

Hope and the Ministry of Planning and Management

M. DOUGLAS MEEKS*

Is there an appropriate planning and management style for Christian ministry? This question cannot be answered on its own terms, since we must first find out what is the appropriate objective of Christian ministry. Christian ministry is a function of the church. The appropriateness of Christian ministry is measured by the whole mission and ministry of the church. Therefore any theology of ministry, including ministry as management, must be an integral part of an ecclesiology. But ecclesiology, including ministry as management, will be only an ideology if it merely serves as a rationale for the existing churches, their programs, structures and practice.

We must go further, then, and realize that the church is a function of the ministry of Jesus Christ. All questions of ministry thus should be directed toward the *calling* of the church by and through Jesus Christ. Therefore any theology of ministry, including ministry as management, must be an integral part of a christology. But ministry in the context merely of ecclesiology and christology will lead to a strange and unbiblical existence between the church and Jesus Christ, namely a worldless or world-escaping existence.

We must go further then and realize that the ministry of Jesus Christ is a function of the eschatological lordship of God himself. If we want to ask our question in the most comprehensive horizon we shall have to say that Christian ministry is a function of God's trinitarian history with God's people and God's creation.¹ Our task then will be to search for a planning and management style which is appropriate to this horizon. I will focus on the eschatological dimension, since it is the one probably most neglected in contemporary debates about church planning and management. I will argue that the dominant biblical metaphor for God's history of liberation and suffering with his people and creation is *covenant*. The question of the appropriateness of planning and management in the church should be judged in the context of covenant reality.² First, a possible ecclesiological framework for understanding church organization will be suggested. Then,

* M. Douglas Meeks is Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy at Eden Theological Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri. Printed with permission of Center for Parish Development.

the distinctness and interrelatedness of hope and planning will be discussed, concluding with some observations about needed emphases in our critical and constructive work in management and planning theory.

I

FORGOTTEN DIMENSIONS OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION

The principal problem in church administration today is that theology and polity have been split apart. The result is that theology tends to be out of touch with the suffering of the church and polity turns more and more to secular sciences and wisdom to perform its necessary functions of ordering the life of the church. But theology and polity are not two distinct fields and disciplines. They are about the same thing and should ask the same question, that is, whether the church will be faithful to its calling to God's righteousness in Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit. If we are going to make use of the best of secular sciences, as we must, then we have to be ready to engage in the task of transmuting and transvaluing them into the covenant context of reality. This will mean that one important element of constructing a pastoral style of management will be making clear the differences between the covenant ethos and the ethos of the urban industrial technocratic society.

The Christian church is not the only organization in our urban society which has a formal ecclesiology.³ There are other "churches" which also have to some degree:

1. a basic credo and belief system
1. a set of consciously held values
3. a peculiar kind of "worship" and morality
4. a particular view of law and codification of law
5. a specific form of organization and management.

Multinational corporations, political parties, universities, medical centers, unions, newspapers—all have the formal aspects of an ecclesiology. If the Christian church is not aware of the fact that many organizations in our society can and do function (at least in the formal sociological sense) as "churches," than it will not even be aware that it can become more like the secular "churches" than the free church of Jesus Christ. The single most decisive reason for the growing irrelevance of the mainline denominations in North America is that they are too "relevant," that is too adjusted and accommodated, to our lives and society. If the church wants to say something new to our society and have anything of value to say about the future of our world it will have to recover its courage to be in conflict with the world for the sake of the transformation of the world.

The value of any theory of management and planning will depend on how well it brings together the five levels of "ecclesiology" mentioned above. To illustrate the five levels, multinational corporations will be discussed since it is their history and life that have had an overwhelming influence on theories of church management and planning. But perhaps the latter have not paid enough attention to the unified and integrated ecclesiology of the multinational corporations. It may be that corporations have done a better job of bringing together "theology" and polity than have the Christian churches.

The most crucial level of any ecclesiology is that of credo or belief system. Everything in any "church" or organization is finally determined by this level in which the faith or the profoundest interest (*inter-esse*) of the members and the organization comes into being. These interests are always borne or transmitted historically by the deepest stories an organization believes and tells about itself. These stories not only give the organization its identity but they actually bring the community and then the organization into historical existence and form it. Multinational corporations have been so "successful" for several decades now because they are so certain of their credo and their interests. They have been incredibly successful with their "evangelization" and "mission," which, similar to that of the Christian church, has an increasingly world-wide scope. Planning in multinational corporations proceeds in strict compliance with the expression of their deepest beliefs and interests. The greatest threat in Christian church management theory would happen if, faced with the crisis of biblical faith, we would take over unawares the credo and interests of the corporations, so impressed are we by their organizational success. If we do so, we may "run" a successful organization for awhile. But its death knell will be the boredom and passivity of the people because it will be nothing new or different from what they experience in all other "churches" of their lives.

On the second level, that is the level of values, multinationals have also been extremely successful. All values in the developed world cluster around the questions of freedom, power, and justice. These questions are not the unique domain of the Christian tradition and church. Everyone talks about freedom, power, and justice in our urban society. But they do not mean the same thing by them. The peculiar content, the "valence," of what a community believes about freedom, power, and justice comes from the interest-laden stories that it believes about itself and reality. Our Christian churches have become so unsure about how to form objectives for communal and missional policy because they have become so unsure of their values as compared to the values of other communities and "churches" in our society.

On the third level, that is the level of worship, multinational corporations have been no less spectacular in their achievements. The term "worship" is understood as the way we embody our deepest interests and

values in our everyday decisions, actions, and communal/social relationships. In a time when corporations have developed an almost exhaustive impact in forming the total individual, familial, and communal lives of their members, the mainline denominations have been increasingly unable or unwilling to speak convincingly of an ethos or lifestyle that is appropriate to the Gospel and biblical values. Even the Methodist Churches have found it next to impossible to speak about the real historical significance of sanctification in the everyday life of Christians.

On the fourth level, that is the level of law, the ability of multinational corporations to express their interests, values, and "worship" in law is everywhere unquestioned. Law is the codification of everything crucial to the life and historical formation of a community (or society) so that it may live from today until tomorrow. Law usually expresses the interests and shape of life of those who are most powerful in a community or society, but law must always be justified in regard to the justice of these interests and life forms.⁴ In a period in which corporations have more and more determined the law of our communal and social existence, the Christian church has found it increasingly difficult even to speak of law in terms of its total life or in relation to economics and politics in our society. This is partly due to extreme theologies of freedom and justification that end in ahistorical and apolitical definitions of faith, but in any case it represents a loss of nerve in the Christian church to recognize that all social relationships must have law to exist historically and that, according to the Gospel, law has to be justified by a cruciform criterion. As is the case in the life and ministry of Jesus (as the Gospels amply demonstrate), the life of the faithful Christian church means a conflict over law with those around it.

Finally, on the fifth level, that is the level of organization, multinational corporations have become the epitome of modern organizational genius. There is not space here to discuss the debates over the actual historical effects and prospects of multinationals.⁵ But that they offer for many in the industrialized West (and in Christian churches) the exclusive model for organization, planning and management is clear. It seems that the genius of their organization results from the fact that they integrate so systematically the four deeper levels of their existence into the form and substance of their organization and management. Conversely, the shortcoming of organization, planning and management in the mainline Christian churches is that they have not appropriated and integrated the four deeper, biblically authorized levels into the actual form of their organizational existence. In fact, there is a tendency in contemporary church management theory to take over organizational theory from corporations without even being aware how well their peculiar interests, values, worship/morality, and understanding of law are embodied in their management theory and practice.

II

THE CHURCH AS VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION AND CORPORATION

We can see better what is at stake here if we take a look at the two prevailing models of the mainline churches which most affect contemporary styles of ministry.

According to the model of the church as "voluntary association" each lay person gives to the church what is left over in his or her time, energy, and money. The church belongs to that realm of culture which is essentially outside production and consumption. It does not have the everyday character of the necessity of work and labor. There is nothing you *have* to do in the church. Thus the church is the place where you can relax and do what you will to be self-actualized and "authentic." The church can be a place of compensation for the bad feelings one gets in an impersonal, technocratic world. But when the church is defined as the zone of the voluntary, it ends up being, as is the case for a vast majority of lay people today, the least important institution in one's life.

What style of ministry is appropriate to this context? Is ministry even necessary? These questions have caused a deep crisis of identity, dignity, and self-worth among ministers. One answer has come in the form of a discovery of something that may be necessary in the church: the church can be the place where therapy can be performed to help the individual adjust better to his or her life situation. Under this model, ministry in recent decades has come to be defined in terms of managing the psyche and the internal, private and familial lives of the lay people. Pastoral care has been more and more reduced to pastoral counseling and the minister understands himself or herself on a medical model of treating a patient-client.

Ministry as management of the psychic and volitional life of a voluntary association has in the last decades taken over many of the psychotherapeutic theories of secular psychology.⁶ The Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) movement has captivated countless "professional" ministers with the assumption that theology can be done out of the "resources" of psychological sciences and the practice of ministry out of the struggle for psychological health. We are only now beginning to see the deep problems connected with this assumption.

The first problem is that ministry as psychological management takes over uncritically the assumptions about the human being, society, and reality which lie behind current psychotherapeutic theories. It brings these assumptions into the church, naively unaware that they are often not at all appropriate to biblical assumptions about the human being, society, and reality. Before long the language of the psychological perspectives replaces the biblical logic and the biblical universe of discourse so that the Bible

becomes alien, a book without expectations and authority. Secondly, ministry as psychological management tends to cut off the actual social, economic, and political situations of the counselee so that ministry deals only with his or her psychological hurts without addressing faith to the very conditions which have often given rise to the psychological disorders. Finally, the more the minister feels that the only thing the people *have* to come to church for is therapy for their psychic existence, the more he or she builds the whole of ministry around that concern and the less he or she takes responsibility for the formation of the congregation, the whole people of God in community.

If church as “voluntary association” is the common sensical viewpoint of most lay people, church as “corporation” has become a compelling model for many clergy. Ministers have also found new self-images by taking over professional roles and identities from the socioeconomic professions. But they have sometimes taken over organizational theories from the sciences of organizing large business concerns just as uncritically as psychotherapeutical theories have been taken over. It is mistakenly thought that systems theories are interest and value-free. But management theories, as far back as they are recorded in history, have always been connected with economics, that is, with the basic question of the allocation of scarce resources and with the management of property, capital, means of production, modes of labor, and people—all with identifiable objectives in mind.⁷

The new elements in modern theories of management are, of course, technology and cybernetics. These powers of the human being to manipulate nature (including our own bodies) and systems makes management at once patently more necessary and infinitely more complicated than ever before in history but also considerably more powerful as a means of control. This latter consideration requires that any management theory constantly ask the self-critical questions: 1) How shall we control the instruments (of technology, etc.) by which we control nature and history so that our own “creations” will not control us? and 2) Who will manage the manager? The only way to answer both of these questions is to refer to the interests that are authorized in the context of reality in which all the relevant powers are at play. If the church takes over management theories and practices from multinational corporations without being deeply critical of the interests and goals that lie behind those theories and practices, it runs the risk of becoming enslaved to the interests of the prevailing economic ethos of our society.

The church is called to be neither a voluntary association nor a corporation, but rather a covenant community. We now turn to the specific problem of planning in order to develop this theme more particularly.

III

PLANNING AND HOPE IN THE COVENANT CONTEXT

Hope and planning are interrelated and interdependent.⁸ But because they represent the future in decisively different ways we must be careful to note their differences when we ask about planning as a part of an appropriate management style for ministry. The greatest threat in management is that hope will be totally replaced by planning. This is the tendency of modern management which the church of Jesus Christ must resist with all its power.

Planning depends on hope's destruction of human despair. There will be no planning out of despair, except for nihilistic projections of death wishes. Without hope, planning sees no possibilities because it sees no ultimate goal. Hope, on the other hand, depends on planning. There will be no continuing hope which does not struggle against irrationality and randomness through responsible planning. Hope without planning is unembodied and unrealistic. In history hope and planning give life to each other.

But between the two it is easier for us to comprehend the value and necessity of planning. For anyone who has deeply sensed the possibilities and threats of the industrial revolution, planning has become a necessity. With the rise of vast scientific and technical powers, the ancient vision of a unified humanity becomes at once actually possible and necessary. Modern planning aims at the coordination of human energies and goals. It envisions a unified horizon of human history which can be made by human beings. The other side of the coin is the discovery that human power over nature and history can also destroy the whole world project. Progress (secularized providence), it is discovered, is not after all irreversible or even uniformly serviceable of the human good. Thus planning takes on an inextricable ambiguity. It can serve human survival or human destruction.

It is much more difficult for us to comprehend the reality and necessity of hope, and this is partly so because hope and planning look so much alike. Both hope and planning are in love with the *future*.⁹ They find their field of action in the future. This is because they both live out of a deep dissatisfaction with the present. They are unwilling to accept what exists as if it were eternal finality. Rather they are fascinated with the *possible*. They are compelled by an urge to fuse the possible and the existing. What is does not have to be because the possible stands on the threshold. But the possible can be introduced into the existing only because of the third common factor of hope and planning: They are the chief advocates of *freedom*. They are not afraid of the risks of freedom and the pain of change because they know

that freedom can be realized only in a changeable world. Thus hope and planning are one insofar as future, possibility and freedom are their historical ontological and anthropological categories.

If we want to discover what is distinctive about hope over against planning and thus what it is about hope that planning cannot do without, we have to turn to hope's peculiar realm. Hope arises out of and is alive in the context of covenant. Hope presupposes the radical otherness of the Other.¹⁰ It presupposes God's sovereign freedom and righteousness, that is God's power for life. In God's freedom and out of God's righteousness the future is created. Thus hope looks not for the future which it can engender, make or put at its disposal but rather for the future which God puts at its disposal. Hope expects the future which God promises. In the midst of covenant reality, then, hope understands the future as the *promised new*, possibility as the *power of suffering*, and freedom as *patient trust*.

1. *The Future*. Hope is different from planning in that it sees the *origin* of the future in God's faithfulness to God's promise. When this assumption is absent, planning will view the future as an extrapolation of the present. Moltman has made this distinction clear by comparing two senses of the future: *adventus* and *futurum* (1970: 11 ff.; 1969: 177-199). Advent is the word which translates *parousia* (a present coming or a coming presence) and indicates that God brings the future toward us in God's faithfulness. Unfortunately the English language (unlike French, *avenir*, and German, *Zukunft*) does not have a second word to indicate this understanding of the future. "Future" comes from the Greek *Phuo* (*Phusis* = nature) which refers to the fecund womb of the present out of which the future develops. This has given rise to deterministic conceptions of planning in which the future and the possible can be turned into necessities on the basis of computing laws of cause and effect. In this case hope is viewed as relating only to those factors which are random, incalculable and unplanned after all causes and effects have been computed. This form of planning is appropriate to automatic complexes of production but not to the context of covenant in which the future arises out of God's faithfulness to himself. Hope looks forward and plans in the light of the radically other, promised and freely given future of God.

The advent of God's future creates the *new* and gives birth to hope (Moltmann 1967: 133ff., passim; 1969: 3-18; and Meeks 1974: 73-75, 86-88, 96-97). Hope always recognizes the newness of God's future over against what is known in the present. If this assumption is lacking, planning may indeed look for different possibilities for new perception and development, but it may in fact be doing nothing but making history one-dimensional by reducing the risk and contingency which are inherent in the radically new. Prognostic planning on the basis of concluded facts of history is a distortion of "providence" and the "divine-planning mentality for history" (Moltmann 1971: 184). Hope shares with planning the intention of

removing irrationality, fate and chance from historical decisions and projections. But it steadfastly believes that God's new thing of freedom and salvation has appeared in Jesus Christ in the mode of promise (Moltmann 1967: 139–165). This makes the present a “front line” in which the old breaks up and the new breaks in, and in which we may confidently “seek first the kingdom of God” in expectation that God's power and faithfulness will create the future of God's promise.

By itself, planning can easily destroy itself by planning the “end of history.” It can do this by removing what is radically new or by realizing all existing possibilities. In either case planning needs hope which overshoots every reality (Moltmann 1967: 32 ff.).¹¹ Planning which begins with the intention to control fate and history may end with nothing but a systematic adjustment to fruitless developments. Hope consistently sees what cannot be fully realized in present experience and looks to the future of God which criticizes and liberates everything that looks finished or finally disappointed.

2. *Possibility.* Hope is also different from planning in that hope accepts suffering from the contradictions of the present as the precondition of God's *novum* transforming the present. That is, hope does not rest in the simple movement from possibility to reality, but it accepts the discontinuity of God's own suffering power to overcome sin, evil and death (Meeks 1974: 87–89). The issue at stake here is how the new comes into the midst of the old and becomes real. Probabilistic systems of planning make possibilities into probabilities by taking into account the interaction between various originators and systems and by calculating the outcome of their combined processes of actualization. This form of planning is appropriate to a complex of fixed systems each with potentials whose actualization will not contradict the realization of the total aggregate of possibilities. But it is not appropriate to the context of covenant in which suffering from the present is the very power by which the present is changed. Hope plans out of the power of suffering which holds on to the negations of the present until they are transformed.

Planning depends on hope to keep alive the sense of need in the present (Bloch 1970: 2 ff.). When there is no sense of need, suffering ceases and with that so does hoping for something new and different. When this happens planning loses both its contact with the future and its contact with what needs to be changed in the present. It then can serve only the ideological function of manipulating and preserving conditions of surfeit.

3. *Freedom.* Finally, hope is different from planning in that hope expects genuine freedom only in the context of promises given and received (Moltmann 1967: 143 ff.). Hope does not expect that freedom will come through work or competition. Game theory systems of planning assume that freedom is a function of the actions and reactions of opponents and competitors. The desired objective can be brought toward realization by human

intention and effort which can be calculated by games and simulators. This form of planning is closest to hope because it assumes that planning is an action already fully engaged in the realization of the objective. Planning itself takes part in creating the conditions for reaching the goal. It shapes and forces history to move toward specific objectives. It is interested not only in foreseeing what is not yet in existence but also in producing what is not yet in existence. This kind of planning is appropriate to organizations which are competing with other organizations under conditions of equity.¹² But it is not appropriate to the context of covenant in which one promises oneself in hoping and patient trust to another for the other's future.

Planning needs hope to criticize its faith in work, its naiveté about competition, and its constant tendency to measure the boundaries of equity and justice according to its own present interests. Hope lives from the Holy Spirit's yearning for a universal reality of reconciliation (Moltmann 1977: 133–136, 189–196). Hope keeps planning from becoming pretentious because it knows that no one is saved until all are saved. And thus it calls into question planning's tendency to mark the lines of its concern with its own racial, sexual, cultural, class or national boundaries.

IV

TOWARD AN APPROPRIATE STYLE OF PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT FOR CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

Out of the many implications that can be drawn from the preceding, I would like to emphasize the need for forming mature charismatic congregations as a major factor in determining the appropriateness of a style of planning and management for Christian ministry today.¹³ We should speak of the formation of mature charismatic congregations as both the context and goal of planning and management. There can be appropriate planning in the church today only within mature charismatic congregations, but, on the other hand, mature charismatic congregations have to be planned and managed. Thus the interdependence of hope and planning can be demonstrated, since if such congregations come into existence they will be the creation and gift of the Holy Spirit and also the result of responsible planning. Thus we are speaking of performative and hope-filled planning which does today what it expects tomorrow.

The style of ministerial planning and management which can best serve the creation of mature charismatic congregations will not be one of narrow specialization. It is time that we reemphasize in church and seminary that ministers must be trained in the total formation of the congregation. The special task of ordained ministry is to shepherd the congregation in its performance of its tasks of kerygma (prophetic ministry), koinonia (priestly

ministry), and diakonia (kingly ministry).¹⁴ Each of these ministerial functions belongs first of all to the whole congregation and in some measure to the ministry of each person in the congregation.¹⁵ Only when these three functions are performed simultaneously and interdependently is it possible for a mature charismatic congregation to come into existence. Planning and management are in every sense functions of the interdependence of these ministries.

Planners and managers should be preachers/teachers who help the congregation accept in faith the peculiar interests which the biblical stories bear to them and to deal with the conflicts which these interests cause in the life of the church in the world. Planning presupposes a free church in faith. Planners who do not make all decisions on behalf of a free church in faith will thwart the life of freedom to which Christ has freed us and called us (Gal. 5:1). Free persons in Christ who do not make responsible plans for the embodiment of freedom are liable to submit again to the yoke of slavery.

Planners and managers should be pastoral carers who help the congregation live the new humanity of Jesus Christ and form the peculiar ethos of suffering love. Planners who do not expect the realization of all plans out of the power of suffering love serve other powers rather than subjecting themselves "as is fitting in the Lord" (Col. 3:18; cf. Eph. 5:21ff; I Pet. 2:13ff.). Persons empowered with suffering love who do not consistently plan the growth and spreading of love in the congregation and world do not cooperate in the history in which all powers will submit to Christ.

Planners and managers should serve the ordering and organization of the church for its life of liturgy and mission in the world. Planning presupposes a church commissioned to mission in hope. Planners who do not expect the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the world will seek something other than God's righteousness as the source of life. Persons in the Spirit who do not plan for the conditions which serve God's righteousness forsake the Holy Spirit's fight against the demonic spirits of our society and world.

The mature charismatic congregation is the open promise of the Reformation. It is the Reformation's unexplored, virgin territory, since what we often call congregations do not even approximate the original vision of the Reformation.¹⁶ Planning and management will have their most important impact in the coming decades as they experiment with new sciences and disciplines that can only emerge out of the praxis of free, loving and hoping congregations who are prepared to be in conflict with the world precisely because of God's passion for the world which God yearns to transform (Jn. 3:16).

The conflict begins when the stories of the Gospel are told and believed. Then the mature charismatic congregation begins to see how differ-

ent its interests and values are from those which derive from the other deep stories it hears in our urban culture. The very shape of planning and management will be determined by which stories the congregation believes.

1. The congregation hears the story of Prometheus (paradigmatically restated in modernity by Adam Smith and Karl Marx) told to it a thousand different ways every day in the urban ethos. It also hears the story of the resurrection/creation. According to the Promethean story, we are what we make out of ourselves. Through our ingenuity and *techne* we have the power to control nature and make our future. Therefore the deepest interest in life is self-creation through work. Work is thus viewed as the origin of freedom, power and justice. Only those who work are valued as free and powerful, that is, capable of planning and managing their future. The standards of the just allocation of scarce resources become: a) to each according to his or her efforts or achievements, b) to each according to his or her usefulness to the community, and c) to each according to his or her ability to supply the demand of the others. Each of these standards has deadly dehumanizing implications for many persons in our society. If the Christian church tells this story about itself, its interests, the shape of its life and its view of the world will not be different from any other organization in our technocratic society.

A mature charismatic congregation begins to come into being when the story of the resurrection/creation is told and believed. This story contradicts the Promethean story by proclaiming that God creates life out of death, out of the power of nothingness itself. We cannot create ourselves or justify ourselves through work. We cannot get to the kingdom of freedom and a new future through the kingdom of work.¹⁷ Therefore the charismatic congregation celebrates the sabbath on the first day of the week and not on the last. The congregation is not a vacation, the "pause that refreshes," a voluntary relaxation from the pain of the world. Rather the congregation is the single most important reality in the lives of people who in God's creative grace *are* before they *do* anything.

This does not mean that work is not important. In fact, nothing in the church is voluntary. God's freedom binds us to the redeemed work which serves the conditions of his righteousness, and thus life. The eschatological *novum* of God's creative righteousness can transvalue all our values of work. But this can happen only if we are freed from the fear of death, which is the source of the anxiety that submits us to the deadly compulsions of work. A Christian style of planning assumes that the Gospel can free us from the fear of death and the compulsion to self-creation through work. Otherwise planning is from the beginning vainly tied to death's grip on the old.

2. The congregation hears the story of Oedipus (restated by Freud) countless times each day in our urban culture. It also hears the story of the

crucified resurrected one. The story of Oedipus tells us that everything human begins with guilt and that we must devise ways of dealing with our guilt or suffer the consequences of repressing it.¹⁸ Our guilt produces our neuroses ("private religion" as Freud called them) and these in turn become the "coercive rituals" and projections by which we dehumanize others in the aggressions of racism, sexism, and classism. The answer of the psychosocial sciences to these problems amounts to the old Stoic answer: Get control of yourself, possess yourself and protect yourself against suffering. The old Stoic wisdom rings in our ears from every dimension of society: If you want to keep from getting hurt, then do not fall in love. Keep a distance and play it cool. And thus we have the increasing apathy, the inability to suffer with another, in our society. This is the most ominous sign for an aborted future.

The story of the crucified resurrected one is that we are not guilty siblings who destroy each other trying to rid ourselves of guilt, but that we are forgiven brothers and sisters. Christianity is not a religion of guilt. The life of the charismatic congregation begins with God's power of forgiveness through God's own passion. It is not only possible to fall in love, but we are commanded to fall in love. God's gift of life to us is this suffering love, this power to love the radically other, the stranger. Only those who can suffer are capable of loving. Only they can savor the depth of life. Christian planning must assume the forgiveness of the congregation, its freedom from guilt, and also its passion, its power to suffer. Otherwise planning will be in vain, since no matter what is planned guilty persons will serve the interest of suppressing or escaping their guilt and will in the process deny the life of the other.

Ministerial management in our time should make an abrupt departure with recent theory and practice by putting at its heart the questions of ethos and lifestyle, that is, the question of sanctification. This will, to be sure, require a bold new imagination about the disciplines of church planning and management. But I do not see how they can make an appropriate contribution to the future of our churches in these times without addressing themselves to the radically new shape of life that is required in our congregations if they are to survive in our society. What is needed is the training of persons in seminary and church in a planning and management style appropriate to missionary churches with messianic lifestyles.¹⁹

3. The congregation hears everywhere in our society the story of Odysseus (restated by Darwin) and the story of the Holy Spirit's creation of Christian mission. The story of Odysseus claims that we get home through competition. The one who achieves success in the end will have won according to the rule of "the survival of the fittest." Mobility is the sign of life. One has no value if one is not going somewhere in time, space or social position. And this can be measured in the final analysis only by whether the other goes down as I go up.

The biblical story is that we are sent into mission out of the power of the Holy Spirit. Ministerial planning is also an economic planning. But we are called to plan by the economics of the Holy Spirit.²⁰ All economics in our society begins with the assumption of scarcity, with the assumption that there is not enough of what it takes to live to go around. From the covenant perspective, however, we must begin with the assumption that the Holy Spirit destroys scarcity with the superabundance of his gifts for life.²¹ Whenever God the Holy Spirit makes his righteousness present there is always enough to go around. This calls for a radically different conception of planning. If planning does not presuppose that the Holy Spirit is making present the conditions of righteousness in the congregation and world, then whatever is planned will be in vain, since the people will serve the interest of competing for scarce necessities.

Planning and management are beset today by unheard of value problems raised by questions of distributive justice. The ethos of our society is becoming more and more one of consumption based on constant creation of artificial senses of scarcity in the human psyche. The congregation will have to fight these values in its own ethos before it can serve justice in society. Management must assume the peculiar task of forming a congregation in which each person among God's *laos* can accept his or her call to ministry and can begin to practice justice within the congregation. The congregation is the place of training for mission by practicing justice in love. This cannot happen if planning and management theory are not finely tuned to the vast problems of overcoming the clergy-laity split in the church.²²

We can make a start in this direction by realizing that the congregation actually comes into existence with the gifting of each person by the Holy Spirit with the charismata which indicate his or her unique calling to ministry. The main charisma we should be looking for in ordained ministers is the gift to see and nurture the charismata in each person of the congregation. There is no other way for a planning and management theory to deal with what Lyle Schaller has aptly called and described as the "passive church" (1978: 16-19).²³ Church planning and management have no other goal than helping to create mature, active ministers in the congregation who are free and disciplined to participate in God's liberating history with God's creation.

NOTES

¹ Jürgen Moltmann has developed an aspect of ecclesiology in each of his three major books. In *Theology of Hope* (1967), he spoke of the "exodus church" in the light of the eschatological future of mission opened up by the resurrection. In *The Crucified God* (1974), he wrote of the "church under the cross" which struggles to gain its freedom over against the powers of the world. In *The Church in the Power of the Spirit* (1977), he has emphasized the Spirit-created fellowship which embodies a messianic lifestyle. He now has taken up these three aspects into a trinitarian view of the church as participating in God's history. See Moltmann 1977: 50-65.

² Lyle E. Schaller has also made this his starting point in his book *Parish Planning*.

³ I use "church" here in the attenuated sense of the "ecclesiology of sociology" developed in the writings of Max Weber, Ernst Troeltsch, and H. Richard Niebuhr. Cf. the discussion of the types of organizational structure in Beveridge 1971: 51-78.

⁴ See Harold J. Berman, *The Interaction of Law and Religion*.

⁵ Representative of the debate are Richard Barnet and Ronald Müller, *Global Reach* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1975); and Thomas Balogh, *Fact and Fancy in International Economic Relations* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1973). Helpful in elaborating the ethical issues involved in corporations are S. Prakash Sethi, *Up Against the Corporate Wall: Modern Corporations and Social Issues in the Seventies* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974); Thomas A. Pettit, *The Moral Crisis in Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), and John C. DeBoer, *How to Succeed in the Organization Jungle without Losing Your Religion* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1972). See also *Corporate Social Policy*, ed. by Robert L. Heilbroner and Paul London (Reading, Ma.: Addison-Wesley, 1975).

⁶ Several recent publications have engaged in a serious criticism of the church's uncritical use of psychotherapeutic theories. Among these are Don Browning, *The Moral Context of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976); and Paul Pruyser, *The Minister as Diagnostician* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976). See also Gaylord B. Noyce, "Has Ministry's Nerve Been Cut by the Pastoral Counseling Movement?" *The Christian Century* 95 (February 1978): 103-114.

⁷ See Claude S. George, Jr., *The History of Management Thought*.

⁸ In this section I am following closely Jürgen Moltmann's seminal essay "Hope and Planning" (1971: 178-198).

⁹ A fuller development of the following categories can be found in Ernst Bloch, *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*; and *A Philosophy of the Future*. See also Jürgen Moltmann, *The Experiment Hope* (1975: 15-59).

¹⁰ See Moltmann 1967: 84ff., 143 ff. Cf. Meeks 1974: 43-49.

¹¹ See also Jürgen Moltmann, *Man: Christian Anthropology in the Conflict of the Present*, trans. by John Sturdy (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974). Robert C. Worley has worked at this insight in his book *Change in the Church: A Source of Hope* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971).

¹² The problem of course is always how to assure the conditions of equity. In American economics, for example, there is little actual law and order that assure equity, and as a result monopolies quickly bring competition to an end.

¹³ Cf. here chaps. 5 and 6 of Moltmann (1977).

¹⁴ Cf. the treatment of the *munus triplex* in Moltmann 1977: 76-108.

¹⁵ See Moltmann 1977: 300ff. Also suggestive are Manfred Josuttis, *Praxis des Evangeliums zwischen Politik und Religion: Grundprobleme der Praktischen Theologie* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1974) and *Theologie und Kirchenleitung*, ed. by Wolfgang Erk and Yorick Spiegel (Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1976).

¹⁶ See Meeks 1976: 303-306.

¹⁷ Cf. Moltmann 1972: 46-47.

¹⁸ Cf. Moltmann 1974: chap. 7.

¹⁹ See Jürgen Moltmann, *The Passion for Life: A Messianic Lifestyle*, trans. by M. Douglas Meeks (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978) and Gerhard M. Martin, *Fest: The Transformation of Everyday*, trans. by M. Douglas Meeks (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

²⁰ See my article, "Gott und die Ökonomie des Heiligen Geistes," (1980: 40-58).

²¹ The New Testament speaks of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in language of superabundance. "He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all, will not give us all things with him?" (Rom. 8:32). Cf. also I Cor. 1:5,7; 3:21-23; Phil. 4:12b-13, 19; Acts 4:31-35.

²² Church management theory will be greatly strengthened once the church has worked seriously and deeply with a theology of ordination for our time. See Alfred Burgsmüller and Reinhard Frieling eds., *Amt und ordination im Verständnis evangelischer Kirchen und ökumenischer Gespräche* (Fütersshoh: Gerd Mohn, 1974).

²³ Robert C. Worley is making some creative advances toward the involvement of all members of the congregation in ministry. See his *A Gathering of Strangers: Understanding the Life of Your Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976) and *Dry Bones Breathe* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1977).

REFERENCES CONSULTED

Berman, Harold J.

1974 *The Interaction of Law and Religion*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Beveridge, W. E.

1971 *Managing the Church*. London: SCM.

Bloch, Ernst

1959 *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

1970 *A Philosophy of the Future*. Translated by John Cumming. New York: Herder & Herder.

George, Claude S., Jr.

1972 *The History of Management Thought*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Meeks, M. Douglas

1974 *Origins of the Theology of Hope*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1976 "Directions toward a Church of the People." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 3: 303-306.

1980 "Gott und die Ökonomie des Heiligen Geistes." *Evangelische Theologie* 40: 40-48.

Moltmann, Jürgen

1967 *Theology of Hope*. Translated by James W. Leitch. New York: Harper & Row.

1969 *Religion, Revolution and the Future*. Translated by M. Douglas Meeks. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

1970 "Theology as Eschatology." In *The Future as Hope*, edited by Frederick Herzog. New York: Herder & Herder.

1971 *Hope and Theology*. Translated by Margaret Clarkson. London: SCM.

1972 *Theology of Play*. Translated by Reinhard Ulrich. New York: Harper & Row.

1974 *The Crucified God*. Translated by R. A. Wilson and John Bowden. New York: Harper & Row.

1975 *The Experience Hope*. Translated by M. Douglas Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1977 *The Church in the Power of the Spirit*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. New York: Harper & Row.

Schaller, Lyle E.

1970 *Parish Planning*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

1978 "The Passive Church." *Church Management—The Clergy Journal* 55: 16-19.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.