation* demonstrate how widely the Raders have read, as they often quote from church history, Salvation Army heritage, and those writing of evangelism, holiness, and church growth during their years of leadership. However, they have also interspersed names such as Simon and Garfunkel, Kathleen Norris, Anne Lamott, Philip Yancey, Brennan Manning, and more—indicative of their willingness to think outside the box to engage their topics.

The book often calls on the reader to ask: *how does this apply to my ministry, my life, and me?* This volume offers solid scholarship and a deep understanding of the life of The Salvation Army.

When the Raders entered retirement, they said, “We will leave on tiptoe in expectation of what is yet to be, for ‘never a day goes by without His unfolding grace.’” That unfolding grace is clearly evident in their desire for transformative change in the world and in the individual soul, and their continued willingness to engage with the changing culture even in their post-retirement years. In its passion and compassion, *To Seize This Day of Salvation* leaves the reader in anticipation of the unfolding grace of God in the days ahead.



Salvation Army National Publications

YOU CAN FIND THE TITLES BELOW AT WWW.CRESTBOOKS.COM

Crest Books, a division of The Salvation Army's national publications department, was established in 1997 so contemporary Salvationist voices could be captured and bound in enduring form for future generations, to serve as witnesses to the continuing force and mission of the Army.

Stephen Banfield and Donna Leedom, *Say Something*

Judith L. Brown and Christine Poff, eds., *No Longer Missing: Compelling True Stories from The Salvation Army's Missing Persons Ministry*

Terry Camsey, *Slightly Off Center! Growth Principles to Thaw Frozen Paradigms*

Marlene Chase, *Pictures from the Word; Beside Still Waters: Great Prayers of the Bible for Today; Our God Comes: And Will Not Be Silent*

John Cheydleur and Ed Forster, eds., *Every Sober Day Is a Miracle*

Christmas Through the Years: A War Cry Treasury

Helen Clifton, *From Her Heart: Selections from the Preaching and Teaching of Helen Clifton*

Shaw Clifton, *Never the Same Again: Encouragement for New and Not-So-New Christians; Who Are These Salvationists? An Analysis for the 21st Century; Selected Writings, Vol. 1: 1974-1999 and Vol. 2: 2000-2010*

Stephen Court and Joe Noland, eds., *Tsunami of the Spirit*

Frank Duracher, *Smoky Mountain High*

Margaret E. Doughty, *The Offering: An Act of Worship*

Easter Through the Years: A War Cry Treasury

Ken Elliott, *The Girl Who Invaded America: The Odyssey of Eliza Shirley*

Ed Forster, *101 Everyday Sayings From the Bible*

William W. Francis, *Building Blocks of Spiritual Leadership; Celebrate the Feasts of the Lord: The Christian Heritage of the Sacred Jewish Festivals*

Henry Gariepy, *Israel L. Gaither: Man with a Mission; A Salvationist Treasury: 365 Devotional Meditations from the Classics to the Contemporary; Andy Miller: A Legend and a Legacy*

Henry Gariepy and Stephen Court, *Hallmarks of The Salvation Army*

Roger J. Green, *The Life & Ministry of William Booth* (with Abingdon Press, Nashville)

How I Met The Salvation Army

Carroll Ferguson Hunt, *If Two Shall Agree* (with Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City)

Bob Hostetler, ed., *Samuel L. Brengle's Holy Life Series*

John C. Izzard, *Pen of Flame: The Life and Poetry of Catherine Baird*

David Laeger, *Shadow and Substance: The Tabernacle of the Human Heart*

John Larsson, *Inside a High Council; Saying Yes to Life*

Living Portraits Speaking Still: A Collection of Bible Studies

Herbert Luhn, *Holy Living: The Mindset of Jesus*

R.G. Moyles, *I Knew William Booth; Come Join Our Army; William Booth in America: Six Visits 1886 – 1907; Farewell to the Founder*

Philip Needham, *He Who Laughed First: Delighting in a Holy God*, (with Beacon Hill Press, Kansas City); *When God Becomes Small*

Joe Noland, *A Little Greatness*,

Quotes of the Past & Present

Lyell M. Rader, *Romance & Dynamite: Essays on Science & the Nature of Faith*

Amy Reardon, *Holiness Revealed*

R. David Rightmire, *Sanctified Sanity: The Life and Teaching of Samuel Logan Brengle*

Allen Satterlee, *Turning Points: How The Salvation Army Found a Different Path; Determined to Conquer: The History of The Salvation Army Caribbean Territory; In the Balance: Christ Weighs the Hearts of 7 Churches*

Valiant and Strong

Harry Williams, *An Army Needs An Ambulance Corps: A History of The Salvation Army's Medical Services*

A. Kenneth Wilson, *Fractured Parables: And Other Tales to Lighten the Heart and Quicken the Spirit; The First Dysfunctional Family: A Modern Guide to the Book of Genesis; It Seemed Like a Good Idea at the Time: Some of the Best and Worst Decisions in the Bible*

A Word in Season: A Collection of Short Stories

Check Yee, *Good Morning China*

Chick Yuill, *Leadership on the Axis of Change*