



---

*A Publication of The Edwin Mellen Press*

---

**Word & Deed Mission Statement:**

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

**Salvation Army Mission Statement:**

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

**Editorial Address:**

All manuscripts, requests for style sheets and other correspondence should be addressed to Lt. Colonel Marlene Chase at The Salvation Army, National Headquarters, 615 Slaters Lane, Alexandria, VA 22313. Telephone (703) 684-5500. Fax: (703) 684-5539. Email: marlene\_chase@usn.salvationarmy.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 which 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 the manuscript 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, please 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 3 1/2 inch floppy disk, using Microsoft Word format; 3) a 100-word abstract of the article for use at the discretion of the editor (e.g. on The Salvation Army's web page or in advertisements about 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 for the spring issues and September 1 for the fall issues. A style sheet is available upon request.

**Editor in Chief:** Marlene J. Chase

**Co-Editors:** Roger J. Green, Gordon College

Jonathan S. Raymond, William and Catherine Booth College

**Editorial Board (1998-2001):**

Elaine Becker

William Crabson

Terry Griffin

Vernon Jewett

Lee Lescano

Edith Pigford

John Rhemick

Robert Watson

**Abstracts/Indexing:**

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

**Word & Deed**

Vol. 2, No. 2

May 2000

ISBN 0-7734-7762-4

ISSN 1522-3426

Copyright 2000 The Salvation Army. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

# WORD & DEED

---

---

Vol. 2, No. 2

May 2000

---

---

*Editorial:*

Roger J. Green and Jonathan S. Raymond ..... 1

*Marching on the Margins: An Analysis of The Salvation Army in the United States*

John Hazzard ..... 3

*The History of Salvation Army Doctrine*

Earl Robinson ..... 31

*Book Reviews*

*Salvation Story: A Salvationist Handbook of Doctrine* by The Salvation Army International Headquarters, reviewed by Ian Barr ..... 47

*Salvation Story: A Salvationist Handbook of Doctrine* by The Salvation Army International Headquarters, reviewed by Elaine Becker ..... 53

*Salvation Story: A Salvationist Handbook of Doctrine* by The Salvation Army International Headquarters, reviewed by John Rhemick ..... 56

*Salvation Story: A Salvationist Handbook of Doctrine* by The Salvation Army International Headquarters, reviewed by Robert A. Watson ..... 61

*Red Hot and Righteous: The Urban Religion of The Salvation Army* by Diane Winston, reviewed by Barbara Robinson ..... 66

## Editorial

In this issue of *Word & Deed* we continue with the broad subject of ecclesiology. Any comprehensive look at the Army must include an understanding of the relationship of the Army to the wider Christian Church, and the lead article to this issue assists us with an analysis of who we are. We are indeed grateful to Jack Hazzard for his careful work in this article.

Central to any ecclesiastical organization is the doctrine by which that body of believers lives, and the International Doctrine Council has developed a new doctrine book entitled *Salvation Story*. We have asked Colonel Earl Robinson, the chair of that council, to introduce the work of the council to the readers to acquaint them with what led to the publication of *Salvation Story*. And, because this new doctrine book is so important in clarifying basic Army beliefs, we thought that a simple book review of *Salvation Story* would be inadequate for this journal.

Therefore, we asked four people to provide more than just a review of the book—we asked them to write critical essays about the book. We did not inform the writers of the identity of the other writers, thus ensuring both objectivity and confidentiality in the writing of these book essays. We believe that the essays reflect a wide range of acceptance of *Salvation Story* as well as helpful criticism of the book, and we look forward to a long and healthy dialogue about the use of this new doctrine book at every level of our life together. Indeed, we encourage all readers of this journal to read *Salvation Story* carefully and thoughtfully.

We complete this issue with a review of a book which has captured the attention of the American press, *Red Hot and Righteous: The Urban Religion of The Salvation Army* by Diane Winston. This look at the Army in America by someone who

has no Army ties makes for interesting reading, and, as always, assists the Army reader with self-understanding and those outside the Army with a deeper look at the impact which the Army has made on American culture.

This issue and the previous one only begin to assist us in determining how precisely we are a part of the broader body of Christ. This is a doctrine to which we will undoubtedly return in the future, but in the meantime we thank our readers for their interest in this topic. We encourage readers to write to the newly inaugurated readers' forum. Readers may write in response to this issue, to the three previous issues, or to future issues. In so doing, they may enter into dialogue among the readers on these topics of enduring importance to the thought and work of The Salvation Army.

In the meantime, may God continue to assist us in this project and may The Salvation Army and the broader Church benefit from the writing contained in this issue.

RJG

JSR

# Marching on the Margins: An Analysis of The Salvation Army in the United States

John W. Hazzard

## Introduction

Most people think of The Salvation Army as a charitable organization that provides social services to those in need, and report that they are happy to donate clothing, furniture, and money to help it carry out its mission. In fact, *The New York Times* reports that the Army was the leading recipient of charitable donations in the United States from 1992 through 1994.<sup>1</sup> Few people, however, think of The Salvation Army as a religion or a church. Even sociologists seem to be unclear about its identity, placing it in one or another of the religious sect categories. For example, Moberg refers to The Salvation Army as an enthusiastic sect<sup>2</sup>, while Scharf calls it an established sect.<sup>3</sup> Chalfant, Beckley, and Palmer,<sup>4</sup> taking their cue from Yinger,<sup>5</sup> identify it as an aggressive sect along with Jehovah's Witness. Wilson refers to it as a conversionist sect,<sup>6</sup> and in his recent work keeps it placed squarely in the sect category.<sup>7</sup> Wuthnow calls the Army a special purpose group by which he means a

---

*John Hazzard is the Assistant Professor of Sociology at St. Joseph's College in Patchogue, New York. The full version of this article appears in: Review of Religious Research, Vol. 40, No. 2 (December, 1998), pp. 121-141.*

group “founded by members of larger religious organizations for the task of administering charity, helping the poor, or reforming social conditions.”<sup>8</sup>

Roland Robertson provides the best sociological description of The Salvation Army. His analysis of the English Salvation Army from its beginnings to the 1950s leads him to conclude that it has evolved through four stages into an established sect.<sup>9</sup> The “incipient phase” and the “phase of enthusiastic mobilization” were characterized by “sensationalist methods of conversion” and by the development of its military rules and regulations.<sup>10</sup> During the third phase “routinization and formalization occurred and numerous ‘aberrations’ such as belief in faith-healing and millennial tendencies were finally eschewed, and a more flexible and accommodative system of social teaching was developed.”<sup>11</sup> After a leadership crisis of the late 1920s resulted in a new procedure for electing Generals (very similar to that for electing Popes in the Roman Catholic Church), the Army entered the final phase of “terminal institutionalization” where it “has become a stabilized, *established sect* (author’s emphasis).”<sup>12</sup>

Robertson uses a multidimensional church–sect typology in his analysis in which a sect is defined as a voluntary association of converted individuals who are held to strict tenets of belief and rigid standards of moral behavior, and who think of themselves as possessing some spiritual insight that sets them apart from and against secular society and institutions.<sup>13</sup> A church, on the other hand, is defined as an inclusive, universal, and often hierarchical religious association that relies on a “birth-based membership” and takes a compromising stance toward secular society and its institutions.<sup>14</sup>

Critics (e.g., Bainbridge,<sup>15</sup> Iannaccone,<sup>16</sup> Johnson,<sup>17</sup> Stark and Bainbridge,<sup>18</sup>) argue that these categories contain too many correlates and usually leave the researcher describing the organization studied as neither church nor sect but as some combination of the two. This is what Robertson does when he calls The Salvation Army an established sect. Established sects have firm organizational structures and stable relations with other religious groups and secular authorities, but “maintain effective boundaries—physical, ideological, or symbolic—between themselves and the threatening ‘world’.”<sup>19</sup> McGuire uses the Old Order Amish, the Hutterites and Bruderhof communities, and the Hasidim as examples of established sects.<sup>20</sup> Placing the Army in this category gives the false impression that it is also a relatively fixed group sheltered from influences of the sociocultural context in which it exists.

For this analysis of The Salvation Army I will use a church–sect continuum first

suggested by Benton Johnson<sup>21</sup> in which a church is differentiated from a sect based on the single attribute of acceptance or rejection of the sociocultural environment. Religious norms of a church are relatively close to secular norms whereas religious norms of a sect are relatively distant from secular norms, and a church is also more tolerant of deviation from its religious norms than a sect.<sup>22</sup> Building on this distinction, Stark and Bainbridge<sup>23</sup> situate the ideal sect and the ideal church on opposite poles of a continuum. The ideal sect is characterized by so much tension with the sociocultural environment that its "members are hunted figures,"<sup>24</sup> while the ideal church identifies so strongly with the environment that no tensions exist between the two. These ideal types "identify a clear axis of variation and its end points."<sup>25</sup> As a result religious groups can be compared to each other according to their location on the continuum without developing mixed types of religious groups such as the established sect. The movement of religious groups toward one pole or the other over time also can be plotted.

I re-examine the Army's history, including its American experience, to demonstrate its historical accommodation to American secular and religious culture and to provide context for analysis of its current doctrinal and social beliefs with the following question in mind: Where is The Salvation Army located on the church-sect continuum, and is it moving toward the ideal church pole?

## Historical Overview

### The English Experience

The Salvation Army emerged as one stream of a larger social and religious movement in the latter half of nineteenth century Victorian England. In the throes of rapid and transforming change caused indirectly by the impact of the eighteenth century intellectual revolution and directly by the Industrial Revolution, Victorian England was ripe for the emergence of the Evangelical movement. Enlightenment ideas about the importance of the individual over and against social institutions, mixed with liberal economic ideology and democratic political notions, undermined the political and religious hierarchies leaving individual judgment as the touchstone to truth. "For all the advantages brought about by [these revolutions, they] produced a kind of rampant individualism."<sup>26</sup> Rightmire argues that these changes did not lead to greater freedom and openness but "paradoxically produced a yearning for certainty and an anxious will to believe ... Destitute of faith, this age was simulta-



neously terrified of skepticism.”<sup>27</sup>

The Industrial Revolution caused significant demographic and social change. England evolved from a predominantly agrarian to an urban society. By 1851 half the English population lived in cities characterized by overcrowding and chaos due to the lack of social planning. New middle and working classes emerged along with an underclass of unemployed and unemployable people who were thrown together in the growing slums.<sup>28</sup>

The Evangelical movement took root in this social and cultural milieu. “Inheriting the evangelical spirit of John Wesley, Victorian England experienced the power of an unadorned gospel preached with great effect to the laboring masses.”<sup>29</sup> The unadorned gospel referred to here was stripped of the “excesses” of established church worship and the rational approach of established theology and re-adorned with a more immediate experience of religion. Evangelicals gained a reputation for their “desire to save the souls of themselves and others, a pious moral existence which sometimes included total abstinence [from alcoholic beverages], ... and a strong social conscience. It was often the latter which drew the working classes to these Dissenters, and there was a distinct alliance between Evangelicals and the working classes. Evangelical chapels were filled with [laborers].”<sup>30</sup>

The free churches, especially the Methodist churches, gained respectability which they sought to protect as they moved to play a role in the social and political system.<sup>31</sup> As a result these churches neither welcomed the disreputable underclass nor were particularly attractive to those individuals. So the under classes were left unchurched and unconvinced of their need for religion. The urban slums of “disreputables” became mission fields for independent revivalists to harvest, and in the east of London, several of these street missions sprang up.<sup>32</sup>

William Booth became one of these itinerant revivalists. He and his wife, Catherine, opened their tent services in 1865 and eventually took the leadership of the East London Christian Mission in 1867.<sup>33</sup> From this organization they formed the Christian Mission (later to be named The Salvation Army) and established a set of doctrines. The original doctrines of the Christian Mission were neither new nor outside the orthodox Christian tradition. Murdoch makes a convincing case that the original doctrines were adapted from the list of doctrines established by the Evangelical Alliance in 1846.<sup>34</sup>

The incipient phase of The Salvation Army was characterized by revivalism and “the intuitive virtue of the pure in heart.”<sup>35</sup> The Booths wanted to reach out to the

disreputable poor and present them with the Christian gospel. While this mission necessitated feeding, clothing, and housing the destitute, the central thrust was evangelization. Booth believed that the people to whom he ministered had to experience a religious conversion before they could be reintegrated into society. Saving the individual soul was the single mission during the incipient and enthusiastic mobilization phases of development.<sup>36</sup>

As Robertson asserts, the third phase begins toward the end of the 1880s resulting in Booth's book *In Darkest England*, and culminating with the establishment of the Army's social reform wing.<sup>37</sup> Green points out that "the organized social work of the Salvation Army did not begin at the initiation of William Booth in the East End of London but with Salvationists in Melbourne, Australia in 1883 when they established a half-way home for released prisoners."<sup>38</sup> Booth came slowly to realize the important effects of social and economic factors on people's lives and only gradually accepted the idea of a second mission.

Several factors contributed to Booth's changing ideas, including the change of influential people in his life. Early in his ministry Booth was particularly influenced by American revivalists, his wife, Catherine, and others who were primarily evangelists. By the early 1880s Booth was swayed by his son, Bramwell, W.T. Stead (editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette*), Frank Smith (an officer who briefly headed the Army's work in America where he was influenced by its religious social reformers),<sup>39</sup> and Suzy Swift (who assisted Booth in writing *In Darkest England*).<sup>40</sup> Booth's work borrowed from several sources arguing not simply for social aid to the poor, but for real social reform. In 1890 the social reform wing of the Army was formally established under Frank Smith's leadership. The Salvation Army "finally recognized institutionally the importance of the second mission ... [and] ... engaged in two works—personal salvation and social salvation. It now had ... a dual mission."<sup>41</sup>

### **The American Experience**

The Salvation Army officially established its work in the United States in 1880 when George Scott Railton and seven Salvationist women arrived in New York City. "They marched down the gangplank [of the ship], holding one of their Salvation Army flags—to which a small American flag had been affixed in the union corner—aloft ... The Army flag was planted with dramatic postures, and the country was claimed for God and the Army."<sup>42</sup> Actually Army work had been established in the U.S. five months before Railton arrived. Eliza Shirley (a teenager) and her

mother, Annie, received permission from William Booth to open a Salvation Army mission in Philadelphia where Mr. Shirley had preceded them. After a rough start the women drew converts into their "citadel" in such large numbers that they had to open a second corps. "With two corps in operation, Eliza reported to her General, who replied that he had read of the warfare and was sending [Railton]."43

Railton's antics and the Army's style of evangelistic meetings both fascinated and repelled many New Yorkers thus leaving his immediate effort only partially successful. However, by the time Booth made his first visit to America in 1886, 228 corps had been established and 569 officers, most of them American, were in the ranks.<sup>44</sup>

The period between 1879 and 1899 was the American Army's "phase of enthusiastic mobilization." The pioneers who helped establish the Army in America were primarily evangelists who were out to "save souls." But many of their converts were migratory while the Army needed people who would stay in place and help it grow. It needed soldiers to complement the work of the officers.

Officers were warned that the Army could not long survive if it did not make more converts into soldiers ... The key to the problem was clearly to attract into the ranks what the old General called "the better sort of mankind." But beyond that the Army had to build a second generation, the families of its recruits had to be secured as well, if the Army were to have a future.<sup>45</sup>

This led to the development of religious programs and organizations that were sectarian in nature. The corps would become the "church home" for converts and their families. In their corps (church) they would "mature in the faith" and be motivated to serve as active Salvation soldiers. Because it had Methodist roots in England and stressed a second spiritual blessing called sanctification, the Army naturally aligned itself with the non-charismatic holiness denominations, such as the Church of the Nazarene, the Christian and Missionary Alliance and Wesleyan Methodist churches.<sup>46</sup>

While corps programs developed along sectarian lines, the Army's social wing expanded. The Army's organizational structure and dual mission fit well into the American religious and charitable milieu. When it incorporated, the Army referred to itself as a "religious and charitable corporation."<sup>47</sup> It responded to the social and economic conditions of the time by developing programs to help the victims of unemployment, homelessness, poverty, and alcohol abuse. Along with other groups, such as the various rescue missions and the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church,

the Army provided charitable relief while working to "save souls."<sup>48</sup>

These social work efforts contributed greatly to the Army's acceptance both by the privileged and those needing its services. Since, however, its work needed the financial support and good will of society's privileged, the social reform fervor of Frank Smith was replaced by a social welfare orientation that reflected conservative social values and Christian charity. This change was not calculated and pragmatic; it reflected the convergence of the Army's English evangelical roots with American evangelicalism's commitment to the prevailing ideas of individualism and free market capitalism. Therefore, it focused on personal salvation (a core evangelical belief) and individual effort to overcome the contingencies of life rather than on reform of the social and economic systems. Because the Army emphasized conversion as the means of changing individuals and society, it has been referred to as a conversionist sect.<sup>49</sup>

The Army's continued work with military personnel during the wars, and its service to police and emergency personnel won it praise and support. And in recent years, the establishment of medical care facilities, child care and youth centers, senior citizens' residences, and institutions for delinquent youths, with its Adult Rehabilitation Centers for alcohol and drug abusers required the Army to find external sources of funding. Its participation in United Way campaigns and its growing dependence on governmental funding promote the image of the Army as a humanitarian and social welfare organization. The Salvation Army assumes full responsibility for its agencies and institutions. But, "in a time when the Army is changing and developing as a Protestant denomination, the role of social service is being discussed more and more."<sup>50</sup>

As the Army grew and gained greater acceptance, its form of evangelization and religious worship began to conform more to American religious norms. Its doctrines remained firm and its officers and soldiers identified with the evangelical churches which usually maintained a separatist stance in relation to the mainline denominations, but the social programs of the Army put it in a more cooperative relationship both with mainline religion and the larger culture.

As part of The Salvation Army's centennial in America in 1980, its leaders mapped out a strategy for the second century. Among the objectives were the following:

An affirmation of the Army's basic spiritual commitment and the key role played by the local corps (congregation) as the basic unit of Army life;

Improved communication to address the "blurred image" problem.<sup>51</sup>

These objectives indicate awareness by Army leaders of its ambiguous position among religious institutions and of the need to clarify its place as a legitimate Protestant denomination while retaining the integrity of its social welfare programs. Contemporary leaders have tried to resolve the issue in the following international 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 love for God. Its mission is to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ and meet human needs in His name without discrimination.<sup>52</sup>

But this statement equivocally defines The Salvation Army as a church. While asserting that the Army is part of the universal Christian church, the statement reflects the leaders' attempt to keep some of the charisma and spontaneity associated with its early period at the same time they legitimize the institutionalization of rational-legal elements necessary for the operation of a modern, formal, religious organization.

## Contemporary Marginality

The question remains: Is The Salvation Army a church? Wuthnow argues that the Army is one of the special purpose groups founded in the nineteenth century "to carry out the churches' tasks more effectively in the new urban environment." He states that the Army came close to "evolving into a distinct sect ... [but] its goals focused primarily on the specific task of ministering to the urban poor ... [It used] its uniforms and brass bands to attract attention, rather than holding conventional worship services."<sup>53</sup> Wuthnow captures only one side of The Salvation Army in this description and misses its development as a church.

McKinley points out that the Army established its corps as churches with regular worship services from the beginning of its work in America.<sup>54</sup> Early in its history in both England and the United States, the services were often unconventional. But since the beginning of the century, particularly after World War II, worship services became more conventional. Two types of services evolved which reflect the Army's doctrinal beliefs. The Sunday morning service, called Holiness Meeting, is reverential and focuses on the members' spiritual growth. Hymns are sung, prayer is offered, a scripture passage is read, and a sermon is preached. Since the Army does not

practice the sacraments, communion is replaced by a time of reflection and recommitment. The service ends with a closing hymn and benediction. Sunday evening service, called Salvation Meeting, includes a lively offering of gospel songs accompanied by hand-clapping, a period of personal testimonies offered voluntarily by members of the congregation, a sermon stressing the need of personal religious conversion, and a call for potential converts to kneel at the altar and pray to be saved. The Salvation Meeting is sometimes preceded by a street meeting where the band plays and people are encouraged to march back to the corps for the service, but this occurs less often particularly in the suburban corps. Since fewer strangers attend the service, the Salvation Meeting is evolving in many corps into a service of praise.<sup>55</sup>

Army leaders emphasize that the corps is its basic unit, but they will not downplay its social welfare programs. As a result, The Salvation Army is still perceived as a special purpose group even as it takes its place within the network of American churches. In reality the Army straddles the functional margins that conceptually separate the two types of organizations. It provides a church for its soldiers in which they worship, witness, and serve, but it does not impose membership on its volunteers and clients (most of whom are not soldiers). Furthermore, it employs a professional staff (some of whom do not share its religious beliefs) to carry out its social services programs. While Salvationists and the denominations with which they are closely associated view The Salvation Army as a church with a vigorous social services component derived from the Army's religious beliefs, the general public sees the Army as a humanitarian and charitable organization (a special purpose group) with a religious component that motivates its social work.

An active member of the National Holiness Association, The Salvation Army can be situated theologically among evangelical denominations with Wesleyan roots. It shares common doctrinal beliefs with these denominations and participates in ecumenical programs within the evangelical community. Also, like many other evangelical denominations, it shows little willingness to reinterpret its doctrines to assimilate prevailing secular or religiously liberal assumptions and values into its theology. In this matter it stands in tension with the sociocultural environment. When it comes to social issues, however, Army values are more compatible with the values expressed in mainline denominations and more accommodating to the sociocultural environment. The Army straddles the divide between conservative and liberal denominations, and therefore, I place it in the margin between evangelical con-

servative and mainline churches.

Marching in the margins, so to speak, between liberal and conservative denominations creates tension between the Army and both religious camps. As Wuthnow argues, the highly ideological "economic and political changes that have greatly restructured the fabric of American social life" in recent decades have also impacted organized religion. The religious community has split into two opposing camps, liberals and conservatives. While this split has occurred within denominations, it has been played out most dynamically between conservative evangelical and liberal mainline denominations.<sup>56</sup> The conservative camp accuses the liberal camp of assimilating secular-humanist presuppositions that undermine historic faith and traditional values. Liberals accuse conservatives of practicing a loveless religion resulting in bigotry that harms the very people whom the Christian gospel calls them to love and protect. Accusing liberals of aligning themselves uncritically to the secular culture, conservatives take the position of a culture saving counterculture. The battle lines have been drawn around the issues of abortion, homosexuality, and the role of women in the family, church, and society.<sup>57</sup>

Fundamentalists within the conservative camp take an uncompromising stand against the sociocultural environment, insisting that believers witness to their values by protesting evil and living exemplary lives.<sup>58</sup> Hunter's analysis of college educated evangelicals in the conservative camp reveals a tendency to reduce tension with the sociocultural environment by adopting the values of rational argument over dogmatism and cultural pluralism over cultural conquest. This approach results in shifting religious belief from the public square to the private sphere.<sup>59</sup> By straddling the margin between the conservative and liberal camps, The Salvation Army has avoided fundamentalist sectarianism and evangelical privatism. It has maintained a thoroughly evangelical doctrine of personal salvation, making it suspect from the liberal mainline perspective. But it has also maintained the compassion of the social gospel accepted by mainline denominations, making it suspect from the conservative perspective.

## **Methods of Research**

### **Analysis of Official Documents**

Using the organization as the basic unit of analysis, I examine the three essential

documents of The Salvation Army: *The Handbook of Doctrine, Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army*, and *Position Statements of The Salvation Army*. These documents represent the Army's official stance on theological beliefs, organizational discipline, moral behavior, and social issues. I look specifically at doctrinal statements in *The Handbook of Doctrine* concerning the Bible because a denomination's belief regarding the Bible's centrality in determining subsequent doctrinal beliefs and social ethics indicates the group's position in the conservative (evangelical) or the liberal network of denominations.<sup>60</sup>

I also evaluate the *Position Statements* and *Orders and Regulations* regarding the issues of atheism, homosexuality, abortion, and women in society, because these are issues that divide conservative and liberal groups. Conservative denominations are more resistant to the changing religious and societal norms in these areas than are liberals.<sup>61</sup> Although The Salvation Army is well known for its insistence on total abstinence from alcoholic beverages, I am not using this social issue in the analysis. The Army operates large treatment programs throughout the world and "believes that total abstinence [is] the only successful guarantee against overindulgence and the evils attendant to addiction."<sup>62</sup> Since the Army does not claim that its position is biblically based and does not condemn non-Salvationists who drink alcoholic beverages, I suggest that its stance on this issue is influenced mainly by its continued involvement in alcohol abuse treatment programs.

### **Survey of Salvation Army Officers**

In addition to studying Salvation Army documents, I designed a survey instrument to measure the beliefs and attitudes of Salvation Army officers. The Army's authority structure is hierarchical and its theological beliefs and social positions do not emanate from a constituent church body. For example, The *Position Statements* are formulated by committees appointed by the Commissioners' Conference (the National Commander and the four territorial commanders). The committees include Salvation Army officer professionals in the fields relevant to the issues studied. The committees articulate the statements which must be approved by the Commissioners' Conference and the General's representatives in England. The approved statements become the Army's official position on the issues. While the positions are open for review and can be amended in light of new knowledge, the rank and file officers have virtually no input. They receive the statements from the hierarchy.



I want to know the extent to which the beliefs of the Army's officers square with its official dogma. The officers' beliefs and values are crucial in providing accurate description for analysis of the organization because they represent the Army to the public and provide religious and moral instruction to its members. Survey data also provide a basis for comparative analysis. I structured the questionnaire to match studies by Hunter<sup>63</sup> and Roof and McKinney<sup>64</sup>, so I can compare the officers' responses with those of the evangelical seminarians in Hunter's study and with liberal, moderate, and conservative Protestant responses in the Roof and McKinney study, as well as to the Army's official positions. I assume that close alignment of the officers' responses to respondents from conservative, moderate, or liberal Protestants will also reflect less tension between the Army as an organization and the denominations represented in the Hunter and Roof and McKinney samples. I expect the Army's official statements and officers' responses about religious doctrines will be consistent with conservative Evangelicalism, and that its official positions and officers' responses on social issues will be closer to the views of moderate and liberal Protestants than to conservative Protestants.

### **Sample**

With permission in 1993 from Salvation Army leaders, I gathered data from a national sample of Salvation Army officers. The hierarchy in each territory (roughly the equivalent to a Methodist Annual Conference) selected one of its divisions (roughly equivalent to a Methodist District or an Episcopal or Catholic diocese) in which all of the officers were asked to take part. They completed the questionnaires in privacy to protect confidentiality, and the questionnaires were sent to me without hierarchical review. I sent a statistical summary to the Army authorities for their perusal.

I surveyed 382 officers in the four territories of the United States: the New York City area in the Eastern territory, North and South Carolina in the South, Wisconsin and Upper Michigan in the Central territory, and Oregon in the West. I received 252 (66%) completed responses; 22% from the East, 28% from the South, 27% from the Central, and 23% from the West. Forty-five percent of the respondents are female and 54% are male. Thirty-six percent have been officers for 10 or fewer years, 20% between 11 and 20 years, and 44% for more than 20 years.

## Results

### Theological Beliefs

The Salvation Army fits well into the conservative theological camp called Evangelicalism. A careful reading of its officially stated doctrines supports this assertion. For example, The Salvation Army's *Handbook of Doctrine* states: "We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by the inspiration of God; and that they only constitute the divine rule of Christian faith and practice."<sup>65</sup> In the explication of this doctrine, the *Handbook* points out that:

With regard to the relationship of the Bible to science, it is a mistake to consider that the aim of the Bible is to give a history of the universe or be a textbook of human knowledge. We must avoid the error of those who regard advances in scientific knowledge (not theories) as inimical to the truth and authority of the Scriptures . . . .<sup>66</sup>

To ascertain the extent to which officers' beliefs square with official doctrines, I asked the respondents their beliefs about the Bible and the devil. I also compared their answers to those of students in evangelical seminaries as reported by James Davison Hunter who gathered data from seven evangelical seminaries including Fuller, Asbury, Wheaton, and Gordon-Conwell. Army officers' beliefs should correspond with the beliefs of the evangelical seminary students.<sup>67</sup>

Officers tend to hold a more conservative view of the Bible than seminary students. In fact the majority (69%) take a more literal view of the Bible than stated in the Army's official doctrine (see Table 1). Officers with undergraduate and graduate degrees, however, are more likely than officers with less education to agree that the Bible should not always be taken literally in matters of science and historical reporting (see Table 2). The data in Table 2 suggest that more officers with some college or associate degrees take a literal view of the Bible than officers with only a high school diploma. Since the Army has been requiring more formal education of its officers in recent years, there may be a shift away from biblical literalism over the next several years.

While the Army has no formal doctrine explicitly about Satan or the devil, its teaching about temptation and sin assumes a personal devil. For example, in its explication of temptation the *Handbook* reads: "It is an astonishing fact that Satan and Jesus sought to persuade men . . ."<sup>68</sup> Satan and Jesus are given the same status of personhood. I asked if the respondents believed in a personal devil. On this question

**Table 1**  
**Comparison of Officers and Seminarians**  
**on Biblical and Mission Issues (Percent)**

	Officers	Seminarians	Chi <sup>2</sup> Value of Significance
<b>I believe the Bible:</b>			
is inspired, not mistaken and taken literally	69	43	
is inspired, not mistaken but not always taken literally in matters of science and historical reporting	26	54	X <sup>2</sup> (2)=60.4819 p<.001
becomes the word of God for those reading in faith	5	3	
N =	250	847	
<b>I believe the Devil is a:</b>			
Personal Being	95	96	
Impersonal Force	5	4	X <sup>2</sup> (2)=0.5358 N.S.
N =	249	822	
<b>Pursuit of Justice is:</b>			
less or almost as important as evangelism	61	77	
equal to or more important than cvangelism	39	13	X <sup>2</sup> (1)=24.5876 p<.01
N =	247	847	

**Table 2**  
**Officers' Belief About Bible by Education (Percent)**

	H.S. Dip.	Some Coll.	Assoc. Deg.	Bach. Deg.	Grad. Deg.
<b>The Bible should:</b>					
be taken literally	71	81	80	60	55
not always be taken literally	29	19	20	40	45
N=	55	96	25	40	20

$$\chi^2(4)=10.7446 \text{ } p<.05$$

Salvationists and seminarians are in virtual agreement (see Table 1).

The emphasis given to evangelism and social justice in Christian mission often distinguishes evangelicals from liberals. This is a particularly interesting question to put to Salvationists because of the Army's historic dual mission. I asked the question in two ways, one specifically about justice and evangelism and the other specifically about the Army's evangelistic and social missions. Salvationists are more likely than seminarians to view the pursuit of justice as equal to or more important than evangelism (see Table 1), and 50% of the officers in the sample say that the Army's social mission was equal to its evangelistic mission while 18% agreed that the social mission is almost as important as evangelism. Only 18% say it is less important. While Salvationists are thoroughly evangelical, they still are committed to their social mission.

### **Social Beliefs**

The Salvation Army's official positions on social issues reflect accommodation to the sociocultural environment as they diverge from those of conservative religious groups and move closer to mainline Protestant denominational stances. Three specific issues that divide conservatives from liberals illustrate the Army's accommodation to changing values: questions of civil liberties for atheists and homosexuals, issues about the status of women in society, and the specific issue of abortion

rights.

To compare social attitudes, I replicated three sets of questionnaire items established by Roof and McKinney.<sup>69</sup> The first two sets combine identical questions about atheists and homosexuals as shown in Table 3, and the third set combines questions measuring attitudes toward women as shown in Table 5. I used a Likert-type index with (-2) representing the strongest intolerant score and (+2) representing the strongest tolerant score. I also compared the percent of officers' tolerant responses on the individual items to the tolerant responses of three religious groupings developed by Roof and McKinney for their large-scale study of American mainline religion.

The Army takes a tolerant stance toward those who hold non-Christian beliefs. Instructions officers receive in *Orders and Regulations* for conversing with a non-Christian include: show respect, be willing to learn, be positive, be just, be patient. The goal is to witness to the nonbeliever with the hope of conversion to Christianity, but the attitude is one of tolerance.<sup>70</sup> As indicated in Table 3, Salvation Army officers agree that atheists should have the right to speak their minds in public forums, teach in public schools and have their literature in libraries. Their attitudes in this matter fit the tone of the Army's official view and are more consistent with moderate and liberal tolerant attitudes than with conservative intolerant views.

Regarding homosexuality, The Salvation Army's position has evolved. In a 1985 statement it held that homosexuality is "contrary to the teachings in the Bible and presents a serious threat to the integrity, quality and solidarity of society as a whole."<sup>71</sup> The statement distinguished between homosexual orientation which is "not blameworthy and should not be allowed to create guilt" and actual behavior. It concluded that homosexuals can be treated medically and psychiatrically. But in 1992 the Army amended its official position. While it still believes the Bible teaches "that God's intention for mankind is that society should be ordered on the basis of lifelong, legally sanctioned, heterosexual union," it now "regards the origins of a homosexual orientation as a mystery and does not regard a homosexual orientation as blameworthy in itself or rectifiable at will."<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, homosexuals should not express their orientation in sexual acts. While embracing celibacy for homosexuals, the statement continues:

In obedience to the example of Jesus, whose compassionate love was all embracing, Salvationists seek to understand and sensitively to accept and help those of a homosexual orientation and those who express that orientation in sexual acts. Salvationists are opposed to the victimization of persons

**Table 3**  
**Percent Taking Tolerant Attitude About**  
**Civil Liberties of Atheists and Homosexuals**

	Salvationists	Conservative Protestant*	Moderate Protestant*	Liberal Protestant*
<b>Atheists:</b>				
Right to Speak	77 <sup>c,m</sup>	45	63	75
Right to Teach	50 <sup>c,m</sup>	26	38	48
Opp. Removing Books	51 <sup>c,m,l</sup>	39	60	75
<b>Homosexuals:</b>				
Right to Speak	65 <sup>l</sup>	44	64	75
Right to Teach	26 <sup>m,l</sup>	30	51	62
Opp. Removing Books	21 <sup>c,m,l</sup>	36	55	70
	N = 252	2696	4128	1482

c - statistically significant difference from conservatives at .05

m - statistically significant difference from moderates at .05

l - statistically significant difference from liberals at .05

\* Data collected by Roof & McKinney from G.S.S., 1972-78, 1982-84. Conservative Protestants included Southern Baptists, Churches of Christ, Nazarenes, Assemblies of God, Churches of God, Adventists, and those calling themselves evangelical, fundamentalist, and pentecostals. Moderate Protestants included Methodists, Lutherans, Disciples of Christ, Northern Baptists, and Reformed Church. Liberal Protestants included United Church of Christ, Episcopalians, and Presbyterians.

on the grounds of sexual orientation and recognize the social and emotional stress and loneliness borne by many who are homosexual.<sup>73</sup>

While Salvationists are much more tolerant than conservatives concerning the right of free speech for homosexuals, they are less tolerant than liberals (see Table 3). Regarding the right of homosexuals to teach in schools, Salvationists side with conservative Protestants. They are the most rigid group when it comes to censorship of homosexual literature in libraries. Officers in this sample clearly have not caught up to the organization's official change of attitude as indicated by their lack of support of homosexuals' civil liberties to teach or to keep literature in libraries. The data in Table 4, however, show regional differences.

I eliminated the respondents who expressed no opinion about whether homo-

**Table 4**  
**Officers Approval of Removing Books Supporting  
 Homosexuality From Libraries by Territory (Percent)**

	Eastern Terr.	Southern Terr.	Central Terr.	Western Terr.
Disapprove Removal	57	20	27	13
Approve Removal	43	80	73	87
N =	51	66	62	54

$$X^2(3)=29.1798 \text{ } p<.001$$

sexual literature should be removed from libraries, and compared tolerant and intolerant views by territory. Officers from the Eastern territory (sampled from the New York City region) were more tolerant than officers from the other three territories. The high percent of intolerant responses from officers in the Western territory may reflect the polarization in their region at the time I collected the data. This subsample came from Oregon where the homosexual issue was polarized and many evangelicals were taking a strong anti-civil liberties stance in a highly politicized battle. Salvationists' stands on civil liberties seem to be shaped more by regional attitudes than by commonly shared religious beliefs or Salvation Army position statements. But the official position indicates greater convergence with societal norms related to homosexuality.

The Salvation Army has been cited often as a leader in women's rights, especially in terms of Christian ministry, but a careful reading of its history reveals that William and Catherine Booth, as well as their daughter, Evangeline, were not supportive of the larger women's rights movements of their day. While adopting and employing the idea that women can share equally with men in Christian ministry, the Army has also held to traditional views about the family roles assigned to women. For example, according to *Orders and Regulations*, an officer-wife may find "her sphere of service differs from that of other officers, and she may be inclined, especially in certain circumstances (when closely occupied by a young family, for example), to feel that her opportunities are comparatively restricted," and it instructs her to give "all due attention to the claims of husband, home, and children [and to]

conduct her domestic affairs simply and methodically, omitting all that is unnecessary, in order that as much as possible of her time and strength may be available for direct salvation service."<sup>74</sup> This ambiguity about the organizational and family roles of women shows itself in the six items summarized in Table 5.

The Salvationist sample is more likely than all other groups to support traditional family roles of women and more likely than all other groups to support a woman's right to work even if her husband earns enough to support her. Salvationists take the most liberal view of women's emotional capacity to engage in politics.

**Table 5**  
**Percent Expressing Tolerant Attitudes**  
**About Women's Rights**

	Salvationist	Conservative Protestant	Moderate Protestant	Liberal Protestants
Women should take care of home (disagree)	46 <sup>m l</sup>	52	67	78
Both women & men emotionally fit for politics	91 <sup>c m l</sup>	42	55	61
Approve woman working if husband can support her	77 <sup>c m</sup>	67	68	79
Would support woman as Presidential candidate	76	71	80	83
Favor abortion in case of rape	45 <sup>m l</sup>	48	88	95
Favor abortion for married woman	14 <sup>c m l</sup>	28	46	62
N =	252	2,696	4,128	1,482

c - statistically significant difference from conservatives at .05

m - statistically significant difference from moderates at .05

l - statistically significant difference from liberals at .05



The first American General, elected in 1994, instituted changes regarding the organizational status of women which were met with mild resistance. For example, married women officers now retain their ranks when being addressed. Instead of Captain and Mrs. John Smith, the couple is now referred to as Captains John and Mary Smith. Also, in the past women officers took the rank of their husbands when they married. Now the couple takes the higher rank regardless of gender. The General also ordered a review of *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army* to remove sexist language and reflect new policy. Emerging organizational norms show greater acceptance of societal gender norms.

Regarding the abortion issue, however, only 45% of the Salvationists sampled favor abortion for a woman who has been raped, while 44% do not favor the abortion option and 11% do not take a position. Once again the data show regional differences. Officers from the Central and Western territories are much more disapproving than those from the East and South.

The Central and Western officers do not seem to subscribe to the Army's official position on abortion. The Position Statement opposes abortion on demand or as a means of birth control, but says "abortion is justified only in the rare cases in which

**Table 6**  
Officers Attitudes About Abortion in the  
Case of Rape by Territory (Percent)

	Eastern Terr.	Southern Terr.	Central Terr.	Western Terr.
Approve abortion if raped	55	66	27	33
No opinion	11	10	16	07
Disapprove abortion if raped	34	24	57	60
N=	56	71	68	57

$$X^2(6)=31.5529 \quad p<.01$$

the health and life of the mother are endangered, the pregnancy is the result of incest or rape, [and] if reliable diagnostic procedures determine that a fetal anomaly is present which is incompatible with postnatal survival for more than a few weeks, or where there is total or virtual absence of cognitive function."<sup>75</sup>

## Conclusion

While The Salvation Army is thoroughly evangelical in theological belief, its break with the social conservatism of evangelicals places it at the margins of that community. Its agreement with moderate and liberal Christian groups in matters of civil liberties and civil rights aligns the Army with mainline Protestant churches, but its unabashed evangelical theology places it at the margins of that community. Existing on the margins of these religious communities contributes to the confusion many have about The Salvation Army.

In addition, its military image gives the impression that it is a quaint sect. Wilson asserts that the sectarian quality of The Salvation Army is demonstrated in the maintenance of its military analogy and hierarchical structure as though they were "legitimized and sanctified by ancient precepts, even though they were initially purely a matter of expediency."<sup>76</sup> The Salvation Army's authority structure is episcopal, actually modeled along the lines of the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>77</sup> While promotion in the ranks from lieutenant to major is simply a matter of years of service, the ranks of colonel and above are based on positions in the hierarchy and are roughly equivalent to the titles of Archbishop and Cardinal. These appointments are made by the General in consultation with the territorial commanders. But collegiality is developing within that structure through the formation of a variety of advisory panels which have input into the decision-making process.

The Army's military trappings are part of its organizational culture. William Booth was inspired by a popular image of the "church militant" in naming and organizing his new religious movement. Booth used the ideas of disciplined order and active engagement of the troops in a spiritual fight against the devil and his forces of evil and injustice as organizing principles which gave The Salvation Army both a distinctive purpose and identity. The military image still works well for The Salvation Army because it provides a common vernacular and an organizational ethos necessary to maintain a strong sense of unity in a religious organization that commonly crosses the boundaries of class, race, culture, and nation. Army leaders

recognize that maintaining the military analogy contributes to the difficulty of establishing its identity as a legitimate denomination, but abandoning the analogy, they believe, would impact negatively their social mission. The uniform and the military titles are fixed in the public's mind, distinguishing the Army as a charitable organization. Public and private financing and voluntary support of the Army's social programs could be jeopardized if it is identified primarily as a religious denomination. Maintaining the military helps The Salvation Army carry out its dual mission, but it also keeps it in the margin between special purpose group and religious denomination.

The Salvation Army has some lingering sect-like characteristics putting it in tension with established Christian denominations. For example, it does not practice the sacraments basic to historic Protestant Christianity. Actually, the Army practiced the sacraments of baptism and holy communion during its early years, but in 1883 Catherine Booth established the policy of prohibition. Murdoch points out "that while some argue that the prohibition was to protect converted alcoholics from the taste of juice, it is more likely that it had to do with female ministry. Too many worshipers were unwilling to accept the sacrament from a woman."<sup>78</sup> But The Salvation Army still practices the prohibition even though the ministry of women has been generally accepted within Protestant circles. Its *Handbook of Doctrine* argues that the sacraments function only "to draw attention to the truths they symbolize."<sup>79</sup> Therefore, the Salvationist does not need to practice these ceremonies to live a life committed to sacramental service. The Army's rationale for nonobservance of the sacraments fits Wilson's description of sectarianism. It is an organization stance that persists as if it were "legitimized and sanctified by ancient precepts."<sup>80</sup> The Army's view of the sacraments also contributes to its marginal position between a special purpose group (not quite a church) and the community of evangelical denominations. But doubts about the Army's standing as a legitimate religious denomination are mitigated by the fact that "sacraments have not been an important part of church life" among the group of holiness denominations.<sup>81</sup> Most of the holiness churches in the Wesleyan tradition practice only two sacraments (baptism and communion) and some of the churches consider these to be ordinances.<sup>82</sup> So, while the Army's refusal to observe sacraments appears sectarian from the perspective of denominations in the Catholic tradition, it is simply an extension of holiness beliefs about the sacraments.

Robertson made a legitimate case for calling The Salvation Army in mid-twenty-

tieth century England an established sect, but I have found evidence of church-like tendencies developing in the second half of the century, especially in the United States. The data suggest that the organization is adapting to the changing sociocultural environment in ways one would not expect from an established sect. But the data also suggest that the Army's official positions in matters of biblical inerrancy, abortion, and homosexuality are more accommodating to the environment than the attitudes of a significant proportion of the officers in the sample. There is some tension in the ranks.

Robertson also concluded that tension existed within Army ranks regarding "changes in its doctrine, organization and methods of operation."<sup>83</sup> He identified three orientations: old-guard defense of the traditions without regard to the cost, "acceptors" or those who wish to retain basic Army structures while taking a neutral attitude toward society, and modernist accommodation to changing social conditions.<sup>84</sup> While my data suggest that tension exists, it takes on a different configuration of orientations from those suggested by Robertson. Two ideal types seem to emerge from the data. A *traditional orientation* adheres strictly to a conservative theology (literal view of Bible and personal devil) and social conservatism (low tolerance of homosexuality, feminism, and abortion). Traditionalists believe the Army's mission is primarily to save souls (evangelism over social mission), and that the social programs are organized primarily to bring people under the influence of the gospel. Some are more likely to define the Army as a religious movement than a denomination. Traditionalists also are comfortable with and fully accepted by other conservative evangelicals and experience greater tension with the sociocultural environment. A *progressive orientation*, on the other hand, seeks new perspectives within conservative theology that informs the Army's social positions to meet the changing needs of people in contemporary society. Progressives are less likely to take the Bible literally, more tolerant of homosexuality, feminism, and abortion, and more likely to see the social and evangelistic missions integrated in ways that offer ministries of social justice and personal salvation. They are comfortable with liberal evangelicals (e.g., Evangelicals for Social Action) and moderates within the mainline denominations, and they are more ecumenical than traditionalists. Some progressives are more likely than traditionalists to define the Army as a church or denomination. Finally, progressives will be more likely to have college and advanced degrees or serve more educated congregations than traditionalists.

The traditional and progressive orientations reflect the Army's marginal posi-

tion between special purpose groups and recognized Christian denominations and between conservative and liberal Protestant denominations. My impression from considerable contact with Salvationists during the course of this study is that these orientations are not manifested in opposing political camps organizationally. The data suggest that officers who identify more with one orientation or the other also accept aspects of the opposing orientation. As a result, the Army does not experience an internal chasm analogous to the split between conservative and liberal camps in the larger religious milieu. Its marginality provides the Army with the opportunity to serve as a bridge for conversation and religious cooperation between religious conservatives and liberals who have not identified with the positions of those at the two poles on the religious continuum. If, however, Salvation Army leaders recognize or accept such a mission, they have not communicated it in any of the literature I have been able to review. But for others who are looking for ways to build such a bridge, the Army's organizational marginality, if not its organizational style and specific theological substance, could serve as one viable model.

Notes

1. "Gifts to Largest Charities Rose in 1994," *The New York Times* (Oct. 30, 1995), p. B5.
2. David O. Moberg, *The Church as a Social Institution: The Sociology of American Religion*, 2nd edition (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1984).
3. Betty R. Scharf, *The Sociological Study of Religion* (London: Hutchinson University Library, 1970).
4. Paul E. Chalfant, R.E. Beckley and C.E. Palmer, *Religion in Contemporary Society*, 3rd edition (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, Publishers, 1994).
5. Milton J. Yinger, *The Scientific Study of Religion* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1970).
6. Bryan R. Wilson, ed. *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements* (London: Heinemann Publishing, 1967).
7. Bryan R. Wilson, *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism: Sects and Religious Movements in Contemporary Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).
8. Robert Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion: Society and Faith Since World War II* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989).
9. Roland Robertson, "The Salvation Army: The Persistence of Sectarianism," in Bryan R. Wilson, ed. *Patterns of Sectarianism*, pp. 49-105.
10. *Ibid.* p. 54.
11. *Ibid.* p. 50.
12. *Ibid.* p. 51.
13. Wilson, ed. *Patterns of Sectarianism*.
14. Laurence R. Iannaccone, "Why Strict Churches Are Growing," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 99 (1994), pp. 1180-1221.
15. William Bainbridge, *The Sociology of Religious Movements* (New York: Routledge, 1997).
16. Laurence R. Iannaccone, "A Formal Model of Church and Sect," *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 94 (1988), pp. S241-S268.
17. Benton Johnson, "On Church and Sect," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 28 (1963), pp. 539-549.
18. Rodney Stark and William Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1985).
19. Meredith B. McGuire, *Religion: The Social Context*, 2nd edition (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1992).
20. *Ibid.*
21. Johnson, "On Church and Sect."
22. Iannaccone, "A Formal Model of Church and Sect."
23. Stark and Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion*.
24. *Ibid.* p. 23.
25. *Ibid.* p. 23.
26. Roger J. Green, *The Theology of William Booth*. Ph.D. Dissertation (Boston, Massachusetts: Boston College Department of Theology, 1985).
27. David R. Rightmire, *Sacraments and The Salvation Army: Pneumatological Foundations* (Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1990), p. 4.
28. Green, *The Theology of William Booth*.
29. Rightmire, *Sacraments and The Salvation Army*.
30. Green, *The Theology of William Booth*, p. 10.
31. Norman H. Murdoch, *The Salvation Army: An Anglo-American Revival Social Mission* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, Inc., 1985).
32. Rightmire, *Sacraments and The Salvation Army*.
33. John R. Rhemick, *The Theology of a Movement: The Salvation Army in Its Formative Years*. Ph.D. Dissertation. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Department of Theology, 1984).
34. Norman H. Murdoch, "Evangelical Sources of Salvation Army Doctrine," *Evangelical Quarterly*, Vol. 87 (1987), pp. 235-244.
35. Victor Bailey, "In Darkest England and the Way Out: The Salvation Army, Social Reform and the Labour Movement," *International Review of Social History*, Vol. 9 (1984), pp. 133-171.
36. Green, *The Theology of William Booth*.
37. Robertson, "The Salvation Army: The Persistence of Sectarianism."
38. Green, *The Theology of William Booth*, p. 127.

39. Robert Sandall, *The History of The Salvation Army: Social Reform and Welfare Work, 1883–1953*, Vol. III (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Publishers, 1955).
40. Norman H. Murdoch, "In Darkest England," *Christian History*, Vol. 9 (1990), pp. 33–36.
41. Green, *The Theology of William Booth*, p. 130.
42. Edward H. McKinley, *Marching to Glory: The History of The Salvation Army in the United States, 1880–1980* (San Francisco, California: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1980), pp. 11–12.
43. Sally Chesham, *Born to Battle: The Salvation Army in America* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1965), p. 57.
44. *Ibid.* p. 74.
45. McKinley, *Marching to Glory*, p. 100.
46. Gordon J. Melton, *The Encyclopedia of American Religions, Vol I* (Wilmington, North Carolina: McGrath Publishing Company, 1978).
47. McKinley, *Marching to Glory*, p. 83.
48. Norris Magnuson, *Salvation in the Slums: Evangelical Social Work in the United States, 1865–1970* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1977).
49. Wilson, *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism*.
50. Ellen F. Netting, "Church Related Agencies and Social Welfare," *Social Services Review*, Vol. 58 (1984), pp. 404–420.
51. Dale Hanson Bourke, "The Salvation Army Seeks a New Image," *Christianity Today*, Vol. 25 (1981), pp. 40–41. Also, Jean Caffry-Lyles, "New Battle Plan for Booth's Army," *The Christian Century*, Vol. 97 (1980), pp. 811–812.
52. *Good News*, (Nyack, New York: The Salvation Army in the USA Eastern Territory, 1993).
53. Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion*, p. 105.
54. McKinley, *Marching to Glory*.
55. I published this article for an audience with very little knowledge of the Army. In my first draft I omitted this general description of Army worship services, but the editor of the journal asked me to provide it. I am aware of being dangerously close to over generalizing in this description. While I edited out some obvious descriptions (for example, defining a corps as a local parish or congregation), this passage seemed to be an essential part of my overall argument.
56. Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion*, p. 315.
57. Nancy Tatom Ammerman, *Baptist Battles: Social Change and Religious Conflict in the Southern Baptist Convention* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1990).
58. Nancy Tatom Ammerman, *Bible Believers: Fundamentalists in the Modern World* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1987).
59. James Davison Hunter, *American Evangelicalism: Conservative Religion and the Quandary of Modernity* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1983).
60. Both Ammerman, *Bible Believers* and Hunter, *American Evangelicalism* make this point.
61. See Ammerman, *Baptist Battles* and Wuthnow, *The Restructuring of American Religion*.
62. *The Salvation Army Position on Alcohol and Drugs*, 1982.
63. James Davison Hunter, *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation* (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
64. Wade Clark Roof and William McKinney, *American Mainline Religion: Its Changing Shape and Future* (New Brunswick, New Jersey, Rutgers University Press, 1987).
65. *Handbook of Doctrine* (London: Campfield Press, 1969), p. ix.
66. *Ibid.* p. 21.
67. Hunter, *Evangelicalism: The Coming Generation*.
68. *Handbook of Doctrine*, p. 82.
69. Roof and McKinney, *American Mainline Religion*.
70. *Orders and Regulations for Officers of The Salvation Army, Vol 2, 2nd edition* (London: Campfield Press, 1987), p. 139.
71. *The Salvation Army Position on Homosexuality*, 1985.
72. *The Salvation Army Position on Homosexuality*, 1992.
73. *Ibid.*
74. *Orders and Regulations*, p. 78.
75. *The Salvation Army Position on Abortion*, 1986.
76. Bryan R. Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 107.
77. See *Orders and Regulations*, Vol 2, chapter 5.
78. Norman Murdoch, "The Army Mother," *Christian History*, Vol. 9 (1990), p. 8.
79. *Handbook of Doctrine*, p. 182.

*Marching on the Margins: An Analysis of The Salvation Army in the USA* 29

80. Wilson, *Religion in Sociological Perspective*, p. 107.

81. Melton, *The Encyclopedia of American Religions*, p. 201 .

82. Ibid.

83. Robertson, "The Salvation Army: The Persistence of Sectarianism," p. 104.

84. Ibid.



# The History of Salvation Army Doctrine

*Earl Robinson*

## **The Doctrines of The Salvation Army**

From the beginnings of The Salvation Army in 1865 as the East London Revival Society to the present, there has always been a definite creed to which the movement's members have subscribed. The first printed document of this kind was issued by the East London Christian Revival Society in 1866 or 1867 (the precise date is not known). This included seven articles of faith and a five-point bond of agreement: a "creed" to believe and a "code of conduct" to follow.

### **East London Christian Revival Society**

"Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Rev. 2:10

**"ALL FOR CHRIST, AND ALWAYS FOR CHRIST"**

<b>Articles of Faith</b>	<b>Bond of Agreement</b>
1. We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were given	1" We engage from henceforth to strive earnestly

---

*Earl Robinson is a colonel in the Salvation Army presently serving as the International Secretary for External Relations at the International Headquarters of the Salvation Army. Colonel Robinson is the chair of the International Doctrine Council.*

by inspiration of God, and are the only rule of Christian faith and practice.

2. We believe that there is one only living and true God; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—three persons in one God—equal in power and glory; and the only proper object of religious worship.

3. We believe that in the person of Jesus Christ the Divine and human natures are united, so that He is truly and properly God, and truly and properly man.

4. We believe that all mankind, in consequence of the disobedience of Adam are sinners, destitute of holiness, and justly exposed to the penalty of the divine law.

5. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ has, by His suffering and death made an atonement for the whole world, so that whosoever will may be saved.

6. We believe that repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and regeneration by the Holy Spirit are necessary to salvation.

7. We believe in the immortality of the soul—in the resurrection of the body—in the general judgment at the end of the world—in the eternal happiness of the righteous—and in the endless punishment of the wicked.

to depart from all iniquity, and to aim at the highest degree of personal devotedness to God.

2<sup>nd</sup> We agree to set our hearts upon the salvation of souls, and to put forth constant personal effort to secure the conversion of sinners.

3<sup>rd</sup> We engage, so far as we have opportunity, to attend the meetings held by the Society, both indoors and in the open air, and to cooperate to the utmost of our ability, in every effort put forth by the Society to bring souls to Christ.

4<sup>th</sup> We will strive to cultivate a spirit of brotherly affection towards the members of the Society, and manifest this by seeking, so far as we have opportunity, each other's temporal and spiritual welfare.

5<sup>th</sup> We will contribute according to our ability weekly offerings to assist the Society in its operations.

When William Booth began his work in the East End of London he was responding to a request to accept the leadership of an evangelistic mission. The mission was unsectarian. Its creed was the Bible. Its work was to preach the gospel. All were welcomed as co-workers who, as William Booth said in an appeal for Christians to join him, "hold the word of God as the statement of faith and practice, and whose hearts are in sympathy with revival work." This appeal was published in the mission's annual report for 1867. It was to serve this unsectarian mission—the East London Revival Society—that the 1866/67 statement was issued.

At this time William Booth had no wish to establish a separate organization. He wanted rather to form a link between the unchurched masses he longed to reach with the gospel and the existing churches. He wrote later, reflecting on this, "We have no definite plans for the future. From the first I was strongly opposed to forming any separate organization ... My first idea was to get the people saved and send them to the churches."

Many of Booth's co-workers were in committed membership of some section of the Christian Church. They therefore held differing theological views, and could continue to do so within the broad terms of the words in the 1867 "appeal." Working within William Booth's society meant no cancellation of existing connections with churches. It was an extra dimension of commitment, providing evangelically minded Christians with an outlet for soul-saving work they could not find within their own denomination. They were invited to give one, two or three days a week to the work of the society as they had opportunity.

The statement of doctrine provided common ground on which members of different sections of the Church could unite. The seven articles were designed as a statement of evangelical truths to be held by those wishing to preach the gospel of salvation, and nothing more.

In 1870 the original statement was revised and extended to ten statements in a constitution adopted by the first Conference of the Christian Mission. This was necessary to meet a changed situation. Since William Booth's intention to send the converts to the churches was not realized, the mission developed into a denomination. That happened because, as he said of new converts, "First, they would not go when sent. Second, they were not wanted. And third, we wanted some of them at least to help us in the business of saving others. We were drawn to providing for the converts ourselves." Part of that provision was an enlarged statement of faith from seven to ten and then to 11 points. The original seven-point statement was con-

cerned with bringing people to Christ; the new need was for a document adequate to provide guidance for Christian life and development subsequent to conversion.

By the time of the Mission's Deed Poll of 1875 there were eleven doctrines, all of which also appeared in an undated leaflet, "Rules of the Christian Mission," possibly going back to 1873. The last statement to be added was what is now number nine, having to do with continued obedient faith in Christ. This extended statement was, with minor amendments, included in the Foundation Deed Poll of The Salvation Army in 1878 and since then has remained unchanged and today are the doctrines of The Salvation Army and the 11 statements of belief.

No changes in the doctrinal statements of The Salvation Army were actually allowed from the 1878 Deed Poll and other succeeding documents until the Salvation Army Act 1980 when the following preamble of 1878 was omitted: "That the religious doctrines professed and believed and taught ... are and *shall for ever be* [italics added] as follows ..." With reference to the Religious Doctrines schedule, the 1980 Act indicated that the schedule "may from time to time be extended or varied by deed executed by the General, such deed having the prior written approval of more than two-thirds of the Commissioners."

In keeping with the Salvation Army Act 1980, the Doctrine Council constituted in 1992 asked if changes could be recommended to the doctrines to correct omissions, the most significant of which is that of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Such permission was initially granted. Later, on the advice of the Advisory Council to the General, the General instructed the Doctrine Council to make no changes to the Religious Doctrines schedule of the 1980 Act.

The Doctrine Council did however cover significant omissions in the exposition of the doctrines in *Salvation Story*, such as that having to do with a Salvation Army doctrine of the Church in chapter ten, "People of God." The council was also allowed to conclude all chapters with summary statements which deal with doctrinal omissions in the 11 statements of belief:

We believe in Jesus Christ, God's eternal Son, conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of Mary, in whom humanity and deity are united. He lived a perfect life, died an atoning death, was raised from the dead and lives at the right hand of the Father; he intercedes for his people and will return in power and glory.

Future generations of The Salvation Army may look upon these statements as important contributions to the theological education and development of the move-

ment.

The eleven-point statement of faith adopted in 1878 and affirmed in 1980 is as follows (recorded in this article for immediate comparison with the seven-point statement):

**Salvation Army Doctrines**

As set out in Schedule 1 of The Salvation Army Act 1980

1. We believe that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, and that they only constitute the Divine rule of Christian faith and practice.

2. We believe that there is only one God, who is infinitely perfect, the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of all things, and who is the only proper object of religious worship.

3. We believe that there are three persons in the Godhead—the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, undivided in essence and co-equal in power and glory.

4. We believe that in the person of Jesus Christ the Divine and human natures are united, so that He is truly and properly God and truly and properly man.

5. We believe that our first parents were created in a state of innocency, but by their disobedience they lost their purity and happiness, and that in consequence of their fall all men have become sinners, totally depraved, and as such are justly exposed to the wrath of God.

6. We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ has by His suffering and death made an atonement for the whole world so that whosoever will may be saved.

7. We believe that repentance towards God, faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit, are necessary to salvation.

8. We believe that we are justified by grace through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ and that he that believeth hath the witness in himself.

9. We believe that continuance in a state of salvation depends upon continued obedient faith in Christ.

10. We believe that it is the privilege of all believers to be wholly sanctified, and that their whole spirit and soul and body may be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.

11. We believe in the immortality of the soul, in the resurrection of the body, in the general judgment at the end of the world, in the eternal happiness of the righteous and in the endless punishment of the wicked.