# POWER RELATIONS IN THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY:

# THEOLOGY, ORDER, POLITICS AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

by

DIETER QUICK

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham

for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Theology and Religion
School of Philosophy, Theology and Religion
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
October 2017

# ABSTRACT

This thesis for the first time demonstrates that power relations, which are as disparate as juridical frameworks, political engagement, spiritual experience, theology and God, can be fully accounted for in a single theory approach that is descriptive analytical, post-structuralist and rhizome ontological. This is achieved through an exploration of Christian ministry practice and theological approaches, the politics of the Confessing Struggle, Barthian dogmatics and Pentecostal power accounts.

It is argued that a conventional normative-theological reflection of the Christian ministry obstructs both practical-theological accountability and having an empowering pastoral approach. Thereby, the conceptual creation, counter-modern capacities and limitations—as well as the ministry-internal effects—of different forms of Christian agency formation are explored, using Foucauldian terms. These include: Barth's 'theological existence,' Pentecostal empowerment through Spirit baptism, and the distributed-charismatic and prayerful pursuit of divine power and presence.

It should be possible to engage and reconcile all forms of Christian empowerment to one another on the basis of a rhizomic ministry practice; one which, when established upon a charismatic-revivalist ethos, is able to facilitate the occasional formation and coming to life of a distributed divine presence and power.

**Keywords:** power, order, spirituality, theology, Church, organisation, politics, embodiment; Foucault, ANT, Deleuze-Guattari, rhizome; Barth, Barmen, Pentecostal, Bartleman

For good friends who encouraged me,

for my wife and children,

for a God whose love melts mountains

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| ANT | Actor-Network Theory |
| *BK* | Confessing Church (*Bekennende Kirche*) |
| *CA* | Augsburg Confession (*Confessio Augustana*) |
| *CD* | Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* 4 vols. of several parts, (German ed.: *Kirchliche Dogmatik,* 1934–1967) |
| *DC* | 'German Christians' ('*Deutsche Christen*') |
| *DEK* | German Evangelical Church (*Deutsche Evangelische Kirche; 1933–1945*) |
| DG | Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari |
| *EKD* | Evangelical Church in Germany (*Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland*) |
| LWF | (the) Lutheran World Federation |
| NT | New Testament |
| OPP | obligatory passage point (Michel Callon) |
| *VELKD* | United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany (*Vereinigte Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirche Deutschlands*) |
| WARC | World Alliance of Reformed Churches (1970–2006; predecessor of the World Communion of Reformed Churches) |

# 0 Introduction: Is it Possible to Account for Power in Christian Ministry?

Christian leadership is facilitated by many fields and relations of power, and contributes itself to the stabilisation and emergent change of power fields. Leadership routinely navigates its way through complex relations of organisational and political power, both within religious communities and in a wider society context. In many ways, leaders themselves contribute to the ever developing power relations. As religious leaders, they have facilitative control over spiritual times, spaces, experiences and beliefs. Thereby they even participate in the sanctity and power of the divine. As preachers, pastors and theological commentators, they contribute to the shaping of personal, sociocultural and political meaning. As representatives of their religious communities and organisations—and even simply by exercising intellectual, organisational or political skill—Christian leaders and groups can become relevant political agents within their wider communities and beyond. Further, Christian leadership—at its best—empowers ordinary people. In the most

exciting forms of Pentecostal Christianity for example, (good) Christian

leadership is understood as being facilitative of such experiences of

charismatic empowerment amongst people 'in the pews,' on the basis of

enlarging religious experiences, embodied capacities and practices.[1]

However, even the most adept pastoral teams may find themselves often

overwhelmed by the task of managing people's subsequently emerging

sense of identity and calling to church or community service, and a relating

pluralisation of ministry contributions and theological proposition making.

Churches and religious communities should thus take an interest in

understanding how fields of power facilitate, direct—and limit—Christian

ministry and action/identity relations.  Only then are they able to account

---

1    Charismatic empowerment encompasses spiritual experiences and enlarged personal capacities such as exceptional insight, healing gifts, moving and effective prayer and bodily spiritual experiences, but also enhanced capacities of wisdom for encouragement and community development, or of economic excellence: Allan Heaton Anderson, *An Introduction to Pentecostalism,* 2nd edn (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 179ff.; Vinson Synan, ed., *Spirit-Empowered Christianity in the Twenty-First Century* (Lake Mary, Fl.: Charisma Strang, 2011); W. J. Hollenweger, 'Gifts of the Spirit: Natural and Supernatural,' in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements,* ed. Stanley M. Burgess, ass. ed. Eduard M. van der Maas, rev. edn (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2002), 667f.; Arnold Bittlinger, *Gifts and Ministries* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1973); Heribert Mühlen, *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit* (London: Burns and Oates; New York: Paulist, 1978), 145ff.; William K. Kay and Anne E. Dyer, ed., *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies: a Reader* (London: SCM, 2004), 83ff.; Enrique Nardoni, 'Charisma in the Early Church since Rudolph Sohm: an Ecumenical Challenge,' *Theological Studies* 53, no. 4 (1992): 646ff.; Ernst Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community in the New Testament,' in *Essays on New Testament Themes,* tr. W. J. Montague (London: SCM, 1964), 63ff.

for power, as it is relevant with regards to the Christian ministry.[2]

Churches already attempt the latter within the doctrine of the church (ecclesiology) and through an academic/professional routinisation of ethical-theological reflection. All too often, a critical understanding of Christian engagement with such complex relations of ministerial power, embedded as it is within its wider relational fields, remains incomplete and skewed, as the task of theological accountability is pursued with insufficient—even flawed—analytical tools. *Is it conceivable to integrate all power concerns that are relevant to the Christian ministry, into a single (approach to) theorisation?* Such a unified analytical approach would need to do justice to concerns as diverse as: ministerial and professional praxis, internal church order and politics; external power relations of a social, political, legal, organisational or cultural nature; and 'religious' powers such as spirituality, theology and God. This theory approach would further feature the capacity to clarify concrete and complex interferences—both warranted and unwarranted—which occur between such 'different kinds of power.'

This introduction begins (in section 0.1) with a brief survey of

---

2    Roy Kearsley, *Church, Community and Power* (Farnham, Surr., and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2008), 1ff.

relevant power-theoretical perspectives and resources, across the fields of academic theology, sociology and ethnography of religion, as well as political/ organisational theory (sociology) which one would conventionally be directed towards given the task of understanding the many relations and dimensions in which 'power' is relevant to the Christian ministry.  One must apologise for the preposterous breadth at which this introduction begins, retracing some meandering channels across a vastly spread-out inland delta of academic reasoning.  The necessity arises from the researcher's explicitly attempt to evade, for one, normative reasoning, the 'definition' and preliminary enclosure of relevant 'categories' such as power, order, spiritual experience, theology and God.  The reason is that these are, in themselves, paramount resources and techniques of power.  In addition, the researcher aims to evade the exclusive commitment to any particular (normatively enclosed) understanding and practice of religion, 'salvation,' power and God.  The 'inland delta' of analysis flows into a twofold conclusion which identifies both ideal-typical essistentialism and 'normativity' as constructive problems which (pre-)determine one's understanding of, and engagement with, relations of power across relevant disciplinary lenses and hampers an integrated analytical-theoretical description and approach.  If it is the case that the categorical definition of the terms and conditions of power and order, normativity and theological

truth must be seen as in themselves major resources and deployments of power, then it is not appropriate to begin descriptive research into power by definition or normative deduction—not even by delineation or common-sensual location within a 'bigger picture'—of one's relevant relational field.[3] As for the practice of power, one cannot account for it on the basis of its very own strategic construction. Together with the construction of power technologies, relations and strategies themselves, their analytical understanding proceeds 'from the middle, through the middle, coming and going rather than starting and finishing' (Deleuze and Guattari [DG]).[4] This insight marks this thesis' point of departure, after which section 0.2 outlines a two-layered research question, strategy and rationale. On the basis of a post-structuralist understanding of power-analytical, subversive 'toolbox' deployments (0.2.1), the selection, in different chapters, of relevant practical-theological problems and historical fields, together with

---

3   Latour emphasises that an analytical account of 'social' associations must not begin with definitions, but with 'uncertainties' relating to their disparate social contributors, the rules and reach of group formation and the subsequent nature, capacities and power of the association: Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: an Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2005), 12 and passim.

4   Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari (hereafter DG), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia,* tr. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, Minn., and London: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1987), 25. Cf. Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, *An Introduction,* tr. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 92ff.; Bruno Latour, 'The Powers of Association,' in *Power, Action and Belief: a New Sociology of Knowledge?,* ed. John Law (London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986), 264ff.

their relating power-analytical lenses and concerns, can be considered and justified; and eventually the subsequent-emergent assemblage of an interweaving-theological rationale (0.2.2). This introduction concludes in section 3 with two systematic literature reviews: the first engaging with relevant theorisations of 'power' in the fields of academic theology and Pentecostal studies; the second introducing currently unfolding discourses around the engagement of Foucault and Deleuze with Christian theology. This second review indicates some relevant interlocutors and discussions for consideration regarding a charismatic and Pentecostal mode of creating theology; a task which is on the horizon rather than in the substance of the research presented in this thesis.

## 0.1  A practical-theological task and impasse

In order to tackle the practical-theological task of understanding relevant relations relating to the Christian ministry, a few theoretical resources and lenses from different academic disciplines are readily at hand. They are to consider: (1) normative-theological accounts of the powers of the divine and of Christian leadership; (2) a power concern in the sociology and anthropology of religion; and (3) modern-political and

organisation-sociological theorisations of power.  The following discussion

aims to take hold of the nature of how one would conventionally encounter

and engage power-related concerns within relevant academic-disciplinary

discourses.  Each subsection ends with a brief discussion of specific

limitations which have become identified within each academic field; after

which the specific practical-theological difficulty of a missing integrated-

analytical understanding of power is identified as a subsequent effect of a

conventionally informed understanding of power and its relations.  There is

no intention to offer a 'complete' overview, in any sense of the word, and a

selection of literature which is more specifically relevant to the

understanding of power, order, Christian leadership, spiritual experience

and agency facilitation in the fields of theology and Pentecostal studies,

including recent publications, shall be reviewed in the third section of this

introduction.


*(1)  Systematic theology and dogmatics*


Within theology, just as in sociological studies of religion (see

below), power is an important—albeit an underdeveloped—concept.[5]

---

[5] Stephen Sykes, *Power and Christian Theology* (London and New York: Continuum, 2006), 1ff.; Martyn Percy, *Power and the Church: Ecclesiology in an Age of Transition* (London and Washington: Cassell, 1998), 1; Kearsley, *Church, Community and Power;* James A. Beckford, 'The

Nonetheless 'power' is relevant with regards to, at least, three theological concerns.  Firstly, academic theology conventionally facilitates church-historical accounts of Christian engagements with the predominant social questions and politics of its day, as well as prompting ethical and doctrinal-theological reflection:  In the nineteenth century, the churches were seen as powerful conservative forces contributing to the integration, sustenance, cohesion and raising of moral standards amongst all members of society, and occasionally as a political threat; yet failing to address the pressing social issues of the time.  The best of twentieth-century Christianity and theology instead could be seen to facilitate and empower resistance against totalitarian, oppressive regimes and social justice.  The affirmation of the 1934 Barmen Theological Declaration, that 'Jesus Christ, as he is attested for us in Holy Scripture, is the one Word of God which we have to trust and obey in life and in death,'[6] facilitated disobedience and resistance against the Nazi ideology and state power.  Political and liberation theologians from the 1960s harnessed the powers of moral and theological communication as they fought alongside Western critical theory and a (more or less) radical politics of the time for social justice, political change

---

Restoration of "Power" to the Sociology of Religion,' *Sociological Analysis* 44, no. 1 (1983): 11ff.

6    Arthur C. Cochrane, *The Church's Confession under Hitler,* 2nd edn (Pittsburgh, Penn.: Pickwick, 1976), 239.

and a different theology and church practice.[7]  Boff drew inspiration from

the Augustinian social-trinitarian doctrine for the justification a grass-roots,

counter-cultural model of authority in Christian 'base communities.'[8]

Moltmann, Nicholls and, more recently, Agamben (amongst others) show

how the doctrine of God informs different versions of political rule and

social organisation.  They link monotheism with political domination,

imperialism and totalitarian rule, but also link trinitarian theology with

political pluralism, social forms of democracy, and, more recently, neo-

liberal politics and reasoning.[9]  Moltmann also points out that monotheism

has been the cause of equally important ecclesiological implications

---

7    James C. Livingston and Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* vol. 2, *The Twentieth Century,* with Sarah Coakley and James H. Evans, Jr (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2006), 273ff.; Rebecca S. Chopp and Ethna Regan, 'Latin American Liberation Theology,' in *The Modern Theologians: an Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918,* ed. David F. Ford, with Rachel Muers, 3rd edn (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005), 469ff.; Stanley J. Grenz and Roger E. Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992), 210ff.

8    Leonardo Boff, *Trinity and Society,* tr. Paul Burns (Tunbridge Wells: Burns and Oates, 1988).

9    Jürgen Moltmann, *The Trinity and the Kingdom: the Doctrine of God,* tr. Margaret Kohl (London: SCM, 1981); David Nicholls, *Deity and Domination: Images of God and the State in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989); Giorgio Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory: for a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government (*Homo Sacer 2,2*),* tr. Lorenzo Chiesa, with Matteo Mandarini (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2011); Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life,* tr. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1998).

regarding how churches have been conceptualised and governed.[10]

Milbank's more recent engagement with sociological theories amounts to a comparable theological critique and foundational work which, on the basis of the rejection of a pervasive modern-ideological secularism, can support a contemporary-'progressive' politics.[11]

Secondly, Christian theology has always understood God's presence—in the Holy Spirit—to be 'powerfully' manifest and in charge of the work of salvation.  In biblical terms and within Christian history, this work of salvation has been understood in a number of different ways, depending upon the historical and socio-cultural situation of the churches, as well as the biblical and theological understanding of relevant Christian leaders.  This, in turn, also determines an understanding of the nature, agency, capacities and power of the Christian God.  In his treatise 'Concerning Christian Liberty' of 1520, Martin Luther, for example, declares that believers are 'internally' saved and freed through the gospel and therefore submit to 'externally' love and serve others in their social and political engagements.[12]  This however individualises and confines the

---

10  Moltmann, *Trinity and Kingdom,* 200ff.

11  John Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory: beyond Secular Reason,* 2nd edn (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2006).

12  Martin Luther, 'On the Freedom of a Christian,' in *On the Freedom of a*

work and power of the Spirit to (predominantly) affect believers' hearts, souls and minds; and suggests that it is only by working through believers' words and actions that the social world can be made a better place. Whilst Luther would surely acknowledge God to be at work in society, history and nature in other powerful ways, a modern (post-Kantian-)academic theology has been overall more restrictive with regards to how the gospel—and the work and power of the Spirit—is conceptualised with reference to people's individual faith, understanding and moral capacities and actions. Influentially, Schleiermacher conceptualised 'the Christian faith' as 'intuition and feeling,' respectively 'the consciousness of being absolutely dependent.'[13] This amounts to what one today would call a (form of) 'personal spirituality.' Alternatively, the gospel could be understood to be made relevant by God's Spirit being at work in people's hope and actions,[14]

---

*Christian: with Related Texts,* ed. and tr. Tryntje Helfferich (Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 2013), 17ff.

13 Friedrich Schleiermacher, *On Religion: Speeches to Its Cultured Despisers,* ed. Richard Crouter (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1988), 22; Schleiermacher, *The Christian Faith,* 3rd edn (London and New York: Bloomsbury T. and T. Clark, 2016), 12; James C. Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought,* vol. 1, *The Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century,* 2nd edn (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2006) 93ff.; Jacqueline Mariña, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher* (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005).

14 Dorothee Sölle, *Mutanfälle: Texte zum Umdenken* (Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1994); Sarah K. Pinnock, ed., *The Theology of Dorothee Soelle* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2003).

or through hermeneutical experience and formation.[15]  Academic-

Pentecostal and charismatic theologies emphasise that, in Spirit baptism,

healings and the miraculous, the power of God's Spirit reaches beyond

such dimensions into the field of physical-embodied and material

experience.[16]  Reflecting on Pentecostal-charismatic practices of the

prophetic, intercessory prayer and community outreach, Pentecostal

theologies could (should) also aim to acknowledge God's power in the

cultural healing and transformation of troubled social communities,

societies, cultures, histories and regions.  Theological accountability, with

regards to both the internal *and* external relations of these kinds of

Pentecostal-religious practices (if they were at all 'real,' relevant and

'biblical'), would require a conceptual integration and interweaving of

*both,* embodied-spiritual (ethical), as well as external-political and material

relations, into a single, holistic-soteriological/pneumatological perspective.

---

15  Mark D. Menacher, 'Gerhard Ebeling (1912–2001),' in *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians,* ed. Mark C. Mattes (Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013), 307ff.; Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, ed., *A Map of Twentieth-Century Theology: Readings from Barth to Radical Pluralism* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1995), 115ff.

16  Frank D. Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit: a Global Pentecostal Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2006); Amos Yong, *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005); James K. A. Smith, *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions in Christian Philosophy* (Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010); Stephen Jack Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality: a Passion for the Kingdom* (Cleveland, Tenn.: CPT, 2010).

To come to a better understanding of the nature and effectiveness of divine power, according to Pentecostal-charismatic experience/practice, Pentecostal-academic theology must continue to engage, as it does, with contextual-Pentecostal grass-root pneumatologies and practices; and chapters 5 and 6 of this research contribute to such an engagement. As Welker sees it, a threefold 'captivity' through simplistic part-whole (e.g. the Christian in the world), dialogistic (I—Thou) and moral-market conceptions, altogether limit today's Christian-theological imagination and practice. Welker encourages a theological engagement with relativistic-sociological conceptualisations and new realistic-philosophical ontologies.[17]

Finally, historical-mainline Christian traditions account for ministerial powers and their administrative practice by way of ecclesiological reflection: the Church's nature and social form is inferred and determined, together with the relevant fields of ecclesial practice and the means by which 'salvation,' or encounters with the divine, are facilitated. Depending upon a church's theological tradition, these might include a theology of the sacraments and of biblical proclamation, in

---

17  Michael Welker, *God the Spirit,* tr. John F. Hoffmeyer (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1994), 40ff.

connection with a theological legitimisation of the essential ecclesial office

(essential offices) and ministerial structure. All of this tends to be

reflective of a specific understanding of the nature of salvation and the

presence/work of God's Spirit, and is conventionally codified through

authoritative historical documents.[18] Accordingly, ecclesiological

accountability in (mainstream) Pentecostal-charismatic traditions might

further include teaching on spiritual gifts, worship, the laying on of hands,

etc., and the 'charismatic' nature of the 'body of Christ.'[19] Through

different reasonings and experiential perceptions, ecclesial offices are

deemed necessary for facilitating and policing access to these means and

places of divine encounter to an extent that they themselves begin to share

in their sanctity and religious power.[20] Around an inner circle of

---

18    Arthur C. Cochrane, ed., *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century: Edited with Historical Introductions* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 2003); Church of England, 'The Thirty Nine Articles of Religion,' in *The Book of Common Prayer: the Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662,* ed. Brian Cummings (Oxford: OUP, 2011), 674ff.; Paul Avis, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: an Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2000); Second Vatican Council, 'Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*),' in *Vatican 2: the Essential Texts,* ed. Norman Tanner (New York: Image Random House: 2012), 100ff.; Joseph Ratzinger, *Called to Communion: Understanding the Church Today* (San Francisco, Cal.: Ignatius, 1996); Roger D. Haight, *Christian Community in History,* 3 vols. (London and New York: Bloomsbury T. and T. Clark, 2014).

19    Larry Christenson, ed., *Welcome Holy Spirit: a Study of Charismatic Renewal in the Church* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1987); Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology.*

20    Ratzinger, *Called to Communion;* Heribert Mühlen, *Kirche wächst von innen: Weg zu einer glaubensgeschichtlich neuen Gestalt der Kirche,*

---

theological dimensions of ministerial roles, spaces and items (church, altar,

chalice, pulpit, font ...); and non-theological administrative and supporting

roles, practices, means and structures have evolved and developed.

Strategic-organisational readjustments at a denominational or regional-

church level tend to be accompanied by, in general well-documented,

practical-theological (including ecclesiological) academic/professional

discourse.[21] Administrative-organisational reasoning and accountability

can be shown to evolve in systemically self-containing discourses and

decision-making processes which, at times, although they include

ecclesiological justification, tend to ward off—rather than connect with—

theological reasoning.[22] The 'empirical turn' in practical theology unseats,

---

*Neubestimmung des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Gesellschaft* (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 1996), 266ff.; Manfred Josuttis, *Die Einführung in das Leben: Pastoraltheologie zwischen Phänomenologie und Spiritualität,* 2nd edn (Gütersloh: Kaiser/Gütersloher, 2004).

21  For the Church of England, for example: Archbishops' Council, *Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context* (London: Church House Publishing, 2004); Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas, *Faith in the City: a Call for Action by Church and Nation, the Report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas* (London: Church House Publishing, 1985).  Consider also relating, subsequent publications, webpages and resource packs, as well as records and small publications which accompany important diocesan-synodal decision-making processes.

22  Martyn Percy, *The Future Shape of Anglicanism: Currents, Contours, Charts* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017) 25ff.; G. R. Evans and Martyn Percy, ed., *Managing the Church?: Order and Organization in a Secular Age* (Sheffield: Sheffield Acad. Press, 2000); Evangelischen Kirche in Hessen und Nassau, ed., *Person und Institution: Volkskirche auf dem Weg in die Zukunft; Arbeitsergebnisse und Empfehlungen der Perspektivkommission*

so to speak, the encompassing-hierarchical authority of theological

dogmatics and ecclesiological reasoning, rendering it just one normative-

discursive rationale alongside other (i.e. sociological) modes of

understanding.[23]  All of this—as well as its interpretations by relevant

players—typically contributes to the power field of ministry and can

empower, or disempower, church leaders and has the potential to contribute

to Christian ministry relations being more or less (dys)functional.  The

theological challenge is thus greater than simply accounting for Christian

leadership, the power capacities of gospel, sacraments, the pulpit, and of

divine revelation/salvific action.  Both practical theology and theological

ecclesiology have not provided a coherent model which allows for a

description of, and thus accounts for, power in Christian and ministry

contexts.  Further to the already mentioned imaginative-conceptual

'captivity' of twentieth-century systematic-theological construction

(Welker), Milbank points out that modern-sociological reasoning comes

with an absolute and normative—albeit 'secular' and atheist—imposition

---

*der Evangelischen Kirche in Hessen und Nassau* (Frankfurt: EPV, 1993).

23  Johannes A. van der Ven, 'Practical Theology: from Applied to Empirical
    Theology,' *Journal of Empirical Theology* 1, no. 1 (1988): 7ff.; Andrew
    Root, 'Regulating the Empirical in Practical Theology: on Critical Realism,
    Divine Action, and the Place of the Ministerial,' *Journal of Youth and
    Theology* 15, no. 1 (2016): 3ff.; Kent D. Miller, 'Organizational Research as
    Practical Theology,' *Organizational Research Methods* 18, no. 2 (2015):
    276ff.

and violence of its own; one which, according to Milbank, Christian

theology must reject as it repositions itself as a culturally more promising,

counter-modern, social science.[24]


*(2)  Sociology and anthropology of religion*


The pioneers of sociology and anthropology as academic disciplines

clearly perceived the religious as both empowering and powerful.

Influential beyond the science of religion, Rudolf Otto, himself building on

Schleiermacher's definition of 'faith' as a sense of encompassing

dependency, defined 'the holy' or divine as composite of a rationally

(theologically or philosophically) identifiable dimension with an irrational

experience of the 'numinous,' i.e. terrifying, majestic mysterious, and

energising.[25]  Besides giving religion the powerful, social function of

ritualistically integrating a group or society, Durkheim points out that

religious encounter strengthens and empowers.[26]  He sees this facilitated by

---

24  Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory.*

25  Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: an Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational,* tr. John W. Harvey, 2nd edn (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1950).

26  '[...] the real function of religion is not to make us think, to enrich our knowledge, [...] but rather, it is to make us act, to aid us to live.  The believer who has communicated with his god is not merely a man who sees new truths of which the unbeliever is ignorant; he is a man who is *stronger.*  He

participation in communal cult, at the base of which are cultural techniques to mark the difference between what is deemed to be special and sacred amidst the 'everyday' and profane.  In his (generalising-)phenomenological examination of religious-cultural development, van der Leeuw, identifies the experience of the acting power of a 'significantly other' at the core of all religion.  At some cultural stage, he claims, experienced power is transformed into 'theorized power,' i.e. a philosophical/theological discursive relation.[27]

Parson's functionalism played its role in that, by the mid-twentieth century, a predominant concern for meaning had replaced power in the sociology of religion, whilst the theorizing of power had completely moved to the field of (modern-)political theory.[28]  Building on Durkheim's social functionalism, Parsons describes religion as powerful in the sense that, within the 'cultural system,' it provides meaning and value orientations

---

feels within him more force, either to endure the trials of existence or to conquer them.  It is as though he were raised above his condition as a mere man; he believes that he is saved from evil, under whatever form he may conceive this evil.'  Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life,* tr. Joseph Ward Swain, 2nd edn (London and Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1976), 416, orig. emph.

27  Gerardus van der Leeuw, 'Macht und theoretisierte Macht,' in *Religionsethnologie,* ed. Carl August Schmitz (Frankfurt: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1964), 51ff.

28  Beckford, 'Restoration of Power.'

which guide human-social action.  As a reference to transcendence, within the framework of the human condition, religion further helps people make sense of their life as they face existential crisis.[29]  Closely linked with Parsons' system-functional theory, the anthropologist Geertz understands religion as a symbolic system which, by formulating an ontological order, 'establishes powerful, pervasive, and long-lasting moods and motivations in men.'[30]  In the work of the liberal-Protestant sociologists of religion, Berger and Luckmann, power does not feature at all in the description of religion in the modern-secular world;[31] and Marxist theory sees religion as

---

29   Sigrid Brandt, *Religiöses Handeln in moderner Welt: Talcott Parsons' Religionssoziologie im Rahmen seiner allgemeinen Handlungs- und Systemtheorie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1993), 113ff.; Günter Kehrer, *Einführung in die Religionssoziologie* (Darmstadt: WB, 1988), 38f.

30   Clifford Geertz, 'Religion as a Cultural System,' in *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 90.  Geertz stresses that cultural symbolism is public and not just 'in the mind;' he explicitly allows for material, embodied and enacted dimensions within a wide conception of cultural symbolism, as he links symbolic meaning to the ethnographic-analytical task of 'thick description' of observable actions, rather than establishing inner-symbolic systematic coherence: Geertz, 'Thick Description: toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture,' in *Interpretation of Cultures,* 3ff.  Asad's critique that a privatised and mentalised understanding which disconnects religion 'conceptually from the domain of power' favours European-modern cultural and religious hegemony is valid, in principle, but under-represents Geertz' position: Talal Asad, 'The Construction of Religion as an Anthropological Category,' in *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993), 29; Kevin Schilbrack, 'Religion, Models of, and Reality: Are We through with Geertz?' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 73, no. 2 (2005): 429ff.

31   Peter L. Berger, *The Social Reality of Religion* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973); Thomas Luckmann, *The Invisible Religion: the Problem of Religion*

a powerful contributor to ideological hegemony exerted over the poor in

the cultural 'superstructure,' although Western Marxists would mostly

refrain from applying this to a description of contemporary-liberal forms of

Christianity.  As a theoretical category, power remains largely confined to

politico-economical analysis, but also becomes polemically linked with

representations of Catholic or evangelical 'fundamentalism;' a category

with polemical connotations which tends to identify a religious other that,

rightly or wrongly, is perceived to be 'reactionary' with regards to its

theological and political stance, posing some kind of challenge to the

progressive politics or liberal-religious adjustments of the secularised-

modern world.[32]

    From the 1980s onwards, power concerns have become increasingly

relevant again in ethnographies of religious sects, new religious

movements, Pentecostalism and eventually the role and future of 'religion'

in the face of modernisation, secularisation and rapid change.[33]  Most of

---

      *in Modern Society* (New York: Macmillan, 1967); Beckford, 'Restoration of
      Power.'

32  Sherry B. Orthner, 'Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties,' *Comparative*
      *Studies in Society and History* 26, no. 1 (1984): 126ff.

33  Rosalind I. J. Hackett, 'Anthropology of Religion,' in *The Routledge*
      *Companion to the Study of Religion,* ed. John R. Hinnells, 2nd edn (London
      and New York: Routledge, 2010), 165ff.; Judith Fox, 'New Religious
      Movements,' in *Routledge Study of Religion,* 339ff.; Inger Furseth and Pål
      Repstad, *An Introduction to the Sociology of Religion: Classical and*

these discourses still draw significantly on the imagination evoked by

Weber's sociology of religion, namely, his typologies of religious authority

and organisational forms; and, more recently, Foucauldian (and related)

perspectives and analytical concerns have also been introduced to relevant

fields.[34]  To date, Weberian ideal types and Weberian categorical

frameworks continue to facilitate, limit and distort, the imaginative

possibilities of a sociological, ethnographic-analytical and theological

understanding of power, leadership and power dynamics in religious

groups, movements and in relation to societal developments:  Weber and

Troeltsch introduced a classification of religious organisation which

distinguishes 'church,' 'sect' and 'mysticism.'[35]  Weber's threefold ideal-

---

*Contemporary Perspectives* (London and New York: Routledge, 2016); Grace Davie, *The Sociology of Religion: a Critical Agenda,* 2nd edn (London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 2013); Martin Riesebrodt and Mary Ellen Konieczny, 'Sociology of Religion,' in *Routledge Study of Religion,* 145ff.

34  Gregory Alles, 'The Study of Religions: the Last 50 Years,' in *Routledge Study of Religion,* 39ff.; Jeremy Carrette, 'Post-Structuralism and the Study of Religion,' in *Routledge Study of Religion,* 274ff.; Furseth and Repstad, *Sociology of Religion.*

35  Max Weber, Ernst Troeltsch, Georg Simmel and Ferdinand Toennies, 'Max Weber on Church, Sect and Mysticism,' *Sociological Analysis* 34, no. 2 (1973): 140ff.; Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches,* vol. 1, tr. Olive Wyon (London: Allen and Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1931), 331ff.; Max Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* ed. and tr. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 302ff and 324ff.; Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism,* tr. Talcott Parsons (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 93 and passim; Weber, *Economy and Society: and Outline of Interpretive Sociology,* 2 vols., ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, tr.

typical differentiation of 'charismatic,' 'traditional' and 'legal' forms of

domination/authority explicitly evokes a perception of divine proximity,

grace and inspiration amongst the power resources of 'charismatic'

leadership and proposes charisma's inevitable 'routinisation.'[36] Of course,

Weberian categories and reasoning also continues to inform the Christian-

theological understanding and analysis of the nature and dynamics of

Christian power, the ordering of churches and the inner dynamics of

processes and movements of spiritual renewal.  This will be further

explored in the literature review below.

    Within the sociological-theory discourse, Bourdieu points out that

Weber's strategy of constructing social theory based on 'Aristotelian' ideal

types is essentialist, in that it gives elements ontological primacy over

relationships; the problems with this strategy, Bourdieu observes, are its

rudimentary, unclear definitions which exclude contingent singularity or,

alternatively, where singularities are allowed for, the ideal type can always

---

Ephraim Fischoff et al. (Berkeley, Cal., and London: Univ. of California
Press, 1978), 1204ff.

36 Max Weber, 'The Three Types of Legitimate Rule,' tr. Hans Gerth, *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions* 4, no. 1 (1958): 1ff.; Weber, *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology,* ed. and tr. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (London and New York: Routledge, 2009), 245ff. and 262ff.; Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations,* ed. Talcott Parsons, tr. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York: Free Press, 1947), 358ff.; Weber, *Economy and Society,* 212ff. and 1111ff.

be pronounced as being 'not clearly definable.' Due to the 'essentialism' of

its Aristotelian categorical relations, Weber's ideal types become stabilised

on the basis of binary oppositions and exclusions. Categorical

standardisation is given priority over historical particularities and specific

relations. Imagined general ('substantial') differences may be played off

against a lack of precision and explanatory relevance with regards to their

analytical/ethnographic deployments.[37] Recent sociological and

ethnographic research is becoming aware that Pentecostal and charismatic

religious movements have produced phenomena which Weber did not

anticipate (more below).


*(3) Political and organisational power theory*


     Efforts at facilitating theological accountability, with regards to the

---

37  Pierre Bourdieu, 'Legitimation and Structured Interests in Weber's Sociology of Religion,' in *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity,* ed. Scott Lash and Sam Whimster (London and Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 119f.; Max Weber, *The Methodology of the Social Sciences,* ed. and tr. Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1949), 42ff. and 90ff.; cf. Martha B. Calás, 'Deconstructing Charismatic Leadership: Re-reading Weber from the Darker Side,' *Leadership Quarterly* 4, no. 3–4 (1993): 305ff.; consider also: DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 5; André Droogers, 'Essentialist and Normative Approaches,' in *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods,* ed. Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder, André Droogers and Cornelis van der Laan (Berkeley, Cal., and London: Univ. of California Press, 2010), 32; Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology,* tr. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, corr. edn (Baltimore and London: J. Hopkins Univ. Press, 1997).

Christian relevance and use of power, often fall short of serious

engagement with the complexity and perspective of sociological

theorisation. Two reasons for this have already been identified: a common

poverty of conceptual imagination (Welker); and the normative-conceptual

incompatibility between orthodox-theological accounts and the—equally

normative and absolute—secular-atheistic bracketing of social-theory

deployments (Milbank). A third reason lies with the complexity and

pluriformity of sociological theorisations of power relations themselves.

Both theoretical conceptualisation, but also ordinary efforts, at clarification

of 'power' are manifold and complicated; 'essentially contested,' as Lukes

(quoting Gallie) points out.[38] Haugaard identifies power as a

Wittgensteinian 'family resemblance' and, in an effort to organise thirty

significant theorisations according to their pedigree relations, he

distinguishes consensual, conflictual and 'constituting' theorisations, in

addition to 'power-over' and 'power-to' conceptualisations.[39] The two most

notable systematic-theological discussions of power to date, draw specific

insights and analytical propositions from sociological theorisations

---

38 Steven Lukes, *Power: a Radical View,* 2nd edn (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 14; W. B. Gallie, 'Essentially Contested Concepts,' *Procedings of the Aristotelian Society,* n. s., 56 (1955–56): 167ff.

39 Mark Haugaard, ed., *Power: a Reader* (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002), 1ff. and vii (fig.).

(Percy);[40] and respectively offer an ethical-normative assessment which
organises the field of biblical and theological references to power alongside
modern(-secular) theorisations (Sykes), arguing that all and each of these
references and concepts are disparate beyond a unified-systematic
understanding.  Sykes chooses Lukes' Western-Marxian 'radical view' on
power, as his preferred sociological interlocutor who, equally, claims an
'ineradicably evaluative' nature of all theoretical accounts of power.[41]

There are currently two noteworthy sociological theorisations which
aim to integrate previous power concepts into a single conceptualisation
that appreciates the full complexity of power relations across modern-
organisational fields and their relating politics:  Haugaard's theorisation
arises from an effort to repair a theoretical weakness in Gidden's

---

40  Percy refers to the 'fixing' of 'nodal points,' according to Clegg (or rather:
    Callon, and Laclau and Mouffe); otherwise, Percy's research overall
    deploys—and thereby extends and corrects—Weberian categories: Percy,
    *Power and the Church;* Percy, *Words, Wonders and Power: Understanding
    Contemporary Christian Fundamentalism and Revivalism* (London: SPCK,
    1996); Stewart R. Clegg, *Frameworks of Power* (London and Thousand
    Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1989), 204ff.; Michel Callon, 'Some Elements of a
    Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen
    of St Brieuc Bay,' in *Power, Action and Belief: a New Sociology of
    Knowledge?* ed. John Law (London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and
    Kegan Paul, 1986), 196ff.; Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony
    and Socialist Strategy: towards a Radical Democratic Politics,* 2nd edn
    (London and New York: Verso, 2001).

41  Sykes, *Power and Christian Theology;* Lukes, *Power,* 14.

'structuration' program of squaring a sociological understanding of social

structure with a mode of theorisation which begins with interacting

agencies, by adding a theory of 'restructurisation.'[42] Clegg offers 'a

laudable syncretism of earlier theories' which, at the same time, self-

identifies as belonging to an alternative mode of theorisation, deriving from

Machiavelli and Foucault, rather than from Hobbes and the majoritarian

tradition of twentieth-century political/sociological power theory.[43] Power,

according to Clegg, flows through circuits which engage (1) the episodical

interaction of agencies with (2) the dispositional 'fixing' of the rules of

social play and (3) systemic-environmental selection processes.[44] Both

Clegg and Haugaard recognise Lukes' Marxian ('radical') 'three-

dimensional' understanding of power as the culmination of a previous

theory development which began with Dahl's behaviouristic-causal power

---

42  Mark Haugaard, *Structures, Restructuration and Social Power* (Aldershot, Hants, and Brookfield, Verm.: Avebury, 1992); Haugaard, *The Constitution of Power: a Theoretical Analysis of Power, Knowledge and Structure* (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 1997); Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 1984); Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis* (London and Basingstoke, Hants: Macmillan, 1979); Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 135ff.

43  Percy, *Power and the Church,* 7; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.

44  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 187ff.; Haugaard, *Power,* 245ff.

definition.[45]  In addition to Bachrach and Baratz' dimension of

'nondecision-making' and the mobilisation of bias, as a 'second face' of

power, by which certain political players are in a position to pre-determine

the political agenda under consideration,[46] Lukes adds a 'radical third

dimension' which draws on the Marxian notions of 'false consciousness'—

and 'real interests'—of those on the receiving end of hegemonic power

deployments.[47]

It has been pointed out that this extends Dahl's mechanistic-causal

and normative 'definition' of power which, by its mode of construction,

cannot do justice to the structural dimension of power, and requires social

theorists to have an exclusive-'objective' understanding of players' 'real

interests' beyond what subjugated agents, within the game, could allegedly

know.[48]  As Foucauldian—and relating—theorisations emphasise, the rules,

---

45   'A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B
      would not otherwise do.'  Robert A. Dahl, 'The Concept of Power,'
      *Behavioral Science* 2, no. 3 (1957): 202f.; Dahl, 'Power,' in *Power: a
      Reader,* ed. Mark Haugaard (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ.
      Press, 2002), 8ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 39ff.

46   Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, 'Two Faces of Power,' in *Power: a
      Reader,* ed. Mark Haugaard (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ.
      Press, 2002), 28ff.; Bachrach and Baratz, 'Decisions and Nondecisions: an
      Analytical Framework,' *The American Political Science Review* 57, no. 3
      (1963): 632ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 11ff. and 75ff.

47   Lukes, *Power.*

48   T. Benton, '"Objective" Interests and the Sociology of Power,' *Sociology* 15,

force relations and flows of power must be constructed and 'fixed,' prior to them becoming 'deployable' and applicable to relevant agencies within the game.[49]  Drawing on Kuhn's proposition of academic 'paradigm change' and on Bauman's differentiation of 'legislating' and 'interpretatory' modes of learned discourse, Clegg identifies—and disavows—a modern-mainline, normative-'legislatory,' moralistic and mechanistic theory tradition which leads from Hobbes via Dahl, to Lukes (including comparable theories).  A better mode of theorisation, according to Clegg, would be non-normative, non-mechanistic, analytical-descriptive and consistently relativistic. Instead of 'legislating' on the (universal) legitimacy of power in a manner that is subservient to the 'sovereign'-hierarchical (legal) constitution, imposition and power of the modern state—even deploying mythological-salvific narrative to stabilise such an order (with Hobbes' 'social contract' ending an unbearable 'state of nature')—the Foucauldian (Machiavellian) mode of power theory observes and describes the methods, means and

---

no. 2 (1981): 161ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 86ff.; Haugaard, *Power,* 38ff.; Giddens, *Central Problems,* 88ff.; Giddens, *Constitution of Society,* 213ff.

49  Haugaard, *Power,* 181ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 149ff.; Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy;* Michel Callon and Bruno Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Marco-Structure Reality and how Sociologists Help Them to Do So,' in *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: towards an Integration of Micro- and Macro-Sociologies,* ed. K. Knorr-Cetina and A. V. Cicourel (London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 277ff.

efficacy of power (including the deployment of myths) from a place of moral agnosticism.[50] Such a problematisation of legislatory normativity, in relation to the understanding and deployment of power, resonates, of course, forcefully with the use of theological, doctrinal and ecclesiological reasoning across mainline-Christian traditions, as considered above.

One's ordinary—i.e. modern-Hobbesian and thereby normative-moral—understanding of a legal-constitutional (and normative-moral) order establishes state sovereignty, the rule of law and the state's monopoly on the (legitimate) use of force (vs. unlawful violence). It further facilitates a secular politics that is more or less independent from the (privatised) 'religious.' It establishes boundaries around the (legitimate) game of politics, thereby delineating the constitutional order of the state from (party) politics. In addition, it destinguishes state constitution/politics from 'society' (respectively, 'the private'). Eventually, Hobbesian normativity even delineates the lawful, necessary, reasonable and morally due from what must be unlawful, irresponsible, destructive and evil. Several of these political propositions lose their apparent plausibility where they encounter,

---

50  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.; Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* 4th edn (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2012); Zygmund Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters: on Modernity, Post-Modernity and Intellectuals* (Cambridge: Polity, 1987).

for example, a sub-Saharan 'politics of the belly' (Bayart).[51] According to

Tempels' inappropriately generalised and rough—but not disproven—

understanding, an African-ordinary perception, ontology, and

understanding of power would be: thoroughly vitalistic, centred on human

bodies, cosmic-unified, hierarchical; and would gather power 'outside in'

through external relationships and symbolisation.[52] Where such an

'African-philosophical' orientation engages successively with the

European-colonial state and politics, the Cold War bipolar-global order,

repeated political violence, and eventually exposure (or access, in the case

of wealthy people) to an unhinged neo-liberal market, it creates an

---

51  Jean-François Bayart, *The State of Africa: the Politics of the Belly,* 2nd edn (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2009), lxxvi, lxxxivf., 228ff. and 267f.  Jeffrey Herbst, *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control,* new edn (Princeton, N. J., and Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press, 2014); Patrick Chabal, *Power in Africa: an Essay in Political Interpretation* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992); Philip Roessler, *Ethnic Politics and State Power in Africa: the Logic of the Coup—Civil War Trap* (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2016).

52  According to Tempels, in all that Africans do, 'their purpose is to acquire *life, strength* or *vital force,* to live *strongly,* that they are to make life stronger, or to assure that force shall remain perpetually in one's posterity.' Placide Tempels, *Bantu Philosophy,* tr. Colin King (Paris: Présence Africaine, 1959), 44f., orig. emph.; see also: Alexis Kagame, *La philosophie Bantu comparée* (Paris: Présence Africaine, 1976); Theo Sundermeier, *The Individual and Community in African Traditional Religions* (Hamburg: Lit, 1998).  Anderson argues that this concept of power has entered the African-Pentecostal understanding of God and of Spirit baptism: Allan Heaton Anderson, *Spirit-Filled World: Religious Dis/Continuity in African Pentecostalism* (London and Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018); Anderson, *Moya: the Holy Spirit in an African Context* (Pretoria: Univ. of South Africa Press, 1991).

increased need and 'hunger' for a certain accumulation of power and

resources amongst political elites who represent their different

communities.  Here, certain key features of a modern-European political

reasoning, such as the exclusion of 'religion' from politics, the apparent

self-evidence of the supremacy of constitutionality or the 'rule of law,' the

political delegitimisation of political violence etc., no longer appear self-

evident.[53]  Mbembe successfully uses Foucauldian concepts and lenses in

order to gain an understanding of the often disruptive nature of the politics

of (certain) sub-Saharan communities, nations, and their relating social and

identity formations.[54]

This research opts for Clegg's theory framework over Haugaard's

theorisation due to a greater correlation with a Foucauldian/post-

Foucauldian reasoning regarding the nature and constitution of power, as

---

53   Neither, for that matter, does a disembodied systemic-functional societal
     differentiation: Niklas Luhmann, *Ecological Communication,* tr. John
     Bednarz, Jr (Cambridge: Polity; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989).

54   Achille Mbembe, *On the Postcolony* (Berkeley, Cal., and London: Univ. of
     California Press, 2001); Mbembe, 'African Modes of Self-Writing,' tr.
     Steven Rendall, *Public Culture* 14, no. 1 (2002): 239ff.; Mbembe, 'Pouvoir
     des morts et langage des vivants: les errances de la mémoire nationaliste au
     Cameroun,' in Jean-François Bayart, Achille Mbembe and Comi Toulabor,
     *Le politique par le bas en Afrique noire,* new edn (Paris: Karthala, 2008),
     155ff.; Mbembe, 'Necropolitics,' tr. Libby Meintjes, *Public Culture* 15, no. 1
     (2003): 11ff.; cf. Ruth Marshall, *Political Spiritualities: the Pentecostal
     Revolution in Nigeria* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2009).

well as a less exclusive commitment to a modern-organisational and modern-political understanding.  So far, it has been pointed out that the Hobbesian-normative approach limits and disrupts a theoretical understanding of even political power.  Furthermore, similar reasons shall also be explored in this introduction (below), as well as in the first chapter.

*Theological accountability*

A few summative conclusions can be drawn from the conceptual difficulties which have arisen, within relevant academic fields, concerning the task of understanding the Christian use and relevance of power:  Efforts at facilitating theological accountability often fall short of serious engagement with the complexities and perspectives of relevant realistic-sociological theorisations (Welker).  On the other hand, modern-political and organisational theorists, such as Haugaard and Clegg, consider the powers of social structure, organisation, political action and how they inter-engage, but do not explicitly reflect on whether specific challenges exist concerning an understanding of the powers of (whatever is deemed to be) 'religion' and relations of the divine.  Academic and professional-theological reflection tends to take on the form of a hierarchical-normative discourse in which (each) Christian soteriology informs the theological and

ecclesiological assessments and accounts for Christian ministry practices and the churches' organisational order; in certain relations of the Christian ministry, normative-theological reasoning encounters—and clashes with—certain self-contained, otherwise normative modes of organisational reasoning. A conventionally compartmentalised theorisation of power facilitates messy and badly understood practical deployments and relevances of power in Christian/organisational situations.[55] Weberian ideal-typical constructive-theoretical imagination and method, it has been shown, are to shoulder (some of) the blame (Bourdieu), as they continue to inform both an academic and an ordinary-compartmentalised understanding of power, as well as its dynamics and relations.

On a practical level, questions may surface as to whether one deals with: 'office' and 'order,' legislative frameworks, organisational setups, church and secular politics; how power in theological and political discourse comes into play; how professional standards, religious credibility and charismatic authority—empowerment even—may occur; how God, culture, society, history or a secular rationale relate to each and all of these. Delineating the inter-connectedness of some of these relations or

---

55  At the beginning of this research journey, an academic at a postgraduate seminar urged me to pre-determine 'what kind of power' my research aims to consider.

formations of power appears to be more straightforward than it is with others.  The relationship between a religious organisation, its legal set-up and the surrounding modern-constitutional arrangement seems to be a straightforward issue of state–church legislation and political history. Religious, theological or administrative-Christian contributions to the establishing of a modern-secular state constitution—or the formation of a political culture or identity—may equally be clarified by historical research.  According to one's sociological/modern-political understanding, when it comes to observing (certain) sub-Saharan politics, common conceptual bifurcations cease to take on immediate plausibility.  These common bifurcations include: 'secular' politics vs. privatised 'religion;' a legal/constitutional order vs. the (legitimate) play of (party) politics; the state vs. 'society;' an exclusion of violence from society and the game of politics; and, underlying them all, the reasonable/ethical vs. the destructive/evil.  Given that this is a test case, the relations between power, politics, religion and God may also prove to be more complicated and warrant closer analytical-theoretical consideration when it comes to modern-European/Western politics and culture.

Finally, political and organisation theory has recently moved on from a Hobbesian mechanistic-causal and normative mode of theorising power

to opt for a non-mechanistic, non-normative, analytical-descriptive, Foucauldian theorisation (Clegg). One of the reasons for this is that the normative definition and control of the 'correct' discursive understanding of power is, in itself, an especially formidable means and deployment of power. This, of course, identifies and implies a comparable difficulty arising from the normative nature of theological and ecclesiological-discursive reflections on the nature and good use of power, order, politics, and theology itself; a difficulty which arises across different mainline-Christian traditions and different modes of academic/professional reasoning. Furthermore, 'religious experience,' 'theology' and 'God' are each power relations in their own right, the understanding of which—as well as their complexly interwoven relations—relies, again, upon widely pluralised normative reasonings across different theological and religious studies disciplines, as well as their many relevant—and often antithetically established—conceptualisations. How then is it possible to analyse, understand and describe 'theological' power, the power of spiritual experience and the power of God, if normative definition and reasoning itself creates a theoretical blind spot at the very core of theorisation that distorts any power analysis of its categorical relations and meaningful insights?

The intellectual journey of this research begins with Stewart Clegg's insight that—in the main—modern theorisations of (political and organisational) power follow Hobbes' *Leviathan* in their pursuit of legislation to define what power must be within a salvific and moral order of absolute necessity and reach.[56]  Clegg's contention, it has been argued, translates into a major ecclesiological and theological challenge.  At the most elementary level of discursive formation is *the idea of 'legitimate power' itself and its deployments, top-down, from an unassailable place of absolute necessity,* which is common to Christian ecclesiology and theological dogmatics; but which is equally operative in a conventionally modern understanding of organisational and political structure/power, so that whilst the power relations relevant to the ministry are accounted for, they also become curtailed, fragmented and obscured.  Hobbes' secular 'Leviathan' clearly shows that it is heir to an understanding of the divine within the European tradition.[57]  This consideration marks the starting point—and the theoretical bottom line—from which my exploration into an understanding of power relations relevant to the Christian ministry arises.

---

56  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.; Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters.*

57  The amount of effort invested into defanging and secularising theology, the power of bishops, appeal to scripture, revelation, angels and God, evidences how much Hobbes' totalitarian-normative legislation of conducive political order owes to traditional-Christian normativity and practice.  Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan: with Selected Variants from the Latin Edition of 1668,* ed. Edwin Curley (Indianapolis and Cambridge, Mass.: Hackett, 1994).

As it gives priority to one strand of Christian agency and discourse formation above all the others, doctrinal-theological discourse itself must be seen as playing a crucial role in establishing, facilitating, strengthening and undermining power relations—and indeed in covering over, concealing and muddying an appropriate descriptive understanding of what is going on with regards to the power that operates—and which is exercised—within, over and through Christian ministries and their wider sociopolitical contexts.

## 0.2  Research question, strategy, rationale

In a similar vein to conventional power theorisations that continue to be informed by Hobbes, the normative-'monohierarchical' deployment of Christian-doctrine[58] conceals and obscures the very resources and operations by which power becomes established and operates.[59]  Post-structuralist theorisations of power (following Foucault) have opted instead to adopt a non-normative, ethnographic-analytical approach.  They embrace

---

58  Cf. Welker, *God the Spirit,* 27.

59  'Up there among the power-holders domination cannot be seen—and so maybe does not exist.  But it is there and will continue to have its victims.' Kearsley, *Church, Community and Power,* 8.

a strategic and distributed understanding of power: relations of power are created by dispersed micro-practices, resistances, technologies; they are supported by material and symbolic ordering devices, from which overarching relations and strategies arise.[60]  Furthermore, power relations may be reframed in terms of a, secondary, mono-hierarchical, juridical rationale.  To date, three distinctive approaches to the theorisation of power can be recognised: *Clegg's* 'three-circuits' framework of organisational power; *Foucault's* theorisations, which came to fruition in the second half of the 1970s and relate to embodied identity formation; and thirdly, *Actor Network Theory* (ANT), developed initially at the Paris School of Mines to facilitate the ethnographic study of natural sciences and of technology which—in various places—is also presented as a concern relating to modern power relations.

The main research question: whether it is possible, in principle, to account of 'all' dimensions and relations of power relevant to Christian ministry within a single theory approach—i.e. within a coherent constructive-analytical understanding—shall be pursued through a

---

60  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92ff.; Foucault, 'Powers and Strategies,' in *Power/Knowlege: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, tr. Colin Gordon et al. (New York: Vintage Random, 1980), 142ff.

pragmatic-strategical research rationale; one which is akin to giving

plausibility that checkmate victory in a game of chess is possible, by

demonstrating how a rook, two bishops and the queen may be taken out.

At first, plausibility must be given to the claim that these—quite

distinctive—theoretical approaches share a single perspective, or are

closely related as comparable perspectives, regarding their theorisations of

power (chapter 1).  '[P]roceeding from the middle,'[61] together they: deploy

a non-normative and ethnographic-analytical research perspective;[62]

consider close connections between distributed and heterogeneous elements

that are both, meaningful *and* material;[63] and follow a Foucauldian power

understanding, according to which, distributed practices and techniques

become connected through overarching strategies.[64]  By way of an initial

introduction, the nature, strengths and limitations of each theory

contribution are to be identified; and some connections between them are to

---

61  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 25.

62  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.

63  John Law, 'Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics,' in *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory,* ed. Bryan S. Turner (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 141ff.; Michel Foucault, 'The Confession of the Flesh,' in *Power/Knowlege: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, tr. Colin Gordon et al. (New York: Vintage, 1980), 194.

64  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92ff.

be traced. Other related poststructuralist theorisations—in particular, Deleuze and Guattari's (DG) metaphysics of creative exploration, which allows one to connect Foucault's power-analytical concern with the 'material-semiotic' ontological perspective of ANT—[65] may then be integrated into a reconstruction of these non-normative ethnographic understandings. Together, these theory propositions have been developed to clarify resources and deployments that are relevant to the contemporary power situation, which previous, modern-'Hobbesian' power deployments tend to obscure. This task of a post-structuralist subversion has been expressed as a comparison of theory creation using a 'toolbox' (section 0.2.1).

This research tests a range of power-theoretical relations and analyses a distinctive variety of forms of organisation, power and empowerment against a range of relevant practical-theological concerns and historical case studies (0.2.2, [1]–[6]). On the basis of power-analytical, as well as material-theological decisions and experimentations, a secondary, subsequent layer of theological reasoning begins to emerge (0.2.2, [5]–[7]). A clarification of theory deployment, according to the

---

65 Brent Adkins, *Deleuze and Guattari's* A Thousand Plateaus: *a Critical Introduction and Guide* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2015); Law, 'Actor Network Theory.'

post-structuralist power-analytical 'toolbox,' lays the foundation for a methodological reflection of the rationale of relevant power-theoretical, as well as material-theological, decisions; and the methodological reasoning by which power analyses and case studies are organised and engage with one another.

## 0.2.1  Deploying power-theoretical toolboxes

It was Deleuze who, in a conversation at an earlier stage of Foucault's research into power, first introduced the idea that both their theories were 'exactly like a box of tools.'[66]  Just as a previously learned understanding of theorists and educated commentators introduces itself to the normative and totalising system of power and discourse (Foucault points out), a new (post-structuralist) theory should also contribute to an ever 'regional' and specific 'struggle against power, a struggle aimed at revealing and undermining power where it is most invisible and insidious' and one which (according to Deleuze) is not established upon 'resemblance,' 'representation' and 'totalization' as regards the relationship

---

66  Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power,' in Michael Foucault, *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays,* ed. Donald F. Bouchard, tr. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), 208.

between theory and practice.[67]  Alongside other practices, theoretical

practice 'serves as relays and form networks;' respectively, they take on the

form of 'a system of relays within a larger sphere, within a multiplicity of

parts that are both theoretical and practical;' the construction of power, as

well as research into its understanding, is thus locally specific and proceeds

'from the middle.'[68]  Theorisations, according to Deleuze, are 'like a box of

tools' in that they must be strategically productive as regards the practical

task of revealing/undermining a (totalising-normative form of) power/truth

in certain specific 'locations,' or 'regions' in the outside world.  Deleuze

credits Proust with the consideration that one must be eclectic when it

comes to choosing which theoretical relation one should deploy:

> Treat my book as a pair of glasses directed to the outside; if they don't
> suit you, find another pair; I leave it to you to find your own instrument,
> which is necessarily an instrument for combat.  A theory does not
> totalize; it is an instrument for multiplication and it also multiplies
> itself.[69]

In a few places thereafter, Foucault refers to power/truth-related

theorisations in terms of a 'toolbox:'

> I'd love it, if my books were like some kind of a toolbox which others
> would search for a tool which they'd use in whatever way they'd

---

67   Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power,' 208 and 206.

68   Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power,' 207 and 206.; DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 23 and 25.

69   Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power,' 208.

consider right within their field.[70]

Foucault, too, identifies the (political and strategical) function of power theory as resisting the urge 'to formulate the global systematic theory which holds everything in place;' instead one is 'to analyse the specificity of mechanisms of power, to locate the connections and extensions, to build little by little a strategic knowledge.'[71]  He identifies himself as 'an experimenter and not a theorist:'

> I call a theorist someone who constructs a general system, either deductive or analytical, and applies it to different fields in a uniform way.  That isn't my case.  I am an experimenter in the sense that I write in order to change myself and in order not to think the same things as before.[72]

Elsewhere, Foucault explicitly rejects the usefulness of a conventional 'theory of power' based on definition: 'Since a theory assumes a prior objectification, it cannot be asserted as a basis for analytical work.'[73]

---

70   Michel Foucault, 'Prisons et asiles dans le méchanisme du pouvoir,' *Dits et écrits: 1954–1988,* vol. 2, *1970–1975,* ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), no. 136, 523, tr. DQ.

71   Foucault, 'Powers and Strategies,' 145.

72   Michel Foucault, 'Interview with Michel Foucault,' in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984,* vol. 3, ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley et al. (London and New York: Penguin, 2002), 240.  Dianna Taylor, 'Introduction: Power, Freedom and Subjectivity,' in *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts,* ed. Dianna Taylor (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 1ff.; Jeremy R. Carrette, *Foucault and Religion: Spiritual Corporality and Political Spirituality* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 9.

73   Michel Foucault, 'Subject and Power,' in Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul

The 'toolbox' proposition invites eclectically experimental deployments of specific Foucauldian theory relations for alternative (whilst specific) political and academic purposes; for example within gender studies, organisation theory or cultural studies.[74] At times, this comes with the misconception that a straight-forward 'practical application' of single theory relations can be applied. One however must not miss (Deleuze's and) Foucault's emphasis that post-structuralist theory itself must be political practice; and that it must not progress by way of analogical resemblance, representation and universal generalisation, but only by way of repetition and multiplication, according to that which is relevant within the 'region' of a different academic—and political—contention.[75] O'Farrell points out that, whilst single Foucauldian theory relations are rather easily transferrable (based on resemblance), redeploying Foucault's toolbox, as a whole, is much more cumbersome—in both minute and more substantial

---

Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics,* 2nd edn (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983), 209.

74  Lisa Downing, 'Introduction,' in *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018), 1ff.; Sverre Raffnsøe, Marius Gudmand-Høyer and Morten S. Thaning, *Michel Foucault: a Research Companion* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), x; Clare O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault* (London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 2005), 53; Jeffrey T. Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault: Power and Its Intensifications since 1984* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2008), 2, 82, 108 and 112.

75  Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power;' Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition,* tr. Paul Patton (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1994).

ways—since Foucault permanently redefines and changes his concerns, perspectives, theory relations and concepts.  Foucault's theoretical (and historical) work becomes 'extremely difficult to systematise for the purposes of a methodical and wholesale application.'[76]  His research—including his deployment of theory—is relativistic in nature.  It lacks a single, overarching method, focus and concern; and therefore, disagreements concerning the nature of Foucault's theorisation, as well as its interpretation are rife; such disagreements multiply in precisely the same way that Foucault's own theorisations, theoretical perspectives and argumentative concerns multiply, evolving as they do at every step.[77]  By changing his theoretical concerns and revisiting his previous understandings and theorisations, Nealon sees Foucault achieve progressive 'intensifications' and, more than a generation after Foucault's untimely death, calls for a re-reading and translation of Foucault from the place of a changed historical (politico-cultural) situation—and encounter with—power.  A further 'intensification' of one's (post-)Focauldian understanding is to be achieved through a contemporary-strategical revisiting/

---

76  O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 50.  Similar Hoy: 'As he moves from one topic to another, however, his methods and purposes seem to change.  So there may not be a single "Foucault."'  David Couzens Hoy, 'Introduction,' in *Foucault: a Critical Reader,* ed. David Couzens Hoy (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1986), 2.

77  O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 50ff.

transformation of Foucault's progressive insights and theory developments, beginning with his theorisation of power in the 1970s.[78] Similar observations of conceptual transfers, aiming at conceptual multiplications, the creation of 'multiplicities' and theoretical intensification, can be made regarding Deleuzean multiperspective-ontological theorisations; with DG's interwoven conceptual 'plateaus' in the second volume of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia* being the most striking case in point.[79]

Foucault's theorisations are concerned with power as it engages with relations of truth and the constitution of the (late-)modern self, always including a strategical quest into possibilities of their alteration and subversion.[80] Foucault's historico-analytical theorisations always include

---

78  Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault.*

79  'Each segment of Deleuze and Guattari's writing tries to combine conceptual bricks in such a way as to construct this kind of intensive state in thought.' Brian Massumi, *A User's Guide to* Capitalism and Schizophrenia: *Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT, 1992), 7. Massumi refers to DG's metaphysical thought in terms of a conceptual 'toolbox:' Ibid., 8 and 26.  DG, *Thousand Plateaus;* Petra Hroch, 'Intensity/Intensive,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 95ff.

80  Such a description arises even from the conventional discernment of three consecutive phases in Foucauldian theory development ('archaeology'— 'genealogy'—'ethics'): Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 2; Michael Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon: Entwicklungen—Kernbegriffe—Zusammenhänge,* 2nd edn (Paderborn: Fink, 2009); Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace, *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject* (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1997); Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault:*

strategical engagement with power: both of a political and an 'artistic'

nature, in the sense of introducing (intuitive, preconscious) alterations to

one's perception of (power/truth within) reality and oneself.  Of course, this

leads to a less rigorous control of Foucault's (ever-evolving) theoretical

lenses and to uneven historical descriptions, analyses and theorisations.[81]

The difficulty increases in size where a Foucauldian (or otherwise post-

structuralist) understanding of 'religion' and 'spirituality' is concerned.[82]

Although Foucault engages, at certain points in his career, with both these

notions, and explores some relevant relations, neither he nor Deleuze are

particularly interested in doing justice to the relations of Christian theology,

order, practice or 'spirituality.'  As Carrette points out, the distributed,

'selectively introduced,' references and accounts of Christian-theological

relations and religious practices in Foucault's writings and interventions are

functionally subservient to his ongoing—and changing—interests with a

('genealogical'-historical) analytical understanding of modern and

---

*beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics,* 2nd edn (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983).

81  'The critical impact of Michel Foucault's philosophy is not based on the explicit theories or judgements he makes, but rather on the approach that he adopts to analysing our present.'  Johanna Oksala, 'Freedom and Bodies,' in *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts,* ed. Dianna Taylor (London and New York: Routledge, 2014), 85.  O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 51f.; Taylor, 'Introduction.'

82  Carrette, *Foucault and Religion.*

contemporary relations of power, truth and subjectification, as well as with possibilities of their (contemporary) subversion.[83] It is not difficult to point out historical and analytical mistakes, distortions and overgeneralisations if one focuses on what is more marginal to the (evolving) central concern of Foucault's own 'genealogical' interest and experimentation: Foucault identifies, for example, Christian-pastoral practice—especially the (Roman-catholic) 'confession'—as being both paradigmatic and facilitative of modern-repressive practices of discursive-disciplinary control, whilst he appears to identify liberating-embodied self-practices (and 'spirituality') as being somewhat outside (or as marginal within) the Christian-religious tradition.[84] With regards to theological doctrine, Foucault extends the notion of Nietzsche's 'death of God' to the death of modern(-transcendental) subjectivity; on the whole, Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari, are atheists who reject traditional-theological and philosophical transcendence and analogy.[85] One would neither expect Foucault nor Deleuze (nor DG) to offer a focused, balanced or fair

---

83  Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 6.  Ibid., 5f. and 7ff.

84  Carrette, *Foucault and Religion.*

85  Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 63ff. and 85ff.; Daniel Colucciello Barber, *Deleuze and the Naming of God: Post-Secularism and the Future of Immanence* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2014); F. LeRon Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology: Gilles Deleuze and the Secretion of Atheism* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2014).

analysis/understanding of any such historical and Christian relations. For

this reason, this research has not been established methodically upon a

systematic-analytical reading of either of their analyses or propositions;

instead it will be eclectical, experimental—and discerning—in choosing its

relevant theory tools and conceptual-analytical propositions. Other recent

theological research has, of course, successfully chosen such an approach.[86]

However, with a focus on the 'final Foucault,' as well as discursive truth

conditions and agency construction, recent theological readings of Foucault

have often presented a simplified (i.e. non-multiplied) understanding of

Foucault's theorisations of power.[87]

Actor-Network Theory (ANT) which, after Clegg and Foucault, is

the third theory-relation that is relevant to this research, in which power is

conceptualised, has also been described in terms of a 'toolbox' (or 'toolkit')

and their theory elements portrayed as 'tools;'[88] as has Clegg's already

mentioned organisation-political theorisation on the basis of it being an

'open theory of power' with a 'conciliatory tone and laudable syncretism of

---

86   See the literature review at the end of this chapter.

87   James Bernauer and David Rasmussen, ed., *The Final Foucault* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT, 1987).

88   Law, 'Actor Network Theory;' Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 191, 2 and passim.

earlier theories.'[89]  ANT and Clegg's three circuits are of course, significantly more purposefully focused, disciplined and complete, in line with general academic expectations.  ANT presents a set of theory tools which offers a particularly high level of ontological abstraction and analytical control.[90]  'Actor-network' connective relations are established upon the premise of a 'generalized symmetry' according to which distributed contributors ('actors') of a most heterogeneous nature—human, material, symbolic, invisible—are, in principle, capable of association at both close and distant ranges.[91]  Latour emphasises that ANT introduces a set of mainly negative theory tools which introduce five conceptual 'uncertainties' and flatten sociological conceptualisations of 'the social;' as a theory, ANT (like Foucault and Deleuze) cannot be 'applied' but must also not be 'mixed and matched' with a different style of sociological theorisation.[92]  Relevant to this research, ANT offers two contributions: it inspires an understanding of the disparate and distributed nature of contributors towards the construction of organisational relations of power, as well as those which may emerge from distributed-Pentecostal practices

---

89  Percy, *Power and the Church,* 7.

90  Cf. Harman's reading of Latour: Graham Harman, *Prince of Networks: Bruno Latour and Metaphysics* (Melbourne, Austr.: Re.Press, 2009).

91  Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

92  Latour, *Reassembling the Social.*

'in the Holy Spirit' (cf. below, chapter 6); ANT also clarifies a perspective regarding the understanding of power in terms of its effects—capabilities, characteristics, reliabilities and reach—which may emerge from the gathering of an association's distributed elements.[93]

Clegg's power theory situates, organises, integrates and inter-engages other relevant organisation-theory contributions and perspectives within a three-circuits analytical framework.  Not only is it therefore possible to further consider and refine different theory lenses and contribution,[94] their organic inter-engagement with other theory perspectives across the relations of Clegg's circuits facilitates further-going insights.  In chapter 2, a reading will be proposed which both selectively emphasises certain contributing organisation-theoretical 'tools' and chooses to reverse the order in which Clegg introduces the three circuits of his framework.[95]  As with ANT, Clegg shares an ontic-sociological theory perspective; however Clegg's overall theory, due to his integration of organisation-theoretical contributions, are less thoroughly generalised.  As one deploys Clegg's

---

93  John Law, 'Notes on the Theory of the Actor-Network: Ordering, Strategy and Heterogeneity,' *Systems Practice* 5, no. 4 (1992): 379ff.

94  Percy's deployment of Clegg concentrates overall on the theorisation of nodal fixing within Clegg's dispositional circuit: Percy, *Words, Wonders and Power,* 34ff. and 95f.; Percy, *Power and the Church,* 8ff.

95  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 187ff.

framework beyond the relations of modern-organisational politics and practice, one must remain aware of the possibility of certain limitations arising from such conceptual limitations.

The non-modern, 'Foucauldian'-subversive nature of Clegg's theory has already been referenced in the first section, above. In the case of ANT, there are perhaps three anti-Hobbesian, non-modern/non-normative, theory deployments which merit mentioning: (1) In an early paper by Callon and Latour, the argument runs explicitly against a modern-Hobbesian (in the sense of mechanistic and sociological-normative) theorisation of power, pointing out that every 'Leviathan,' and in particular its capacities of long-distant control, must be constructed and maintained, on the basis of material technology.[96] (2) Latour's methodological ANT introduction of 2004 calls sociology to abandon the (Hobbesian-modern) notion of 'the social' and 'society' in the very same way that twentieth-century particle physics abandoned the outdated notion of an 'ether:'[97]

> What has struck all readers in Hobbes's sketch of his Leviathan is how fragile 'this mortal god' was and how quickly it could dissolve. [...] But

---

96 Callon and Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan.' Cf. Latour, 'Powers of Association;' John Law, 'On the Methods of Long-Distance Control: Vessels, Navigation and the Portuguese Route to India,' in *Power, Action and Belief: a New Sociology of Knowledge?* ed. John Law (London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987)*,* 234ff.

97 Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 12.

as soon as you displace the mode of existence of the public into that of a society, so as to save you the immense, contradictory, and arduous task of composing it through political means, *its problematic fragility* vanishes. [...] As long as we detect behind the collective the shadow of society and behind society the shadow of the Leviathan, no science of the social can proceed forward. [...] *either there is society or there is sociology.*[98]

Finally (3), Latour's essay in the 'constitution' of a 'non-modern' politics proceeds by reconsidering the Hobbes–Boyle controversy concerning the methodologies of modern-scientific knowledge creation (presented as the beginning of a thoroughly 'modern' conceptual division of 'nature' vs. human 'culture' by Latour) which then facilitates the conceptually uncontrolled creation/proliferation of technology ('hybrid networks').[99]

The character and nature of Clegg, Foucault (even Deleuze/DG) and ANT, as these relevant power-theoretical conceptual 'toolboxes,' which this research will scour for useful theory perspectives and contributions, is thus rather distinctive and different. These conceptual toolboxes nevertheless share something of Deleuze's and Foucault's 'toolbox' approach in that they: (1) develop and deploy a different (post-structuralist) type of theory,

---

98   Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 162f., original emphases.

99   Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern,* tr. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993); Steve Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life,* new edn (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press, 2011).

thus strategically subverting (modern-Hobbesian) mechanistic, normative and totalising power accounts; (2) reveal how power operates in a mode of analytical description, instead of defining what power (legitimately) is to be; (3) develop an understanding of power which consistently begins with theoretical analysis of 'regional' and contingent relations; (4) grow such an understanding by way of 'repetitions' and multiplications, rather than through repetitive 'applications' of the always same relation. In accordance with such a post-structuralist understanding, this thesis itself deploys a post-structuralist 'toolbox' approach as it aims to eclectively and experientially explore, dislocate and redeploy a selection of specific perspectives, theorisations and insights from these theory-toolbox relations, in a manner which is politically productive with regard to a different task at hand: the facilitation of practical-theological accountability with regards to the relevance and use of power within the relationships of Christian ministry.

The understanding of both Foucault's and Deleuze's 'toolbox' methodology of a strategical-analytical subversion of normative-discursive deployments of power lays the foundation for a number of reflections concerning decisions which shape the research journey behind this thesis, and its presentation: (1) Which theory tools, from each of the different

toolboxes, one should choose for different purposes depends upon the academic/political field ('region') of their deployment. (2) Learned normativity, beginning with the 'definition' of one's categories and the framing of one's research, are, in themselves, power deployments. In particular, this research has to deal with the difficulty that any conventional theological understanding of 'God'—and also 'religious experience'—is normative in nature. In chapters 5 and 6, for example, 'Pentecostal practice' does not merit 'definition' but rather a power-analytical (as well as historical-analytical) exploration. It is only subsequently that such an approach can lead towards an understanding of the constructive means, capacities and nature of (historically specific) Pentecostal-charismatic modes of power and ordering. (3) Due to this specific historical-analytical and practical-theological task, the researcher has chosen not to proceed (in chapters 5 and 6) by way of a systematic-theological re-reading and deployment of Foucault's (and Deleuze's) work, as others have (successfully) done. (4) Practical-theological problems and historical fields have been selected for power-analytical investigation according to 'an experimenter's' (Foucauldian) rationale. (5) Historical studies and contingent relations, on the one hand, and theory deployments on the other, according to the 'toolbox' rationale, are not external to one another, but rather organically connected through a creative refashioning and

'multiplication.' (6) The forging of a theological rationale is subsequent to a series of successful power-analytical investigations. Both the reasoning which connects the different historical case studies and practical-theological analytics, as well as the subsequently emerging analytical-theological argument, develop in a mode of creative-rhizomic growth and a complex-rhizomatic interweaving of 'multiplicities,' according to a Deleuzo-Guattarian understanding (cf. below, 0.2.2, [7]).[100] Finally (7), the argumentative function of each 'case study' power analysis is multiple and somewhat fluid. What eventually emerges is the structured 'middle (*milieu*)' of a certain theological field of reasoning, so that there cannot be a single, fixed 'function' which would relate to an enclosed totality of systematic reasoning.[101]

---

100 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff. On 'rhizome:' Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 22ff.; Eugene W. Holland, *Deleuze and Guattari's* A Thousand Plateaus (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 37ff.; Felicity J. Colman, 'Rhizome,' in *The Deleuze Dictionary,* ed. Adrian Parr, rev. edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010), 232ff. On 'multiplicity:' Patrick McLane, 'Multiplicity,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 121ff.; Jonathan Roffe, 'Multiplicity,' in *Deleuze Dictionary,* 181f.

101 'The rhizome is reducible neither to the One nor the multiple. [...] It is composed not of units but of dimensions, or rather directions in motion. It has neither beginning nor end, but always a middle (*milieu*) from which it grows and which it overspills.' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 21.

### 0.2.2 Case studies and theological reasoning

Following on from the consideration of both a post-structuralist 'toolbox' type of power analytics, as well as the rhizomic-emergent gathering of a theological argument, the following section considers the main material and theoretical-analytical decisions which underlie the research in the different chapters (subsections [1]–[6]) and eventually the emergent-rhizomatic gathering and construction of a theological argument ([7]). Developing a distributed and 'subversive' power analytics prepares the way for the subsequent construction of theological reasoning. Due to this two-step development of research and its presentation, as well as the rhizomatic-emergent nature of reasoning across successive chapters, the seven subsections cannot consistently reproduce the semblance of conventional-linear progression across the 6 thesis chapters.

*(1) Clegg and organisational politics*

Clegg can be shown to offer a powerful theory frame for a full analysis of (modern-)organisational politics, even in volatile, fast-moving, political situations and in historically 'interesting' times of open-ended

developments at a deeper-systemic level.[102]  Chapter 2 tests Clegg's three-

circuits framework in a power analysis of the different phases of the

'confessing' Protestant struggle in Nazi-Germany; an area of historical

research which offers precisely these kinds of challenges.  The fields from

which the case study is drawn is extremely well researched and possible

innovation is therefore limited.[103]  As a historical context, it further

contributes significantly towards (normative-)theological decisions and

developments which shaped that which prevailed as Christian theology and

mainline (ecumenical) practice in the second half of the twentieth

century.[104]  The chapter demonstrates that it is possible to resolve virtually

---

102 According to Latour, more conventional sociologies are 'pre-relativist' in the
sense that they rely on 'an absolutist framework generating data;' a strategy
which falters precisely when faced with historical acceleration and the
proliferation of innovations.  'For sociologists of the social, the rule is order
while decay, change or creation are the exceptions.'  Latour, *Reassembling
the Social,* 12 and 35.

103 Ernst Christian Helmreich, *The German Churches under Hitler:
Background, Struggle and Epilogue* (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press,
1979); Klaus Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich,* 2 vols., tr. John
Bowden (London: SCM, 1987 and 1988); Christoph Strohm, *Die Kirchen im
Dritten Reich,* 2nd edn (Munich: Beck, 2017); Olaf Blaschke, *Die Kirchen
und der Nationalsozialismus* (Stuttgart: Reclam, 2014); Kurt Meier, *Kreuz
und Hakenkreuz: die evangelische Kirche im Dritten Reich,* new edn
(Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001).

104 Philip Kennedy, *Twentieth-Century Theologians: a New Introduction to
Modern Christian Thought* (London and New York: Tauris, 2010);
Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* vol. 2; David
F. Ford, ed., *The Modern Theologians: an Introduction to Christian
Theology since 1918,* with Rachel Muers, 3rd edn (Oxford and Malden,
Mass.: Blackwell, 2005); Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century
Theology;* Grenz and Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology.*

all of the theoretical impasses which were identified at the beginning of this introduction, within a Cleggian-analytical concern with organisation and politics. Clegg's model lacks the necessary conceptual generalisation for a theorisation of less 'hard-wired' non-modern organisational forms of power and agency, including the 'living' presence/power of a distributed-charismatic divine (a point to be made in chapter 1). Notwithstanding such limitations, Clegg's theorisation provides a first insight into the conceptual complexity which any comprehensive power analytics would need to negotiate.

*(2)  Subverting theological and pastoral control*

The aim of this thesis: to theorise 'all' power relations, insofar they are relevant to the Christian ministry, within a single, consistent theory approach, requires the examination of relational forms that are vastly diverse with regards to their constructed nature. Although research methodology accounts for a seeming (!) lack of consistency and focus *on the side of the case studies and power concerns* that have been chosen within this research, consistency is nevertheless to be found; and initially, within the social-theoretical and power-analytical concern behind the case studies. In chapters 3–6, this thesis deploys mainly Foucauldian theory

'tools' in order to examine different modes of Christian ('religious') empowerment, agency construction and the creation of order/organisation: through normative theology/ecclesiology (studied through Barth's theological dogmatics and the Augsburg Confession [*CA*]), pastoral professionalism and Pentecostal-charismatic experience/practice—according to eyewitness (autobiographical) accounts which relate to the Azusa Street revival of 1906.

Through a superficial theological reading of the following chapters, one could be tempted to identify the classical systematic-theological opposition which regards Barth's theology as a 'neo-orthodox' reconceptualisation of the doctrine of God; the alternative is a normative-dogmatic approach to theological construction 'from below,' i.e. based on 'religious experience.' Conventionally, the latter is often identified with Schleiermacher (see above); alternatively, the North-American pragmatist William James also offers a relevant set of foundational observations, definitions and a methodological approach.[105] As Clegg, Foucault and Deleuze make clear (see above), either approach of beginning systematic-

---

105 William James, *The Varieties of Religious Experience: a Study in Human Nature,* ed. Martin E. Marty (London and New York: Penguin, 1985); Simeon Zahl, 'Experience,' in *The Oxford Handbook of Nineteenth-Century Christian Thought,* ed. Joel D. S. Rasmussen, Judith Wolfe and Johannes Zachhuber (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2017), 177ff.

theological analysis/construction—the one which establishes itself (with

Barth and 'with God') 'from above' as well as the one which starts with

Schleiermacher (seemingly) 'from below'—encounters the difficulty of all

normative construction that begin with definition/preliminary enclosure:

that, as a discursive practice, normative reasoning and definition always

remain subservient to an academic and pastoral power deployment, which,

in nature, is totalising, restrictive and 'top-down' (notwithstanding that

normative reasoning may unfold 'from below').

Furthermore, if a post-structuralist 'toolbox' deployment of theory

relations aims to subvert normative power in many locations 'from within'

and progresses by way of the displacement and 'multiplication' of

analytical understandings, then one must be cautious with regards to undue

generalisations:[106] Although theological, sociological and organisational

'normativity' have been identified as a general difficulty, this research

---

106 'This is a complete reversal of the world of representation, and of the sense
that "identical" and "similar" had in that world. This reversal is not merely
speculative but eminently practical, since it defines the conditions of
legitimate use of the words "identical" and "similar" by linking them
exclusively to simulacra, while denouncing the ordinary usage made from
the point of view of representation. [...] The true distinction is not between
the identical *and* the same, but between the identical, the same or the
similar—it matters little which, once these are posited as primary on various
grounds—and the identical, the same or the similar understood as secondary
powers, but all the more powerful as such, turning around difference, being
said of difference itself.' Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition,* 301, orig.
emph.

specifically examines the systematic construction of Barthian normative-discursive practice and empowerment, as well as that of the Lutheran confession; it is plausible to compare them with other normative-transcendental theory approaches that were developed by other young academics and intellectuals in the 1920s, since they share a similar mode of construction;[107] in addition, pastoral empowerment and order according to the Augsburg Confession ecclesiology can plausibly be compared with the ministerial order in other historical-mainline doctrinal traditions.  If one however were to ask what ethical practice and agency formation is facilitated, for example, through fundamentalist-evangelical normativity[108]

---

107 Georg Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie: zu Genese und Kontext eines paradigmatischen Entwurfs systematischer Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Klaus Scholder, 'Modern German History and Protestant Theology: Aspects and Questions,' in *A Requiem for Hitler: and Other New Perspectives on the German Church Struggle* (London: SCM, 1989), 35ff.; Christian Graf von Krockow, *Die Entscheidung: eine Untersuchung über Ernst Jünger, Carl Schmitt, Martin Heidegger* (Frankfurt and New York: Campus, 1990); Kurt Sontheimer, 'Anti-democratic Thought in the Weimar Republic,' in *The Road to Dictatorship: Germany 1918–1933,* tr. Lawrence Wilson (London: Wolff, 1964), 39ff.

108 George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture,* 2nd edn (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2006); Harriet A. Harris, *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1998); Gary J. Dorrien, *The Remaking of Evangelical Theology* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Know, 1998); Nancy T. Ammerman, 'North American Protestant Fundamentalism,' in *Fundamentalisms Observed,* ed. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1991), 1ff.; Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Milleniarism, 1800–1930* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970); J. Michael Utzinger, *Yet Saints Their Watch Are Keeping: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and the Development of Evangelical*

or, for that matter, Schleiermacher's theology and ethics,[109] a *repetition* of both investigation and investment of analytical tools would be advisable.

In the same way, that which is analysed in chapters 5 and 6, in terms of 'spiritual' or Pentecostal/charismatic experience or practice, should by no means be framed according to a generalised concept of 'religious' or 'spiritual experience'(/'practice'); and one must refrain from aligning one's understanding of Pentecostal-charismatic construction with James' and Happold's pragmatic-psychological research into 'mysticism.'[110]  When, in this thesis, such words are used, the primary reference specifically denotes accounts of Pentecostal and charismatic-Christian experiences and

---

*Ecclesiology, 1887–1937* (Macon, Georg.: Mercer Univ. Press, 2006); Glenn T. Miller, *Piety and Profession: American Protestant Theological Education, 1870–1970* (Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007).

109 Schleiermacher, *Christian Faith;* Schleiermacher, *Selections from Friedrich Schleiermacher's Christian Ethics,* ed. and tr. James M. Brandt (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 2011); Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought,* vol. 1, 93ff.; Jacqueline Mariña, *Transformation of the Self in the Thought of Friedrich Schleiermacher* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2008); Eilert Herms, 'Schleiermacher's *Christian Ethics,'* in *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher,* ed. Jacqueline Mariña (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005), 209ff.

110 On mystical experiences: F. C. Happold, *Mysticism: a Study and an Anthology,* rev. edn (Harmondsworth, Mddx: Penguin, 1970); James, *Varieties of Religious Experience;* Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright and Edward Yarnold, ed., *The Study of Spirituality* (London: SPCK, 1986); cf. T. M. Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God* (New York and Toronto: Vintage Random, 2012).

practices; and more specifically experiences/practices which flow from the 1906 Azusa Street Pentecostal revival; and even more specifically still, from its early, 'hot,' phase (chapter 5), as well as the preparatory journeys and processes which are elucidated by the autobiographical accounts of one of its leader participants (chapter 6).[111]  The researcher understands that, although Anderson historically disturbed the narrative of a single point of origin of twentieth-century global Pentecostalism, the 'Los Angeles Pentecost' continues to have paradigmatic significance for many Pentecostals and charismatics worldwide, as well as for academic-Pentecostal theologians.[112]  Nonetheless, one must, again, be careful not to overextend the possibility of generalisation; even 'classical' Pentecostals and their pastoral leadership, with roots and a contribution to the Azusa Street revival, soon lost certain spiritual-experiential capacities and understandings; or—at least—the communal capacity to replicate essential

---

111 [Apostolic Faith Mission], *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles), 13 iss. (1906–1908), ifphc.org; Frank Bartleman, *Witness to Pentecost: the Life of Frank Bartleman,* ed. Donald W. Dayton (New York and London: Garland, 1985); Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: the Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement* (Nashville, Tenn.: Nelson, 2006).

112 Allan Anderson, *Spreading Fires: the Missionary Nature of Early Pentecostalism* (London: SCM, 2007); Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, 'The Origins of Modern Pentecostalism: Some Historiographical Issues,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism,* ed. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, and Amos Yong (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 13ff.; Walter J. Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997), 18ff.; Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality.*

processes and modes of 'spiritual' construction which facilitated the breakthrough and 'move' of the Holy Spirit that occurred at the Azusa Street mission: there are reasons as to why many Pentecostal/charismatic pioneers find it difficult to contribute towards the ushering in of the *next* spiritual breakthrough.  The researcher is aware that the naming of certain pioneer revivalists' experiences, practices and understandings as 'Pentecostal' or 'charismatic' implies a strategical-political provocation; a challenge to those who identify with this strand of Christianity.

Chapters 3–5 deploy a Foucauldian theory concern with practice, discourse and embodiment in order to conceptualise and compare different 'religious'—as well as commonly modern—forms of agency construction (ethics) and empowerment.  Such a Foucauldian exploration of empowerment through Barth's dogmatics (chapter 3), on one hand, and through Spirit baptism and Pentecostal-charismatic experience/practice (according to Azusa Street testimonies; chapter 5), on the other, is in accordance with the initial—and central—concern of this thesis: to explore whether all forms of power that are relevant to the Christian ministry can be accounted for within a unified strategical deployment of a selection of specific theorisations within a single, post-structuralist—descriptive-analytical, and thereby subversive—'toolbox' approach.  At the same time,

chapters 3 and 4 focus on facilitating an analytical understanding of resources, capacities and modes of theological and pastoral empowerment. These include: normative-theological discernment (using Barth as an example in chapter 3); the doctrinal construction of ordained ministry and access to the pulpit (according to the Lutheran-Protestant tradition in 4.3); and eventually academic formation (4.4). Although Foucault mainly studies modern-disciplinary power through the prison system, his understanding of 'examination' translates immediately to an appreciation of the making of a professionally trained clergy.[113]

## (3) Foucault and Pentecostal experience/practice

Global Pentecostalism features a 'great diversity' of theological, practical, organisational and cultural expressions.[114] According to the sociologist of religion Cox, it simultaneously features a recovery of a pre-modern 'primal spirituality;' at the same time, this also facilitates

---

113 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison,* tr. Alan Sheridan, 2nd edn (New York: Vintage, 1995), 170ff.

114 Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, and Amos Yong, 'Global Pentecostalism: an Introduction to an Introduction,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism,* ed. Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, and Amos Yong (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 1ff.; Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism.*

successful adaption to modernity.[115]  In order to clarify how a Pentecostal-

experiential empowerment facilitates creative-conceptual, organisational

and cultural resistance and innovation, chapter 5 attempts a 'playful'-

experiential formulation of the counter-modern form and rationale of

Pentecostal empowerment, along the lines of Foucault's dispositive of

'sexuality.'[116]  Land's understanding of 'Pentecostal spirituality,' in terms of

an apocalyptically and relationally directed 'affection' and 'passion,' is

conceptually comparable to a Foucauldian analytics of sexual desire in

that—with 'affection' just as much as with 'desire'—experiential, practical,

personal, social and symbolic relations are gathered into a single-

embodiment assemblage or power relation.[117]  Pentecostal scholars continue

to see 'Spirit baptism' as paradigmatic for Pentecostal-Christian experience

and practice; but with their personal backgrounds (in many cases) in North-

American Pentecostal traditions, they often follow Hollenweger's advice to

---

115 Harvey Cox, *Fire from Heaven: the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1995), 81.

116 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 105f.  In addition to the 'experimental' deployment of post-structuralist toolboxes, consider Drooger's 'methodological ludism:' Kim Knibbe and André Droogers, 'Methodological Ludism and the Academic Study of Religion,' *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 23, no. 3–4 (2011): 283ff.

117 Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 1, 2 and passim; Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 5 and passim; Foucault, *The Use of Pleasure: Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality,* tr. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1990)*,* 5 and passim.

identify early post-Azusa Street theological and organisational

developments, discussions and decisions as normative, thereby establishing

the denominational particular of a third ecumenical family of churches.[118]

However, the nature and capacities of an innovative assemblage, according

to Latour, is best studied through a retracing of difficulties along the

processes of its construction.[119]  Such an exploration of emergent

construction is pursued, in particular in chapter 6, through a study of

Bartleman's ministry accounts.[120]

A few preliminary considerations are also due regarding the nature of

Foucault's power analytics.  Foucault's theorisation of power changed over

time; and so has the understanding of Foucault since he died in 1984.

Foucault's quest into power/truth relations in the early part of the 1970s

sought to understand epistemic-conceptual changes, as facilitated through

---

118 Walter J. Hollenweger, 'Pentecostals and the Charismatic Movement,' in *The Study of Spirituality,* ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright and Edward Yarnold (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1986), 549ff.; Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 14f.;  Smith, *Thinking in Tongues,* 22ff.; Yong, *Spirit Poured Out;* Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit.*

119 Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 88ff.; Latour, *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1987); cf. Graham Livesey, 'Assemblage,' in *The Deleuze Dictionary,* ed. Adrian Parr, rev. edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010), 18f.

120 Bartleman, *Witness to Pentecost.*

the invention of modern practices which direct discourse towards human

bodies.  From here, Foucault moves on to explore different resources and

modes of modern-political reasoning, and the possibilities of ethical-

aesthetical self-formation and freedom.[121]  With the publication of new

Foucauldian interviews, smaller publications and lectures, the

understanding of Foucault's work on power changed over time.[122]  Since

the end of the post-war block confrontation, Foucault tends to be read

through the lens of the 'final Focault.'  Foucault continues to be referenced

in much research concerning minoritarian (feminist, postcolonial, black and

queer) identity construction and resistance, under the conditions of a post-

ideological, neo-liberal, politico-cultural situation,[123] which, since the

---

121 Stuart Elden, *Foucault: the Birth of Power* (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.:
Polity, 2017); Elden, *Foucault's Last Decade* (Cambridge and Malden,
Mass.: Polity, 2016); Lisa Downing, ed., *After Foucault: Culture, Theory,
and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge and New York: CUP,
2018), 15ff.; Dianna Taylor, ed., *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts* (London
and New York: Routledge, 2014); Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault;* Todd
May, *The Philosophy of Foucault* (Chesham, Bucks.: Acumen, 2006);
O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 83ff., 96ff. and 109ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,*
21ff.; Arnold I. Davidson, 'Ethics as Aesthetics: Foucault, the History of
Ethics, and Ancient Thought,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault,* ed.
Gary Gutting, 2nd edn (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005), 123ff.

122 Introduction to the different parts of Foucault's oevre: Clemens Kammler,
Rudolf Parr and Ulrich Johannes Schneider, ed., *Foucault-Handbuch:
Leben—Werk—Wirkung* (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 2008), pt. 2, 9ff.;
O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 33ff.

123 Downing, *After Foucault,* 85ff.; Oksala, 'Freedom and Bodies;' Sabine
Mehlmann and Stefanie Soine, 'Gender Studies/Feminismus,' in *Foucault-
Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 367ff.; Margaret D. Kamitsuka, *Feminist Theology
and the Challenge of Difference* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2007); Judith

banking crisis of 2008, can also be conceptualised in terms of Foucault's

historical readings of liberalism and neo-liberalism.[124]  Furthermore,

theological readings are directed towards the 'final Foucault' because it was

only towards the end of his career and life that Foucault's interest in

confessional practices, pastoral power and, eventually, 'spiritual' resistance

intensified and came to fruition.[125]  Subsequent to a 'final-Foucault' focus,

important earlier power-analytical differentiations—and thus resources—

can be overlooked.[126]

---

Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006); Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 2.

124 The English translation of Foucault's *Biopolitics* lectures was pubished in the year of the Lehman Brothers' bankrupcy: Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79,* ed. Michel Senellart, tr. Graham Burchell (Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).  Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (New York: Zone Books, 2015); Daniel Zamora and Michael C. Behrent, ed., *Foucault and Neoliberalism* (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016); Nicholas Gane, 'Foucault's History of Neoliberalism,' in *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018), 46ff.

125 James W. Bernauer, *Michel Foucault's Force of Flight: toward an Ethics for Thought* (Atlantic Highlands, N. J., and London: Humanities Press, 1990); Carrette, *Foucault and Religion;* Karen Vintges, 'Freedom and Spirituality,' in *Michel Foucault,* ed. Taylor, 99ff.; Bernauer, 'Confession,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 75ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 161ff.; Michel Foucault, *Religion and Culture,* ed. Jeremy R. Carrette (London and New York: Routledge, 1999).  Relevant theological titles are discussed below, at the end of this introduction chapter.

126 Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 3.  Cases in point: Downing, *After Foucault;* Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory.*  On the most important conceptual

Different to other theologians and researchers who, committed to minoritarian and emancipatory-political concerns, refer to final-Foucauldian embodied-ethical/aesthetical theorisations,[127] this research develops a understanding of Pentecostal-charismatic agency/truth construction and facilitation, of both Christian resistance and creative innovation from Foucault's generalised analytics of the dimensions of 'sexuality,' as a modern power/truth dispositive.[128] One must, however, not overemphasise the difference since Foucault himself, in the introduction to the 1984 volumes of *The History of Sexuality,* points to the conceptual continuity of his understanding of sexuality as a modern construction which interweaves (1) modern-scientific discourses with (2) power practices and (3) modes of subjectification; even as his analytical focus

changes and variations in Foucault's understanding of power: Richard A. Lynch, 'Foucault's Theory of Power,' in *Michel Foucault,* ed. Taylor, 13ff.; Ellen K. Feder, 'Power/Knowledge,' in *Michel Foucault,* 55ff.; Judith Revel, 'Power,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 377ff.; Joseph Rouse, 'Power/Knowledge,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault,* ed. Gary Gutting, 2nd edn (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2003), 95ff.; Hannelore Bublitz, 'Macht,' in *Foucault-Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 273ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 146ff.

127 Downing, *After Foucault;* Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 178ff. James W. Bernauer and Michael Mahon, 'Michel Foucault's Ethical Imagination,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault,* ed. Gary Gutting, 2nd edn (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005), 149ff.; Sophie Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul: Subjects of Power* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory.*

128 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92ff. and 105ff.

shifts to the third, ethical/aesthetical concern.[129] Whilst Bernauer's and

Fuggle's theological engagements (successfully) attempt a more direct

exploration and exploitation of final-Foucauldian possibilities for a

theological conceptualisation of 'spiritual'/political-ethical resistance and

subversive experimentation;[130] Carrette rightly points out that Foucault's

understandings of Christianity and 'spirituality' are fragmentary and, due to

Foucault's systematic-subversive and modern-'atheistic' concerns, even

historically skewed and conceptually flawed (in certain places).[131] There is

no need to discuss specific details (more below, 5.1); what matters here is

that, in order to come to an analytical description of Pentecostal-

charismatic 'Spirit baptism' (embodied empowerment) in chapter 5, the

researcher chose to proceed by way of deploying a *generalised* analytical

frame, rather than annotating relevant Foucauldian texts, insights and

interpretations.

---

129 Foucault, *Use of Pleasure,* 4ff.; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 253ff.; Foucault, 'Subject and Power;' Jacques Khalip, 'Foucault's Ethics,' in *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018), 155ff.; Monica Greco and Martin Savransky, 'Foucault's Subjectivities,' in *After Foucault,* 31ff.

130 Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 178ff.; Bernauer and Mahon, 'Michel Foucault's Ethical Imagination;' Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul.*

131 Jeremy R. Carrette, 'Prologue to a Confession of the Flesh,' in *Religion and Culture,* Foucault, 1ff.; Carrette, 'Rupture and Transformation: Foucault's Concept of Spirituality Reconsidered,' *Foucault Studies* 10 (2013): 52ff.; Carrette, *Foucault and Religion.*

*(4)  Barth, Foucault and the Kantian form of an ethical argument*


Both Barth and Foucault, in their different ways, deploy the form of Kantian-transcendental ethical reasoning.  According to Pfleiderer, Barth—alongside other academics and intellectuals of his generation—deployed an inverted neo-Kantian, transcendental theory design for the 'practical' purpose of facilitating a forcefully focused reflective agency of a theological and political vanguard.[132]  This amounts to a Foucauldian-embodied ethical facilitation, albeit on the basis of a radicalised transcendental-reflective normativity.  In Foucault's case, there is, of course, the ever-intensifying quest of the possibility of ethical-embodied resistance, subversion and freedom.  Furthermore, Foucault's historical ('archaeological') analytics of discursive formations, asks how the 'preconceptual field,' which 'allows the emergence of the discursive regularities and constraints,' amounts to a historisation of Kantian ethico-epistemological theory relations.[133]  It was only later that Foucault identified the 'historical apriori' when he focused on the relations and technologies of power in the creation of discursive truth relations.[134]

---

132 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie.*

133 Michel Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* tr. A. M. Sheridan Smith (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), 70.

134 Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 142ff.; Béatrice Han, *Foucault's*

Foucault's philosophical work had begun with research into Kant and, in a text, at the end of his life and career, he re-anchored his research within a Kantian-categorical framework.[135]  It is on the basis of this shared Kantian—and Foucauldian—transcendental-ethical theory design that it becomes possible, in chapters 3 and 5, to compare the Barthian (twentieth-century normative-dogmatic) mode with the Pentecostal-charismatic mode of counter-modern ethical formation and empowerment.

The mode of inter-engagement, in chapter 3, of a Barthian with a charismatic-revivalist, and a Foucauldian, ethical empowerment, resistance and freedom, can be rephrased in Deleuzean terms:  It is (according to the methodological chapter of *A Thousand Plateaus*) through 'rhizomic' growth of insight and understanding 'from the middle,' and not by way of an 'arborescent' mode of causal-linear development, that the reasoning of

---

*Critical Project: between the Transcendental and the Historical,* tr. Edward Pile (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2002); Hans-Herbert Kögler, *Michel Foucault,* 2nd edn (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004), 27ff., 34ff. and 55ff.; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Focuault,* 44, 56ff., 79ff. and 102f.; Jeffrey T. Nealon, 'Historical a Priori,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 200ff.

135 Michel Foucault, 'Foucault,' in *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology,* ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley et al. (New York: New Press, 1998), 459ff.; Béatrice Han, 'The Analytic of Finitude and the History of Subjectivity,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault,* ed. Gary Gutting, 2nd edn (Cambridge and  New York: CUP, 2005), 176ff.

this thesis developed.[136]  Normative-theological empowerment (according

to Barth) and Pentecostal-charismatic empowerment (through 'Spirit

baptism') are the heterogeneous tubers—the 'cat and baboon,' as it were—

of a Deleuzo-Guattarian 'asymmetrical evolution,' with the Kantian-

transcendental form being their connective 'C virus' that facilitates the

possibility of them both 'becoming-Foucauldian.'[137]  DG's

conceptualisation of rhizomatic innovation and growth will be used for an

analytical understanding of the creation and accumulative construction of

the 'presence'/'power' of God's Spirit, according to a distributed-

charismatic (Pentecostal) experience/practice (see below, point [6]).

Furthermore, a rhizomic-constructive rationale underlies the creation of a

theological-analytical argument, *as an effect,* which emerges from the

interconnection of different, disparate, practical-theological and historical

---

136 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.

137 'If evolution includes any veritable becomings, it is in the domain of
symbioses that bring into play beings of totally different scales and
kingdoms, with no possible filiation.  There is a block of becoming that
snaps up the wasp and the orchid, but from which no wasp-orchid can ever
descend.  There is a block of becoming that takes hold of the cat and baboon,
the alliance between which is effected by a C virus.  There is a block of
becoming between young roots and certain microorganisms, the alliance
between which is effected by the materials synthesized in the leaves
(rhizosphere).' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 238.  Ibid., 10f. and 232ff.; Jason
Wallin, 'Animal/Becoming-Animal,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an
Inroductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed.  Rob Shields and Mickey
Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 17ff.; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand
Plateaus,* 141ff.; Holland, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 102ff.

examinations in chapters 2 to 6 (see below, point [7]).  As a first step, the Foucauldian-analytical comparison of a Barthian-theological empowerment with a Pentecostal-embodied empowerment can be contextualised and 'intensified' (Nealon) through Foucault's historical reading of different modes of liberal-political reasoning.

*(5)  Foucault on liberalism and neo-liberalism*

A Foucauldian power analytics also gives rise to a consideration of the strategical relevance of a historical situation of an embodied engagement, empowerment, resistance and freedom.  Foucault's comparative examination of classical-liberal and 'neo-liberal' forms of governmental reasonings in his 1979 lecture series facilitates an understanding of more recent, structural changes to the field of political-economical relations.[138]  This, in turn, facilitates a historically (with regards to political culture) 'contextualised' exploration of the relevance—as well as some specific limitations—of both a Barthian-theological and a Pentecostal-charismatic agency construction and empowerment.

Political philosophers and academic theologians have, of course,

---

138 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.*

taken account of Foucault's genealogy of liberal 'governmentalities,' the

English translation of which was published in 2008, around the time of the

financial crash.[139]  Contemporary readings of Foucault by Western-Marxian

political philosophers have pointed out that Foucault's interest with

political liberalism and different forms of neo-liberalism are framed by an

overarching concern with the government of human beings, both at an

individual and a societal level ('governmentality' and 'biopolitics').

Foucault's eventual concern with human agency-construction,

subjectification and freedom would equally be situated within such an

overarching concern.[140]  Brown points out that the neo-liberal rationale

undermines the liberal-democratic political culture by 'remaking' public

institutions, including academic/professional training and reasoning, the

rationale of state politics and the modern sense of self.[141]  Ewald, on the

---

139 Nicholas Gane, 'Foucault's History of Neoliberalism,' in *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018), 46ff.

140 Agamben, *Homo Sacer;* Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Assembly* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2017); Hardt and Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 2000); Réal Fillion, 'Moving beyond Biopower: Hardt and Negri's Post-Foucauldian Speculative Philosophy of History,' *History and Theory* 44, no. 4 (2005): 47ff.; Vanessa Lemm and Miguel Vatter, ed., *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism* (New York: Fordham Univ. Press, 2014); Thomas Lemke, '"The Birth of Bio-Politics:" Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-Liberal Governmentality,' *Economy and Society* 30, no. 2 (2001): 190ff.

141 Brown, *Undoing the Demos,* 17ff.

other side, sees Foucault 'offering the apology' of Chicago-school neo-liberalism.[142]  One should, however, consider Nealon's proposition that, in a changed historico-political situation, several decades after Foucault's death, an 'intensification' and a rereading, which takes 'Foucault beyond Foucault,' would be necessary.[143]  Recent theological contributions engage with Foucault's and Agamben's theorisations of neo-liberalism and 'biopolitics.'[144]  In the very same way that chapter 4.1 engages with the

---

142 Gary Becker, François Ewald and Bernard Harcourt, '"Becker on Ewald on Foucault on Becker:" American Neoliberalism and Michel Foucault's 1979 *Birth of Biopolitics* Lectures; a Conversation with Gary Becker, François Ewald, and Bernard Harcourt,' *Institute for Law and Economics Working Paper,* 2nd ser., 614, and *Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper* 401 (2012): 4, www.snrn.com; Mitchell Dean, 'Foucault, Ewald, Neoliberalism, and the Left,' in *Foucault and Neoliberalism,* ed. Daniel Zamora and Michael C. Behrent (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016), 85ff. More recent considerations whether and in which sense Foucault could be seen as an apologist of neoliberalism in other chapters of this book: Zamora and Behrent, *Foucault and Neoliberalism.*

143 Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault.*  A selection of older research: Thomas Lemke, *Eine Kritik der politischen Vernunft: Foucaults Analyse der modernen Gouvernementalität* (Berlin and Hamburg: Argument, 1997); Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, ed., *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government* (London: UCL Press, 1996); Colin Gordon, 'Governmental Rationality: an Introduction,' in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality,* ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Millner (Hemel Hempstead, Hert., and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991), 1ff.

144 Dotan Leshem, *The Origins of Neoliberalism: Modeling the Economy from Jesus to Focuault* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2016); Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul;* John Milbank, 'Paul against Biopolitics,' in *Paul's New Moment: Continental Philosophy and the Future of Christian Theology,* ed. John Milbank, Slavoj Žižek and Creston Davis, with Catherine Pickstock (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos, 2010), 21ff.; Roger Haydon Mitchell, *Church, Gospel, and Empire: how the Politics of Sovereignty Impregnated*

biblical-scholarly understanding of Paul's charismatic ecclesiology

(merely) through a systematic reading of Käsemann's 1948 lecture,[145]

chapter 3.6 limits its textual base to the content of Foucault's lecture

series.[146]  The decision to somewhat disregard certain reflective

differentiations concerning developments and changes within neo-liberal

economics/politics since Foucault's days, as well as secondary

engagements with Foucault's understanding of liberalism/neo-liberalism, is

offset by a greater systematic-analytical clarity and more efficient

presentation of what Foucault himself has to offer to our contemporary

understanding.

*(6)  DG and Pentecostal-charismatic organisation*

Chapters 5 and 6, arguably, offer the most profound contribution to

an understanding of religious power relations.  Chapter 5 attempts to

formulate the counter-modern form and rationale of Pentecostal

empowerment along the lines of Foucault's dispositive of 'sexuality.'

However, when Pentecostal-charismatic revivalists account for the

---

*the West* (Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 131ff.

145 Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community.'

146 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* lectures 9–12, 215ff.

experience and 'presence' of the Holy Spirit, they do not always refer to the

language and perspective of individualised-embodied empowerment.

Bialecki considers that, in the reception of the Luhrmann's research into

'Third Wave' neo-charismatics, one could

> [...]take a subtle shift from a psychology-orientated epistemology that is
> central to her project and reread it through the lens of a Latourian
> inflected ontology.

From the place of anthropological agnosticism, an ANT-informed ontology

would lead one to consider the possibility of Luhrmann's imagined-

Pentecostal divine (or spirits, angels, demons) becoming a real social actor.

'[...] in societies where He is produced, we have to ethnographically

include God—and specifically, include him as a (potential) social actor.'[147]

With regards to contemporary forms of (sung) worship, for example,

charismatics and Pentecostals evidence inter-personally and time-spatially

distributed processes and flows of Spirit presence, of changing intensities,

which are, on occasion, accompanied by (what is understood to be) more

specific divine engagements or actions;[148] however, even across the

---

147 Jon Bialecki, 'Does God Exist in Methodological Atheism?: on Tanya
Lurhmann's [sic!] *When God Talks Back* and Bruno Latour,' *Anthropology of
Consciousness* 25, no. 1 (2014): 39 and 38. Cf. the transition from political
epistemology to a distributed ontological concern: Latour, *Reassembling the
Social,* 254ff. On 'object-oriented ontology' also: Graham Harman, *Tool-
Being: Heidegger and the Metaphysics of Objects* (Chicago and La Salle,
Ill.: Open Court, 2002); Harman, *Prince of Networks*.

148 Jon Bialecki, *A Diagram for Fire: Miracles and Variation in an American*

relations of ordinary Roman-Catholic parish communication, Piette traces

an 'oscillating' divine presence/absence, activity and agency.[149]  Bialecki's

and Piette's ethnographic-ontological consideration of a distributed-

heterogeneous reality of the divine further resonates with Welker's biblical-

relativistic concept of pursuing 'the emergence of ever-new forms of the

"unity of the Spirit"' as a central Christian and theological concern.[150]  I

would, furthermore, like to acknowledge that the privilege of travelling

alongside a small number of exceptional—though largely unknown—

charismatic-prophetic pioneers, groups and sub-movements, and observing

their practices, over the years, has also contributed towards my

understanding.  It is in such an ontological-relativistic understanding that

chapter 6 returns to a distributed, relativistic-ontological theory perspective

(cf. Clegg) but—this time—using DG's conceptualisation of imaginative

rhizomic exploration in order to clarify the development and growth of

embodied Pentecostal-Charismatic ministry capacities; and eventually the

'living' presence and power of God's Spirit as facilitated through

---

*Charismatic Movement* (Oakland, Cal.: Univ. of California Press, 2017), 28ff.; Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 4ff.

149 Albert Piette, *La Religion de près: l'activité religieuse en train de se faire,* (Paris: Métailié, 1999).

150 Welker, *God the Spirit,* 25; on emergence: ibid., 28f. (fn 58), 52ff. and passim.  Cf. also: Michael Welker, 'Das Reich Gottes,' *Evangelische Theologie* 52, no. 6 (1992): 497ff.

distributed-Pentecostal/Charismatic religious performance. The same (kind of) analytical perspectives and comparable theory tools, as were used in chapters 1–4 for an analysis of historical and conventionally modern relations of ecclesiastical power and empowerment, will be deployed in order to analyse the nature and living movement of the power of the Pentecostal/Charismatic divine according to Frank Bartleman's account of the Azusa Street revival.[151]

A few points must be made concerning the link between Foucault's embodied ethics/sexuality concept and DG's rhizome ontology. Foucault's embodied-ethical freedom and aesthetics, on the one hand, and DG's metaphysical concern with libidinal production and subversive innovation, on the other, are not incompatible: Deleuze recognises 'a lot of parallels' between Foucault's work and their own, though philosophical methods and objectives differ;[152] and a few of the current left-of-centre political-philosophical and theological readings do not hesitate to engage, in turns, with both Foucault and Deleuze (and Guattari) within the construction of a

---

151 Frank Bartleman, *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As It Was in the Beginning,* 2nd edn (Los Angeles: self-pub., 1925), facsimile reprint in Bartleman, *Witness to Pentecost.*

152 Gilles Deleuze, 'Breaking Things Open, Breaking Words Open,' *Negotiations, 1972–1990,* tr. Martin Joughin (New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1997), 85.

single argument and rationale.[153]  After Foucault's death, Deleuze offers an

'accurate' translation of Foucault into his own metaphysical concern.[154]

The strategical difference between Foucault's and DG's efforts at

subverting and replacing Freudo-Marxist ethical formation is instructive

with regards to the transition from Foucault's ethical-analytical to a

Deleuzean metaphysical-constructive perspective (in chapter 6):  Different

to Foucault, who within an ethical-aesthetical concern replaced (Freud's)

'desire' through 'pleasure,'[155] DG's *Anti-Oedipus* proposes a

reconceptualisation of 'desire' as both a holistic-individual and a socially

distributed force which facilitates both holistic-personal *and* societal

productivity, inertia and innovation.[156]  'Desire' is thus the distributed-

---

153 Antonio Negri, 'Gilles Deleuze: the How and When of Deleuze-Guattari,' *Marx and Foucault: Essays Volume 1,* tr. Ed Emery (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2017), 166ff.; Petra Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt: Foucault, Deleuze and Theology beyond Representation* (Aurora, Col.: Davies Group, 2014); Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 173ff.; cf. Stefan Münker and Alexander Roesler, *Poststrukturalismus* (Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 2000).

154 Frédéric Gros, 'Deleuze's *Foucault:* a Metaphysical Fiction,' in *Between Deleuze and Foucault,* ed. Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016), 129; Gilles Deleuze, *Foucault,* ed. and tr. Seán Hand (Minneapolis, Minn.: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1988); Deleuze, 'Michel Foucault's Main Concepts,' in *Between Deleuze and Foucault,* 59ff.

155 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 4, 11 and passim.  In the 1984 volumes, Foucault reverts to 'desire:' Foucault, *Use of Pleasure,* 4 and passim.

156 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia,* trs. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane

embodied force which brings forth 'the entire socio-political field' of one's

modern-capitalist 'reality.'[157]  Where Foucault points out that, through

modern 'sexuality,' 'power relations can materially penetrate the body in

depth' so that they bypass people's consciousness and self-understanding,[158]

DG's 'schizoanalysis' of desire draws a similar conclusion, although it is

attributed to economy, society and culture:  'Underneath all reason lies

delirium, and drift.'[159]

In particular, earlier interpretations of DG see 'desiring-production'

as an essential connecting link between the two volumes of *Capitalism and*

*Schizophrenia*.[160]  On the other hand, many of the more recent

---

(Minneapolis, Minn.: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1983).  Nicolae Morar and Marjorie Gracieuse, 'Against the Incompatibility Thesis: a Rather Different Reading of the Desire—Pleasure Problem,' in *Between Deleuze and Foucault,* ed. Nocolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016), 232ff.

157 Daniel W. Smith, 'Deleuze and the Question of Desire: towards an Immanent Theory of Ethics,' in *Deleuze and Ethics,* ed. Nathan Jun and Daniel W. Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2011), 138.

158 Michel Foucault, 'The History of Sexuality,' in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, tr. Colin Gordan, Leo Marshall, John Mepham and Kate Soper (New York: Vintage Random House, 1980), 186.

159 Gilles Deleuze [and Félix Guattari,] 'On Capitalism and Desire,' in Gilles Deleuze, *Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953–1974,* ed. David Lapoujade, tr. Michael Taormina (Los Angeles and New York: Semiotext[e], 2004), 162.

160 DG, *Anti-Oedipus,* 5 and passim.  DG, *Thousand Plateaus.*

interpretations emphasise Deleuze's long-running concern with Spinozan-metaphysical continuity which conversely links *A Thousand Plateaus* with *Difference and Repetition.*[161]  Both interpretations are relevant to this thesis: On the one hand, chapter 6 argues that Pentecostal connectivity, creativity and growth—based on distributed-spiritual experiences and practices—can be understood along the lines of accessing DG's rhizome ontology through 'desiring-production;' on the other hand, it is through a higher-generalised metaphysical concern with an ontological 'pluralism' that equates to 'monism'—respectively a differentiated 'univocity of being,'[162] that it is possible to engage ANT (which Latour once suggested could be named an 'actant-rhizome ontology') and alongside it, a more elaborate and tested analytical theorisation of power.[163]  One must, further, be aware that

---

161 Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus;* Holland, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus;* Barber, *Deleuze;* Brent Adkins and Paul R. Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology with Deleuze: a New Cartography* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013).  Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition;* Deleuze, *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza,* tr. Martin Joughin (New York: Zone Books, 1990); Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *What Is Philosophy?* tr. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1994).

162 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 20; Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition,* 37 and passim.  Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition,* 35ff. and 303f.  Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 31.

163 Bruno Latour, 'On Recalling ANT,' in *Actor-Network Theory and After,* ed. John Law and John Hassard (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999), 19.  Law, 'Notes on the Theory;' Law, 'On Power and Its Tacticts: a View from the Sociology of Science,' *The Sociological Review* 34, no. 1 (1986): 1ff.; Latour, 'Powers of Association;' Callon and Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan.'

reading Foucault through Deleuze reinforces a unification of Foucault's

otherwise multifarious power theory through both 'biopower' (cf.

Deleuze's 'control societies') and Foucault's eventual ethical concern.[164]

      To conceptualise the emergent gathering and creation of a

distributed-Pentecostal power 'in' and 'of the Holy Spirit,' chapter 6

proposes an analytical and experimental deployment of the 'rhizome'

concept which DG develop in the methodological introduction to *A

Thousand Plateaus*.[165]  Despite a growing interest in Deleuze, the

researcher is not aware of any substantial theological use of DG's 'rhizome'

to date.[166]  A subversive-analytical (post-structuralist) 'justification' of such

---

164 Gilles Deleuze, 'Postscript on Control Societies,' in *Negotiations, 1972–
    1990,* tr. Martin Joughin (New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia
    Univ. Press, 1997), 177ff.; Thomas Nail, 'Biopower and Control,' in
    *Between Deleuze and Foucault,* ed. Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel
    W. Smith (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016), 247ff.

165 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 22ff.;
    Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 72ff.; Erin
    Kruger, 'Rhizome/Arborescent,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory
    Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee
    (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 153ff.; Colman, 'Rhizome;' Claire
    Colebrook, *Understanding Deleuze* (Crows Nest, N. S. W.: Allen and Unwin,
    2002), xix, xxviif. and 76f.; Todd May, *Gilles Deleuze: an Introduction*
    (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005), 133ff.; Gregg Lambert, 'Notes from
    a Thought Experiment: What Is a Rhizome? (ca. 1976),' in *In Search of a
    New Image of Thought: Gilles Deleuze and Philosophical Expressionism*
    (Minneapolis, Minn., and London: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2012), 45ff.;
    William Bogard, 'Sense and Segmentarity: Some Markers of a Deleuzian-
    Guattarian Sociology,' *Sociological Theory* 16, no. 1 (1998): 52ff.

166 Ward identifies the difference between modern and post-modern culture in

an experimental deployment of this concept would need to amount to a

gathering of distributed strands of reasoning, in addition to the conceptual

link between Foucault's analytics of 'sexuality' and a Deleuzean-libidinal

ontology which has just been presented.  '[P]roceeding from the middle,

through the middle, coming and going rather than starting and finishing,'

together, these different strands amount to a 'justification' of a kind which,

in its nature, is not necessary and preliminary, but rather subsequent to a

successful investigation and construction from distributed strands:[167]

According to Vondey, 'play' is specific to the Pentecostal-Christian

contribution; and Drooger regards that 'religious' practice, as well as its

anthropological investigation, proceeds best in a mode of experimental

ludism.[168]  The examples which Deleuzeans evoke to illustrate the notion of

---

terms of DG's opposition of 'arborescence' and 'rhizome:' Graham Ward, 'Postmodern Theology,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 322ff.  In his discussion of Deleuze's rejection of divine judgement, Hinckly's references a 'rhizomatic anarchy of natural life' which an absolute ordering renders impossible; to then offer no more than a commendation of a Lutheran understanding of 'justification' and 'justice:' Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 191; Gilles Deleuze, 'To Have Done with Judgment,' in *Essays Critical and Clinical,* tr. Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco (London and New York: Verso, 1998), 126ff.

167 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 25.  'The tree imposes the verb "to be," but the fabric of the rhizome is the conjunction, "and ... and ... and ..."  This conjunction carries enough force to shake and uproot the verb "to be." Where are you going?  Where are you coming from?  What are you heading for?  These are totally useless questions.'  Ibid.

168 Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism;* André Droogers, *Play and Power in Religion: Collected Essays* (Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 2012).

rhizomic organisation: swarms, 'wasp and orchid,' fungal mycelia, creativity, the neural structure of the brain etc.,[169] resonated with the researcher's (initially untested) practical-Christian understanding of the construction and nature of engagement with God's Spirit, according to a certain charismatic-revivalist experience/practice. As chapters 5 and 6 will demonstrate, a 'post-structuralist,' counter-modern, confrontation/ subversion of top-down normative and organisational power, vested in both the professional-pastoral ministry as much as in the secular state and culture, is akin to a certain charismatic-revivalist mode of 'spiritual' empowerment, organisational innovation and conceptual creativity. Chapter 6 eventually demonstrates the viability of such an intuitive speculation and experimentation with an experimental deployment of DG's six rhizomatic 'principles' so as to facilitate a conceptual understanding of the gathering, construction and subsequent power of a Pentecostal-embodied ministry and, eventually, the cumulative build-up of 'divine presence' in the 'hot phase' of revival, on the basis of a published Pentecostal ministry account.[170]

---

169 Several of these are mentioned explicitly in DG's 'Rhizome' chapter: DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 6ff.

170 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 7ff.

*(7)  Rhizomic emergence of a theological argument*

With regards to the first goal of this research, to demonstrate that it is possible to account for all dimensions, forms and relations of structure, power and empowerment which are relevant to Christian ministry, using a single, subversive-analytical 'toolbox' approach, it is important that relevant theorisations (by Clegg, Foucault, DG and ANT) are tested in practical-theological and historical studies which relate to relations of power and modes of empowerment that are as different and divergent as possible; due to the independent, and often conflicting nature of their normative understandings, some of these (conventionally) appear to be mutually exclusive or, rather, their mutual relevance and engagement seem difficult to name.  Such a connection is achieved through studying: both the impact and changing relations of, on the one hand, a secular and increasingly hostile (fascist) politics in rapidly shifting times and, on the other side, Christian politics and ecclesiastical-organisational practices (chapter 2); what Barthian-normative empowerment can (could historically) do, and why it (arguably)—both historically and conceptually—hits certain limits (chapter 3); what facilitates the (Protestant) ministry of doctrinal and pastoral oversight and why it is challenging (to say the least) to integrate its forms and resources of

disciplinary empowerment within a Pauline-charismatic ordering of Christian-ministry relations (chapter 4); how, according to published Pentecostal accounts ('testimonies') of the Azusa Street revival, Spirit baptisms facilitate both ethical-embodied and conceptual-theological innovations (chapter 5); whether, according to the Azusa Street revivalist Frank Bartleman's practical understanding, 'Spirit power,' and a distributed-charismatic (self-)organisation, can be conceptualised through the Deleuzo-Guattarian 'rhizome' (chapter 6). Given a higher word limit, one could—in addition—have shown how to (as it were) eliminate the other rook, by including a chapter on the power relations of Catholic-Eucharistic worship. An ANT rationale offers itself as an apposite tool to explore the relevant 'material-semiotic,'[171] social and temporal-spatial dimensions. Piette's ethnography of God in contemporary-European parish-ministry and discourse is a good starting-point; from here, one would further emphasise embodied, objective/material, spatial/temporal dimensions of religious-celebration.[172]

Testing out the analytical capacities—and general suitability—of

---

171 Law, 'Actor Network Theory,' 141 and passim.

172 Piette, *Religion de près;* Piette, *Le fait religieux: une théorie de la religion ordinaire* (Paris: Economica, 2003).

post-structuralist 'toolboxes' requires a reaching out, as far as possible, to the left and to the right, into the extremes of disparately constructed (historical and practical-theological) modes and relations of power, politics, ordering and empowerment.  With regards to this primary research objective, light is thrown upon a range of capacities, strengths and limitations of certain theory relations and analytical tools, as the investigation proceeds from Clegg's 'three circuits' of agency/action, organisation and disciplinary means, to Foucault's concern regarding power working on human bodies, and eventually to a consideration of the possibility of understanding God in Pentecostal experience/practice to be an embodied-distributed 'actor network' and a Deleuzo-Guattarian 'rhizome.'  There is, however, a strategical-theological provocation associated with selecting Barth's dogmatics, the Augsburg Confession, Protestant resistance in Nazi Germany, and the 1906 Los Angeles revival for historical fields of study.  These relational fields have an ongoing material—as it were, a 'normative'—significance within many of today's mainline-Christian—respectively global-Pentecostal—academic-theological discourses; which, in turn, supports an extension of the analytical subversion of the post-structuralist 'toolbox,' as well as its material considerations, into the very heart of certain normative-theological, and practical-pastoral, concerns.  The strategy comes to

fruition as an ethico-theological argument begins to emerge as an effect

from the analytical-relational construction across chapters 2 to 6,

subsequent to a rhizomatic interweaving of power-analytical descriptions of

'essentially' ('normatively') disparate relations.

The mode of this subsequent gathering of these different strands of

theological reasoning into an organic, theological, argument is clearly not

linear in nature, but 'rhizomatic.'[173] As with the case studies of Barmen,

Barth and Azusa Street etc., research begins by grasping distributed and

heterogeneous matters, each on their own terms, 'in the middle.'[174] DG's

rhizome-metaphysical method proceeds by way of connecting 'plateaus'

which are each reconceptualised according to their distinctive reasonings,

yet doing so in a subversive-analytical conceptualisation 'from within' its

relations, and then pursuing—and encouraging—a multiplication of

creative connections and relations into other, 'external' relational fields.[175]

---

173 'It's not easy to see things in the middle, rather than looking down on them
      from above or up at them from below, or from left to right or right to left
      [...].' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 23.  Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,*
      22ff.; Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 72ff.

174 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 21, 23 and 25.  Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,*
      24 and 32; John Protevi, 'Deleuze and Life,' in *The Cambridge Companion
      to Deleuze,* ed. Daniel W. Smith and Henry Somers-Hall (Cambridge and
      New York: CUP, 2012), 254ff.

175 'Every plateau [chapter] in the book [*A Thousand Plateaus*] is an attempt at
      seeing things in the middle.  Each plateau takes up something that we're

DG encourage their readers to further displace their theorisations and understandings, so as to creatively establish additional, external, connections; and thus multiplications and intensifications: 'proceeding from the middle, through the middle, coming and going rather than starting and finishing.'[176] Thereby, 'lines of articulation or segmentarity, strata and territories' must never be seen to exclude 'lines of flight, movements of deterritorialization and destratification.'[177] One must not begin with a definition of one's object or one's relevant categories; nor with essentialised differences or determining one's organising principle or central idea.[178] Instead, one should consider the nature of the emerging capacities and possibilities, subsequent to rhizomatic construction.

---

used to seeing from above or below, as whole and discrete, and seeing it in the middle. That is, seeing where the lines of flight are, seeing what other assemblages it might be connected to.' Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 32. DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 23; Éric Alliez, *The Signature of the World: or, What Is Deleuze and Guttari's Philosophy,* tr. Eliot Ross Albert and Alberto Toscano (London and New York: Continuum, 2004), 100ff.; Paul Patton, 'Mobile Concepts, Metaphor, and the Problem of Referentiality,' in *Deleuzian Concepts: Philosophy, Colonization, Politics* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2010), 19ff.; Lambert, 'Notes from a Thought Experiment.'

176 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 25.

177 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3; Rob Shields, 'Line, Line of Flight,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 99ff.; Tamsin Lorraine, 'Lines of Flight,' in *The Deleuze Dictionary,* ed. Adrian Parr, rev. edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010), 147f.

178 'Insisting that nature must be carved at the joints ensures that all lines of flight are cut off.' Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 30.

Rhizomes have neither static boundaries nor prefixed capacities.

> A multiplicity has neither subject nor object, only determinations, magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the multiplicity changing in nature (the laws of combination therefore increase in number as the multiplicity grows).[179]

As a rhizome spreads, and as rhizomic relations increase, especially where rhizomes become interlinked with other rhizomes to form a weave of multiplicities, rhizomatic capacities both change and increase.[180] 'What a rhizome can do,' grows—it even changes—as rhizomic connections increase and 'multiplicities' and new dimensions are interwoven with one other.[181]

> Form rhizomes by making an asignifying rupture, that is, not by trying to represent something else, but by following a line of flight in order to see where it leads, see what new connections it's capable of. This can never be known beforehand; it can only be discovered through experimentation. Paraphrasing Spinoza, no one knows what a rhizome can do.[182]

---

179 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

180 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8f. Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 26; cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 11.

181 Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 29. Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 1f. Along similar lines, Latour admonishes sociological researchers to refrain from beginning one's investigation by enclosing the field of research and limiting its relevant contributing factors. Instead, one is 'to follow the actors themselves,' as they establish and secure their relevant network relations; thereby, it is just as likely that contributing factors and entities may be gathered over long-range distances as within a specific locality: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 12. Latour once called ANT an 'actant-rhizome ontology:' Latour, 'On Recalling ANT,' 19.

182 Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 29.

It is according to the rhizomatic mode of theological-analytical construction that the different case-study analyses are interwoven and given their different distinctive functions within each strand, or relation, of theological reasoning.

Rather than beginning with (normative) 'justification' or 'definition,' which would limit and enclose the field and scope of exploration,[183] this research is thus established upon 'playful'-ethnographic power analyses of distributed, and disparate, power relations (Barth, Spirit baptism, neo-liberalism etc.) which, in a second step, become inter-connected through a range of (again, disparate) formal and material connective relations: transcendental theory construction, Foucauldian embodiment and changing political reasonings, plus a range of other theological concerns. A second, subsequent, level of consistency becomes apparent with regards to a theological argument which unfolds, both *due to*—and subsequent to—the successive concerns that have been chosen and explored. At this secondary level, the thesis chapters are thus connected through the progressive steps of a theological argument consisting of, again, two major strands. Firstly, there are ecclesiological and practical-theological concerns with Christian

---

183 Latour calls to resist theoretical 'framing' and reference to the 'big picture:' Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 143f. and 185f.

order and theological accountability regarding the power that is relevant to the practice of the Christian ministry:  Is conflict between 'flowing in the Spirit' and ecclesiastical 'oversight' (respectively, modern organisation) inevitable?  Is it conceivable to pursue an exclusively charismatic ordering of Christian relations, in a Pauline sense?  Is Weber's 'routinisation of charisma' inescapable?  Concerns regarding the order of the Christian ministry also interfere with the conceptualisation of God as a power relationship, both in and across distributed religious experiences, practices and understandings.  In order to clarify these (and relating) concerns, the essential relations, which facilitate/empower a traditional pastoral ministry, are being considered by way of the case studies:  In chapter 3, a systematic analysis clarifies the creation of a commanding normative judgement and agency through Barth's theological dogmatics.  In order to understand the challenges involved in empowering ordinary worshippers and congregation members to make a distributed charismatic contribution, within the relations of a conventionally ordered pastoral ministry, chapter 4 investigates: the power relations of the Protestant ministry; access to the pulpit according to the Lutheran doctrinal tradition (4.3); and empowerment through theological formation and professionalism (4.4). Approaching the concern of charismatic empowerment from a different angle, chapter 6 explores the assemblage and development of a Pentecostal-

Charismatic journey, ministry and emergent order 'in the Holy Spirit,' in terms of DG's rhizomatic principles.

The second strand of theological consideration emerges from the deployment of a Foucauldian theory perspective and concerns the clarification of forms of agency construction and empowerment in chapters 3–5. Barth's 'theo-logical dialectics' and the Barmen Declaration of 1934 facilitated a meaningful 'confessing' Protestant confrontation and resistance to ideological state fascism. Thereafter—arguably due to its historical success—Barth and 'Barmen' became one of the most influential contributions of the post-war ecumenical and academic-theological discourse. There is an indication however that, given the more recent historical changes regarding the sociopolitical situation, Barth's theology might begin to reach the limits of its explanatory relevance and instructive power. In chapter 3, a Foucauldian exploration, which focuses on ethical formation, empowerment and different governmental rationales, is able to clarify how Barth's theology—due to its particular theory design—was able to facilitate a political confrontation to the twentieth-century ideological/ totalitarian forms of governmental power; and also how—more recently— it failed to engage a predominantly 'neo-liberal' political rationale and globalised 'rule of the market' in any meaningful way or form. The

question is raised as to how a Christian agency construction might need to be constructed so that—as '*homo spiritualis*'—it is able to empower a counter-modern Christian resistance and critique within a neo-liberal (and post-neo-liberal) political culture (3.6). By way of a Foucauldian ethnographic analysis, chapter 5 explores how Pentecostal-spiritual practice and Spirit baptism empower and introduce change to Pentecostal seekers' sense of self, as well as to their discursive and identity formation. A rhizome-ontological ethnographic analysis in chapter 6 (according to one possible reading) explores how the kind of ethical/relational decisions, which Pentecostal-charismatic worshippers and pioneers make, correlate to the facilitation of a distributed living presence, power and agency of God 'in the Holy Spirit.' Could a Pentecostal/charismatic empowerment, agency construction, theological discourse and facilitation of 'Kingdom' relations of the divine, both in theory and in principle, have the capacity to do better and to do more? The reader should, however, not expect a definitive answer to such questions since theological reasoning is consequential to the main aim of exploring a power-analytical rationale and its relating theory tools. As a theoretical-analytical investigation, this thesis can only hope to do some of the spadework for the analytical understanding of a further theological quest, and to go no further. The reader should not expect an authoritative or full answer to any of the practical, ethical,

ecclesiological or pneumatological issues which this research clearly

touches on, but rather a contribution to establishing the foundation on

which they can be considered.  It is only by way of an evaluative outcome,

at the very end of the research journey, that a certain clarity is achieved

with regards to some important academic-theological findings and

propositions; as well as the provisional shape of a theological argument.  It

is thus appropriate that it is only in the thesis conclusion that, for the

purpose of further discussion, certain analytical-theological considerations

are presented in full.

## 0.3  Review

In order to further contextualise the research presented in this thesis,

the subsequent concise review will serve to clarify some of the relevant

systematic perspectives and contributions concerning power and its

theorisation within the fields of Christian theology and Pentecostal/

Charismatic studies.

*(1) Power in theology and Pentecostal studies*

Theological reflection on the history of Christian leadership and church order continues to be framed within the categories of 'charisma' and 'office' as they were introduced in an extended controversy between the legal historian Rudolph Sohm and Adolf Harnack in the 1890s and 1900s.[184] From here, Weber develops 'types of legitimate domination' and an understanding of the dynamics of their transformations. These continue to provide a major categorical framework of research in the areas of sociology/anthropology of religion.[185] Weber's theory of the 'routinisation of charisma' continues to guide and to guard the imaginations of researchers into contemporary Pentecostal Christianities; and it continues to be challenged and undermined by its findings. Only recently, poststructuralist—mainly Foucauldian—perspectives and sensitivities have entered this field of study through academic engagements with postcolonial concerns and with African politics. The following considerations aim to

---

184 Nardoni, 'Charisma in the Early Church.'

185 Max Weber, *Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology,* 2 vols., ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (Berkeley, Cal., and London: Univ. of California Press, 1978). Referencing Sohm: ibid., 216 and 1112. 'Types of legitimate domination:' ibid., 212ff. 'Charisma and its transformations' ('routinization' theory): ibid., 246ff. and 1111ff. Predominance of Weberian power-theory in the study of religion since 1980s: Beckford, 'The Restoration of "Power".'

identify a knowledge baseline and point of departure.  A complete review

of relevant literature is not intended.  The predominantly theoretical and

systematic concern of this research justifies presenting ethnographic/

anthropological research alongside power theory and theological

exposition.

Bourdieu calls to correct Weber's simplistic 'illusion of absolute

autonomy' in charismatic leadership which is based upon (alleged) direct

access to divine inspiration, through consideration of the interaction of

different roles within the religious field and work by which—over time—

religious players accumulate religious competence and power.[186]  Weber's

routinisation of charisma, and the related 'secularisation' hypothesis, fail to

account for reversed dynamics—within modernisation(s)—such as: the

return of religion, witchcraft and traditional identities/resources; or the

possibility of charismatic liquidisations of power structures and routines.[187]

Following their explorations into global Pentecostalism(s) in the early

1990s, Martin and Cox saw the need to revise their position regarding the

---

186 Bourdieu, 'Legitimation and Structured Interests.'

187 A complete review of relevant literature is not intended and not necessary for the purpose of this research which is to explore and highlight some of the difficulties which emerge from Weberian, conventional social-theory informed, and normative-theological accounts of power-relations relevant to Christian ministry, and to mark a starting point.

secularisation hypothesis.[188]  Ethnographic research into Pentecostal power

relations began to correct common (mis-)conceptions and generalisations,

one at a time.  In her Weber-informed account, Meyer shows how Ghanaian

Pentecostals do *not* evoke a generalised religious rationality, but instead a

returning pre-modern/pre-Christian spirit world, as they engage with the

modern dynamics and challenges of modernisation, globalisation and

individualisation.[189]  Kirsch shows how, in Zambian Spirit churches, books,

literacy and documentation are, in effect, power tools which are being used

to enhance—rather than undermine—the 'charismatic' nature of Christian

leadership.[190]  In his early, predominantly text-based, research on power

and Christian leadership, Percy formulates a double-normative, both neo-

Weberian sociological-phenomenological *and* 'orthodox liberal'[191]

theological interpretation/critique of the 'domination' power of Pentecostal

188 Cox, *Fire from Heaven;* David Martin, *Pentecostalism: the World their Parish* (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002); Martin, *Tongues of Fire: the Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America* (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1990).  Cf. Cox, *Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective,* new edn (Princeton, N. J., and Woodstock, Oxon: Princeton Univ. Press, 2013); Martin, *On Secularization: towards a Revised General Theory* (Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2005).

189 Birgit Meyer, *Translating the Devil: Religion and Modernity Among the Ewe in Ghana* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1999).  On Meyer's Weberianism: ibid. xixff., 53, 110f. and 213ff.

190 Thomas G. Kirsch, *Spirits and Letter: Reading, Writing and Charisma in African Christianity* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2008).

191 Percy, *Power and the Church,* 2.

leadership (John Wimber).[192] According to Percy—then—'charismatic'

evangelical leaders conflate an ideologically (theologically and

relationally) regulated divine power with leadership domination.[193] In a

fluid 'postmodern' cultural situation, which lacks the orienting framework

of a normative meta-rationale, 'charismatic' leadership would sidestep

Weber's dynamics of routinisation/rationalisation and prolong their

'charismatic' domination by dispositional, doctrinal and social-

organisational innovation, 'flux and change.'[194] Percy's Wimber study fails

to acknowledge how Vineyard leaders facilitate charismatic-embodied

liberation, individualisation and empowerment amongst ordinary

worshippers; often with—in the long run—disruptive effects which are

likely to fracture the homogeneously united followership that Weberians

imagine 'charismatic' leaders would evoke. After engaging in participant

observation to study the rise and demise of a 'charismatic' movement at the

Toronto Airport Christian Fellowship, between 1996 and 2002, Percy

---

192 Percy, *Words, Wonders and Power;* Percy, *Power and the Church,* 59ff. On 'fundamentalism:' Percy, *Words, Wonders and Power,* 9ff.; Percy, *Power and the Church,* 64ff.

193 Reference Clegg's 'dispositional power' and 'nodal points:' Percy, *Words, Wonders and Power,* 45ff., 51f., 87f., 95 and 125f.; Percy, *Power and the Church,* 7, 10 and 75ff. Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 185 and 199; Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,* 112 and 113; cf. Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

194 Percy, *Power and the Church,* 10f.

discards, not only the 'fundamentalism' misnomer (which was previously

central to his interpretation of Pentecostal power), but even the Weberian

account of leadership as 'charisma'/domination.[195] Percy's Pentecostal

research demonstrates how a Weberian categorical scheme may lead to

misrepresentations of Pentecostal 'charismatic' dynamics and relations of

power. By deploying a standardised canon of 'legitimate' social categories

of their own, social theorists/researchers—alongside theologians and

Christian-professionals—are also important players in the politics of

normativity which facilitate both religious accountability and

construction.[196]

Some research seeks to negotiate the powers, actions and currents

which are relevant to religion along binary considerations of 'good' versus

'bad' power. The anthropologist Droogers replicates Sohm's office–

charisma juxtaposition as a differentiation of 'power' and 'play.' Thereby,

'power' stands for hierarchical social domination, and 'play' for religious

---

195 Percy, *Power and the Church,* 101ff.; Percy, '"Sweet Rapture:" Subliminal
    Eroticism in Contemporary Christian Worship,' *Journal of Theology and
    Sexuality* 6 (1997): 70ff.; Percy, 'The Morphology of Pilgrimage in the
    "Toronto Blessing",' *Religion* 28, no. 3 (1998): 281ff.; Percy, 'Adventure and
    Atrophy in a Charismatic Movement: Returning to the "Toronto Blessing",'
    *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 20, no. 1 (2005): 71ff.

196 Cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 227ff. and 52.

culturally productive innovation.[197]  In a similar vein—yet from a

systematic-theological perspective—Vondey sees Pentecostal and Holy

Spirit 'play' as introducing new vitality and creative space and flexibility to

the more disciplined traditions and practices of historical and mainline

Christianity and its theological discourse.[198]  Droogers also gives 'play'

methodological priority in the pursuit of thick ethnographic description,

thereby replicating poststructuralist epistemological sensitivities.[199]  The

Anglican theologian Sykes offers a theological account of different forms

and understandings of power as they relate to common sense, political

theory, scripture and theological reflection.  In line with Sykes'

theologically reflected concern with social justice, power deployments are

morally tagged as 'pejorative,' ambivalent or 'benign.'[200]  By way—

mainly—of an implicit dogmatic assumption, Sykes reaffirms a paramount

---

197 Droogers, *Play and Power.*

198 Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism.*

199 Knibbe and Droogers, 'Methodological Ludism;' André Droogers,
'Methodological Ludism: beyond Religionism and Reductionism,' in *Play
and Power in Religion: Collected Essays* (Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter,
2012), 311ff.; Droogers, 'The Third Bank of the River: Play, Methodological
Ludism and the Definition of Religion,' in *Play and Power,* 357ff.; cf.
Droogers, 'Essentialist and Normative Approaches,' in *Play and Power,*
30ff.; cf. DG methodologically giving 'cartography' priority over 'tracing:'
DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 13ff.

200 On the side of political theory and sociology, Sykes engages in particular
with Lukes' neo-Marxian 'three-dimensional' theorisation: Lukes, *Power.*

link and conflation between the powers of the gospel and the cross, with

the rule of theologians and the hierarchical office (if understood and

practised 'appropriately') both in and over the ministry of the church.[201]

Just like Percy's biased judgement of Christian 'fundamentalism,' Sykes'

doctrinal/ecclesiological work is a normative intervention within the

politics of power itself, and thereby a defence and reinforcement of an

asymmetrically constructed status quo, in which everybody's understanding

of right and wrong is determined by ministerial and theological

accountability.  In addition to (Hobbesian) top-down domination being

reflective of political 'sovereignty,' oppression, control and divine

omnipotence, Pasewark's 'theology of power' identifies a second

dimension of theological-divine power.  With Foucault's 'biopower' and

distributed micro-practices, Luther's sacramental theology and Tillich's

existential-soteriological conceptualisations, Pasewark identifies a

different, whilst yet correlated, creative-salvific power which he names 'the

communication of efficacy' and which is reflective of this-worldly ubiquity,

salvific encounter, grace and love in the Spirit of God.[202]  Kearsley attends

to—and, in some respects, misconstrues—Foucault's theorisations of

---

201 Sykes, *Power and Christian Theology.*

202 Kyle A. Pasewark, *A Theology of Power: Being beyond Domination*
(Minneapolis, Minn.: FortressPress, 1993).

power and the feminist politico-cultural challenge as he develops

Pasewark's differentiation, within the overarching concept of power,

towards an ecclesiological and practical-theological concern, concluding

that churches must begin to account for the destructive and constructive

reality of power within the relations of local-Christian communities.

According to Kearsley, Foucault's research sees a ubiquitous and pervasive

presence of power as a contributing factor which inter-engages with other

features of social relations at the grass-roots level of local engagement.[203]

With a thorough understanding of today's Anglican culture (from an

Australian perspective), Ogden refers to Foucault—as well as to Arendt and

Rahner—pointing out that, by its very nature, 'sovereign power' within

Christian order implies practices of systemic exclusion and 'epistemic

hubris.'  Like Sykes, Ogden emphasises that the church must therefore

never forget her vocation and be proactive in creating spaces in which

freedom can be reimagined.[204]  Pasewark, Kearsley and Ogden appear to

eschew some more radical Foucauldian conclusions as regards the

systematic relationship between practice and discourse within modern

forms of power and domination.  All three, innocently, continue to call

---

203 Kearsley, *Church, Community and Power.*

204 Steven G. Ogden, *The Church, Authority, and Foucault: Imagining the Church as an Open Space of Freedom* (London and New York: Routledge, 2017).

upon Christian leadership and draw conceptual necessity and moral urgency from normative-ecclesiological argumentation. In addition, Ogden continues to rely upon the improvement and reformation of institutional and professional practices, procedures and training/formation to facilitate greater 'trust, transparency, accountability.' After completely misconstruing 'micro-power' as being different to 'disciplinary power' and 'bio-power,' Kearsley even goes so far as to charge Foucault with missing 'clear normative control for his theory' and—without further analysis or discussion—also with rendering 'widely shared assumptions such as the value of ideology, a generic defining of humanity and the reality of the human subject' to be problematic.[205] Asad's postcolonial and Foucauldian challenge to the asymmetrical imposition of authoritative readings onto a cultural 'other' is not only relevant to anthropology, but also to all ecclesiastical practices of theological assessment and expert discourse.[206] As Asad demonstrates, the self-deception is established upon the modern presumption that—similar to thinking within modern-academic

---

205 Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault,* 159; Kearsley, *Church, Community and Power,* 43ff., 215 and 216.

206 Talal Asad, 'The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology,' in *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (London and Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993), 199; cf. Richard King, *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and 'the Mystic East'* (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 211.

discourse—our modern-enlightened, 'better,' religion, theology and

Christianity, is to be (and all religion should be) separated from power—

though in reality, it is not.[207]

James proposed the consideration of religious (mystical) experience

as a psychological state of the mind that, only by a secondary move, may

relate to—and facilitate—reflective (theological) insight and social

ordering.  Happold further develops and explores such an understanding.[208]

The ethnographer Mauss first identified learned, habitual 'techniques of the

body'—the disciplining of bodily composure—as being pivotal to the

transmission of social ordering into individual-emotional (psychological)

formation as well as being central to the creation of a shared morality,

consciousness and—in some cultures—self-reflective, reasoned control and

agency.

> [...] at the bottom of all our mystical states there are techniques of the
> body [...] there are necessary biological means of entering into
> communication with God.[209]

In the 1970s the concern with techniques of the body became central to

---

207 Asad, 'Construction of Religion,' 28.

208 James, *Varieties of Religious Experience,* 379ff. and 430ff.; Happold,
    *Mysticism.*

209 Marcel Mauss, 'Techniques of the Body,' tr. Ben Brewster, *Economy and
    Society* 2, no. 1 (1973): 87.

Foucault's work into power relations and modern identity formation.[210]

Political theorists have successfully used Foucauldian concepts and lenses

in order to gain understanding of the often disruptive nature of the politics

of (some) sub-Saharan communities, nations, and their identity formations,

which would have been impossible using a Hobbesian framework.[211]

According to the anthropologist Marshall, the aim of 'conversion' ('making

a complete break with the past') and related embodied practices and self-

practices of Nigerian Pentecostals such as prayer, miracle healing, spiritual

warfare, declarations and enactments of 'faith,' is to facilitate alternative,

eschatologically empowered and renewed, 'subjectivation' and

'governmentality' (Foucault). And this taking place under the conditions of

an uncertain and deteriorating political and economic situation, rife with

conflict, corruption and power abuse.[212] Different from Marshall, this

research emphasises that Pentecostal performance can facilitate a

charismatic pluralisation of ethical self-formations and understandings.

Foucault's understanding of 'sexuality' is used as an analytical tool in the

---

210 Elden, *Foucault: Birth of Power;* O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 42ff. and 96ff.;
Rouse, 'Power/Knowledge;' Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 101ff.;
Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 37ff.; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Foucault,
*History of Sexuality*, vol. 1; Foucault, *Power/Knowledge.*

211 Bayart, *State in Africa;* Mbembe, *On the Postcolony;* Mbembe, 'African
Modes of Self-Writing;' Mbembe, 'Necropolitics.'

212 Marshall, *Political Spiritualities,* 45, 51 and passim.

clarification of Pentecostal embodied power formation.  Rooted in a

Jamesian understanding of mystical experience, the psychological

anthropologist Luhrmann proposes that the God relationship of North

American 'Third Wave' evangelicals is based upon learning to imagine and

experience an invisible biblical reality, in addition to the mental capacity of

'absorption' ('flow').[213]  This, nonetheless, is relevant to a Foucauldian and

Deleuzo–Guattarian reconstruction of the Pentecostal-embodied experience

of divine realms and powers.


Bialecki's newly published ethnographic research into the manifold

relations of the miraculous within Wimber-influenced ('third-wave')

evangelicalism uses Deleuzean insights into a distributed-relativistic virtual

and the ontological inter-engaging of assemblages.[214]  ANT not only

considers natural, material and technological objects to be 'actors' within

the context of social relations—on equal terms with humans and semiotic

relations;[215] in addition, Latour emphasises that 'spirits, divinities, voices,

ghosts, and so on'—similar to the invisible agencies and forces of the

213 Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back;* James, *Varieties of Religious Experience;*
     cf. Happold, *Mysticism.*

214 Bialecki, *Diagram for Fire.*

215 Cf. principle of 'generalized symmetry:' Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,'
     197ff.; Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 103ff.

market, the rule of law, organisations or ideas—also have their invisible

agency and powers; and, in some way, an external provenance.[216] From a

Pentecostal point of view, Latour's linguistic experimentation of evoking a

sense of religious presence—religious truth as a rendering present of 'love,'

and even of the distant beloved—remains strangely individualistic,

incorporeal and introspect.[217] This is the case despite the fact that, in other

places, Latour forcefully argues in support of the externality, materiality

and constructedness of pre- and non-modern religious powers and powerful

objects;[218] and owes this understanding to the ongoing influence of

Bultmann's theological existentialism on Latour's Christian-Catholic

practice.[219] Piette offers a seminal ANT ethnography of ordinary religious

---

216 Though this challenges academic observers' understanding, '[p]ious souls
have an uncanny obstinacy to speak as if they were attached to spirits,
divinities, voices, ghosts, and so on. [...] But divinities, spirits, and voices
live a rather cramped life inside the individual person's sphere. They are too
precise, too technical, too innovative. They move too wildly and they
obviously overflow the individual capacity of invention, imagination, and
self-delusion. And besides, actors still insist they are made to do things by
those real entities "outside" of them!' Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 234f.

217 Versions of Latour's 'sermon:' Bruno Latour, *Rejoicing: or the Torments of
Religious Speech,* tr. Julie Rose (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity,
2013); Latour, 'Thou Shall Not Freeze Frame;' Latour, '"Thou Shalt not
Take the Lord's Name in Vain"—Being a Sort of Sermon on the Hesitation
of Religious Speech,' *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 39, no. 1 (2001):
215ff. Cf. also: Anders Blok and Torben Elgaard Jensen, *Bruno Latour:
Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World* (London and New York: Routledge,
2011), 158f.

218 Latour, 'Cult of the Factish Gods.'

219 Bruno Latour, 'Coming Out as a Philosopher,' *Social Studies of Science* 40,

interaction, discourses and routines, in the parish and church-district

meetings of French Roman Catholics.  Here, the aim of planning and

ordinary parish communication/interaction is to render present an absent

divine.  As members of parish teams follow their different agendas and

hold their contradictory points of view, they are—time and time again—

made to re-engage with each other: by the gospel, during prayer and

Eucharistic celebration, by familial discursive tolerance and 'love' and, in

and across all of these, by distributed traces—and a circulating presence—

of the divine.[220]  Much may be comparable; however, to Pentecostal

revivalists, divine power and presence is a more disruptive, risky and

manifestly transformative concern.  Welker's relativistic pneumatology

offers a distributed understanding of God as Spirit.  It includes a concept of

ever-renewing situational hope for salvific unities (and unity) based

precisely upon the foundation of *strengthening* a distributed particularity,

specific identity and difference.  As a biblical-messianic hope, it reaches

deeper and further than modern-organisational and political achievement

and understanding: 'beyond justice and morality,' 'beyond the acquisition

of political loyalty,' 'beyond the condition of [...] a particular time and

---

no. 4 (2010): 600f.

220 Piette, *Religion de près*.

situation,' 'beyond imperialistic monocultures' and 'beyond nature.'[221]

However, Welker's pneumatology does not draw on embodied-Pentecostal

transformation experiences; instead, he holds biblical-theological insights

in cross-disciplinary dialogue with natural sciences, and engages them with

structural and systemic-functionalist theorisations of secular modernity.

*(2) Foucault, Deleuze and theology*

Beyond the immediate concern of this research which is to explore—

including the compatibility of—analytical theorisations of power, it is

worth taking into account the current and unfolding academic-theological

encounters relating to Foucault and Deleuze. The following discussion

focuses mainly on monographic contributions.[222]

---

221 Welker, *God the Spirit,* 108, 124, 134, 147 and 158.

222 In addition to the monographic literature which is discussed below, the following edited volumes and published papers offer valuable access points to current and unfolding discourses: James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette, ed., *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience* (Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004); Christian Bauer and Michael Hölzl, ed., *Gottes und des Menschen Tod? die Theologie vor der Herausforderung Michel Foucaults* (Mainz: Grünewald, 2003); John McSweeney, 'Foucault and Theology,' *Foucault Studies* 2 (2005): 117ff.; Lindsay Powell-Jones and F. LeRon Shults, ed., *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016); Mary Bryden, ed., *Deleuze and Religion* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001).

Several theologians choose to engage with Foucault within a normative discursive formation.  Although Milbank accuses Foucault (along with Nietzsche, Deleuze and others) of 'nihilism' and 'ontological violence,' which a Christian-theological discourse must duly avoid, exponents of 'Radical Orthodoxy' continue to reference Foucault and other poststructuralists in their analysis and critique of modern power and culture.[223]  Beyond the Radical-Orthodoxy core group, Tran reframes a Foucauldian power analysis and ethics within a normative-theological affirmation of divine omnipotence and apocalyptic victory.  Foucault's eventual interest in early-Christian practices of (ascetic) 'self-care' and courageous witness in the face of power should direct today's Christian-political resistance whilst, at the same time, reframe and correct Foucault's secular 'hope' and 'resistance,' within the relations of the church's eschatological 'witness,' which posits the power of the 'coming Kingdom'

---

223 Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory,* 278ff.; Graham Ward, 'Kulturkritik im Dienste der Theologie,' in *Gottes und des Menschen Tod? die Theologie vor der Herausforderung Michel Foucaults,* ed. Christian Bauer and Michael Hölzl (Mainz: Grünewald, 2003), 129ff.; Ward, *Cultural Transformation and Religious Practice* (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2004); James K. A. Smith, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: Mapping a Post-secular Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004), 42f. and 67f.; cf. Ward's interpretation of Barth through Derrida: Ward, *Barth, Derrida and the Language of Theology* (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1995).  Stephen Carr, 'Foucault amongst the Theologians,' *Sophia* 40, no. 2 (2001): 31ff.; Barber, *Deleuze,* 83ff.; Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt,* 58ff.

against tyrannical oppression.[224]  A Foucauldian power-analytics and rationale can thus be deployed to either erode or reassert normative and theological control.

Much contemporary academic-theological engagement reads Foucault through the 'final Foucault's' examinations of embodied subjectivisation and the possibilities of distributed resistance and ethical freedom within pervasive relations of power and (theological) truth, often asking which of the different approaches to the production of theological and pastoral truth(s) would correspond to a truly liberated (embodied and pluralised) Christian agency.[225]  In addition to affirming Nietzsche's proclamation of the 'death of God,' Foucault, according to Bernauer, undermines the transcendental human subject, thereby freeing up conceptual space for a new theological quest.[226]  Bernauer understands

224 Jonathan Tran, *Foucault and Theology* (London and New York: T. and T. Clark, 2011).

225 Bernauer and Rasmussen, *Final Foucault;* Foucault, *Use of Pleasure*; Foucault, *The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of The History of Sexuality,* tr. Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1986); Foucault, *The Courage of the Truth (The Government of Self and Others II): Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–1984,* ed. Frédéric Gros, tr. Graham Burchell (Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).  Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight;* Carrette, *Foucault and Religion;* Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt;* McSweeney, 'Foucault and Theology.'

226 James Bernauer, 'The Prisons of Man: an Introduction to Foucault's Negative Theology,' *International Philosophical Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1987):

Foucault's exposition of an 'archaeological' method of historical-epistemic analysis and his later quest into embodied-ethical formation and freedom, in terms of a non-transcendent mysticism and 'negative theology.'[227] Bernauer points out that, in his final lectures, Foucault, on the one hand, charges the Christian tradition—through the introduction of practices of ascetic self-renunciation, 'confession' and 'pastoral' oversight—of giving rise to: the 'power/knowledge' of the human sciences, the modern (disembodied and frightened) 'soul,' a docile and obedient human agency and fascist oppression. On the other hand, Foucault identifies an (at first Socratic, Cynic and then) Christian-mystical tradition of παρρησία (frank utterance) which, in view of the costs of revolutionary (or expressive) freedom and speaking truth to power, chooses wisdom and a detached and austere living—respectively a bold responsiveness to mystery and outspoken confidence in God's saving love.[228] Fuggle deepens such a

---

365ff.

227 Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 90ff. and 178ff.; Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge;* Foucault, 'A Preface to Transgression,' in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews,* ed. Donald F. Bouchard, tr. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977), 29ff.; Michel Foucault and Maurice Blanchot, *Foucault—Blanchot: Maurice Blanchot: the Thought from Outside,* tr. Brian Massumi and Jeffrey Mehlman (New York: Zone Books, 1990); cf. Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 90ff.

228 James Bernauer, 'Michel Foucault's Philosophy of Religion: an Introduction to the Non-Fascist Life,' in *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience,* ed. James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette (Aldershot,

Christian appropriation of Foucault by comparing Foucault's ethics and 'care of self' with Paul's παρρησία and soteriology in the New Testament. She thereby aims to further clarify—against the backdrop of the latest political-philosophical engagements with Paul and the church's theological tradition—how a purposeful and celebratory political resistance can emerge and colonise the fissure between the ever-deferred deployment of the state (Agamben's 'empty throne' of 'glory') and an unaccountable management of 'the economy.'[229]  In the process of gathering a Foucauldian 'religious question' from the margins, as it were, of Foucault's academic concerns, Carrette calls for restraint to be exercised.  He identifies a two-step Foucauldian disruptive-creative challenge ('political spirituality') of both a conventional-theological and secular-modern discursive truth within their pervasive relations of power and discipline.  He does so, firstly, by accounting for Foucault's concern in the 1960s to express the 'silenced'

Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004), 77ff.; Michel Foucault, *The Courage of Truth (The Government of Self and Others II): Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–84,* ed. Frédéric Gros, tr. Graham Burchell (New York: Picador, 2011); cf. Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 130ff.; cf. Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 52ff.

229 Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul;* Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Alain Badiou, *Saint Paul: the Foundation of Universalism,* tr. Ray Brassier (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2003); John Milbank, Slavoj Žižek and Creston Davis, *Paul's New Moment: Continental Philosophy and the Future of Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos, 2010); cf. Stanley Hauerwas, 'The Christian Difference, or Surviving Postmodernism,' in *The Blackwell Companion to Postmodern Theology,* ed. Graham Ward (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2001), 144ff.

'spiritual'-embodied experiences of an 'other,' which modern and transcendental-'theological' reason and discipline exclude. Then, in a second step, he re-engages this 'spiritual corporality' with Foucault's later concern of establishing the modern power, discipline and management of human bodies and embodied selves through an analysis of the Christian (Roman-Catholic) 'confession,' the coerced disclosure—and repudiation—of 'the truth' of oneself and one's sexual desires.[230]

Since Foucault's embodied-sexualised 'spirituality' is not at all concerned with renewing a material-Christian understanding and practice, but rather with the possibilities of a secular-philosophical (even 'atheist') critique and a widening of the range of late-modern embodied modes of experience, knowledge and identity formation, a Christian-theological learning from Foucault must refrain from premature, immediate engagements of Foucault's 'spiritual' concern, material insights and argumentative dynamics.[231] Following Butler, feminist, queer and liberal-contextual biblical scholars and theologians deploy Foucauldian conceptualisations of the embodied-discursive performances of gender,

---

230 Carrette, *Foucault and Religion.*

231 Jeremy Carrette, 'Rupture and Transformation: Foucault's Concept of Spirituality Reconsidered,' *Foucault Studies* 15 (2013): 52ff.; Timothy Fitzgerald, 'Problematising Discourses on Religion,' *Culture and Religion* 2, no. 1 (2001): 103ff.

normality and its subversion.  They challenge the dominant-theological—

and biblical—discourses and discursive practices, which impose male-

hierarchical power/truth relations, conventionalise and normalise gender

roles and silence women and marginalised voices.[232]  Carrette points out

that the ambiguity of 'queered' sexual practices, relationships and identities

could assist a necessary theological pluralisation which would wrestle

human bodies, self-understandings and the Christian divine from

normative-discursive control.[233]  Accordingly, Althaus-Reid's explorations

of a Latina-queer liberation theology push into 'indecent,' unstable-

'nomadic,' and thereby creative, explorations which go beyond—and yet

also challenge—the enclosures of normalised-heterosexual embodiment

(desire), ideology and theology.  Althaus-Reid's theology both references

---

232 Butler, *Gender Trouble;* Lynne Huffer, 'Foucault and Queer Theory,' *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018), 93ff.  Kamitsuka, *Feminist Theology;* Sharon D. Welch, *Communities of Resistance and Solidarity: a Feminist Theology of Liberation* (Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 1985); Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: a Discourse of Power* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1991); Olu Jenzen and Sally R. Munt, 'Queer Theory, Sexuality and Religion,' in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Contemporary Religion and Sexuality,* ed. Stephen J. Hunt and Andrew K. T. Yip (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), 45ff.; Heather McKay, 'She Said to Him, He Said to Her: Power Talk in the Bible or Foucault Listens at the Keyhole,' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 28, no. 2 (1998): 45ff.

233 Jeremy Carrette, 'Beyond Theology and Sexuality: Foucault, the Self and the Que(e)rying of Monotheistic Truth,' in *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience,* ed. James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette (Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004), 217ff.

and resonates DG's work on *Capitalism and Schizophrenia.*[234] Whereas

previous theological engagements with Foucault and other post-

structuralists were often framed in terms of 'postmodern' philosophy and

culture,[235] in view of political developments after the 2008 financial crisis,

most recent contributions often engage with Agamben's proposition to

complement and deepen Foucault's understanding of contemporary-

Western 'neo-liberal' modes of political thought with an analysis of the

Christian-theological tradition; once again offering the master narrative for

today's (Western-)'secular' political order.[236]

---

234 Althaus-Reid, *The Queer God* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003); Althaus-Reid, *From Feminist Theology to Indecent Theology: Readings on Poverty, Sexual Identity and God* (London: SCM, 2004); Marcella Althaus-Reid and Lisa Isherwood, 'Thinking Theology and Queer Theory,' *Feminist Theology* 15, no. 3 (2007): 302ff.; cf. DG, *Anti-Oedipus;* DG, *Thousand Plateaus;* Kristien Justaert, 'Liberation Theology: Deleuze and Althaus-Reid,' *SubStance* 39, no. 1 (2010): 154ff.; Jenzen and Munt, 'Queer Theory, Sexuality and Religion;' Huffer, 'Foucault and Queer Theory.'

235 Mark C. Taylor, *Erring: a Postmodern A/theology* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1984); James K. A. Smith, *Who's Afraid of Postmodernism? taking Derrida, Lyotard, and Foucault to Church* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2006); Graham Ward, ed., *The Postmodern God: a Theological Reader* (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1997); Sharon D. Welch, '"Lush Life:" Foucault's Analytics of Power and a Jazz Aesthetic,' in *The Blackwell Companion to Postmodern Theology,* ed. Graham Ward (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2001), 79ff.; McSweeney, 'Foucault and Theology.'

236 Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Leshem, *Origins of Neoliberalism;* Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul;* cf. Tran, *Foucault and Theology.* Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.*

Foucault already moved this research's post-structuralist concern with power (and theological truth) towards that of the formation—and liberation—of embodied subjectivities, agencies and ethics. Engaging Deleuze and DG not only introduces additional conceptual resources for the understanding of difference, resistance and innovation. They push one even further: into concerns with a post-structuralist metaphysics and the this-worldly facilitation of thought and innovative conceptualisations as they inter-engage with the perceptive relations to an 'external' world reality. Even as early as *Difference and Repetition,* Deleuze presents a foundational critique of the analogical, representational and transcendental (respectively, theistic) construction of truth within conventional-European thought and theology. In the tradition of Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas and Kant, representational discourse, according to Deleuze, fails to account for the 'gap' between language and its relationships with external referents; and it fails to consider any kind of difference other than opposition, similarity, analogy or resemblance, i.e. always based upon—thus contained by—a shared identity. Deleuze evokes a philosophical/theological sub-current which reaches from the Stoics, via medieval Nominalists, to Spinoza and Nietzsche, and proposes a consistently this-worldly, non-idealistic and non-representational— 'univocal,' immanent and materialistic—facilitation of a radical conceptual creativity and

pluralisation. As the transcendent(al) 'other,' absolute and beyond is 'folded' into Deleuze's 'plane of immanence,' theism facilitates a creative multiplication of subversive ('atheist') religious deformations and innovations.[237]

As with Foucault's analytics of power, truth and ethics, it is possible to contain Deleuzean post-structuralist theorisations and metaphysics within the relations of a conventional normative-theological concern. Within the Roman-Catholic discourse, Pflaum proposes to rethink the 'communication of properties' between divinity and humanity ('God' and 'this world') in Christ, in terms of a univocal and post-representational metaphysics which begins with 'difference' (i.e. not 'identity').[238] Hart and Simpson refer to Deleuze in terms of an absolutising metaphysics of

---

237 Barber, *Deleuze,* 41ff.; Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology;* Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt,* 36ff.; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 1ff.; Jason Wallin, 'Immanence/Plane of Immanence,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 87ff. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition;* Deleuze, *Francis Bacon: the Logic of Sensation,* tr. Daniel W. Smith (London and New York: Continuum, 2003); Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy,* tr. Hugh Tomlinson (London and New York: Continuum, 1986); Deleuze, *The Logic of Sense,* ed. Constantin V. Boundas, tr. Mark Lester with Charles Stivale (London: Athlone, 1990); DG, *What Is Philosophy?*

238 Michael Pflaum, *Deleuze's Differenzdenken und die Idiomenkommunikation: eine neue Perspektive der Theologie* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998). Instead, Shults identifies a radical-atheist critique of the doctrine of incarnation with Deleuze: Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology,* 102f. and 112.

difference and creative play—thus another monotheism—which they regard as being surpassed by the perichoretic difference and loving life of the divine persons of the Trinity.[239]  Adkins and Hinlicky call to reverse the Kantian-transcendental (ethical/epistemological) division of the fields of religion, theology and philosophy (pure reason) through a Deleuzo-Guattarian ontology of rhizomatic assemblages.  DG's univocal metaphysics becomes the protology to a theological turn from 'simile' (analogy) to the more compelling paradoxes of a metaphorical re-imagination of the incarnation and revelation of the incarnate and publicly disgraced God.[240]  Leaving behind both Platonic-analogical metaphysics and the Cartesian (transcendental) self-constituting self, a Christian-theological subjectivity—and ethico-political challenge—emerges from a 'rhizomic' and eschatological engagement with: '[t]he total Christ, the assemblage of Jesus and His people:'

> [...] this achieved transcendence within immanence that comes by the joyful exchanges in which Jesus binds every burdened person to Himself and therewith to one another.[241]

---

239 Christopher Ben Simpson, 'Divine Life: Difference, Becoming, and the Trinity,' in *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion,* ed. Lindsay Powell-Jones and F. LeRon Shults (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016), 59ff.; Simpson, *Deleuze and Theology* (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2012), 63ff.; David Bentley Hart, *The Beauty of the Infinite: the Aesthetics of Christian Truth* (Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003); cf. Milbank, *Theology and Social Theory,* 381.

240 Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology.*

Shults finds Deleuze to be an 'icon-breaking machine, that liberates thinking, acting, and feeling from the repressive power of Images of transcendence' and calls for a complete abandonment of a conventionally European-analogical (or 'representational') rationale.[242] Shults sees Deleuze invert the Platonic foundation of European theological and philosophical thought, according to which the ideal model determines what may counts as its (imperfect) reflections, so as to make room for a creative, immanent 'chaosmos' in which 'simulacra' and 'phantasmic' relations may arise.[243] Shults calls for an anti-Christology—an 'Anti-Christ,' along the lines of DG's 'Anti-Oedipus'—and for a 'schizoanalytical' reversion of transcendent, idealistic, negative-normative, disembodied and morally restrictive ways of conceptualisation within the European Christian-theological, as well as philosophical tradition. Deleuzean philosophical-theological concepts, according to Shults, attempt to clear the field of conceptualisation, subverting and transforming the noetic structures of a two-natures-Christological ('sacerdotal') representation/repression of difference ('perversion'). Shults offers a readable and insightful

---

241 Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 215. Ibid., 144ff. and 186ff.; Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul.*

242 Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology,* 1.

243 'Everything becomes simulacrum, but this becoming is not a participation *in* or resemblance *of* anything [...].' Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology,* 27, orig. emph.

introduction to DG's and Deleuze's non-theistic univocity and metaphysics.

From amongst the multifarious conceptual innovations in DG's *Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus,* Shults explores the atheistic dissolution of theism, religious normativity and oppression, through the notion of the 'nomadic war machine' facilitating rhizomatic-revolutionary subversion and creative eruption.  However, his effort at deploying DG's theorisation of 'social machines' for a description of the late-modern cultural situation, in terms of an 'overcoding' group paranoia and despotism encountering a 'deterritorialising' capitalist production and global marketisation, as well as his proposition that the forces of secularist-atheist rebellion (the 'war machine') must be assisted as they undercut old religious-oppressive delusions, lack the analytical clarity and sophistication of, for example, Fuggle's Foucauldian and secular-Pauline political and ethical analysis.[244]

Barber warns against confusing immanence with post-Christian secularism, as the modern construction of 'the secular' (vs. 'religion') is itself established upon the common, non-univocal, understanding of

---

244 Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology,* 140ff.; Shults, 'The Atheist Machine,' in *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion,* ed. Lindsay Powell-Jones and F. Leron Shults (London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016), 163ff.; DG, *Anti-Oedipus;* DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 351ff.; Eric Jenkins, 'War Machine,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 195ff.

immanence. Deleuzean 'differential immanence' supersedes majority-Christian analogical transcendence as much as it does post-Christian secularism (atheism), since both limit and subjugate imagination, innovation and change to the extent that they can be mediated with an ongoing stabilisation of the 'majoritarian' status quo.[245] Barber explicitly explores—and rejects—Milbank's and Hart's normative-analogical framing of Deleuzean univocal metaphysics.[246] Barber would also purport a correction and refinement of Shults' 'atheistic'-iconoclastic deployment of Deleuze since a 'minoritarian'-Christian (spiritual and theological) imagination and politics clearly remains conceivable within differential immanence and its commitment to conceptual-structural innovation; a future which truly breaks with the presently given;[247] Barber finds a model of such an immanent 'naming of God' in Yoder's Jesuanic-Mennonite and this-worldly political resistance to domination.[248]

---

245 Barber, *Deleuze.*

246 Barber, *Deleuze,* 77ff.

247 By setting itself up as modern overcomer of theology/religion, the modern secular fails to establish 'a genuinely immanent relation with the world' so that '[i]mmanence must adopt a radically critical perspective of the secular.' Barber, *Deleuze,* 212f.

248 Barber, *Deleuze,* 110ff.; John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster,* 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994).

Where Shults hopes to stimulate a further creative 'secretion of atheism,'[249] Carlsson Redell aims to correct a liberal-Protestant conceptualisation and practice. Similar to Shults, Carlsson Redell calls theology to abandon philosophical 'representation' (transcendentally anchored identity/truth) and learn from Foucault and Deleuze to conceptually facilitate otherness and embodied-spiritual creativity. Caught up with a theological and metaphysical tradition of 'representation' and 'analogy,' liberal-Protestant pastoral practice habitually embraces—and thereby suffocates—dissidence and real difference within a fuzzy-Christian (or modern-liberal) commonality, universalisation and reductive reference to an empty conceptual identity.[250] A (Deleuzean) 'post-representational,' creative and critical engagement with the Christian tradition and reference to theism, eternity and transcendence 'could open up a playful, yet serious, form of post-Christian resistance:'

> To repeat, parody and play with whatever comes to the fore as eternal, or as the truth of concrete experience—when reading and doing theology—in order to make room negatively for those realities, actual but unknown, unthinkable yet possible, that no language could ever capture.[251]

Shults and Carlsson Redell embrace the Deleuzean call to embrace

---

249 Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology,* 9 and passim.

250 Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt;* cf. Münker and Roesler, *Poststrukturalismus.*

251 Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt,* 169.

difference by abandoning a representational and 'arborescent' (binary, mono-hierarchical and idealistic) metaphysics.[252]  They also recognise the this-worldly relations and forces of spiritual practices, spirits and the divine.  They, however, fail to consider the pneumatological-conceptual, practical-spiritual and 'rhizomatic' capacity of embracing otherness and facilitating creativity and true difference within emerging and distributed cultures of reconciled engagements and hoped-for unifications of 'love' and of 'peace,' in a Deleuzo-Guattarian 'plane of consistency.'[253]  Simply recognising and imitating, as Hart and Simpson appear to propose, the hovering-normative ideal of a Christian-totalising Trinitarian love and life within ethico-cultural situations does not do justice to the distributed-practical—and indeed noetic—challenges, implausibilities and improbabilities of the task of acknowledging and constructing concrete and reconciled differences, even 'in the Spirit of God.'[254]

In line with the radical and subversive-political thrust of Deleuze's work, Justaert engages liberation-theological, feminist, ecological-

---

252 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.; Kruger, 'Rhizome/Arborescent.'

253 Cf. Welker, *God the Spirit.*  Ronjon Paul Datta, 'Plane of Consistency,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 137ff.

254 Hart, *Beauty of the Infinite;* Simpson, *Deleuze and Theology.*

theological concerns (especially Althaus-Reid's 'indecent theology') with

Deleuze so as to develop 'an immanent theology of life' which strengthens

more marginal, radical-political and mystical, elements within the Christian

tradition, over and against the normative-ecclesial mainstream.  Deleuze's

creative-ethical and spiritual metaphysics of immanence could, further,

'help theology to liberate God*self* from the category of transcendence' in

such a way that the divine life connects all life, as differences are

emphasised and clarified.[255]  A Deleuzean-immanent theology

conceptualises divine transcendence in terms of a dispersed 'God in the

margins,' 'micro-God,' or 'God-as-process.'[256]  Alongside Althaus-Reid,

Justaert calls for a 'dialogical and communitarian' Christology that comes

with a message that is not unchangeably fixed in history: 'A Christology

that encourages all flowing.'[257]  The 'becoming-Messiah' of the New

Testament is a Deleuzean multiplicity of heterogeneous-salvific encounters

which marginalised groups and individuals have had, and continue to have,

---

255 Kristien Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze* (London and New York: Continuum, 2012), 7 and 8.  Justaert, 'Liberation Theology.'

256 Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 35f.

257 Marcella Althaus-Reid, 'Do not Stop the Flow of My Blood: a Critical Christology of Hope among Latin American Women,' in *From Feminist Theology to Indecent Theology: Readings on Poverty, Sexual Identity and God* (London: SCM, 2004), 52; Justaert, 'Liberation Theology.'

with Jesus.[258]

> 'Jesus Christ is no longer a male subject, but a dynamic collective of individuals who are not considered to be subjects (e.g. poor women). The "collective Jesus" evolves continually (in space and time) in a process of becoming-Messiah.'[259]

Participating in this dialogical, communitarian and ever-evolving Christ requires 'giving up your subjectivity,' slipping 'through all categories:' 'becoming-minoritarian' alongside Althaus-Reid's 'girl prostituted in Buenos Aires in a public toilet by two men.'[260]

Engaging theological and poststructuralist-philosophical linguistics, metaphysics, ethics and politics with the task of envisioning an alternative, pluralised and post-normative, Christian theology is, however, not central to the approach and substance of this thesis. Rather, the theological consideration of such Foucauldian and Deleuzean-philosophical concerns becomes relevant in the fringes and peripheries of some of this research's

---

258 Justaert, 'Liberation Theology,' 157ff.

259 Justaert, 'Liberation Theology,' 160. Cf. Michael Welker, *God the Revealed: Christology,* tr. Douglas W. Stott (Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013).

260 Justaert, 'Liberation Theology,' 158; Marcella Althaus-Reid, 'On Wearing Skirts without Underwear: Poor Women Contesting Christ,' in *From Feminist Theology to Indecent Theology: Readings on Poverty, Sexual Identity and God* (London: SCM, 2004), 84. Girls as 'becoming-woman:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 275ff.

findings.  The reviewed discussions indicate the need for some important, whilst yet subsequent, theological decisions which must be considered at a different time at another time and place.  With regards to engaging Foucauldian and Deleuzean perspectives with Christian theology, spirituality, practice—and equally, with the task of exploring resources for an 'ethnographic' power analytics of the range of relations relevant to the Christian ministry—two further points must be made.  One must refrain from uncritically aligning one's Christian spiritual/religious practice, theological understanding and conceptual analytics with certain Foucauldian, Deleuzean, atheistic and modern-philosophical propositions, which, both conceptually and strategically, underdetermine, overstate, misrepresent and misappropriate Christianity, religion and relating concerns, particularlz those that concern the presence, work and understanding of the divine Spirit.  Here, just a few shall be mentioned. Foucault conceives of 'pastoral' Christian practice as being majorly centred in the 'confession,' which he sees as being facilitative of—and modelling— totalitarian domination, obedience and control, whilst introducing the fear of a despotic God to submissive believers.  He further constructs this restrictive (Roman-Catholic) practice by juxtaposing it with the liberating (Hellenistic-philosophical) tradition of παρρησία (straight talking).  In a similar manner, a Deleuzean imaginative framing, as identified above,

represents an atheistic, 'Anti-Christian,' 'demonic' or 'indecent' creative subversion, resistance and opposition against a two-natures Christian-'sacerdotal' representation and repression (Shults). These—and other—post-Christian imaginations aim to facilitate and stabilise Foucault's and Deleuze's analytical-conceptual philosophical counter-propositions, but yet (rightly or wrongly) imply that one must part ways with religion, Christian practice, a material doctrine of God etc., if one is to aim for innovation, difference, change, political resistance, liberation, creativity and life. All the research that has just been discussed makes this point, each in its own way and with different levels of analytical depth. With regards to the power-analytical concern of this research, any strategical, polemical—or even normative-material—imposition or preliminary definition as to what 'religion,' 'Christianity,' 'spirituality' or 'God' might be, must be duly avoided. For this reason, the researcher will be highly selective with regards to what Foucauldian (and Deleuzean) theorisations and perspectives are deployed and sensitive in any suitably refashioning and formalisation of their relevant contributions. This brings us to the final point concerning the nature and use of, in particular, Foucault's analytics of power. The already examined, more recent theological (and philosophical) encounters with Foucault share a perspective that departs from a previous, more limited, rather 'sociological,' interest in Foucauldian power analytics.

Reading 'the complete Foucault' back-to-front introduces curtailed and otherwise flawed imaginations of Christianity.  In addition, it comes at the cost of falling for a somewhat misguided perception of a unified Foucauldian theorisation of power which Foucault himself introduces through successive layers of discursive-theoretical reframings of his previous, detailed explorations of a range of specific power relations.[261] The perception of a unified-modern/Christian power situation is further enhanced since theological interest engages with Deleuze's metaphysics and political ethics of immanence and also since, after the financial crash of 2008, (post-)secular political philosophy and ethics turns to Paul and the patristic-theological tradition—alongside Foucault and Deleuze—to clarify the workings of a neo-liberal politics of the state and contemporary possibilities of political-subversive action, resistance and change.[262]  As this thesis only investigates the possibility of a descriptive power analytics of theological/ecclesial truth relations, practices, agency constructions and God, it uses a more modest—sociological-ethnographic—'toolbox' approach which eclectically exploits Foucault's theorisations, and those of others.

---

261 Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault.*

262 Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul;* Leshem, *Origins of Neoliberalism.*

# 1  A (Single) Distributed and Strategic Analytics of Power

The first chapter of this research offers an initial introduction to power-analytical perspectives that are relevant to this research. These include: Clegg's efforts at formulating a comprehensive framework of power relations that are relevant to organisational concerns; Foucault's concern with power, in terms of the practical and discursive formation of embodied-human identities; and a relativistic-ontological (metaphysical)[1] theorisation. With regards to the latter, in this chapter (since it features explicit considerations regarding power), Actor Network Theory (ANT) replaces Deleuze and Guattari's (DG's) metaphysics of rhizomic exploration which, in turn, will be used to conceptualise the distributed-charismatic presence and power of God in the final chapter. Since each of these theory deployments feature a theory perspective, language and concern of their own, chapter 1 aims to demonstrate that an analytical-

---

1    Michael Welker, 'Alfred North Whitehead's Basic Philosophical Problem: the Development of a Relativistic Cosmology,' tr. Eric von der Luft and Frank Eberhardt, *Process Studies* 16, no. 1 (1987): 1ff.

descriptive power-theoretical method is common to each; and that they also share a Foucauldian power concept in which distributed practices and means correlate to the formation of overarching strategies.

In conventional-modern understanding, power appears to be a fragmented field of multiple-interlocking concerns which, even at the level of (secular-)political and social theory, are difficult to conceptually connect, especially when it comes to tracing processes in situations which are fluid and shifting in nature. In addition, when it comes to the power relations of Christian ministry, it is important that 'the secular' engages with 'the religious.' Christian doctrine and theology both inform and challenge ministerial power; as do powers such as personal authenticity, spirituality and the miraculous, albeit in different ways. In addition, as one listens to theologians and religious leaders, God (the Holy Spirit) must be conceived as engaging with each and all of these power dimensions and concerns; being both a power relation by itself and a source of power which is both critical and affirmative, in a range of forms and ways. More recent—mainly French-inspired 'poststructuralist' sociological theory—has pointed out that within foregone modern-political and organisational theory, a common top-down normative theory design has concealed the very resources and operations by which power becomes established and

operates.  If this problem occurs within the 'secular' theorisation of power, similar effects will also be seen within mainstream Christian doctrine, thereby creating problems as regards power relations of Christian ministry, religious experience and God.  This thesis intends to demonstrate that an approach to the descriptive analysis of power, which would allow for a coherent understanding of different power relations relevant to the ministry, would be one which is: bottom-up, non-normative and ethnographic; physical, practical and meaningful; distributed and strategic.

This chapter surveys a number of relevant power-theoretical approaches.  Each draws upon a range of original concerns and represents distinctive language games.  One must demonstrate how they all imply—or contribute to—power theory.  In addition, one must demonstrate that they share the same—or at least comparable and complementary approaches— towards theorising power.  This exploration brings theory characteristics and features into focus and examines specific analytical lenses, strengths, limitations and tools.  The introduction of Clegg's three-circuits framework, at the beginning of chapter 2, should be read as a systematically necessary next step of exploration.  Clegg's theory does not however provide us with *'the definition'* of power which underpins this research as a whole.  Instead, it is included, in the first place, as a means of

showing the full complexity of any effort to arrive at a *comprehensive* understanding of both the power relations and the various facets that one would need to consider.  Thereafter, a representative selection of Clegg's contributing theorisations will be deployed for an analytical consideration and clarification of a first set of practical-theological, as well as historical-theological, concerns with organisational power and politics.

## Promise of theoretical integration

*(1)  Clegg: organisational power*

Clegg's 'three-circuits' framework offers a descriptive-analytical (Foucault-influenced 'subversive') theorisation[2] which aims to directly conceptualise all relevant dimensions of modern-organisational power. Clegg's power concept builds upon a comprehensive examination of twentieth-century sociological power theory, incorporating many theory contributions: Clegg uses Dahl's (previously paradigmatic) theorisation of power, which is both mechanistic and behaviouristic, to conceptualise 'episodic agency' in the first circuit, i.e. the direct engagement of players

---

2    Cf. sections 0.1 and 0.2, above.

using resources in pursuit of their goals within relevant 'rules of the game.'[3] He considers Weber, alongside Foucault, pointing to the modern-disciplinary challenge and the relevance of resistance to organisational legitimacy;[4] he refers to Laclau and Mouffe—and especially Callon (ANT)—to conceptualise the 'fixing' of 'rules governing relations of meaning and membership' in the second, 'dispositional,' circuit.[5] Furthermore, he bases his understanding of systemic pressures, competition and the emergence of hegemonies, in the third, 'facilitative,' circuit on Hannan and Freeman's organisation-ecological theorisation of environmental selection, together with DiMaggio and Powell's isomorphism concept.[6] These are just a selection of the relevant theorists

---

3    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 84, 209 and passim.  Ibid., 211ff.; Dahl, 'Concept of Power;' Dahl, 'Power.'

4    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 175ff. and 189ff.; Clegg, 'Weber and Foucault: Social Theory for the Study of Organizations,' *Organization* 1, no. 1 (1994): 149ff.  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, tr. Colin Gordon et al. (New York and Toronto: Random House, 1980).

5    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 226, 84, 210, 14 and passim.  Ibid., 178ff. and 203ff.; Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy;* Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

6    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 15 and passim.  Ibid., 134ff., 225ff. and 233ff.; Michel T. Hannan and John Freeman, *Organizational Ecology* (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993); Paul J. DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell, 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields,' *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 1 (1983): 147ff.

that Clegg's framework engages as it aims to supersede Lukes' modern-obsolete 'three-dimensional power.'[7]  Although not central to this research—and not our 'definition' of power—Clegg's three circuits will be introduced in chapter 2 for an initial identification of the inter-connected concerns that are involved in relations of power.  Following a Foucauldian understanding of agency as a disciplinary achievement, and Callon's symmetrical theorisation, Clegg also admits non-human players to his power analytics.  Whilst in principle, Clegg considers 'machines, germs, animals and natural disasters' to have agency and power,[8] the main use of this idea is to theorise collective and strategic agency within modern-organisational contexts.  His acknowledgement of nonhuman-constructed agency—at least in principle—distinguishes Clegg's power framework from otherwise comparably convincing theorisations of organisational power, and is relevant to this study, in as much as our power concerns include divine and spiritual forces: the Holy Spirit, angels, the demonic, invisible 'fires,' 'flows' and 'winds.'  Haugaard develops a power-analytical approach by fixing the conceptual problems in Giddens'

---

7  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 86ff.; Lukes, *Power.*

8  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 188.  Explicitly, Clegg acknowledges 'the humble rat,' the carrier of the bubonic plague, as an agency contributing to the late-Medieval changes in social structure, power and the very course of history: id., 233f. and 244f.

structuration concept.  In many ways, Haugaard's theorisation is similar to

Clegg's and—as an organisational power theory—it performs comparably

well.  However, from such a starting point, Haugaard is unable to embrace

non-human agency.  One must disagree with Haugaard's naive-modern

assumption that neither machines, nor buildings, nor animals have a

rationality of action, and are thus devoid of agency and power.  Haugaard

also wrongly considers rationality and agency to be human prerequisites,

rather than cultural and personal achievements.[9]

Whilst Haugaard's theorisation is deficient in some areas, should one

wish to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the powers of religious

forces and beings, Clegg's categories and theorisations also remain

insufficiently generalised.  In several areas, Clegg remains too closely

aligned with the theoretical modelling of modern-organisational,

administrative and political concerns.  Although perfectly suitable for

appropriate delineations of most power concerns within modern and

historical Christianity (see below, especially chapter 2), a direct application

of Clegg's theory is neither able to facilitate a comprehension of the divine

within Pentecostal/charismatic experience, nor can it assist with an

---

9    Haugaard, *Structures, Restructuration and Social Power;* Haugaard,
     *Constitution of Power,* 54 and 49ff.

understanding of power relations that are less reinforced, further distributed, frequently evolving, fluid, shifting and vague. Clegg's 'relations of meaning and membership'[10] are fixed and reified through *'obligatory'* nodal or passage points.[11] He theorises socially distributed agencies as being merely collective-disciplinary achievements within organisations; and conceives of system integration and change in terms of organisation ecology: as being driven by 'institutional isomorphism,' organisational adaption, evolutionary innovation and competition.[12] Pluralistic-charismatic self-organisation, agency, creativity and salvation are different and more sophisticated. Often, the relations and flows of power as Spirit emerge, evolve, flourish and subsist, beneath the radar of organisational and modern forms of power, in ecological niches, wastelands and in-between modern enclosures.[13]

In order to be successful, according to Foucault, an '"analytics" of power' must leave behind a Hobbesian, purely negative concern with

---

10  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 219, 226 and passim.

11  On 'nodal points' and 'obligatory passage points:' Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 185, 204f., 207 and passim, emph. DQ.

12  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 227. Cf. on 'isomorphism' and the organisation-ecological contribution: ibid., 225ff., 233 and 234ff. On organisations achieving agency: ibid., 187f. and 193ff.

13  Preliminarily, on pluralistic-charismatic relations: cf. Welker, *God the Spirit.*

juridical representation: legislation, sovereignty and repression.  Instead, one is to ask, 'Through which mechanisms, or tactics, or devices?'  One must observe what happens at 'points of resistance.'[14]  With reference to Foucault's work on power, Clegg assumes a poststructuralist and post-Marxian paradigm shift.  Power theory must leave behind a constitution in the individual human subject, its central concern with sovereignty, and a normative 'ethics-of-power' theory design.  It must concern itself with micro-practices, with signification, and with decentring human subjectivity and agency in a 'very concrete and descriptive' approach to power theory.[15] Foucault, Clegg, Laclau and Mouffe, and ANT have shifted the function of theory from a model which *serves* power politics (through a moral-normative legislation as to what power is, and why and how it is to be established) towards an agnostic ethnographic description of the means and strategies by which power operates—complete with morals, legitimacy and

---

14 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 82, 89, 90, 95 and 96.  Cf. Foucault, 'Truth and Power,' *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977,* ed. Colin Gordon, tr. Colin Gordon et al. (New York and Toronto: Random House, 1980), 121; Foucault, 'Power and Strategies,' *Power/Knowledge,* 139ff.; Foucault, 'History of Sexuality,' 184ff.; Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–1976,* ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, tr. David Macey (London and New York: Penguin, 2004), 34f. and 89ff.

15 Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 182 (fig. 7.1) and 152.  Ibid., 1f., 21f., 36ff., 38, 150 and 182ff.

founding myths amongst its resources.[16]


*(2)  Foucault: power, discourse, embodiment*


Foucault's work on power in the 1970s, sought to clarify how historical changes in discursive formations occur.  He refers to Kant's transcendental epistemology so as to clarify the notion that an 'archaeological' quest into historical 'epistemes' must search for—not a transcendental—but rather their respective 'historical *a priori*s.'[17]  From such a starting point, researching the historical conditions of the formation of human agency and ethics is only a small step away.[18]  Foucault's main writings concerning power show how the working together of power, discourse and practices facilitate human identity formation.[19]  Whilst

---

16  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 30ff., 34ff. and 34 (fig. 2.1); Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy;* Bauman, *Legislator and Interpreters;* cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 41.

17  Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 144; O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 62f.; Gary Gutting, *Foucault: a Very Short Introduction* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2005), 36f.; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 55ff., 83 and 91ff.

18  Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 212 and 224f.; Kögler, *Michel Foucault,* 25ff.

19  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1; Foucault, 'Truth and Power,' 112ff.; Foucault, 'Subject and Power.'  In the transition from 'archaeology' to 'genealogy,' Foucault identifies the historical epistemic preconditions as shaped by relations of power/discourse: Gutting, *Foucault,* 50ff.  Thompson retraces this transition in greater detail, albeit through the lens of Foucault's earlier epistemic-archeological

Foucault's understanding of power changes with his learning—but also according to the theoretical/political concerns which he pursues in his communications—[20] his overall understanding of power remains shaped by a concern to clarify relations between: power and discourse; understanding the formation of human identity and personality as power effects; and contemporary politics.[21] Such concerns identify the strength—but also the limitation—of Foucauldian power analysis, for our purposes. Chapters 3–5 of this research deploy Foucault's theorisation(s) of power in order to clarify and compare the many different modes of—both 'religious' and 'secular'—(individually-)embodied empowerment, agency creation and ethical formation; as well as demonstrating how these engage—or fail to engage—with changing historical and political situations. As has just been pointed out: (1) Foucault's 'archaeology' explores distributed micro-practices of power as historical preconditions of the discursive generation of truth relations; (2) his theorisations of power aim at ethical/human-

---

concern: Kevin Thompson, 'From the Historical *a priori* to the *dispositif*: Foucault, the Phenomenological Legacy, and the Problem of Transcendental Genesis,' *Continental Philosophical Review* 49, no. 1 (2016): 41ff.

20  Elden, *Foucault: Birth of Power;* Elden, *Foucault's Last Decade;* Marcelo Hoffman, *Foucault and Power;* Bublitz, 'Macht.'

21  For the last reference, in particular refer to: Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–1978,* ed. Michel Senellart, tr. Graham Burchell (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007); Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.*

identity formation; and (3) his analytic-theoretical concern interlinks the

ethical formation of agency and discursive truth relations, whilst

identifying micro-powers/practices as their contingent-historical *a priori*.

And insofar this is the case, Foucault's theorisations of power can be said

to deploy a quasi-Kantian formal frame.[22]  Such a theoretical perspective

comes with certain features and strengths—which one must explore—as

well as limitations—of which one must be aware.  Whilst some of the

strengths of Foucauldian power theory will be explored in chapters 3–5,

alongside its limitations, one finds that, due to its quasi-Kantian formal

frame, Foucault's power theory is unsuitable for a descriptive analysis of

the distributed relations of the Pentecostal-charismatic divine.  Chapter 6

therefore parts with a Foucauldian research perspective and instead

embraces the realistic-metaphysical lens of ANT and of DG's *A Thousand*

*Plateaus.*

 If one reframed Foucault's understanding of power using Clegg's

power theory, an emphasis would be placed upon the way in which, in the

'dispositional circuit'—as well as in embodied-human agency in the

---

22 This implies that, on the material side, Foucault explicitly rejects a Kantian-
trancendental theorisation: Thomas R. Flynn, 'Foucault on Experiences and
the Historical *a priori*: with Husserl in the Rearview Mirror of History,'
*Continental Philosophy Review* 49, no. 1 (2016): 60ff.

'episodic circuit'—epistemic formations and overarching power strategies become facilitated by disciplinary (and other) power techniques in the circuit of 'system integration.'[23] Foucault develops his power analysis in a way which recognises that the modern-Hobbesian understanding of political power as juridical domination is insufficient. Beneath a common conception of power as a right that some 'hold,' transfer and deploy over others,[24] power takes the form of many practices and techniques. At every level, it engages with resistance; and is productive—even creative—in the facilitation of embodied agency, capacity and identity. '[D]ispersed, heteromorphous, localised procedures of power are adapted, reinforced and transformed by [...] global strategies.'[25] Modern theory continues to conceive of power in terms of sovereignty and legitimacy (autonomous

---

23  On 'episteme:' Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 211ff.; Friedrich Balke, 'Episteme,' in *Foucault-Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 246ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 28ff. and 106ff.; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 17ff., 96f. and 121. On disciplinary power: Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Marcelo Hoffman, 'Disciplinary Power,' in *Michel Foucault,* ed. Taylor, 27ff.; Devonya N. Havis, 'Discipline,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 110ff.; Jürgen Link, 'Disziplinartechnologie/Normalität/ Normalisierung,' in *Foucault-Handbuch,* 242ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 40ff. and 149f.; Rouse, 'Power/Knowledge;' Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 134f., 143f. and 153ff.

24  Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* 13; cf. Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 81ff.; Foucault, 'Power and Strategies,' 139ff.

25  Foucault, 'Power and Strategies,' 142. Foucault, *The History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92ff.

agency and social structure). In practical terms, though, no longer is the deployment of power—or the devising of strategy—located in a central or specific human body/agency.[26] Power analysis must thus begin from an observation of distributed 'techniques and tactics' from below, or, alternatively, from an observation of the many resistances to power practices. Only then, may one understand the nature of an overarching strategic organisation.[27]

## (3) ANT and DG: rhizome-metaphysical analytics

ANT was developed in order to facilitate ethnographic research of the natural sciences and technology. It tends to be introduced as an innovative theory language and method.[28] By comparison with Foucault, this 'sociology of translation' aims for a higher level of methodological control and theoretical abstraction. Though dismissive of a juridical-

---

26 '[...] the representation of power has remained under the spell of monarchy. In political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king.' Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 88f. Foucault goes on to commend Machiavelli's theorisation 'in terms of force relationships,' but 'without the persona of the Prince.' Ibid., 97. Foucault, 'Truth and Power,' 121f.; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish.*

27 Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* 34. Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 95ff.

28 E.g. Law, 'Actor Network Theory.'

normative theorisation and aiming instead for a descriptive-analytical

exploration of historically emergent relations of power, Foucault continues

to pursue a genuinely political theory approach.  ANT, instead, requires a

category scheme that is thoroughly 'agnostic' in nature; and applied in

'generalized symmetry.'[29]  Therefore, the practical-political relevance of

ANT insights may only be a subsequent achievement requiring additional

effort beyond that of an analytical understanding.[30]  Just as Foucault's work

on power examines the effects of technologies, techniques and discursive

practices within the formation of embodied agency; ANT introduces

material and technological dimensions to our understanding of modern

society, power and life.  ANT thus became an alternative way to approach

the task of social theory.[31]

Law points out that the ANT 'sociology of translation' can be

compared to Foucault's work on power, as well as to DG's poststructuralist

rhizome metaphysics, in that, together, they extend mere-linguistic insights

into 'a semiotics of materiality.'  Each and every entity comes to exist as

---

29  Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 200; cf. Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 103f.

30  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 260ff.

31  Latour, *Reassembling the Social;* cf. Matei Candea, ed., *The Social after Gabriel Tarde: Debates and Assessments* (London and New York: Routledge, 2010).

the performativity effects of its manifold relations, which include bodies

and material relations of different kinds, in particular, architecture,

technology and practices.  Both Foucault and ANT have developed a

method of descriptive analysis which is 'material semiotic,' in that it sees

everything in society and nature as resulting from webs of relationships

which are materially and discursively heterogeneous.[32]  Clegg's framework

should be considered material semiotic only insofar as he integrates

Foucauldian and ANT theory elements into his theorisations, e.g. as he

explores the importance of disciplinary and productive-technological

innovation within the facilitative circuit.[33]

Clegg's framework draws on a range of other (in a few cases,

explicitly) modern-organisational theorisations, of which two shall be

---

32  Like Foucault, ANT offers 'a semiotics of materiality:' John Law, 'After ANT: Complexity, Naming and Topology,' in *Actor Network Theory and After,* ed. John Law and John Hassard (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999), 4.  Latour also acknowledges Foucault's congeniality and proximity to the ANT analytical approach, though for political reasons, mainly in the footnotes; Foucault provides an exceptional 'analytical decomposition of the tiny ingredients from which power is made' whereby, differing from his interpreters, he resists referencing a power which would be 'behind,' rather than alongside or subsequent to, activities and conceptual relations: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 86 (fn. 106).  Foucault's major achievement is his re-construction of the many layers of human individuality and agency, again, as effect rather than a precondition of power and its network relations: ibid., 212f. (fns. 284 and 285).

33  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 206, 219 and 232ff.

named: Clegg's understanding of socially distributed agency construction remains majorly oriented towards that of a collectively supported, shared understanding and discipline across a modern organisation.[34] In addition, Clegg's conceptualisation of the systemic-facilitative circuit, and its impacts on social-dispositional integration and change, relies on explicitly (modern) organisation-analytical theorisations of both 'institutional isomorphism' and organisation-ecological selection.[35] In both instances, Clegg's organisation-analytical framework trades conceptual generalisation for a theorisation of less 'hard-wired' non-modern organisational forms of power and agency, which includes the 'living' presence/power of a distributed-charismatic divine: The emergent agency of God's Spirit, or the relations/capacities of God's Kingdom, (according to the Pentecostal-charismatic understanding developed in chapter 6) should be

---

34  'In terms of this book, agency is not a generic term for people: it may well often refer to collective forms of decision-making, such as organization. In fact, the terms organization and agency are necessarily coupled. Agency is entailed in most definitions of organization, which usually refer to purposeful goal-oriented action.' Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 187f. Similar, e.g., Giddens: 'Organizations and social movements are what Touraine calls "decision-making units," utilizing certain typical forms of resources (authoritative and allocative) within discursively mobilized forms of information flow.' Giddens, *Constitution of Society,* 203. Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen and Frank Dobbin, 'The Social Invention of Collective Actors: on the Rise of the Organization,' *American Behavioral Scientist* 40, no. 4 (1997): 431ff.

35  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 233ff.; DiMaggio and Powell, 'Iron Cage Revisited;' Hannan and Freeman, *Organizational Ecology.*

conceptualised in terms of a (modern-organisational) collective will; and, although the organisation-environmental selective pressures of isomorphism and innovation are not irrelevant to understanding the subsequent success of certain Pentecostal-charismatic innovations within specific modern-organisational historical situations and cultures, the organisation-environmental reasoning, which is introduced in section 2.1.3 of the second chapter, is too narrowly defined, and too specific, to facilitate an account of Pentecostal innovation in the way that is attempted in the final chapter of this thesis. Unlike Clegg's theorisation, DG's rhizome concept and ANT suitably facilitate research into the Pentecostal-charismatic mode of spiritual experience and the subsequent construction of God (and other 'invisible' entities and powers), according to a certain Pentecostal/charismatic practice and understanding. As has previously been mentioned, Latour's 'non-modern' metaphysics[36] explicitly allows for spirits and gods, as constructed actor-network agencies.[37] Thus, Latour

---

36  Latour calls it a 'constitution:' Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 14f. and 138ff.

37  Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 46ff. and 138ff; Latour, *Modern Cult.* Within ANT, ontologies, together with self-concepts, ethics and epistemologies, in the first place, are political deployments by which actors gather, defend and fortify their power-networks in competitive and controversial environments. Only by a reflective self-application of the concept of actor-network creation by 'translation'/association, may an ANT sociology be itself turned into an ontological (epistemological, political) proposition. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 249ff.; cf. Latour, *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence: an Anthropology of the Moderns,* tr. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 2013); cf. Annemarie Mol, 'Ontological

offers an insightful—albeit curiously non-corporeal—ANT attempt at

religious speech;[38] and Piette successfully deploys a Latourian-analytical

approach to the re-construction of 'God'—as an agency and actor

network—through and across ordinary religious action/discourse within a

mainline-European parish context.[39]  However, the researcher came to the

conclusion that DG's rhizome methodology of creative-metaphysical

exploration more appropriately facilitates chapter 6's ethnographic analysis

into the formation of Pentecostal ministry capacities, and an investigation

into the charismatic-distributed presence, power and agency of God's

Spirit.  After all, both Latour and Law hint at a far-reaching similarity

between ANT—which could be considered to be an 'actant-rhizome

ontology'—and DG's metaphysical proposition.[40]  Recently, Harman (and

others) have recognised ANT as being reflective of a metaphysics/ontology,

akin to Whitehead, Bergson and DG in that the construction of focused

networks—created from chains of 'translation,' with a disregard of the

common 'bifurcation' of symbolic culture and matter/nature—is central to

---

Politics: a Word and Some Questions,' in *Actor Network Theory and After,*
ed. John Law and John Hassard (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell,
1999), 75ff.

38  Latour, *Rejoicing;* Latour, 'Thou Shall Not Freeze-Frame.'

39  Piette, *Religion de près.*

40  Latour, 'On Recalling ANT,' 19; Law, 'Actor Network Theory,' 145f.

its conception of the real world.[41]  DG's *A Thousand Plateaus* and ANT

thus share a concern for the material-and-symbolic integration of 'the

natural' and 'the cultural' into a single ontological perspective, as well

possessing a similar core understanding that all reality is constructed

through rhizomic connections between distributed and heterogeneous

entities.  As has been previously indicated, Foucault's work on power

follows quite a different, (quasi-)Kantian, theory design with practices,

disciplines and power facilitating epistemic regimes and changes, including

the formation of human subjectivity.[42]  Following Benton's rationale, Clegg

opts for a thorough 'moral relativism' within a 'realistic epistemology;'[43]

and then chooses to place—at the centre of his framework—Laclau and

---

41  On 'bifurcation of nature:' A. N. Whitehead, *The Concept of Nature: Tarner Lectures Delivered in Trinity College, November 1919* (Cambridge: CUP, 1920), 26ff., esp. 30.  On 'translation:' Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.' Bruno Latour made the philosophical reading of ANT explicit: Latour, *Modes of Existence;* Latour, 'Coming Out;' Latour, *Never Been Modern;* cf. Harman, *Prince of Networks.*  Cf. Law, 'Actor Network Theory;' cf. Keith Robinson, ed., *Deleuze, Whitehead, Bergson: Rhizomatic Connections* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).  Consider also the circulatory nature by which an ANT 'sociology of associations' eventually emerges as itself an actor-network effort at tracing—in its own terms—the assemblage of the many modes or regimes, which together facilitate the circulation of 'the social;' and all the time, being surrounded by an incommensurable sea of the unconnected, and thus unknown: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 237ff. and 241ff.

42  Cf. Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 212 and 223ff.; cf. Kögler, *Michel Foucault,* 25ff.

43  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 86f., 95f., 118f. and 120f.; Benton, 'Objective Interests.'

Mouffe's poststructuralist conception of a relativistic-realistic fixing of hegemonic domination onto nodal points—respectively, Callon's theorisation of actor-network construction.[44]  Clegg's theory, therefore, is a tool for *organisation-political* analysis within a relativistic- and distributed-ontological approach to reality.

What gives DG's rhizome ontology the advantage over ANT, with regards to the research of chapter 6, relates to DG's approaching the task of rhizomatic metaphysics as a subsequent step to the liberation of the creative/productive flows of 'desire' from the reductionism of Freud's Oedipal triangle.[45]  This makes Foucault's examination of the modern sexuality dispositive (established upon the confession of illicit 'pleasure')[46] the link that joins a Foucauldian power analytics and a material-semiotic metaphysics.[47]  On the other hand, ANT—and not DG—implies power-

---

44  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 178ff., 185 and 203ff.; Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy;* Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

45  DG, *Anti-Oedipus*.  Compare Schmidt's chapter on DG with Adkin's wider, philosophical-metaphysical, interpretation: Schmidt, 'Gilles Deleuze und Félix Guattari oder Der Anti-Ödipus und die molekulare Revolution;' Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus.*

46  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1.

47  Lash argues that Foucault's 'genealogical' concern with the connection of knowledge, power and the body 'was catalysed by' Deleuzian thought and DG's *Anti-Oedipus:* Scott Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism* (London and New York: Routledge, 1990), 61ff.; quote ibid., 62.

theoretical reflection; therefore, power-analytical insights must be transferred from ANT to DG's method of analysis and knowledge creation. Further, Clegg's 'dispositional circuit' is informed by Callon's theorisations; and many foundational ANT research papers were published under monograph titles with a power reference.[48]  In an introductory essay, Law presents ANT as being essentially 'concerned with the *mechanics of power,'* i.e. how social effects such as 'power, fame, size, scope, or organisation' can be achieved.[49]  Arguably, Latour's—now 'authoritative'—ANT account may be summarised as featuring a central power concern that examines how—under adverse conditions—extended networks are created and stabilised for a coordinated course of action.[50]

Observed differences of theory design notwithstanding, it is apparent how both ANT and Foucault share a distributed-and-strategic understanding of power.[51]  Only by engaging material technology can the

---

48  John Law, ed., *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* (London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge, 1987); Law, ed., *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991); Gordon Fyfe and John Law, ed., *Picturing Power: Visual Depiction and Social Relations* (London and New York: Routledge, 1988).

49  Law, 'Notes on the Theory,' 380.  Cf. Law, *Organizing Modernity* (Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1994).

50  Latour, *Reassembling the Social.*

51  Most explicitly: Law, 'Notes on the Theory,' 387; cf. Law, 'Power,

illusion of Hobbes' politico-contractual Leviathan be created; is it possible

that social actors exercise control over distributed matters and people; can

effects of scale be achieved in power deployments.[52]  A power which exists

in a diffused form across social relations, one which powerful actors may

'have,' 'hold,' 'store,' 'lose' or 'deploy' in performative acts, is a mirage.

The possibility of 'actor A making actor B do something'[53] is an effect or

consequence of a collective acting together of many entities, rather than a

simple mechanistic causal relation.  According to Latour, the following are,

in themselves, significant network achievements in need of explanation: the

extension of an order across distances; its stability over time; the

overcoming of disloyalties, betrayals and resistances from many places

(including the breaking down of technology); and finally, the illusion that

someone is in charge, that power is held, that its order remains reliable.[54]

---

Discretion and Strategy,' in *A Sociology of Monster: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination,* ed. John Law (London and New York: Routledge, 1991), 165ff.

52  Callon and Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan.'

53  Cf. Dahl's classical definition: 'A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do.'  Dahl, 'Concept of Power,' 202f.

54  Latour, 'Powers of Association;' cf. Cf. Foucault, *Society Must Be Defended,* 13.

*Evaluation*

It has become clear that Foucault, ANT, (DG) and Clegg, though different in theory focus and design, share a compatible perspective and approach in terms of the analytics of power relations. By way of a complex interweaving of connections, they cross-reference each other, with Foucault blazing the trail. Foucault's *Discipline and Punish* was published in 1975 (English translation, 1977). By the time ANT started taking shape, and a decade before Clegg's framework, Foucault's work on power was becoming established within a number of fields also including English-language sociology.[55] Clegg and ANT share a Foucauldian understanding of power: one which is distributed, heterogeneous and strategic. Each pursues a descriptive-analytical theorisation 'from below,' distancing themselves from a Hobbesian, modern (and neo-Marxist) paradigm of theorising political/organisational power. All these theory approaches may be qualified as being 'material semiotic' (although Clegg, only in a qualified sense). It is in this sense that Foucault's, ANT's and Clegg's framework represent a paradigm shift which conducts the sociology of power away from a top-down, modern-normative concern, to that of a

---

55  The English translations of Foucault's *The History of Sexuality,* vol. 1 and
    *Power/Knowledge* were published 1978 and 1980 respectively.

grass-roots nature featuring descriptive analytics of practices, technologies

and their secondary strategic organisation.  Clegg explicitly evokes the

notion of a Kuhnian—and post-structuralist—power-theoretical 'paradigm

shift.'[56]  Clegg's book traces a major discontinuity of Foucault's—and

Foucault-influenced—power analytics,[57] as well as the previous mainline of

modern power theory including, amongst others, Western-Marxist

theorisations (Lukes) and Gidden's 'structuration.'[58]  Based on a detailed

analysis of previous theorisations, he argues that there exists a main power-

theoretical

> [...] trajectory from Hobbes to Lukes, a line linking the doyen of
> seventeenth century political theory to late twentieth century social
> science.  There is an obvious difficulty of fixing a co-ordinate anywhere
> on this imaginary line which would be a point of entry for some of the
> more recent debates, particularly those sparked off by the work of the
> major French writer, Michel Foucault.[59]

Clegg's discussion of sociological theorisations culminates in a

---

56  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.; Kuhn, *Scientific Revolutions;* Arthur
Kroker, 'Modern Power in Reverse Image: the Paradigm Shift of Michel
Foucault and Talcott Parsons,' in *The Structural Allegory: Reconstructive
Encounters with the New French Thought,* ed. John Fekete (Minneapolis,
Minn.: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1984), 74ff.  See also the introduction
chapter, above.

57  Clegg references Laclau and Mouffe, as well as Callon: Clegg, *Frameworks
of Power,* 178ff. and 185; Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist
Strategy;* Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

58  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 1ff., 86ff. and 129ff.; Lukes, *Power;* Giddens,
*Constitution of Society.*

59  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 1.

(Foucauldian) post-structuralist call: to render power theory consistently non-ideological; to recognise (human) subjectivity and agency as something other than a pre-requisite, but rather as an effect (an achievement) of power and discipline; and finally, to be consistently realist, morally relativistic and 'very concrete and descriptive.'[60]

There are good practical reasons not to eliminate theoretical differences and thereby secure the specific capacities of each theory approach. Little would be gained by translating one conceptualisation into the other, or by converging and synthesising all three into a single language game. Instead, I have chosen, for our purposes, to explore and deploy a selection of theory lenses and analytical tools, in accordance with their specific strengths, and in line with the concern for which they were originally developed. Clegg's circuits framework shall be introduced initially in order to understand the scope of interlocking concerns which are relevant to power as a complex relation. To be clear, one does not refer to Clegg for a 'definition' of power; nor does he offer a 'starting point' or predominant theory lens. In a post-structuralist exploration, an essentialist starting point would be nonsensical; and Clegg himself emphasises the need to dissociate oneself from the temptation to begin power theory by a

---

60   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 152.  Ibid., 118ff. and 149ff.

normative definition of what power is.[61]  Clegg's circuits identify and

organise complex theory perspectives regarding power in modern

organisation.  According to Clegg, power 'is not a unitary concept;'[62] it is

that which flows through the pathways of a complex relational framework.

Clegg offers a valuable—though only preliminary—understanding of the

complex relations, perspectives and concerns, a power analysis must

engage.  Simultaneously, as a theorisation of modern organisational power

and politics,[63] Clegg's theorisation does not offer the most suitable tool for

an ethnographic analysis of charismatic/Pentecostal experience as a power

relationship.  On this journey of exploration, power will be considered only

initially as Clegg's three circuits; then as a Foucauldian concern with

embodied-human identity formation; and eventually, as the actor-network

rhizome which—to Pentecostals—is God in the Spirit.

---

61  Theorists of power must be observant interpreters of power in action, not
    'legislators' that control what power is about; in addition, a mechanic–
    causalistic theorisation, in particular, must be avoided: Clegg, *Frameworks
    of Power,* 21ff.; cf. Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters.*  In modern social
    theory, Dahl epitomises this approach to power: Clegg, *Frameworks of
    Power,* 39 and 41ff.; Dahl, 'Concept of Power.'  Clegg shows, that Dahl
    becomes the starting point for all subsequent sociological and political
    theorisation up to Lukes' 'radical,' 'third dimension' and Giddens'
    'structuration,' and must be held responsible for the different impasse theory
    has reached both ways: Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 66ff., 86ff. and 138ff.;
    Lukes, *Power;* Giddens, *Central Problems;* Giddens, *Constitution of Society.*

62  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 89.

63  'A generally applicable theory of power must also be a theory of
    organization.'  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 17.  Ibid., 187ff. and 223ff.

From Clegg's work, two theory tools in particular promise a better understanding of power in modern-whilst-historical forms of Christianity. Clegg's theorisation of 'strategic agency' facilitates an analytical observation of the connection between (the layers of) organisational structure and politics.[64]  Clegg's theorisation of 'social integration and system integration' (second and third circuits) will be deployed for an exploration of the complex exchanges and inter-engagements of Christian and secular politics and orderings, especially during times of change and crisis.[65]  It is, however, Foucault's power analysis, rather than Clegg's, that creates the link between power in modern-ecclesiastical matters and power in Christian-Pentecostal experience/practice.  Foucault's theorisation of educational 'tools of adjustment'[66] conceptualises how professional training and exam boards individualise and empower a clergy, and how they lead to theological/pastoral discourse of a professionally confined nature.

---

64  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 198ff.

65  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 219f. and 223ff.  On the differentiation of 'social integration' and 'system integration' also: David Lockwood, 'Social Integration and System Integration,' in *Explorations in Social Change,* ed. Georg K. Zollschan and Walter Hirsch (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964), 244ff.

66  '*Les moyens du bon dressement*:' Michel Foucault, *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison* (Paris: Gallimard, 1975), 200.  Sheridan translates 'The means of correct training:' Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170.  Cf. the illustration of the staking of a young tree, with description: 'Orthopedics or the art of preventing and correcting deformities of the body in children;' ibid., plate 10.

Foucault's exposition of neo-liberalism and of '*homo œconomicus*' as a contemporarily predominant ethics[67] helps identify why, in practical terms, some leading twentieth-century theologies appear to have exceeded their 'sell by date.' His sexuality dispositive[68] offers a blueprint for analysing Pentecostal 'anointing' as a counter-modern power relation. Finally, the rhizome concept (ANT and DG) facilitates 'a subtle shift' from a Foucauldian, 'psychology-oriented epistemology,' towards the objective and 'flat' perspective[69] of a 'Latourian inflected-ontology,' thereby allowing us 'to ethnographically include God—and specifically, include God as a (potential) social-actor;' and facilitate a power analytics of a distributed religious experience from the point of view of an experimental Pentecostal-charismatic ordering.[70]

---

67 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.*

68 'Le dispositif de sexualité:' Michel Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 1, *La volonté de savoir* ([Paris]: Gallimard, 1976), 99; ibid., 99ff. Translation Hurley: 'The Deployment of Sexuality:' Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 75.

69 ANT as a 'completely flat' theorisation of interaction: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 171f.

70 Bialecki, 'Does God Exist,' 39 and 38. ANT as a 'completely flat' account of interaction: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 171f. Bialecki points out that maintaining both perspectives as being co-present is congenial to (educated North-American) Pentecostals. 'When discussing an instance of demonic attack, people will one minute talk about it as a disruptive alien presence and at another moment as a kind of psychological acting out [...]. When praying for healing, descriptions of the supernatural intervention are so detailed and so couched in the language of natural medical processes they can be seen as a description of an already ongoing organic process rather

# PART I

## POWER RELATIONS OF THE MODERN MINISTRY AND ITS THEOLOGY

# 2 Church-Order Politics in a Secular-Political Environment: Protestants under Hitler

In part I, inroads shall be made with regards to the examination of power relations within twentieth-century church ministry. The first paragraph of the introduction lists some perplexing difficulties with regards to the theorisation of power, and organises them (in a conventional manner) into pairs of alternative/opposing concerns, whereby the ways in which they affect one another, in complex—whilst 'somewhat inexplicable'— ways, is clearly visible: organisation (structure, order, legal constitution) vs. political reasoning and action; religious community vs. 'secular' politics; 'God' and 'the religious' over and against 'the secular' or 'non-religious' (both outside and within the ministry); and 'religious' experience (time or space) vs. 'theology.' Clegg's three-circuits framework of modern-organisational power is introduced since it offers a preliminary understanding of the complexity and order of the dimensions/concerns which are relevant to a sophisticated analytics of power (2.1.1). Clegg is not however 'the definition' of power behind this research. Section 2.1.2

uses Clegg's organisational framework in an initial analysis of (parish) politics. One can show how the first of the named theoretical challenges can be resolved within Clegg's theorisation of the relationship between episodic and dispositional power: that is by conceptualising the creation of organisational agency and strategic-political agency, within—and across—organisational structures, and thus clarify the relationship between politics and organisation/order, in both 'religious' and 'secular' domains.

The remaining parts of the chapter seek to explore the extent to which the other identified challenges can be resolved, on the basis of Clegg's theorisation of the connections between the second—'dispositional'—power circuit of social integration and the third—disciplinary and 'facilitative'—circuit of systemic integration. In anticipation of this chapter's findings, one argues that, in essence, Clegg's theorisation enables the clarification of all of the identified impasses, *insofar* they engage with modern-organisational and political concerns. In principle, this includes the relations of conventionally modern and mainline-traditional forms of religious politics and theology. However, efforts to handle theological and spiritual empowerment and agency creation—as well as the emergent capacities and power relations of God, according to distributed-Pentecostal experience/practice—require one to

move towards a Foucauldian—and eventually a rhizome-ontological—theorisation (as expounded in chapters 3–6). Section 2.1.3 explores the relationships between Clegg's second and third power circuits, through a number of essential theory modules which Clegg introduces to his framework: an (early) theorisation of actor-network creation, upon which Clegg's dispositional power relies extensively, and which he interprets as equivalent to Laclau and Mouffe's fixing of 'hegemony' onto 'nodal points;' Mann's 'organisational outflanking' which clarifies the reason why often, political action and resistance is deemed to be futile; environmental pressures towards organisational adjustment ('isomorphism') as well as innovation/competition, which further clarify the nature of the basis upon which dispositional hegemonies are established, secured and superseded.[1]

In sections 2.2 and 2.3, Clegg's theorisation will be put to the test. Putting aside the challenges of theorising religion and God, conventional sociological theorisations do not perform well when it comes to the task of clarifying as-yet-unresolved, contingent and fast-moving historical situations which might introduce an epochal and deeply systemic change to the overall political game. A case study of the struggle of the 'Confessing Church' (*BK*) in Nazi-era Germany provides an occasion to historically

---

1    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 187ff.

observe fast-moving changes within the politics of the day, as well as structurally deep changes of state-church administrative practice as they impact Christian politics and leadership, and are suitable for a further exploration of the performance and scope of Clegg's framework. A comprehensive power analysis, within the context of Nazi church politics and Protestant resistance, would need to clarify some difficult relationships between the contributing factors involved in the power play, including: historical decision-making; players—both religious and state political—who deploy their different versions of controversial—even mutually exclusive (*BK*), and respectively secretive (*Gestapo*)—forms of reasoning against one another; and groups of actors who introduce complex, contradictory, swift and unexpected changes to the conditions with which other groups and players must engage, and by which they must succeed. Section 2.2 traces just a few processes and decisions involved in the process which led to the 'fixing' of the Barmen Declaration as the Confessing Church's 'obligatory passage point' (OPP). Post-war German-Protestant and ecumenical discourses readily evoke 'Barmen' and the proclamation of a *status confessionis* ('state of confession') in terms of a normative-theological bind (cf. below, section 3.4). 'Barmen,' when studied through an ANT analytics, reintroduces the concept of the (rather risky, messy and truly heterogeneous-historical) making of essential

theological relations which only *appear* to be utterly reflective and exclusively open to a learned-discursive discernment regarding their relevance and truth. A historical consideration of Barmen as the Confessing Church's OPP prepares the way for an examination of the historical impact—as well as a specific limitation—of the Barthian-theological mode of 'speaking truth to power' in section 3.4 of the next chapter. In order to clarify a particular theory relation—namely 'nodal fixing'—observations shall be limited to a few relevant symbolic, historical and biographic dimensions which are considered to be of overall importance to the processes and decisions that accompanied both Barth's and Bonhoeffer's—quite distinctively different—theological-political journeys, as well as their decisions to call for a theological schism. Obviously, such a pluralistic and detailed—whilst extremely limited—analytical approach cannot aim to be comprehensive or historically balanced. The perception of a balanced historical judgement, in any case, requires a delusional—respectively normatively constituted—'panoramic' vantage point, beyond the realm of historico-political relations; and normative judgement always superimposes its very own power–truth rationale.[2] Furthermore, scholars of Christian thought will be aware that there is an extensive body of historical research—and relating theological

---

2    Cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 87ff., quote 14.

analysis—concerning this particular area of church history. Due to the nature of their training and profession, modern theologians—during the years of the Protestant Struggle as well as today—have a well-developed understanding of dispositional power. Accordingly, academic-theological analysis and evaluation is often limited to a consideration of the success of the Barmen Declaration strategy of 1934, whilst expressing disapproval of the failure of pastors and church leaders to resist the harassment, persecution and internment of (non-Protestant) political opponents and minorities, and—in the case of disabled and Jewish people—eventual organised mass murder. A third-circuit analysis of the different phases of the confrontation amongst German Protestants, and between Christian groups and the Nazi state, in section 2.3, facilitates a clarification as to: *why,* at a certain point in the struggle, the Barmen-confessing strategy ceases to be expedient in the way it was in the beginning; how the Nazi leadership manages to introduce change to the external-political conditions of church politics, in such a way that it becomes difficult for church leaders to stay together and maintain a common front, or to take any political action; and why—at times—(state-)political effort and will 'backfire' and lead to unexpected religious resistance and organisation which, as it mobilises and unifies in a different and more potent way, can become more difficult to control than a conventionally modern, secular-political

rationale.  Clegg's three-circuits power frame introduces a consistent—though complex—theoretical rationale to the most careful and detailed historical accounts of relevant church-political processes,[3] as well as to modern-political situations, in general.


## 2.1  Clegg's organisation-political framework


### 2.1.1  Complexities of organisational power: Clegg's three circuits

For an initial overview of the different inter-connecting dimensions and concerns encompassed by relations of power, Clegg's analytical framework will be introduced.  According to Clegg, power is best understood 'as a process which may pass through distinct circuits of power and resistance.'[4]  In a first 'episodic' relation, actors compete over resources and engage with one another in pursuit of their goals.  In a second, 'dispositional' circuit, the rules of social engagement ('meaning and membership') become determined and fixed at 'privileged,' 'obligatory

---

3    E.g. Helmreich, *German Churches.*

4    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 18.

passage,' or 'nodal points.'[5] 'Domination,' i.e. which set of rules and agencies either succeed, weaken or are bypassed, depends upon changes in disciplinary and productive techniques in a third, 'facilitative' circuit.[6] Clegg offers 'a rich theory' which dares to integrate many disparate theory perspectives and insights into a single complex relation.[7] Connections across different circuits are manifold and well theorised. Power struggles, achievements, domination and resistance, need not necessarily take place in all three of the circuits.

As long as rules of engagement (second circuit) remain uncontroversial, Dahl's classical mechanistic-causal and mere-episodic view of power suffices as an explanation.[8] Some familiar parish politics and an unsystematic Cleggian exploration of theology in terms of power shall provide some basic illustration. (1) A pastor—'holding' power—may ask a volunteer to help her with a certain task (episodic power). The rules of engagement themselves however, can become a contentious matter, e.g. when a lay worker, who is also trying to enlist support, is challenged—or

---

5   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 203ff.; Callon, 'Sociology of Translation;' Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,* 112f. and 136.

6   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 187ff. and 214 (fig. 8.1).

7   Percy, *Power and the Church,* 7.

8   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 18; Dahl, 'Concept of Power.'

ignored—with a comment such as: 'Who does he think he is?' (dispositional relations). In system integration (facilitative circuit), more foundational problems can emerge such as: child-protection rules have changed, the heating does not work, someone has complained that e-mail addresses were passed on, or people are no longer committed in the way that they once were. (2) Within mainline-historical forms of Christianity (and according to conventional understanding) 'God'—and correspondingly 'the gospel'—are agencies which operate, both within and out of, the compounds of worship and 'faith' (episodic circuit). God would be facilitated by acts of 'faith' and worship and their relating belief systems, i.e. disciplinary regimes of theological truth (dispositional circuit). These are 'fixed' onto 'obligatory passage points' (OPPs), such as the 'theology of the cross,' ecumenical creeds and denominational articles of faith.[9] The churches' dispositional-doctrinal truth relations are further guarded and reinforced by trained theologians and ordained pastors as God's equally obligatory 'spokespeople' (dispositional circuit).[10] Major theological innovations are more likely to occur through, in and after successive thrusts of personal and historical crisis (facilitative

---

9    *Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche: herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgischen Konfession 1930,* 11th edn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992), 61 and 69.

10   Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

circuit/system integration).  Consider how e.g. Barth conceived his theology before and after the Great War;[11] how, in the (perceived) intellectual-cultural upheaval of the Weimar Republic, 'Dialectical Theology' had its breakthrough and gained ground alongside comparable theory projects, not merely amongst theologians;[12] and how Barth's theology eventually facilitating a vocal resistance against the Nazi-Christian takeover of Protestantism in Germany.[13]  In the way that politics can be traced as a narrative of confrontation and competition—or respectively, of successful/failed 'organisational outflanking'—(cf. chapter 2)[14] the same is also true of the story of theological innovation.

In *Frameworks of Power,* Clegg develops his model in the order in which it has been introduced so far: (1) causal-episodic encounter at agency level, (2) social integration (dispositional power), (3) systemic integration

---

11   Best English-language reference: Bruce L. McCormack, *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909–1936* (Oxford and New York: Clarendon, 1997), 29ff. and 127ff.

12   Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* pt. 1, 27ff.

13   Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts,* tr. John Bowden (Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2005).

14   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 218ff.; Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power,* vol. 1, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760* (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1986), 7, 8 and passim.

(facilitative power).[15] This order also retraces the conceptual development in power theory. The overall systematic dynamics of the model however, works in the opposite direction: Agency is not a precondition of social action and power, but rather an outcome and effect of the productive and disciplinary techniques of a culture, time and age (facilitative power); and of the related layering of practical and discursive formations (dispositional power). In its many forms, agency, as it emerges from successful engagements with power, is always a disciplinary achievement; learning, mastery and resistance take place across all three circuits.[16] Reversing the perspective, Clegg—here discussing Foucault's contribution to organisation theory—is able to alternatively formulate that:

> [...] power becomes conceived as a set of techniques, disciplinary practices, as well as the more or less stable or shifting networks of alliances that such disciplinary practices make possible through their elective affinities between wholly contingent forms of identity, extended over a shifting terrain of practice and discursively constituted interests.[17]

---

15  'The general framework [...] is developed from the insight of David Lockwood (1964) into the nature of system and social integration. These are conceptualized as distinct circuits of facilitative and dispositional power respectively, to be seen in the context of their relationship to the episodic agency circuit of power.' Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 18. Ibid., 23f; Lockwood, 'Social Integration and System Integration.'

16  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 187f. and 203ff. '[...] all forms of agency will be an achievement of control produced by discipline. Consistency, coherence and memory of self are not given but learned and accomplished.' Ibid., 188. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish.*

17  Clegg, 'Weber and Foucault,' 157.

Although some semblance cannot be denied, Clegg's circuits model should not be confused with a Marxist theorisation of a power base in productive mode with its relating political/ideological superstructure. Whilst evolving techniques of production and discipline introduce 'strain' to a current dispositional equilibrium—and thus the opportunity for change or even revolution—Clegg explicitly rejects causal determinism, from the facilitative circuit of system integration upwards.[18] At the heart of Clegg's theorisation is the cooperation, resistance, struggle and negotiation involved in creating and asserting one's alternative rules of engagement, in the second circuit.[19] Clegg introduces *Frameworks of Power* as an overdue academic response to the fact that Lukes' *Power* fails to fruitfully engage with newer—Foucauldian and poststructuralist—challenges.[20] Clegg regards Lukes' 'radical view' as being reflective of the concerns with 'non-decision-making' and 'hegemony,' in the 1960s and 70s (and thereby of a conventionally Western-Marxian understanding of power), considering it to

---

18  'The circuit of power through system integration is a source of new opportunities for undermining established configurations of episodic circuits of power, as it generates competitive pressures through new forms of technique, new forms of disciplinary power, new forms of empowerment and disempowerment.  However, no automaticity attaches to these processes (the functionalist and the Marxist error), no matter how long the long run to the lonely hour of the last instance may be.'  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 237.  Ibid., 233.

19  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 223ff.

20  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 1f.

be flawed on several accounts:  Firstly, it continues to use Dahl's theorisation as a starting point, adopting a normative (dogmatic) definition of power and mechanistic-causal explanatory rationale.[21]  Secondly, a conventionally Marxian conception of 'hegemony' requires a presupposition of 'real interests,' implying that social and political theorists would have to have a *privileged knowledge* of social players' interests, over and against their subjective judgements and preferences.  At the same time however, Lukes also wishes to adhere to a conventional moral relativism. Benton names this inconsistency the 'paradox of emancipation;'[22] and Clegg points out that Habermas' non-relativist moral theorisation of an 'ideal speech situation' facilitates a more consistent conception of 'real interests,' though it does so at the cost of rather limited applicability as a power theory.[23]  In common with Benton, Clegg also opts for a more thoroughly relativist-and-realist approach; which leads us to the final point. Foucault replaces the normative and totalising-essentialist Marxian concern with 'dominant ideology,' with a thoroughly relativistic analytics of discursive (micro-)practices, by which truths—as well as human subjectivity and identity—are also established.  There thus is no such thing

---

21  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 41ff. and 86; Dahl, 'Concept of Power.'

22  Benton, 'Objective Interests.'  Lukes, *Power,* 108ff.

23  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 86ff.

as 'false consciousness.' Laclau and Mouffe have furthermore shown that for hegemony to be achieved and sustained over time, 'nodal points' must be constructed on which relations of meaning can be fixed.[24] It is only in the successful construction and maintenance of these nodal points that domination ('hegemony') is realised.

I would locate the contribution of ANT to power/organisation-theory as being 'lower' than where Clegg would seem to place it: not in-between the agency and the dispositional circuits;[25] but rather—similar to Foucault—as a qualitative assessment of power achievements, across the circuits, from the facilitative foundations upwards. Law identifies the ANT contribution to the sociology of organisations by means of posing 'the "how" questions about structure, power and organization:' by what materials and strategies are organisational characteristics and power facilitated as emergent effects? Questions need to be asked concerning: the deployment of heterogeneous technologies/techniques in relation to social connection and structure; achievements such as durability, mobility, reproduction and scale; the distribution and complex layering of

---

24  Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,* 133; ibid., 93ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 178ff. and 204f.

25  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 202ff.

organisational strategies; the role which calculation and self-observation play; who is to represent, speak and manage—and how; as well as posing questions concerning possible centre–periphery effects.[26]

## 2.1.2  Organisational structure vs. politics

The next chapter deploys Clegg's three-circuits model in order to reframe our understanding of the dogmatic and political struggle of the Confessing Church in the Nazi era: from how a small group of pastors and theologians initially succeeded in forging and declaring a formal 'state of confession' (episodic and dispositional circuits); how they, then, became politically outmanoeuvred by Nazi politics (facilitative power); and how, in the post-war era—due to far-reaching changes across all power circuits— they emerged as a key player in academic and ecumenical theology, church and secular politics.  Pressures towards efficiency and 'isomorphism' in the facilitative circuit (system integration) are identified major contributions to the re-establishment of ecclesiastical order under military administration.[27] It is a predominant trait of German-language academic discourse that

---

26  Law, 'Notes on the Theory,' 389f.

27  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 225ff.

relevant areas of church history and historical theology are extremely well researched; and there is no pretence that a new *historical* insight could be offered.  Academics engaging in historical and systematic-theological discourse will therefore have an understanding of events and their theological relevance, and this feature can be used advantageously.  It can assist in the task of exploring power theory in regards to the introduction of relevant analytical tools and perspectives to the fields of theological understanding and reflective construction.  In addition, a baseline is established—a rich fermentive matrix—from which alternative theological narratives and lines of exploration can begin.

Also relevant to our practical-theological concern, is Clegg's compelling theorisation of the creation of political strategy from top-down organisational structure.  In organisations, legitimate power lies within 'the hierarchical structure of offices and their relation to each other,' as found in organisational charts, statutory responsibilities, official functions and channels; and, of course, within Christian doctrinal formulations of church order (hierarchical oversight) and ministry, both Protestant and Catholic.[28] However, organisational obedience is never complete, as members of every organisation resist, undercut, erode and 'legitimate' organisational norms

---

28   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 189.

and expectations.  In general, members would remain beneath the radar of disciplinary sanction as they cultivate and seek to enlarge their freedom and 'discretion.'  In addition, formalised discretion and expected self-determination are unevenly distributed across every organisation (consider e.g. the roles of minister, verger and cleaner).  From both forms of discretion, power resources may illegitimately/informally be 'evacuated' from the organisation's formal purposes, legitimate planning and operative channels.  Alongside 'legitimate' organisational power, there will always be an 'illegitimate or informal' access to power and resources.  The pretence of an even playing field is not exclusive to church politics.  From this, (informal) political strategies may be formed (church/parish politics).[29]

Organisations are places of decisions/action, and thus places of political competition, having concerns, positions and rationales which derive from all kinds of locations, both, internal and external.[30]  Certain

---

29  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 189ff.; Henry Mintzberg, *Power In and Around Organizations* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1983), 171 and 173ff.; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish.*

30  'Organisational action is an indeterminate outcome of substantive struggles between different agencies: people who deploy different resources; people whose organizational identities will be shaped by the way in which disciplinary practices work through and on them, even in their use of such techniques; people who seek to control and decide the nature of organizational action and those many things to which they will routinely have recourse in their membership, work and struggles.'  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 197.  Cf. Barry Hindess, 'Rationality and the

political players or programmes, either wielded from the organisational top, or entering sideways, may achieve 'strategic agency' within an organisational context by disciplining other players' discretion—both formal and informal—so as to render them mere relays or extensions: 'party soldiers' (ideally) of the emergent strategic agency. The wider political concerns of a society or cultural situation may underlie and stratify the practices and structures of an organisation. Strategic agencies seek to increase their capacities of acting strategically by transforming their connections with other agencies to OPPs through which traffic must occur on terms which give privilege to the strategic agency.[31]

According to Clegg, the strategic agency of 'soldiers of God' as a religious vocation, combines high discipline with moral authority.[32] Alternatively, an academic vocation as '[h]igh discretionary strategic agency' is meant to facilitate disciplined creativity.[33] Both will be familiar

---

Characterization of Modern Society,' in *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity,* ed. Scott Lash and Sam Whimster (London and Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 137ff.

31  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 198ff.; Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy;* Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

32  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 199; P. D. Anthony, *The Ideology of Work* (London: Tavistock, 1977).

33  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 199.

to university-trained clergy.  Other ecclesiastical applications include understanding how it can happen that a priest, the organist—or even the 'flower ladies'—may sometimes wield power beyond the weight of their legitimate roles and responsibilities; or how e.g. unfortunate, haphazard decisions can occur at a trustee meeting which nobody wanted, or considers to be sensible.

### 2.1.3  Relationship of dispositional and facilitative power

According to Clegg's theorisation of third-circuit power, volatility and deep historical change in power relations relate to changes in economic and disciplinary techniques/technologies.  These facilitate systemic instabilities and evolution in apparently entrenched relations; although opportunity for change must always be strategically grasped and realised in the second circuit of social integration.  Change may come from either episodic power outcomes (first circuit) or emerge from changing technologies and external conditions in the third circuit itself.  Subsequently, some agencies may impose or consolidate (certain of) their rules of action and end up dominating their competitors.  Some will gain and some will lose resources/capacities of collective action and

achievement.[34]


Clegg theorises the systemic impact of facilitative-disciplinary power within dispositional and episodic power relations by introducing four theory modules.


*(1) Passage points (Callon)*


Central to Clegg's power concept is the discursive fixing of 'meaning and membership' in the relations of dispositional power;[35] this is the 'bread and butter' of politics of all kinds.

> [...] a theory of power must examine how the field of force in which power is arranged has been fixed, coupled and constituted in such a way that, intentionally or not, certain 'nodal points' of practice are privileged in this unstable and shifting terrain.[36]

Clegg's understanding is firmly rooted within Foucauldian power analysis.

---

34  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 130ff.  According to Parsons, power facilitates 'the capacity of persons or collectives "to get things done" effectively, in particular when their goals are obstructed by some kind of human resistance or opposition.'  Talcott Parsons, 'On the Political Concept of Power,' in *Power: a Reader,* ed. Mark Haugaard (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002), 70.

35  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 18, 151 and 230.  On power as 'dispositional:' cf. Dennis H. Wrong, *Power: Its Forms, Bases, and Uses,* new edn (New Brunswick and London: Transaction, 1995), 6.

36  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 17.

He references Laclau and Mouffe's regulation of meaning/discourse in vaguely unified social and political spaces through the fixing of 'privileged discursive points.'[37]  The main building block in Clegg's second circuit however, is Callon's theorisation of 'obligatory passage points (OPP),' which introduce 'four moments of translation,' by which 'spokes[persons]' establish indispensable OPPs for all actors that are relevant to their strategic concern, whilst taking account of each (relevant) actor's own rationale.  By way of fixing their dispositional relations, spokespeople would often aim to establish *themselves* as an essential nodal point with regards to other matters/parties involved.[38]

In Callon's fabulous ethnography, three conchologists manage to establish their research by 'translating' their research question in terms of the particular interests of three relevant groups: peer scientists in their field, local fishermen, and the particular species of scallops they aspire to examine; thereby, they, in turn, 'translate' such relevant actors and also

---

37  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 151, 178ff. and 185.  Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,* 136 and 111ff.  Laclau and Mouffe, in turn, refer to Lacan's 'quilting points:' ibid., 112.

38  According to Clegg, 'translation' and 'enrolment' of relevant-actors and passage-points is the precise ANT-equivalent to Laclau and Mouffe's fixing of nodal-points: Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 185 and 204f.

themselves into 'enrolled' members of this, their emergent actor network.[39]

Comparing quite dissimilar lines of engagement, Callon observes the following general phases of the 'translation' process: (1) Prospective spokespersons introduce themselves as those holding the solution to different difficulties experienced by a relevant groups of actors, framing other parties' challenges in (for them) suitable terms and presenting their OPP as the common solution ('problematisation'). (2) Through the deployment of suitable 'interessement' devices, actors must be encouraged to establish themselves within the parameters of their ascribed roles and discouraged from choosing an alternative association or course of action. (3) Successful 'interessement' leads to the 'enrolment' of actors and the practical establishment of the OPP (actor network), whilst any emerging difficulties must be managed successfully since failure remains an ever-present possibility. (4) There may be controversies concerning whether or not identified 'spokespersons' truly represent the different groups involved in the project. (5) 'Betrayals and controversies' must always be dealt with, following a successful OPP fixing.[40]

---

39   Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

40   Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 219ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 202ff.; cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 21ff.

*(2)  Outflanking (Mann)*

'Organisational outflanking' concerns the possibility and—in most situations—the perceived impossibility of gathering and unifying resistance from below against a hegemonic system of domination.  The consolidation and reinforcement of an established order is achieved by this power strategy which, on the side of dominated agencies, correlates to: ignorance; illusions of stability in the predominant order; division/competition; the calculation of the cost of opposition; or generally 'adverse conditions.'  Organisational outflanking ensures that a dominant set of social rules are reproduced over time, whilst local resistance is not even considered, or may not be gathered into a successful opposition strategy and political challenge.  Against this backdrop, group rituals, routines, narratives, ceremonies and ideological rationales may be introduced to further reinforce the OPPs of a prevailing set of rules (within the dispositional circuit).[41]

*(3)  Isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell)*

Both these next two theory imports clarify, within an organisation-

---

41  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 218ff.; Mann, *Sources of Social Power.*

ecological perspective, how environmental-selective pressures, in a given

field, push organisational forms—on the one hand—towards convergence

and—on the other—towards variation, innovation and selection.[42]

'Isomorphism' describes systemic pressures, based upon productive

and disciplinary innovation, which requires organisational adaption, within

an environment in which relations of domination are being reinforced.

Such pressures are operative in the dispositional circuit of an evolving

organisational field.  Certain players (episodic circuit) introduce, or affirm,

innovations and standards which other players—over time—will also need

to introduce to their organisation, should they desire to maintain legitimacy

and trust.  DiMaggio and Powell discern three types of isomorphic

processes: (1) 'coercive,' e.g. the governmental introduction of new legal

requirements; (2) 'mimetic,' whereby an innovation, a fashion or a policy

gets adopted by an increasing number of players; (3) 'normative,' with

regards to common (professional) standards/expectations, reinforced e.g.

through academic formation.  In all its forms, isomorphism creates adaptive

pressures which normalise and unify the players within an organisational

---

42  Michael T. Hannan and John Freeman, 'The Population Ecology of
    Organizations,' *American Journal of Sociology* 82, no. 5 (1977): 929ff.
    Hannan and Freeman, *Organizational Ecology.*

context.[43]


*(4)  Competitive pressure and innovation (Hannan and Freeman)*


Changes to disciplinary and productive technologies and techniques also play a part in the emergence of systemic and contingent 'contradiction' and insecurity—even volatility—across power dimensions.[44]  Competitive and selective pressures, in increasingly crowded spaces with limited resources, compel organisational players to innovate and diversify.  Some organisational forms may be seen to be more successful than others in gaining legitimacy (isomorphism); whilst others die off or emigrate/diversify into a different ecological niche.

Taking into consideration neo-liberal 'globalisation' and a concern for the creation of healthy cultural environments which sustain 'bio-diverse' or species-rich organisational populations, some research findings appear of interest which Clegg does not reference:  Hannan and Freeman, point out that in general, stable regulatory environments create

---

43   John W. Meyer and Brian Rowan, 'Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony,' *American Journal of Sociology,* 83, no. 2 (1977): 830–363; DiMaggio and Powell, 'Iron Cage Revisited.'  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 225ff.

44   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 224 and 236f.

homogeneous organisational populations.  Once in stable environments large organisations arise, medium-sized organisations—over time—will disappear, as they have to compete with both larger *and* smaller organisations.  Large organisations do not compete against the smallest ones.  Polymorphous populations, i.e. organisation-ecological diversity is facilitated by uncertain environments, which experience longer-term regular phase shifts.  If, in addition, subunits are difficult to set up, complex organisations may have an advantage.[45]

Evolutionary selection of the facilitative circuit reflects the (overall) competitive/efficiency pressures in the field; in the circuits of episodic and dispositional power, it is reflective of the empowerment/disempowerment of players, as well as, their relevant political games/rationales.[46]

The combination of these four theory contributions, together, determine the nature and capacity—as well as the limitations—of Clegg's three-circuits theorisation.  Section 2.3 reviews the different phases of the

---

45   Hannan and Freeman, 'Population Ecology,' 945f. and 953ff.

46   Hannan and Freeman, 'Population Ecology;' id., 'Structural Inertia and Organizational Change,' *American Sociological Review* 49, no. 2 (1984): 149ff.; Hannan and Freeman, *Organizational Ecology.*  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 233ff.

*Kirchenkampf* in order to demonstrate the power-analytical capacity of Clegg's framework.  Thereby, reference is made to organisational outflanking and to power, according to a third-circuit organisation-ecological rationale and, in particular, competitive pressure/innovation. Isomorphic-assimilative forces will be observed at work below, in section 4.2.  The following section (2.2) argues that the distributed historical, theological and biographical rationales and decisions which—together—led to the Barmen Declaration of 1934 (and its relating church-political strategy) exemplify the dispositional nodal fixing of 'relations of meaning and membership' onto an OPP (obligatory passage point):[47] whereby many theologians, pastors and church leaders—each pursuing their own agendas, understandings and rationales—agreed to mobilise a coordinated church-political response to what they—together—believed to be an unprecedented crisis within German Protestantism.  Section 2.2 is structured by Callon's phases of 'translation.'

## 2.2  Nodal fixing of the Barmen Declaration

Regarding the fixing of dispositional relations onto OPPs, important

---

47   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 18, 226 and passim.

changes to theological thought and theological announcements may occur

when and where several contextual fields of reasoning/rationale (can be

made to) coincide.  In order to facilitate this, key players have to invest a

significant political effort.  Contingent developments however, also play a

role, as systemic instabilities, shifts and changes, arising from the depth of

the third circuit, create opportunities, pressures and necessities for the

fixing of new power nodes, which establish a changed theological and

practical-political rationale.  To some extent—due to the overall

systematic-theological interest of this research—chapter 3 focuses on the

differences between Barth's and Bonhoeffer's political/theological

approaches, and between inner-Protestant denominational traditions.

Naturally, this comes at the cost of underdetermining the historical

significance and contribution of certain groups/developments.


By adopting the Barmen Theological Declaration, an initially small

group of pastors and church leaders from Germany's Protestant churches,

reacted to: the rise of the Nazi 'German Christian' (*DC*) movement; the

encroachment of the state upon the inner affairs of gospel proclamation;

and the introduction of Nazi ideology to the rationale governing the order

of ecclesiastical oversight.  The First Confessing Synod, gathered at

Barmen (Bergisches Land) in May 1934 to declare a theological 'case' or

'state of confession' (*status confessionis*): a situation of urgency reflecting the extent to which gospel proclamation was under threat, thereby necessitating each Christian church, congregation, leader and faithful member to take a stance and confess the true faith; and thus expelling from 'the church' all those who adhere to a different belief.[48] The repeated rejection of 'false doctrine,' in each article, implies a formal schism:[49] the declaration of an *anathema* and the excommunication not only of open players within the inner-Christian opposition, but even of those who continue to not take sides on the disputed matter. On the grounds of political pragmatism, matters would remain ambiguous, though: Confessing Church pastors, groups and congregations would continue to engage with the administrative bodies of their 'destroyed' churches and the Nazi state, e.g. in matters of pastoral remuneration, placements and the administration of collections and buildings.[50]

---

48  Cochrane, *Church's Confession;* Helmreich, *German Churches,* 157ff.; Günter Brakelmann, *Evangelische Kirche im Entscheidungsjahr 1933/1934: der Weg nach Barmen: ein Arbeitsbuch* (Berlin and Münster: Lit, 2010).

49  'We reject the false doctrine, as though the Church [...]:' Cochrane, *Church's Confession,* 239ff.

50  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 162ff.

*(1)  A Lutheran-theological memory (problematisation)*

Without aiming to undertake a complete historical reconstruction, a few points regarding *status confessionis* shall be made:  Firstly, declaring a 'case of confession' derives from a sixteenth-century, inner-Lutheran controversy in which Flacius challenged his theological teacher Melanchthon to return to a previous pre-Reformation custom of worship would cease to be a theologically inconsequential matter.  In an effort to safeguard the Lutheran teaching of the gospel and the freedom of conscience, Melanchthon thought it feasible, following the Smalkaldic War (1546–47), to yield to certain imperial demands regarding liturgical customs: Luther had, after all, previously declared external questions of Christian ritual as '*adiaphora* or matters in the middle and of indifference.' Flacius, on the other hand, insisted that '*in casu confessionis*'—during the days of persecution, when the worldly authority threatens coercion—for the sake of the 'weak' and the clarity of the gospel, preachers must actively affirm Christian freedom and not give in to ritualistic demands.  This controversy is remembered within the authoritative body of Lutheran doctrine, as 'Formula of Concord,' article 10, follows Flacius' reasoning.[51]

---

51  *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 816 and 1053, tr. DQ.  Ibid, 813ff. and 1053ff.; cf. Augsburg Confession, arts. 15 and 26 in *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 69f. and 100ff.;

Accordingly, it was the young *Lutheran* theologians Bonhoeffer, Hildebrandt and Sasse who—as early as summer 1933—considered the option of declaring a *status confessionis*.[52] At the time, Bonhoeffer's proposition of calling a 'state of confession' did not resonate with Barth. It was only in the weeks leading up to the Barmen Synod that Barth, rooted as he was in the Reformed-theological tradition, studied the '*Formula Concordiae*' in greater depth.[53] Doctrinal affirmations and catechisms of the Reformation, in turn, reference the creedal symbols of the early church. This, of course, constitutes a shared-Protestant—and ecumenical—tradition of confession.[54] The young pastors and theologians proposed a 'translation' of the Lutheran memory of a historical *status confessionis,* hoping to render

---

Jaroslav Pelikan, *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 2003), 186ff. Introduction and sources on the adiaphoristic controversy: Irene Dingel, ed., *Der Adiaphoristische Streit (1548–1560)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2012).

52  Eberhard Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Theologian—Christian—Man of His Times: a Biography,* ed. Victoria J. Barnett, rev. edn (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 292 and 304ff. After the War, this lead to different—Lutheran and Reformed—ecumenical understandings of *status confessionis*: Guillermo Hansen, 'Neoliberal Globalization: a *Casus Confessionis*?' in *Communion, Responsibility, Accountability: Responding as a Lutheran Communion to Neoliberal Globalization,* ed. Karen L. Bloomquist (Geneva: LWF, 2004), 163ff.

53  Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts,* tr. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1976), 245.

54  *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 510ff. Ibid., 21ff. and 501ff. Cf. Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine,* tr. F. Ernest Stoeffler (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978).

it an OPP and a powerful weapon to challenge the adoption of the Nazi 'Arian paragraph' by their Protestant churches. They approached Barth hoping to enlist him as the senior 'spokesman' of this cause.

*(2) Bonhoeffer's failed interessement devices (summer 1933)*

It is well documented that, according to Bonhoeffer's understanding, a line was crossed when his land church's general synod decided—in September 1933—to introduce the 'Aryan paragraph' to church administrative law, to the effect that church members of Jewish descent were to be dismissed from the clergy and ecclesiastical administration. With Bonhoeffer's Church of the Prussian Union at the forefront of the confrontation and his pastoral colleague and friend Hildebrandt directly affected, Bonhoeffer had *personal reason* to establish the doctrinal argument that 'the church' cannot exclude Jewish Christians from her membership and ministry. Others became 'enrolled' in the cause: Pastor Niemöller from Berlin Dahlem (who had initially welcomed Hitler's takeover) founded the '*Pfarrernotbund*,' one of the early interessement devices which contributed significantly towards the shaping of the inner-Protestant resistance to Nazi-Christian policy; whilst—at the same time—it ensured that Protestant resistance to the Aryan paragraph would not

concern 'secular' state politics.

Barth however decided that it was not yet the time to make his move. In a letter to Bonhoeffer, penned in Oberrieden, Switzerland, on 11 September, Barth affirmed that 'I too am of the opinion that there is a *status confessionis*,' but urged Bonhoeffer to hold back until the other side had introduced the split. Implicitly hinting at Luther's excommunication and imperial ban, Barth writes: 'When the breach comes, it must come from the other side.' It would be desirable 'that the encounter might take place at a still more central point.'[55] The 'interessement' device which was Bonhoeffer's letter thus failed to sufficiently separate Barth from the inner workings of his own theological and political reasoning so as to be fully engaged with the cause in the way in which Bonhoeffer had hoped he would.[56]

By the end of the summer of 1933, Bonhoeffer's strategic—

---

55  Bonhoeffer's letter from 9-9-1933 and Barth's response from 11-9-1933: Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *No Rusty Swords: Letters, Lectures and Notes 1928–1936,* ed. Edwin H. Robertson, tr. Edwin H. Robertson and John Bowden (London: Collins, 1965), 231 and 232. Jordan J. Ballor, 'The Aryan Clause, the Confessing Church, and the Ecumenical Movement: Barth and Bonhoeffer on Natural Theology, 1933–1935,' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 3 (2006): 263ff.; Bethge, *Dietrich Bonhoeffer,* 304ff.

56  'To be interested is to be in between (*inter-esse*), to be interposed.' Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 208.

academic-theological and church-political—contribution towards the resistance of the emerging Nazi church seemed to have disintegrated completely: Bonhoeffer's and Sasse's Bethel Confession of August 1933 turned out to be completely unsuitable as an interessement device, proving to be a statement which could never evoke—let alone unite—a coordinated theological confrontation of Nazi Christianity; Bodelschwingh and Niemöller had colluded to appropriate—and 'improve' upon—its original wording (a 'betrayal' of a kind, to use another of Callon's categories whilst remaining true to Bonhoeffer's and Sasse's perspective);[57] and Barth had declared that this was not yet the time to—nor the theological matter with which to—engage. Unable to establish himself—along with his agenda—as a relevant 'spokesperson' or church-political contributor and 'enrolled' with a different actors' network, Bonhoeffer decided to leave Berlin and head to London.

---

57  Guy Christopher Carter, 'Confession at Bethel, August 1933—Enduring Witness: the Formation, Revision and Significance of the First Full Theological Confession of the Evangelical Church Struggle in Nazi Germany,' diss., Marquette Univ., Milwaukee, Wisc. (1987). Gerhard Ruhbach, 'Das Betheler Bekenntnis,' in *Die lutherischen Kirchen und die Bekenntnissynode von Barmen: Referate des internationalen Symposiums auf der Reisensburg 1984,* ed. Wolf-Dieter Hauschild (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984), 56ff.; Jelle van der Kooi, *Das Betheler Bekenntnis: mit einer Einführung von Jelle van der Kooi und einem Brief Dietrich Bonhoeffers* (Bielefeld: von Bodelschwinghsche Anstalten, 1983).

*(3)  Relevance of biographic rationales*

Within the dispositional power relations which contributes towards theological and political decision-making, one's roots within a particular theological tradition, as well as the fixing of church-political actions, contributions and positions, have thus far been considered.  In addition, other, more personal relations may determine a player's political contributions.  It would appear that the different life-situational and (secular-)political situations of both Barth and Bonhoeffer, played a role in their church-political and theological thought processes, as well as in decision-making.  Bonhoeffer was personally involved in the pastoral work of his church in Berlin; and his upper-middle-class family was deeply engaged in—and always affected by—German national politics.  Barth— being a Swiss national—on the other hand, remained somewhat an outsider and was only expected to engage with German politics from the sidelines.[58] Whilst deeper material-conceptual reasons exist (which will be considered later), Barth's inability to have a more direct involvement in German politics was surely displayed when, in an essay from June 1933, he recommended that during disquieting times, one should stay focused and

---

58  In addition to Busch's and Bethge's biographies: John D. Godsey, 'Barth and Bonhoeffer: the Basic Difference,' *Quarterly Review* 7, no. 1 (1987): 9ff.

continue studying, teaching and writing theology 'as if nothing had happened.'[59]  According to Barth's understanding, the 'still more central point' in relation to the Barmen Confessing Synod introducing the breach in May the following year was the question of rejecting 'natural revelation.'[60]  Later in life, Barth confesses—and regrets—that 'as long as I can remember, I always had to swallow something like a completely irrational distaste' of Jewish people, including Jewish Christians.  Barth however, does not seem to believe that this could have played a role in his decision to wait regarding the question of the Aryan paragraph.[61]  With regards to Callon's theorisation, this subsection highlights the challenge of 'translation' or the fixing of actor-networks which rely on distributed achievements of mutual 'translations' and the discipline of impure, dissimilar and complex contributions which must be aligned with each other and made to act together in a meaningful and coordinated way.

---

59  Karl Barth, *Theologische Existenz heute!* (Munich: Kaiser, 1933), 3, tr. DQ.

60  Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* vol. 2, *The Doctrine of God,* pt. 1, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, tr. G. W. Bromiley et al. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957), 175 (hereafter as Barth, *CD,* 2/1).  Ballor, 'Aryan Clause;' Busch, *Karl Barth,* 209ff.  It is also noteworthy that Barth's contribution to the Barmen Synod is followed by his harsh rejection of Brunner's most cautious consideration of an anthropological correlation of 'Nature and Grace:' Karl Barth, 'No! Answer to Emil Brunner,' in *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom,* ed. Clifford Green (London: Collins, 1989), 151ff.

61  Letter to Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt, 5-9-1967: Karl Barth, *Briefe 1961– 1968,* ed. Jürgen Fangmeier and Hinrich Stoevesandt, Gesamtausgabe, 5/6 (Zurich: TVZ, 1979), 421, tr. DQ.

Contextual-cultural, political, biographic and psychological dimensions, relations and narratives all contribute towards—or can disturb—efforts at creating and directing purposeful-academic or political agency.

Though Bonhoeffer was amongst the first of those who worked towards the formation of the Protestant resistance, by the time the Barmen Confessing Synod was underway, he had left Germany.

*(4)  Establishing the Barmen Synod as an OPP*

In order for the Barmen Declaration to succeed as a church-political strategy, effort and contributions of many places were required.  Callon points out that, notwithstanding the quality of reasoning and disciplinary achievements engaging relevant entities by way of 'enrolment' within their appropriate relations remains hazardous: 'success is never assured.'[62]  Any given link can break and put the success of the whole enterprise at risk. The Confessing Synod in Barmen, during May 1934, could not have become politically relevant (and successful) with regards to Protestant resistance, at that time, had there been a failure to gather and unite already existing, confessing and rogue synodal groups, from different regional

_____

62   Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 211.

churches and denominational backgrounds, into a single movement. At the Barmen gathering, a short document of six articles was drafted and adopted. The Barmen Theological Declaration would become an OPP for all Protestants to follow, from that time forth.

Callon forewarns that the final stage of establishing an OPP/actor network would involve efforts to undo any successful fixing; and that they would take the form of contestation as to whether spokespersons were fully representative of their respective groups.[63] A specific challenge became particularly important with regards to the fixing of the Confessing Church. Alternative 'spokespeople' of relevant groups—and their relating allies which, through the establishment of Barmen as an OPP, were at risk of being sidelined—were likely to raise concerns with representation. Clearly, the Barmen Declaration was drafted by Barth, a Reformed (and contested) theologian, and adopted, mainly, by clergy of Prussian-United (and a few Reformed) churches and congregations. Laying aside this difficulty, within a neo-Lutheran understanding, Barmen would never be acceptable as a 'confession' to sit alongside those of the (Lutheran) Reformation which had been codified as the (Lutheran) historic-doctrinal standard: how could it be

---

63 'The mobilisation of allies: are the spokesmen representative?' Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 214.

theologically binding—even have relevance—for church leaders within the Lutheran theological tradition?  Whilst it was, of course, Barth who wrote the text, it was of the utmost importance—both for its wider acceptance and the gathering momentum of the 'Confessing' theological resistance—that it was a Lutheran—Pastor Asmussen from Hamburg Altona—who introduced defining interpretation to the declaration.[64]  Only in this way was it possible to avoid the impression—or counter an anticipated Lutheran contention— that Barmen merely spoke and 'confessed' on behalf of denominationally Reformed and old-Prussian-United congregations—respectively a Barthian theological agenda.[65]

*(5)  Lutheran controversies and betrayals*

As an interessement device, Barmen proved to make a significant contribution towards the mobilisation, information and unification of the Protestant resistance to the *DC* and the state.  The Nazi 'Faith Movement' would soon be sidelined.  Nevertheless, the history of '[d]issidence:

---

64  Cochrane, *Church's Confession,* 239ff. and 248ff.

65  Cochrane, *Church's Confession;* Brakelmann, *Evangelische Kirche im Entscheidungsjahr*; Joachim Beckmann, ed., *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* 60–71: *1933–1944* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1948), 36ff.; Helmreich, *German Churches,* 157ff.

betrayals and controversies'[66] began immediately after Barmen, when academics of the Erlangen theological faculty joined forces with Lutheran 'German Christians.' According to an explicitly Lutheran-theological and *DC*-'*völkisch*' rationale, the Ansbach Memorandum of June 1934 argued explicitly against Barth's rejection of 'natural theology.' It was only on the basis of the Lutheran contribution and interpretation of the Barmen Declaration, that Bishop Meiser of the Bavarian Lutheran Church was able to limit the damage. At the same time, many Lutheran theologians and pastors, who differed from their Reformed and Prussian Union counterparts in that their doctrinal tradition and identity was more clearly contained, were prepared to acknowledge Barmen as a groundbreaking 'theological declaration' that would guide and challenge all the churches of its day to arrive at a point of confessing decision. From their point of view however, Barmen should not be considered to be 'a new confession,' upon which a united evangelical church had been founded; but must be interpreted on the basis of the different doctrinal-confessional settlements of each denomination.[67] 'Is a spokesman or an intermediary representative? This

---

66  Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 219.

67  Luther-Council on 3-2-1937, quoted in: Heinz Brunotte, 'Die theologische Erklärung von Barmen 1934 und ihr Verhältnis zum lutherischen Bekenntnis,' in *Bekenntnis und Kirchenverfassung: Aufsätze zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977), 149f., tr. DQ.

is a practical and not a theoretical question.'[68]  Is there not a need for Lutherans to theologically challenge Barth and Barmen?[69]  Is it possible for them to affirm and fully participate in a Barmen-united Confessing Church?  Counter-intuitively, Callon's theorisation, according to the 'principle of symmetry,'[70] turns the Barmen Synod and the text of the Theological Declaration into 'spokespeople,' all be they of a non-human nature.  Thus, how must one challenge and resist Barmen—and alongside it, Barth's theology and politics—such that one's genuinely Lutheran-theological voice will be heard and affirmed.

Some time after this 'betrayal' by Erlangen theologians had been resolved, a succession of Lutheran church leaders' groups, 'pacts' and 'councils,' steered by the bishops of the 'intact' land churches of Bavaria, Hanover and Württemberg, was formed to organise, voice and secure the interests of Lutheran churches/congregations across Germany; not only against state intrusion and Nazi church policy, but equally, over and against the more radical voices of the emerging Council of Brethren *BK* within the

---

68   Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 219.

69   Paul Althaus, 'Bedenken zur "Theologischen Erklärung " der Barmer Bekenntnissynode,' in Karlmann Beyschlag, *Die Erlanger Theologie* (Erlangen: Martin-Luther-Verlag, 1993), 258ff.

70   Althaus, 'Bedenken zur Theologischen Erklärung,' 200.

'destroyed' churches, which were largely drawn from the Prussian Union.[71]

Idiomatically, many were (or became) 'Barthians.' Taking a stance in the

middle, it was in the 1940s that the Württemberg Land Bishop Wurm

planted the 'Church Unification Initiative' (*Kirchliches Einigungswerk*)

which paved the way for the post-war, cross-denominational creation of the

Evangelical Church in Germany (*EKD*).[72] Whilst affirming Barmen as a

way to fend off state interference in areas of theology and inner-

ecclesiastical concerns, the bishops of 'intact' Lutheran land churches

would take on an overall more conciliatory—in a few instances, even

affirmative—view of Hitler's national policy, as long as it remained—as

Erlangen theologians at the time would see it—within the state's 'secular'

governmental responsibility.[73] Putting all the differences, as regards

---

71   Thomas Martin Schneider, *Gegen den Zeitgeist: der Weg der VELKD als lutherischer Bekenntniskirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2008); Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, 'Was ist "lutherisch"?: zum Selbstverständnis der Lutheraner des sog. Lutherrats (1936–1948),' *Kerygma und Dogma* 53, no. 2 (2007): 124ff.; Helmreich, *German Churches,* 196ff.

72   Jörg Thierfelder, *Das Kirchliche Einigungswerk des württembergischen Landesbischofs Theophil Wurm* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975); Helmreich, *German Churches,* 333f. and 418.

73   Hans-Otto Langer, *Der Kirchenkampf in der Ära der Kirchenausschüsse (1935–1937)* (Bielefeld: Bechauf, 1971); Schneider, *Gegen den Zeitgeist;* Helmreich, *German Churches,* 196ff. James M. Stayer, *Martin Luther, German Saviour: German Evangelical Theological Factions and the Interpretation of Luther, 1917–1933* (Montreal and Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 2000), 79ff.; Matthew Becker, 'Werner Elert (1885–1954),' in *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians,* ed. Mark C. Mattes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013), 93ff.; Hans Schwarz, 'Paul Althaus (1888–1966)' in *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians,* 136ff.

theological interpretation, disagreement, competition, betrayals and strife,

aside, the parties of the *BK* remained united in their faithful affirmation of

the Barmen Declaration and its relating rejection of Nazi Christianity.

Whilst Barmen held as an OPP of Protestant theological unity and political

resistance, the relating Confessing Church, in terms of its organisational

and ecclesiastical unity, did not.[74] From a *BK Bruderrat* point of view, the

Lutheran bishops had 'become dissidents;' they had 'betrayed' the common

cause such that 'representivity is brought into question.'[75]

'Controversies' around the Barmen Declaration continued after the

war and questions were raised as to: whether, and in what way, it should be

given the normative-theological status of a Protestant 'confession of faith;'

whether, and in what way, it facilitates an ecclesiastical unification of

Protestant Christianity in Germany; and whether Barth and Barmen should

be charged with the introduction of a serious limitation to the possibilities

of Christian-political resistance. Under different circumstances, it was in

Eisenach in 1948, that the previous complex cooperation and conflict

between Lutheran bishops of the Luther Council and the Council of

Brethren culminated in the creation of both the 'United Evangelical

---

74  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 169ff.

75  Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

Lutheran Church of Germany' (*VELKD*) and the *EKD*.[76]  The differences in

the post-Barmen Reformed and the older Lutheran understandings of

'confession,' as a political tool, prompted an uneven deployment of *status*

*confessionis* within some—more recent—politico-ethical discourses of the

Ecumenical Movement (of which there is more detail in chapter 3).[77]

Barmen, limited as it was to inner-ecclesiastical affairs and failing to

acknowledge concerns surrounding the Aryan clause, contributed towards

there being a virtually non-existent Protestant response to the persecution

of the political opposition, Jewish people and other minorities.  After the

war, this would be seen as one of the major flaws of *BK* resistance.  Around

the same time, the fragments of Bonhoeffer's theological thinking found its

readership; of particular interest were his provisional propositions that

---

76  Rat und Kirchenkanzlei der EKD, ed., *Eisenach 1948: Verhandlungen der verfassungsgebenden Kirchenversammlung der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland vom 9.–13. Juli 1948* (Berlin: Wichern, 1951); Lutherische Generalsynode, ed., *Bericht über die Tagung der Verfassungsgebenden Generalsynode vom 6. bis 8. Juli 1948 in Eisenach: mit Dokumentenanhang aus den Jahren 1933 bis 1948* (Hanover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1956); Joachim Beckmann, ed., *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die evangelische Kirche in Deutschland* 72–75: *1945–1948* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1950), 446–453; Annemarie Smith-von Osten, *Von Treysa 1945 bis Eisenach 1948: zur Geschichte der Grundordnung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980); Gerhard Besier, 'Auf dem Weg zur Bildung einer Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands: Die erste Nachkriegstagung des Lutherrates im August 1945,' in *Der Kompromiß von Treysa: die Entstehung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD) 1945: eine Dokumentation,* ed. Gerhard Besier, Hartmut Ludwig and Jörg Thierfelder (Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verl., 1995), 21ff.

77  Hansen, 'Neoliberal Globalization.'

reflected upon Christian-theological engagement with the political resistance and the unchurched-secular world.

*Power-analytical evaluation*

In this section, an unsystematic selection of contributions—of a mixed nature and of various modes of relevance—have been reviewed, towards the 'fixing' of the Barmen Declaration as an actor network and passage point of power. The intention of this exercise was to exemplify Callon's phases of 'translation' which lead towards the creation of OPPs, and a summary of some of the findings of this section now follows: Firstly, it has been ascertained that, during the summer of 1933, Bonhoeffer's 'problematisation' of the need to mobilise immediate resistance against the Nazi takeover of Protestant churches, and the calling of a formal 'state of confession,' failed to resonate with theologians who—like Barth—were not rooted within the Lutheran theological tradition. Considering the fact that within an ANT understanding, non-humans also have agency, upon closer examination, it can be seen that Barth's later approval is indicative of the fact that Bonhoeffer succeeded in 'enrolling' the memory of the Formula of Concords to the Protestant Struggle. Secondly, a number of interessement devices have been mentioned including: Niemöller's *Pfarrernotbund*, the

Bethel Confession, the Barmen Declaration and Bonhoeffer's letter to Barth. At different times and to different degrees, these managed—or failed—to mobilise the relevant parties to engage and coordinate action. Thirdly, it can be seen that having the appropriate representation of all the politically relevant groups was vital for the establishment of Barmen as a new OPP of German Protestantism. According to the same rationale, it can be ascertained that the power concerns, listed in the section above, must be both non-systematically gathered and heterogeneous in nature, so as to give an impression of a comprehensive approach regarding power analysis in terms of actor-network assemblage. Finally, it can be seen that 'spokespersons' and concerns of representation, with regards to the groups which are gathered into a network of power, remain controversial (Barth, Asmussen, the Bavarian land bishop, theologians at the Erlangen theological faculty). Even a cursory review of the relevant processes leading up to Barmen, makes it clear that Callon's theory observation of different phases of 'translation' serves to highlight the fact that the essential challenge, in strategically creating an OPP/actor network, lies in engaging a number of relevant/distributed players of a heterogeneous nature, *each on their own terms.*[78]

---

78   In addition to Callon's paper: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 64f. and 106ff.; Law, 'Actor Network Theory.'

Admittedly, this brief exploration of mixed perspectives, decisions and developments, which led to the creation of the Barmen Declaration, remains incomplete. The Barmen Theological Declaration was established and fixed, as a relation of theological meaning, political affirmation and power, both in and through, the inter-engaging and securing of a good number of heterogeneous layers. Some of these relevant elements, relations and dimensions include: selective activation of historical/ theological memories (Lutheran historical and dogmatic tradition); specific political decisions regarding which concerns to include and which ones to leave aside (with regards to the Aryan paragraph, for example, a decision was made to consider ecclesiastical order, but to lay aside secular politics; otherwise, Barth decided to fight natural theology, but not antisemitism); how the personal, professional, social and political formation—and situation—of key players (Barth, Bonhoeffer and Niemöller) impacted their theological or political decision-making and thinking; whether someone's families and friends were affected (Hildebrandt); whether someone was successful in 'enrolling' potential allies and promoting their respective agenda in order to find their role within other players' political games; and whether relevant 'spokespersons' became recognised as representatives of relevant groups/concerns (whether Asmussen, for example, spoke on behalf of Lutherans; or whether all denominational and academic-theological

groups would back a declaration that had been drafted by Barth). An indication has been given that it was possible to analyse the dispositional relations of each of the identified dimensions/processes, which contribute towards the creation of an historical decision or situation, in their own right. Their 'translation' into an OPP, it has been noted, encourages them to work together, in both essential and stable—whilst imperfect—ways, so as to support and inform each other. Latour defines an actor network as: that which 'is made to act by a large star-shaped web of mediators flowing in and out of it.'[79] This 'flowing in and out'—as well as coordinated action—is also descriptive of the power of an actor network/OPP.[80] One part of the power network of the Barmen Confession comprises therefore, of the subsequent-historical—as well as any as-yet-unrealised 'potential'—effects and developments, including: political or academic reception; and the formation of (theological) opposition and other historical developments.[81] Amongst the relevant historical developments that have been examined are the ways in which Barmen informed the contrasting groups that existed within the *BK*; with the Lutheran bishops of the 'intact' churches on one side and the Councils of Brethren on the other.

---

79  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 217.

80  Law, 'Notes on the Theory.'

81  Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World: Lowell Lectures, 1925* (New York: Free Press, 1967) 103ff.

As a theological and political strategy, in the confrontation and resistance against the Nazi state and its Protestant avatar, the dispositional fixing of Barmen as an OPP proved to be highly successful; at least, with regards to its immediate historical effect; its outcome; and a common theological evaluation. Whilst most academic-theological analyses focus on symbolic/dispositional relations, a more detailed power analysis—and one which is reflective of changing fortunes across the proceeding phases of the Protestant struggle—would need to be established upon a basis that considers all the power relations across all of the circuits of Clegg's framework. Thereby, Mann's outflanking, and organisation-ecological theorisations of isomorphism, pressure and innovation (cf. above, 2.1) are relevant power-analytical contributions.

## 2.3 Moving the goalposts to outflank theological resistance

Clegg theorises that the relationship between dispositional, social integration (second circuit) and disciplinary-facilitative, systemic integration (third circuit), can be regarded as 'outflanking,' domination, population-ecological variation and 'isomorphism.' Through the deployment of these categories, a complete analysis of volatile political

developments, within vacillating state–church relationships, is possible. If

nothing else, this should clarify the complex mutual impact of the powers

of modern-secular politics and legislation, and theological (religious)

mobilisation, upon one another. The (secular) state influences the power

environment within which religious practice, church order and politics

occur. Conversely, the church also influences the state through the

Christian-religious capacity to facilitate the formation of particularly

intensive relationships 'from below,' that relate to identity-formation, social

mobilisation, cohesion and discipline. Furthermore, Christian-theological,

ethical and church-political discourse can also have an impact upon

secular-political discursive relations. 'Religion'—respectively the

churches—make a significant contribution towards the transformation of

disciplinary-and-facilitative environments, within which state and party-

political action—as well as regulation—either succeeds or fails. The aim

of the following analytical considerations is, more specifically, to observe

the systemic effects of state policy and action upon the power capacities of

Christian churches, movements and groups.


*(1) DC and Barmen (1933–34)*


     With Hitler seizing power, leaders in the *völkisch* 'Faith Movement'

pressed ahead 'too much, too soon' and lost support from amongst Protestant moderates (episodic power).  Protestant resistance gathered momentum in 1934, following the dispositional 'fixing' of a theological schism, and of 'church emergency law.'  On this basis, it was possible to amass a broad Confessing Church national movement that would traverse traditional divides and ecclesiastical interests.[82]

The adoption of Barth's Theological Declaration at the Barmen Confessing Synod made it possible for German Protestants to outflank (Mann) the Nazi infraction.  This was achieved through a top-down fixing of theological-dispositional truth relations and—in practical terms— through mobilising a distributed witness and resistance 'from within' (cf. 3.3 and chapter 4).[83]  Given that the Protestant resistance of 1934 was theological in nature, and remained limited to keeping Christian-theological practice free of state interference, it remained inconceivable for the churches to unite in political protest regarding any other political concern, even in the face of stark power abuse and atrocities committed by authorities or party groups against political opponents and Jewish people.

---

82  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 126ff. and 133ff.

83  Mann, *Sources of Social Power;* Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 218ff. Cochrane, *Church's Confession.*

It also mattered that the great majority of Protestant clergy and regular worshippers were of a conservative, anti-liberal political persuasion.[84] In the war years, it was left to a few of exceptional individuals to speak out—locally—against deportations and mass killings of disabled people and Jews.[85]

*(2)  Failed takeover of the intact churches (1934)*

By the end of 1934, an overreaching and reckless church policy, coupled with the agitation of the most radical section of the *DC,* had created a shambolic situation and a great deal of Christian opposition, bringing about the disapproval of the Nazi leadership in Berlin.  A significant majority of pastors and church leaders had closed ranks against the creation of a unified and politically aligned German national church.[86] Efforts at incorporating the still 'intact' regional churches of Württemberg, Bavaria and Hanover, by directing administrative and coercive measures

---

84  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 157ff.

85  Ger van Roon, *Widerstand im Dritten Reich: ein Überblick,* 6th edn (Munich: Beck, 1994), 79ff.; Richard J. Evans, *The Third Reich in Power, 1933–1939* (London and New York: Penguin, 2006), 220ff.; Evans, *The Third Reich at War: how the Nazis Led Germany from Conquest to Disaster,* (London and New York: Penguin, 2009), 92ff., 524ff., 546ff. and 552f.

86  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 169ff.; Brakelmann, *Evangelische Kirche im Entscheidungsjahr,* 109ff.

against church governing bodies and land bishops proved counterproductive. In the affected regions, public protests were stirred from the Protestant grass roots in support of their bishops; public support was channelled away from the Nazi national awakening and towards empowering the Confessing-evangelical resistance from below. As was the case in Leipzig during the 'peaceful revolution' of 1989, the combination of public acts of Christian worship and subsequent political protests facilitated a powerful, politically unified, disciplined and peaceful mass-protest movement, which—in the autumns of both 1934 and also of 1989—took politicians by surprise. Within the relations of the disciplinary and facilitative circuit, the mode—and power dynamics—of a liturgical-political mobilisation/unification is different from (secular-modern) party-political agitation, ideology and polemics. In turn, this also directed the attention of the international press, as well as church leaders of the Ecumenical Movement, towards the situation of the German-Protestant church.[87] In these developments, state policy and action introduced change to the facilitative-systemic context in which the tasks of ecclesiastical (self-)organisation and theological reflection are undertaken. Equally visible is the religious capacity to gather, mobilise, unite and guide both

---

87  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 169ff.; Kurt Meier, *Der Evangelische Kirchenkampf: Gesamtdarstellung in drei Bänden,* vol. 1, *Der Kampf um die 'Reichskirche'* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976).

individuals and movements—from within and from below—and to do so across local communities, cultures and nations. This capability contributes to the organisation-ecological facilitative environment which—based upon disciplinary technique—can either empower or disempower, facilitate or limit, state organisation, policy creation and political action.

The result was that the besieged land bishops emerged with increased strength and the constitutional status quo ante of their regional churches was restored. In Berlin, at the Reich Church, Commissioner Jäger had to resign and Reich Bishop Müller was marginalised. Accordingly, the Nazi leadership introduced new key players and altered their strategy (episodic/causal power).

*(3) Tightening of state–church regulatory conditions (1935–37)*

Across the many social forms/formations that now felt drawn to associate with Barmen, it was still necessary to rely upon—and cooperate with—compromised ecclesiastical governance structures—and even the National Socialist state—in relation to pastoral ordinations and appointments, and virtually all financial and administrative undertakings.[88]

---

88  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 165ff.

It stood to reason that, in 1935, the Nazi state radically changed their strategy, tightening the disciplinary and regulatory conditions of church politics in the facilitative circuit with the following outcomes: in March, state control over church finances was introduced by law; in July, the Reich Ministry for Ecclesiastic Affairs was created with oversight of all aspects relating to national and Prussian state–church matters; and in September, a Prussian Union and a Reich Church Committee (*Kirchenausschuss*) were created to calm the troubled waters and unite and integrate church leaders and moderates on all sides.  Amongst the specific measures, it was decided that church boards and congregations could no longer present (and thus reverse) executive measures before regular courts.

Kerrl's state–church administrative decisions and politics resulted in significant changes within the field of inner-*BK* political relations: Confessing Protestantism had never been a homogeneous movement. Confessing pastors and groups of old-Prussian Union churches, struggling to survive within the contested fields of their 'destroyed' regional churches whilst, simultaneously, being more vulnerable to harassment by local officials and agencies of the state, would naturally take a theologically and more church-politically profiled position.  On the other hand, bishops presiding over 'intact' churches would be considered to be of a higher

status and thus on a par with high-level state and party officials. They would generally be prepared to compromise so as to ensure the smooth running of their ecclesiastical affairs. In addition, these bishops were altogether denominational Lutherans who would perceive both a Barthian and a Prussian-Union theological/church-political gathering of Reformed churches and Lutherans within a united German-Confessing church as a threat to their own ambitions for a closer, Lutheran-national cooperation. Theological difference had already resurfaced over the doctrinal status and interpretation of Barmen. In a way, this moment of Prussian-Union weakness was a rare historical chance to further Lutheran-ecclesiastical unity. As the result of the short successive phases of a complex interplay between church-political interactions amongst *BK* leaders and political and regulatory decisions and actions at Kerrl's Reich Church Ministry, certain organisational agencies that were engaged in church-political activity, were rendered obsolete; and new ones emerged. As has already been pointed out, Kerrl created church committees under the authority of the Reich Ministry with the aim of both directing and moderating the affairs of 'disturbed' church territories. Furthermore, Kerrl's policies aimed to sideline 'radicals' from all parties whilst cooperating with 'moderates,' offering *BK* bishops of the 'undisturbed' churches a lifeline at the very time that Confessing pastors and groups of 'destroyed' churches were

experiencing an increase of state interference and repression. Within *BK* politics, this created a rift. When the Reich Council of Brethren decided, on theological principle, not to engage with relevant church committees, the *BK* Provisional Church-Governing Body (*Provisorische Kirchenleitung*) and its presiding bishop Marahrens (Hanover) felt that they were able to cooperate with the state in affairs which did not directly pertain to pastoral and theological matters.[89] Kerrl's ordinance, from 2 December 1935[90] decreed that in ('disturbed') territories, in which church committees had been established, no other group or body must perform duties of ecclesiastical governance. This directly hampered the work of the Prussian *Bruderrat,* whereas Lutheran bishops of 'intact' churches were not affected as long as the state perceived that, within reason, they remained responsive.[91] At a meeting on 3 January 1936, the *BK* leadership disintegrated over the question as to cooperation: the Reich Council of Brethren (speaking on behalf of the majority view of destroyed Prussian-Union churches) declared that the Provisional Church-Governing Body would no longer act on behalf of the Confessing Church; and the

---

89  Langer, *Kirchenkampf,* 17ff. and 22ff.; Helmreich, *German Churches,* 191ff.

90  Beckmann, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* 60–71, 101ff. and 105f.

91  'To have permitted this ordinance to go unchallenged would have meant the end of the Confessing church in the disrupted church areas; it did not apply to the intact churches.' Helmreich, *German Churches,* 194.

Provisional Church-Governing Body refused to be dismissed.  In February, during rocky proceedings at the fourth (and final) national Confessing Synod at Oeynhausen, the bishops failed to find their feet when a new Reich Council of Brethren was elected.  The Reich Council of Brethren thereafter appointed a new *Provisorische Kirchenleitung* which, it was discovered, could only act and speak on behalf of the more radical and hard-pressed *BK* of 'destroyed' Prussian-Union churches.  This took place at the same time as the Lutheran bishops of 'intact' Hanover, Bavaria and Württemberg intensified their inner-'Lutheran' cooperation and created the 'Luther Council' (*Lutherrat*) which asserted its 'Lutheran'-theological reading of Barmen and an independent church–state politics.  The latter included a qualified cooperation with the Reich Church Committee and Kerrl's Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs.  The Luther Council, at the same time, continued to formally acknowledge the *BK* Provisional Church-Governing Body as the leading ecclesiastical authority and, in practical terms, disregarded many of its policies and decisions.[92]  At a time when the more radical and principled Council of Brethren *BK* bore the brunt of hostile administrative measures and state action, the Luther Council, especially its presiding bishop Marahrens (Hanover), continued to engage with—and come to terms with—the Nazi state.  No wonder, the Council of

---

92   Langer, *Kirchenkampf,* 22ff.

Brethren *BK,* who bore the brunt of hostile administrative measures and

state action, felt betrayed by the bishops as they perceived Barmen, their

common cause, being abandoned.[93]  However, what occurred at the

episodic and dispositional level of church (*BK*) politics, cannot be fully

understood without reference to Kerrl's skilful manipulations of their

organisational environment, within the circuit of systemic integration.  As

ecclesiastical state regulator, the Nazi ministry introduced changes to the

disciplinary regimes and administrative standards/rationales of the

institutional environment within which church administrations and

leadership were to survive.  From a population-ecological point of view,

such alterations of selective environments create adaptive pressures

which—whilst empowering some players—disempower others, forcing

them into ecological niches of their own.[94]  In this case, *DC* and *Bruderrat*

radicals were isolated and disempowered.  On the basis of disciplinary-

facilitative changes, the unity of the Barmen *BK* eroded as a result of the

different interests of the 'intact' and 'emergency law' regional churches,

and over the question of cooperation with the Nazi state.  Kerrl succeeded

---

93  Langer, *Kirchenkampf,* 27; Hartmut Ludwig, 'Tagung der Bekennenden Kirche in Frankfurt/M.,' *Der Kompromiß von Treysa: die Entstehung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD) 1945: eine Dokumentation,* ed. Gerhard Besier, Hartmut Ludwig and Jörg Thierfelder (Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verl., 1995), 9ff.

94  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 225ff. and 233ff.; Hannan and Freeman, *Organizational Ecology,* 66ff. and 91ff.

in segregating the radical *BK* resistance 'from below' in some of the land churches (especially those of the Old-Prussian Union) that had been brought into line under Nazi-Christian ecclesiastical leadership and pushed them into an administrative-environmental 'niche' of their own.  Though he achieved some of his strategic goals within the field of church politics, Reich Minister Kerrl also failed to unite—let alone co-opt and control—the land bishops and moderates of the different factions.[95]

*(4)  Localised coercive action and harassment (1937–40)*

Given the failure of Kerrl's ecclesiastical-unification policy and the consolidation of the authoritarian police state, by 1937, the direct state action and harassment of congregations, pastors and church leaders had increased significantly.  Administrative and financial controls were further tightened.  The influence of bureaucrats without Christian affiliation grew as did—during the later war years—the influence of unsympathetic party members.  There were responsibilities in some arenas—such as the release

---

95  Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, *Dokumente des Kirchenkampfes II: die Zeit der Reichskirchenausschüsse 1935–1937,* 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964 and 1965); Beckmann, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* 60–71, 101ff. Helmreich, *German Churches,* 169ff.; Gerhard Besier, *Die Kirchen und das Dritte Reich,* vol. 3, *Spaltungen und Abwehrkämpfe* (Berlin and Munich: Propyläen, 2001); Langer, *Kirchenkampf;* Kurt Meier, *Der Evangelische Kirchenkampf,* vol. 2, *Gescheiterte Neuordnungsversuche im Zeichen staatlicher 'Rechtshilfe'* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976).

of funds or the countersigning of church-administrative actions within the ministerial finance department—whereby their ever-increasing powers of supervision could be used to: delay/stop pastoral appointments; suspend clergy-salary payments for political reasons; restrict and obstruct congregational offerings and collections; further curb state subsidies (even though these were legal titles) and limit administrative support for church-tax collection from the state and local government; and disrupt the day-to-day operations of ecclesiastical bodies and administrations in many other ways.

At certain times and in certain places, direct coercive measures on the part of police and Gestapo could be directed against preachers, groups and the work of leading bodies. According to *BK* intercession lists, in the spring of 1935, as many as 715 of their preachers were arrested, of which 20 were placed in concentration camps.[96] In 1937, more than 800 pastors spent a night or more in custody, by which means the state would enforce restrictions upon church offerings and other (minor) concerns.[97] By that time, the dispositives and rationale of the police state were firmly established. During the summer, a Reich *Bruderrat* meeting was raided,

---

96   Helmreich, *German Churches,* 179 and 182.

97   Helmreich, *German Churches,* 215.

and all of its members arrested. The president of the Prussian *Bruderrat*, Niemöller, was interned and sent to a concentration camp as a political prisoner. Other police measures undertaken against *BK* leaders and clergy—particularly those of the destroyed churches, and especially those of the Old-Prussian Union—included: homes being searched; fines and confiscations; and also the prohibition of publishing, speaking, travelling or engaging in any public activity. Authorities and police interfered to stop guest speakers addressing a series of talks during Evangelical Week (*Evangelische Woche*), and during August 1937, Himmler ordered a secret police crackdown on (illegal) *BK* seminaries and examination boards.

During this phase of Nazi church policy, neither the actors nor the action was, in general, systematically coordinated at a national policy level. Instead, at any given administrative level, policies and actors were manifold and had discretion to be either lenient or more heavy-handed in their dealings. Overall, the newly-emergent Nazi/government strategy was to disrupt, harass and intimidate (no longer to 'facilitate') congregations, pastors and church leaders at the local level; and to hinder and stop Christian organisation, empowerment and achievement in the dispositional circuits of social integration by introducing coercion, terror and uncertainty to the disciplinary regime within system-integration circuits. Every push

by the state and the Nazi players created ripples which—beginning from the local grass roots of resistance—moved swiftly across the power circuits and organisational layers of Christian resistance and opposition. The effect of court action and church leaders filing written complaints at either a local, national or international level, was significant enough to stop—or at least limit the impact of—Nazi state agitation and policy initiatives. Over time however, ongoing waves of disruption and intimidation eroded the capacity of Confessing Protestants to organise themselves and maintain, not only unity, but a functioning leadership structure, strategy and rationale, both at a regional and national level.

Eventually, in 1940, Hitler made it clear to Kerrl that he must end his work on ecclesiastical order. During the war years, 'All was to be avoided that could lead to strengthening and to a merging of the evangelical church. The "status quo" was to be maintained.' Hitler made it clear that, on one hand, it was not in the interest of the Nazi leadership for the churches to be stirred—and alongside them, the German populace and international politics and press; but on the other hand, it was conducive for there to be a disunity amongst Protestants, in conjunction with a state of weakness and fear. Occasional localised harassment was welcome as a way of sustaining

a general sense of insecurity/intimidation.[98]

During the war years, four out of every ten ordained ministers, and virtually all the curates and theological candidates, were conscripted. As a development in the facilitative circuit, this brought about a dispositional change with regards to the way parish ministry was carried out. It increased the workload of the remaining parish clergy which, in fact, led to the empowerment of congregations, as parish laity found themselves handling many more of the church affairs, including Sunday worship. However, the organisation of overarching communications and decision-making processes came to a complete standstill. Many practical restrictions contributed towards local insulation and made it nearly impossible to strategically communicate, cooperate, and organise across a region or at national level. Such facilitative restrictions and disciplinary-practical changes included: the end of religious publication and printing; political censorship; police action of all kinds; and even the restricted availability of stationery.[99]

---

98  Heinz Brunotte, 'Der kirchenpolitische Kurs der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenkanzlei: von 1937 bis 1945,' in *Zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes: gesammelte Aufsätze,* ed. Kurt Dietrich Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965), 129, tr. DQ.

99  Helmreich, *German Churches,* 207ff. and 303ff.; Kurt Meier, *Der Evangelische Kirchenkampf: Gesamtdarstellung in drei Bänden,* vol. 3, *Im Zeichen des zweiten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht,

*(5)  Warthegau: post-war Nazi church policy (1940–41)*

After the invasion of Poland, the Warthegau 'Germanisation' experiment led church leaders to understand that, following the war, Nazi church policy would aim to systematically marginalise and destroy any form of organised Christianity.  Under Greiser's administration, even German Protestant churches were forced to segregate according to 'race' and lost their privileges as statutory corporations.  Congregations were obliged to manage without any kind of organised structure beyond that which was arranged at a congregation level, deprived as they were of ecumenical connections, youth organisations, children's instruction, charitable work, professional clergy, training, funding and buildings etc. Within episodic circuits, they experienced both arbitrary and extreme discriminatory and restrictive measures which included: requiring worshippers to individually register with the police; imposing strict limitations upon the times and places of worship, as well as upon religious instruction; coercing the closure and merger of congregations; obstructing and imposing control measures to limit pastoral travel and communication; and expropriating buildings; etc.  Needless to say, the treatment of Jewish communities, the Polish-Catholic clergy and other people of a religious

---

1984).

persuasion, was abhorrent on a completely different scale![100]

During the preparation work for an Old-Prussian Union Confessing Synod, which had been planned for the summer of 1941, an anonymous paper was circulated amongst pastors, which discussed how Christian witness and ministry could be sustained, if professionally trained preachers became few and far between. It concluded that para-congregational relationships and unity would need to grow organically from the grass-roots level of worshipping assemblies. All of this had to happen within an environment of state persecution, which would be adverse to the extreme and in which an ecclesiastical hierarchy had ceased to exist.[101] Differing from the modern organisations of Hannan and Freeman, when an end to their valued organisational privileges was to be expected, the Protestant church, as a generalist and highly complex organisational set, appeared to

---

100 Thirteen-Points from 14 March 1940: Beckmann, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* 60–71, 453. Catherine Epstein, *Model Nazi: Arthur Greiser and the Occupation of Western Poland* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2010), 222ff.; Karl-Heinrich Melzer, *Der Geistliche Vertrauensrat: Geistliche Leitung für die Deutsche Evangelische Kirche im Zweiten Weltkrieg?* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991), 239ff.; Paul Gürtler, *Nationalsozialismus und evangelische Kirchen im Warthegau: Trennung von Staat und Kirche im nationalsozialistischen Weltanschauungsstaat* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1958); Bernhard Stasiewski, 'Die Kirchenpolitik der Nationalsozialisten im Warthegau 1939–1945,' *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 7, no. 1 (1959): 46ff.

101 'Ein Trinitatis-Gespräch 1941,' Evangelisches Zentralarchiv, Berlin.

be able—in the face of expected radical changes to their political-institutional niche environments—to consider dispositional adaptation to isomorphic deep-structural changes.

During that particular summer of 1941, the Old-Prussian Confessing Synod were unable to convene owing to key leaders having been arrested (though some did meet later in the year). German Protestants had never come so close to contemplating a charismatic reordering of ecclesial affairs, as when they were preparing for what appeared to be a bleak future.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has sought to explore Clegg's three-circuits organisation-political analytics through an investigation of the Protestant struggle in Nazi Germany. Section 1.3 has already clarified how—alongside organisational agency, and political agency within an organisational context—politics is being created; and thus also the interweaving of strategic action, on the one hand, and modern organisation (respectively structure or systematic planning) on the other. It was pointed out that Clegg's theorisations immediately shed light on the workings of

parish and organisational politics; and that within a conventional understanding, God, salvation and theology must be considered dispositional relations. With regards to the dispositional fixing of the Barmen Declaration as an OPP, section 2.2 has explored how spokesperson actors must work towards engaging, connecting and stabilising relevant players, as well as non-human entities; and to do so *each on their own terms,* so as to reorder their relationships according to the terms of the prospective actor network. Controversies which emerge, over questions of representation and as a result of 'betrayals,' carry on after OPP creation; likewise, subsequent—and potential—developments and processes of historical 'translation' also contribute towards an actor network's accumulative power. Whilst actors' work towards establishing/reproducing their respective dispositional relations and structures are central to an understanding of power, organisation and politics, one must also consider changes in the environmental/ecological relations within which inter-engaging organisation-political strategies either succeed or fail.

Section 2.3 revisited four phases of the Confessing struggle, examining them through the lens of Clegg's facilitative-disciplinary circuit. In 1934, Confessing Protestantism managed to mobilise and organisationally outflank the Nazi DC and state, successfully positing a

normative-dispositional decision. The success of the *BK* in closing ranks, excluding the DC, and stopping the encroachment of the Nazi state is also due—in part—to developments within facilitative-disciplinary power regarding the environment of the (secular) state and party-political games: Nazi politicians were not prepared to allow the churches' (facilitative-disciplinary) capacity to gather and unify a groundswell of popular grass-root support—as well as international backing—for the suspended land bishops. Since liturgical-political—and ecumenical—mobilisation and discipline are 'innovative' and powerful, they introduce competitive/selective pressure to the field of secular politics within its systemic integration. It was for this reason that the state had to retreat and reposition. By introducing change to the facilitative-organisational environment of church-administrative work, following the complete failure of Reich Bishop Müller and the DC, the Nazi state managed to introduce a split and thereby an internal reorganisation of *BK* Protestantism (and of *DC* groups). In terms of Clegg's theorisation, Kerrl's skilful political manipulation of the milieu of ecclesiastical politics further exacerbated the interests of the already existing parties within Confessing Protantism. During 1935 and 1936, this led to the withdrawal of the *BK* bishops of 'intact' land churches (with whom Kerrl collaborated) from the already more radical *Bruderrat BK* of the 'destroyed' Prussian-Union regional

churches who could then be targeted by a succession of low-key, targeted administrative measures and direct coercive action. The power mechanics operate on the basis of an interplay between competitive-innovative and isomorphic-environmental pressures. However, Kerrl's efforts to unify (moderate) *BK* and *DC* church leaders (and those in the middle) remained unsuccessful. Having only the means of state politics at hand, which included (limited and regionally uneven) measures of ecclesiastical administration, political negotiation, coercive threat, as well as (localised) police action, Kerrl was only able to introduce change to the environmental—administrative and political—conditions of inner-religious politics; something which would not suffice to unite church leaders across the theological divide. During the fight, which was not against an inner-Christian adversary but rather against the despotic Nazi state, a politically disorientated and disunited Christian resistance was easily organisationally outflanked. The Nazis eventually succeeded in bringing an end to the Confessing opposition—or so it appeared, for a time—by pushing the *Bruderrat* side of the Confessing Church opposition, who were under Nazi-'destroyed' ecclesiastical administration, into a population-ecological niche of illegitimacy. In such a position, their capacity to politically organise themselves and take action, as well as their individualised members, could be more easily attacked and dismantled. Military

conscription, the conditions of war and the transformation of the police state into a genocidal machine, accelerated such processes. Any dispositional order/rationale was eroded and quickly washed away, as (first-circuit) rogue agency action, with ever increasing immediacy, took direct hold of disciplinary-coercive capacities and processes. The expectation of losing every Constantinian privilege and undergoing extreme political marginalisation—even persecution—after the Nazi '*Endsieg*', led some to embark upon a practical-theological reconsideration of non-hierarchical Christian order. The forecast of deep-systemic and organisation-ecological change gave the appearance of it being necessary to deploy dispositional-theological adaptation so as to facilitate subsequent organisation-structural adaption.

In this section, the forces of institutional isomorphism and environmental variation, selection and competition have been observed, within a (third-circuit) organisation-ecological perspective; and it was noted that Hitler's state manipulated political/administrative environments in such a way that different church-political players were created, empowered or sidelined. It would have been beneficial for this chapter to have included a detailed investigation, as to the process by which selective/ adaptive environmental pressures retranslate into political action and

decision-making, within dispositional and episodic power circuits:  In a crowded space, political competition, the clash of programmatic ideas and the limited availability of resources, will often lead to political alliances, compromises and selective decisions; and this inevitably comes at a cost! Some of this was observed with regards to developments in 1935–36. However, a more suitable place would be a three-circuits analysis of some church-political decisions which—immediately after World War II—led to the re-establishment of the previous land churches and the creation of two national ecclesial bodies.  Below in 4.2, a very brief run-through of church-political developments and decisions, around the time of the Treysa Church Leaders' Conference in August 1945, will be given.  Niemöller and the Council of Brethren had to drop some of their hopes with regards to the renewal of church order, to forge an alliance with Bishop Wurm, and thereby ensure the creation of a unified 'Evangelical Church in Germany,' when the—at the time—more powerful bishops of 'intact' land churches only pursued the narrower plan of organising a denominationally exclusive united Lutheran national church.  However, for the overall recreation of the previous ecclesiastical order, such first/second-circuit church-political decisions were no more important than the—indirect—impact of (third-circuit) systemic-environmental factors, such as: the Allied military governments' church policies, legal opinions, and a political and moral

vacuum which required church leaders to address both the nation and the occupying forces, offering theological, moral and practical admonition and guidance.

By way of an extended case study, many of the challenges that were identified at the beginning of the thesis introduction—*insofar they concern an analytical understanding of organisational politics*—have been considered in this second chapter (together with its 'two external sections' 1.3 and 4.2). The introductory paragraph identified the particular difficulty of a fully descriptive analysis—within a conventionally modern understanding of power—of the complex, mutual relationships between 'religious' and 'secular' forms of power. In this chapter's case study, three paradigmatic instances of mutual impact have been considered: The normative-theological—as well as the political—construction of an act of confession has been seen to mobilise and unify ministers, church leaders and parish groups in the course of their (secular-)political action which, as a mode of resistance, proves to be unexpectedly fast moving and widely distributed, whilst at the same time, being also highly disciplined, focused, authoritative and long lasting. It has been observed that—equally—the combination of public worship and grass-roots political mobilisation and disciplinary-facilitative unification can be politically unexpected and

powerful, whilst different in terms of its power and nature. The construction/nature of this form of religious power would merit further analysis. Finally, legal, political, coercive and arbitrarily tyrannical state action have been observed to impact religious politics, practice, order and theological production, although not by way of an immediately mechanical link or impact. In terms of an organisation-political analysis, this chapter has demonstrated that all of the named instances whereby religious power places a strain upon a secular-political understanding/practice—and vice versa—are best understood in terms of alterations within the respective—facilitative-disciplinary and environmental—conditions, within which, each group's players operate and construct their own positions and dispositional conditions of action.

Amongst the other forms of religious power and empowerment, the remaining chapters aim to facilitate a deeper understanding of: the empowerment and powers of a minister of religion through their theological approach, pastoral practice and professional formation (chapters 3–4); empowerment through spiritual experience (chapter 5); and eventually the distributed relations of divine power according to Pentecostal-charismatic experience/practice (chapter 6). It would obviously be possible—whilst straightforward—to carry on reintroducing

such an exploration and relevant findings into a theory concern with modern organisation/politics; after all, modern-ethical, organisational and political affairs continue to feature prominently across the remaining chapters.  However, these are more appropriately examined within a Foucauldian power analysis of embodied-agency construction, practice/ discourse relations and modern-historical ethics.

Therefore, at this point, the research moves beyond Clegg's three circuits.  The point was made in chapter 1 that, although Clegg's framework operates extremely well in terms of an organisation-political theorisation, it remains insufficiently generalised with regards to its categories and theoretical imaginations.  ANT and DG's rhizome-ontological metaphysics offer this high degree of generalisation, whilst sharing with Clegg a 'realistic'[102] and distributed-relativistic perspective. Chapter 6, below, deploys DG's rhizome concept for the exploration of the creation, growth, development and nature of Pentecostal-embodied ministry capacities, as well as the distributed-charismatic presence and power of the Holy Spirit (according to Pentecostal experience/practice). Prior to this, as has already been mentioned, chapters 3–5 redeploy

---

102 Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 115ff.

Foucauldian power theory and research findings for the exploration of a

selection of concerns relating to ministerial and religious empowerment.

# 3 Normative-theological agency: Barth and Barmen

In chapters 1 and 2, Clegg's three-circuits frameworks has been shown to be a suitable and powerful tool for the exploration of the full complexity of relations between politics (the purposeful creation of strategy and agency), the creation and maintenance of political context, and an apparently more stable structure and order. This includes the interplay between modern-secular political order and practice, and the forms and relations of religious politics and power. The point has been made that, in relation to both modern-secular politics and political reflection—according to a Cleggian three-circuits analysis—church-political, theological and religious forms of power and empowerment contribute towards environmental alterations within the circuits of changing disciplinary means and system integration. The difficulty of understanding 'religion' in terms of 'power' and 'politics' is entirely due to a self-inflicted normative limitation by which a modern-'secular' political practice—and its academic reflection—excludes all matters of religion from the relations of the

242

political.  Historically, this occurred in the Peace of Westphalia, which correlates with a power-theoretical decision in Hobbes' *Leviathan*.  This organisation-political understanding must now be supplemented by an exposition of different forms of religious empowerment, power and structure.  Distinctive relevant means of religious empowerment include: theology and spiritual experience; ecclesiastical order and its relating theological account; and professionalism and academic training.  Eventually, the power of God 'in the Holy Spirit' must be considered; and all of these will be examined in the remaining chapters.  Since empowerment is best analysed within a Foucauldian theory concern with embodiment, agency creation and ethics, Clegg's theorisation of organisational politics (explored in chapters 1 and 2) shall not be pursued any further.  Only in chapter 6, will an objective-analytical perspective be recovered, in order to facilitate an understanding of the Pentecostal/charismatic divine as a power network in its own right; although at this juncture, the ontological objectivism deployed will not be organisation theoretical, and the starting point will be a Foucauldian understanding of spiritual empowerment.

Any reconstruction of the modern (twentieth-century) Christian ministry, in terms of power relations, must include an understanding of the

powers invested in the person/role of a minister of religion.  In chapters 3 and 4, this will be achieved by employing a Foucauldian set of power analysis tools, whereby academic study or professional-theological training, as well as command of a contemporary guise of one's church's normative-theological tradition is amongst the essential resources of pastoral empowerment.  Along these lines, in chapter 3, Barth's theological project, being a seminal twentieth-century effort at both restoring and modernising the top-down, normative-reflective and disciplinary control of the Christian-doctrinal tradition, is analysed in terms of its power relations. Chapter 4 will thereafter relate the theological-doctrinal construction of pastoral ministry according to the defining doctrinal statements; here being those of the German-Protestant (and Lutheran) churches.  However, there is more to the systematic-theological reconstruction in this chapter 3 which aims to clarify the kind of empowerment and disciplining that Barth's theology and Barmen achieve.

The chapter begins in section 3.1 with a power-analytical clarification of 'normativity' in terms of a top-down discursive practice, which impacts modern sociological theory just as much as it does any traditional and modern form of theology and ministry practice.  Thereafter, the seminal role of Barth and 'Dialectical' theology, within twentieth-

century theology, will be briefly explored.  This chapter aims to clarify empowerment through just one, albeit exposed, twentieth-century example of theological normativity, within a Foucauldian power-analytical concern. A more recent reading of Barth proposes that his 'theo-logical' dogmatics take the form of an inverted-transcendental, counter-modern ethics (3.2).[1] An understanding of 'theo-logical' normativity, in terms of transcendental ethics, pastoral empowerment and agency construction, further enables one to compare empowerment by way of twentieth-century normative-dogmatic discourse (Barth); and empowerment by way of spiritual (Pentecostal-) embodied experience (3.3; cf. chapter 5).  It is argued that, precisely because they evolve from the same theory design, Barth's theology is able to facilitate and empower political resistance to—and opposition against— totalitarian ideologies and state tyranny.  In broader terms, Barthian dialectics can be seen to facilitate the ability to engage with a twentieth-century means of forming a political programme, in which general necessity is the driving force.  This reality can also be traced through the more recent Ecumenical-Protestant discussion concerning the 'state of confession' as a theological and political tool.  Here, one can, furthermore make historical-preliminary observations which, arguably, indicate certain limitations of a, then common, theological approach which drew inspiration

---

1    Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie*.

from Barth, Bonhoeffer and Barmen.  The question must thus be raised as to whether—and if so, by what systematic features—Barth's (and comparable) theological approaches appear to find it difficult to engage with the more recent excesses of 'the market,' 'neo-liberal globalisation,' austerity politics and economical redistribution (3.4).  Foucault's exposition of Chicago-school neo-liberal and classical-liberal political rationales facilitate some deeper systematic understanding as to why this would be the case (3.5).  This prompts one to ask the question: is a Pentecostal-experiential empowerment able to facilitate the kind of engagement and resistance required which would, according to a twentieth-century normative-theological approach, ordinarily appear impossible (3.6; cf. chapters 5 and 6)?

The reason for selecting Barth and Barmen (including their ecumenical redeployments) for a Foucauldian power analysis is not simply because it follows on nicely from the previous chapter.  Barth's dogmatics and the Barmen Declaration continue to be paradigmatic and influential. Barth and Barmen are still referred to in the context of Christian-political and pastoral-theological formation.  The history of the ecumenical reception of Barmen, however, seems to indicate a specific limitation to its usefulness.  As well as providing a theoretical (Kantian-formal) bridge

between the Barthian and a Pentecostal-charismatic mode of empowerment, Foucault's neo-liberalism lectures facilitate an understanding of recent changes in our political culture which help clarify why Barthian normativity and a Barmen-informed political strategy appear to lose traction.  The eventual justification as to why Barth and Barmen should be subjected to a Foucauldian-ethical analysis, which is then to be inserted into Foucault's understanding of neo-liberalism, lies in the subsequent outcome of what such an ensemble 'can do:'[2] '[...] the book is a machine; and about a machine one asks not what it might mean but *what it can do* and *how it works.*'[3]


### 3.1 Liberal accountability: a radio interview

In one of his last recordings, which was aired posthumously, Karl Barth—perhaps unexpectedly, though only at an initial, superficial glance—identified himself as being 'liberal.'  He immediately qualified this however, in a distinctively 'Barthian' way: '[...] when I call myself liberal

---

2    Deleuze, *Expressionism in Philosophy,* 257; DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 257.

3    Eugene W. Holland, *Deleuze and Guattari's* Anti-Oedipus: *Introduction to Schizoanalysis* (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 3, orig. emph.  Cf. Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 26 and 29.

what I primarily understand by the term is an attitude of responsibility.'

Barth thus understands responsibility (*Verantwortlichkeit*) as being

accountable: towards a political and Christian public across the ages; but—

more importantly—in response to a divine revelation which he could not

have told, or created for, himself.[4]  In this conversation, Barth constructs

this kind of accountability as one that is liberating.  There is a sense in this

that one does not have to take oneself all too seriously: there is no need to

be correct all the time.  In another sense however, being accountable to

divine revelation frees oneself from the danger posed by ideological

takeovers built upon rigid principles and on all kinds of ideas.  Barth warns

that theoretically, 'liberalism' could be turned into a totalitarian ideology,

too.[5]  As one speaks in response to divine revelation, one may take a stance

that is both assertive and assured in what one knows and has to say; whilst,

at the same time, remaining intellectually relaxed and open-minded.[6]  It is

---

4   Karl Barth, 'Liberal Theology—an Interview,' in *Final Testimonies,* ed.
    Eberhard Busch, tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977),
    34; Barth, 'Interview von Alfred Blatter: 1968,' in *Gespräche 1964–1968,*
    ed. Eberhard Busch, Gesamtausgabe, 4/28 (Zurich: TVZ, 1996), 545.

5   Barth, 'Liberal Theology,' 37.

6   'And that means further that I have always to be open - here we come, do we
    not, to what is usually meant by freedom? I might then add a third element.
    Being truly liberal means thinking and speaking in responsibility and
    openness on all sides, backwards and forwards, toward both past and future,
    and with what I might call a total personal modesty.'  Barth, 'Liberal
    Theology,' 34.

precisely this kind of a theological-ethical subject which Barth's theological dogmatics aims to create.

So, at the end of his life, Barth explicitly self-identifies as a political liberal. Such a claim appears to be counter-intuitive, in particular since (as we shall see below, 3.3) some have charged Barth with deploying an illiberal—even totalitarian—form of reasoning.[7] The question must therefore be asked as to whether, how and in what sense Barth's theological project facilitates an accountable liberalism; respectively, by what theory features is it possible for a Barthian theological discourse and educated-pastoral habitus to facilitate a political resistance and theological confrontation of totalitarian-fascist and ideological state politics.

## 3.2  Normative theology

Before beginning our analysis, a power-analytical understanding of 'normativity' shall be presented. It is based on Clegg's reference to

---

7    Falk Wagner, 'Theologische Gleichschaltung: Zur Christologie bei Karl Barth,' in Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* ed. Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975), 10.

Bauman's distinction of 'legislators' and 'interpreters' within Clegg's review of previous theorisations of power,[8] as well as a Foucauldian recognition that mainline-theological—alongside other modern-academic and professional—discourse is regulated by power deployments and disciplinary regimes which shape religious utterances, embodied-experiential possibilities, roles and the self-constructions of religious players.[9] As Bernauer and Carrette point out,

> [...] Foucault returns theology to its history, to its struggles for authority and power, to its practices of the self and to its embodied reality. Foucault takes theology from its doctrinal closet into its pastoral reality. His work uncovers and destabilizes the unexamined authority of theological discourse and brings Christianity back to the fragility of human struggle.[10]

Even within a post-structuralist and 'post-representational' linguistic-metaphysical and theological concern which disregards questions of power, politics and practice, any categorical control that is introduced as a 'definition,' is seen as an imposition upon—and violation of—the rich possibilities and connections of both life and learning.

---

8   Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters;* Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.

9   Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 145f.; cf. Kamitsuka, *Feminist Theology,* 72ff.

10  James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette, 'The Enduring Problem: Foucault, Theology and Culture,' in *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience,* ed. James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette (Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004), 3.

They ['words' and visible 'things'] do not represent a particular truth—they cannot simply be described through definitions and illustrations—since their effect, the multiplicity of their meaning and function, exceeds our definitions and illustrations. They simply do not fit the pattern of thought that is structured through analogy, identity, similarity and resemblance [...].[11]

Since the capacity of categorical relations forming ever new relations (thus 'multiplicities') of meaning beyond control,[12] as well as the normative imposition of limitations to meaning, are both central to the discursive politics of 'truth,' an introductory 'definition' of normativity would be harmful to the concern of this research. Instead, it is argued that the five features of normativity—and relating difficulties—which Clegg (and others) identify within modern theorisations of power, translate more or less immediately into features—and problems—of a normative-theological and pastoral practice, within mainline and modern-Christian traditions. Due to the 'poststructuralist'-analytical nature of the argument which is pursued by Clegg, Foucault, ANT—and also in this research—the understanding of normativity must not take itself the form of 'normative definition' but, instead, of power-analytical exploration: As Clegg points

---

11  Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt,* 39f.; cf. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition;* Deleuze, *Foucault,* tr. Seán Hand (Minneapolis and London: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1988).

12  On 'multiplicity:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8f. and passim; Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt,* 12, 40, 52 and passim; McLane, 'Multiplicity;' May, *Gilles Deleuze,* 54f., 60ff. and 89.

out, normativity and definition are themselves major tools of deploying power-truth relations.[13]  One must thus pursue an understanding which begins by 'refusing to carve nature at the joints.'[14]

The understanding of normativity in terms of a top-down and 'legislative' power deployment—to be further explored—connects academic-theological discourses with mainline-ecclesiastical order and practice, the resources and relations of which will be further examined below in chapter 4.  This chapter considers Barth's theology as seminal and paradigmatic for the recovery of 'normativity' and conceptual control within twentieth-century academic theology.  Before exploring which theory features—and in what manner—Barth's theology empowers theologians and preachers, the role of Barth within the new theological beginnings, at the outset of the twentieth century, will be reviewed.

*(1)  Normativity as power*

References to 'normativity' within this research derive from a double concern behind this thesis: one with the modern and contemporary

---

13  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 26.

14  Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 27.

theorisation and analysis of power; the other with traditional and mainline-modern Christian-doctrinal (dogmatic) discourse and its facilitation of ecclesiastical order. The research journey of this thesis began with an unsettling recognition that a new poststructuralist analytics of power challenged a previous sociological theorisation of power relations in terms which were very close to the function of normative-doctrinal and academic-theological discourse, as they relate to the common ecclesiastical ordering of the Christian ministry. The point that Foucault, Clegg and Latour make is that a previous-modern political and social theory, which begins with a definition of 'what power is' (or ought to be), must itself become subservient to the creation and stabilisation of a certain manner of ordering these very social and political relations.[15] If asked to 'define' the meaning of normativity, with regards to theorisations of power and Christian theology within the relations of this research, one should therefore begin with revisiting the analytical description of sociological (power-theoretical) normativity as offered by those authors, so as to then consider functional comparability with regards to a mainline theological discourse impacting Christian church order and power/truth relations.

---

15  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 5 and 86; cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 13, 40f., 50f. and 250.

There are five features by which (modern) normativity can be described: (1) Clegg argues that Hobbes' theorisation of relations of power and social order—which offers an original form for (Clegg's) previous twentieth-century theorisations of power—is aligned with, and subservient to, the political facilitation of (according to its theoretical imagination) a unified, all-encompassing and top-down creation/deployment of political power and order by an (ideologically and practically) constructed 'sovereign' which is the modern prince and state at the end of the English Civil War.[16] In addition, Foucault observes that the modern-territorial state and absolute monarchy fashioned themselves in legal terms.[17] Bauman further points out that philosophers of the Enlightenment, and earlier twentieth-century 'intellectuals' in their wake, were in a position to operate as 'legislators,' i.e.,

> [...] making authoritative statements which arbitrate in controversies of opinions and which select those opinions which, having been selected, become correct and binding.[18]

This occurred precisely because of the one-time relative proximities

---

16 Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 23f.

17 'In Western societies since the Middle Ages, the exercise of power has always been formulated in terms of law. [...] they were constructed as systems of law, they expressed themselves through theories of law, and they made their mechanisms of power work in the form of law.' Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 87.

18 Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters,* 4.

between learned reflection and the professional classes, and the hierarchical politics and power of the state and thus decision-making through legislation.[19]  Within the relations of pastoral oversight and church government, the correlation of academic/professional discourse and affirmation of theological truth on one hand, and of hierarchical orderings of power/discourse on the other, remains largely intact.  This will be further explored in chapter 4 with reference to Protestant-Lutheran understanding and practice.  Other mainline-Christian traditions only differ with regards to the relevant authoritative texts and to the details of available pastoral/professional resources, technologies and practices.[20]  On the other hand, as hitherto unprecedented, today's academic/professional contribution towards modern-secular policymaking seems to be under attack within the modern-secular governmental realm.  In particular, we should ask whether intellectuals and expert elites have lost the capacity to offer, as they once did, an authoritative political assessment and encompassing reflection.  Bauman thereby considers that the ongoing academic differentiation of confined, ever more refined, whilst increasingly narrow, academic expertise

---

19  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters,* 140f.

20  Cf. Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault,* 15f.; Haight, *Christian Community;* Ratzinger, *Called to Communion;* Avis, *Anglican Understanding of the Church;* Cochrane, *Reformed Confessions.*

plays a certain role.[21]  Of greater importance however, is the popularisation

and economic marketisation of culture, through the arrival of mass media,

which has accelerated the demise of a well-informed and learned discourse

of the authoritative voices of an educated elite.[22]  Meanwhile, the arrival of

Google and Facebook further popularises and marketises not only access to

knowledge, but also alternative means to create, distribute, manipulate and

reflect upon the stabilisation of discursive power/truth-relations.  Again,

within historical and mainline forms of Christianity, the proximity and

close connection—for now!—between ecclesiastical practice, power, order

and legislation, on one hand, and the creation and deployment of

normative-discursive truth relations based upon academic-theological and

professional-pastoral assessment, on the other, remains firmly in place.

Furthermore, Barth's and the dogmatic-'dialectical' new beginnings within

Protestant theology following the Great War (more below) can be

interpreted as an effort to recover Christian preachers' 'legislator's'

authority to offer overall-normative theological orientation within what was

perceived to be a deep crisis of modernity (more below).


(2) Modern-normative knowledge (Hobbes) would be organised in

---

21  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters,* 21ff.

22  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters,* 162f.

'grand systems,' meta-narratives or great traditions. 'An imagined order, constructed as a totality, would be the representational hallmark of the worldview that was constructed.'[23] Thereby, 'legislators' such as Hobbes deploy 'myth,' the strategically 'oversimplified representation' of (in the case of Hobbesian theory) the 'brutish' state of nature narrative, 'social contract' and a 'good order' emanating from the sovereign as society's single fountainhead.[24] As normativity is subservient to the top-down deployment of power/truth relations, this 'myth,' of course, is equally subservient to political aims, in the sense that the art of politics has been described as 'bringing unacceptable myths into, and preserving one's own myths from derision.'[25] Much of Hobbes' *Leviathan* is concerned with neutralising (potential) ecclesiastical and religious reasoning, power resources and authorities from which an alternative access to power could be derived. Hobbes thus seeks

> [...] secular order through divine grace. Order was to be constructed in the world through secularizing and generalizing God, 'the first author of *speech*' [...], into a rational method capable of reconstituting the 'body politic' through '*pacts*' and '*covenants*' premised on the divine act of fiat.[26]

---

23  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 24.

24  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 26 and 29f.

25  F. G. Bailey, *Morality and Expediency: the Folklore of Academic Politics,* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977) 8; cf. Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 30.

26  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 26, orig. emph.

The original efforts at creating meta-narratives and grand systems were thus theological. Normative-theological metanarratives include reiterating 'salvation history,' with reference to scripture, and any traditional or modern effort at formulating authoritative and encompassing reflective-theological accounts, i.e. doctrinal dogmatics or systematic theologies. Apostolicity and divine revelation of New Testament scripture, apostolic succession of the catholic faith and episcopate, and the Trinitarian 'rule of faith,' as the revelatory backdrop of even the biblical witness (as opposed to heretical-Christian Gnosticism which allegedly originated with Simon the Magician) are early examples of 'political myth' which relate to the formation of the mainline normative-theological approach in the second century, as it emerged from catholic tradition.[27] A modern example of 'political myth' is Barth's claim that he had completely broken with 'liberal

27  Christian hierarchical-normative order indeed has historical precedence over its modern-secular reflections. Ogden is mistaken to claim that 'sovereign power' only entered Christian ministry relations as an outcome of the 'Constantine shift;' relevant decisions were taken much earlier: Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault,* 2. Furthermore, the hierarchical-legal ecclesiastical order—alongside conventional-theological accounts of the Christian divine—predate the modern-secular forms of the modern-political order. According to Schmitt, '[a]ll significant concepts of the modern theory of the state are secularized theological concepts:' Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty,* tr. George Schwab (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2005), 36. On the other hand, Foucault traces the modern 'bio-power' over human bodies and populations back to (Roman-Catholic) 'pastoral power:' Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population;* Ben Golder, 'Foucault and the Genealogy of Pastoral Power,' *Radical Philosophical Review* 10, no. 2 (2007): 157ff.; Bernauer and Carrette 'Enduring Problem,' 1.

theology' after 1914 when his teachers had come out in unequivocal national support of the war.[28]  On the more formal side of 'grand systems,' there are the great systematic works of Christian apologetics and dogmatics, as well as their establishment in a limited set of foundational principles, or even a single form of reasoning.  This leads us onto the next feature.

There are further common elements and aspects to explore as regards an analytical description of modern 'normativity.'  (3) On the 'softer' side of normativity, academic 'legislators' predetermine the selection of worthwhile sources of knowledge, for example collections of 'canonical' texts: catholic creeds, decisions of the 'ecumenical councils,' historical formularies and undergraduate introductions to Christian theology.[29]  (4) From a more hard-nosed perspective, Hobbes' paradigm of 'modern'-academic normativity is 'procedurally legislative:' a prefatory concern with something other than what (in this case) power ought to be (or any other matter of academic concern) but rather with establishing the preconditions

---

28  Busch, *Karl Barth,* 81ff.; Michael B. Aune, 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 1: Recent Scholarship on the History of Early Twentieth Century German Protestant Theology,' *Dialog* 43, no. 3 (2004): 223ff.; Aune, 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 3: Rewriting the History of Protestant Theology in the 1920s,' *Dialog* 45, no. 4 (2006): 389ff.

29  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 24.

and general standards, according to which relevant academic judgement, truth relations and understanding of a matter may be reliably achieved through a 'strict attention to the rules and the external discipline of being self-regarding in respect of one's conduct according to the rules.'[30] The focus is on the adherence to (universally valid) 'procedural rules' which facilitate a discursive capacity amongst academics, professionals and members of the 'chattering classes' so as to arrive at valid selections, judgements with regards to the relevant narrative, as well as advice for the further maintenance of the political and social order.[31] Normative grand narratives tend not be devised in a 'wholesale' manner but through pre-determining ('defining') the topic, elements and means from which an argument and its relating discursive relations may be forged. In general, normative 'legislators' do not immediately insist on a particular grand narrative and 'mythical account,' but instead, tend to devise a set of binding 'procedural rules,' as well as terms and conditions of permitted categories and methods, within the discourse of power and political-social order. In the case of Hobbes—and that of the majority of twentieth-century sociological research—this was 'a conception of power as identical to

---

30  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 24.  Cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 227ff.; Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 15ff.

31  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters,* 4f.

cause,' of individualised agents inter-engaging through mechanistical-causal relations.[32] Accordingly, Latour emphasises that one must not begin sociological research with pre-normative definition of 'the social,' as well as its general nature and relevant parts: defining its 'groups,' 'actions,' 'objects' and 'facts;' nor by predetermining what 'type of study' to pursue,[33] i.e. he advocates the avoidance of framing and limiting one's research *beforehand* within the (allegedly) wider context and only illusionary 'bigger picture.'[34] Systematic theology and dogmatics pursue this kind of introductory, methodological and, maybe, meta-reflective argument within theological prolegomena, 'fundamental theologies' and methodological chapters of smaller academic works.

It is by pre-determining the categories and procedural conditions of research, that (5) peer communities and their possibilities of authoritative discourse and knowledge-creation are normatively formatted and formed. Thus eventually, 'normativity' establishes—and encompasses—peer communities which are marked by disciplined pride and moral exclusion.[35]

---

32  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 26 and 34.

33  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 21f.

34  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 186f.

35  Kuhn, *Scientific Revolutions,* 167 and 175ff.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 24; Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170ff.

> One will have the same regard for others who would be one's intellectual peers as they will have for one's self, with respect to following these rules. For those who play other games, one will have nothing but contempt or pity, depending on how one rates their arrogance. [...] The purpose of following the rules is to achieve a provisionally accurate picture of the accepted state of affairs that one is representing. Means for arriving at this knowledge will be the known-in-common focus for creating a community of scientific legislators. Disagreements occur within the community; they concern the interpretation and application of the rules, not the rules themselves [...].[36]

The *magisterium*, members of a professional clergy, theologians and academics, are such a normative community of peers. Normativity thus facilitates the binding authoritative community of voices of the 'legislator' as 'legitimized by superior (objective) knowledge.'[37]

'Normativity'—both sociological and theological—is thus identified as a practical and discursive relation of power when it encompasses the following five features: (1) it is 'legislatory' and commanding in nature, which includes the observation that there is an original *Sitz-im-Leben* link with governmental-authoritative legislation; (2) it creates and deploys grand systems, meta-narratives and strategical-political 'mythology;' (3) it references collections of authoritative resources and (4) channel's permitted discourse by way of 'definition' of relevant sets of criteria which pre-

---

36  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 25.

37  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters,* 4.

determine permitted elements and acceptable ways of connection; (5) it

establishes—and encompasses—peer communities of disciplined pride and

moral exclusion.  Thereby, normativity is an extension and expression of

the particular historical power formation which Foucault calls 'the juridical

monarchy.'[38]  Should the ('normative') definition of power, truth and order

be, in itself, a means of imposing order and limiting the possibilities of both

power–truth relations and their reflective discourse, the analytical and

conceptual clarification of 'normativity' must not take the form of

categorically enclosing ('normative') definition.  Instead, an analytical

understanding of normativity, in terms of power, must begin 'in the middle'

and grow 'from the middle.'[39]  One must resist any call to establish a

predetermining 'definition,' precisely because, as Latour points out, the

controversial nature of establishing what type of actors, actions, groups,

objects, facts and accounts would be admitted, are among the most

essential resources from which each player within the field aims to form,

reinforce and impose the relations of their respective power base and

strategy.[40]  A better conceptual understanding of power must begin as an

'ethnographic' analysis which consider precisely how actors establish,

---

38  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 89.

39  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 21, 23 and 25.

40  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* pt. 1, 21ff.

select and connect their resources, means and strategic myths, *within the formation* of power and of (an ongoing precarious) order.[41]

Although the chosen examples for the analysis of ecclesiastical and theological normativity indicate that its power-structure has historical roots as deep as the second century, when catholic Christianity emerged from the gnostic crisis, this research focuses its historical-conceptual analyses on contemporary and twentieth-century Christian order, practices and theologies. More specifically for the purposes of this chapter, Barth's Word-of-God dogmatics is explored.

*(2)  Barth and twentieth-century theology*

Although the theological empowerment of a modern, academically trained minister of religion can connect with many different normative theological traditions, this chapter limits itself to a systematic exploration of Barth's theology, which was conceived during the Weimar Republic years and brought to fruition—both during and following—the years of the Confessing struggle. Thus, Barth's dogmatics are representative of a normative theory-constructive approach developed by many theologians

---

41   Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 30f.

and political theorists of the time. Political analysts were the first to observe that young proponents of a 'conservative revolution' during the Weimar Republic were of a generation who, together, experienced the Great War and its outcome as a turning point which, in many cases, caused them to dismiss their seniors' cultural liberalism, as well as the 'Western' democratic tradition of political thought.[42] Sontheimer quotes a study of 1932, according to which during the Weimar Republic years, a majority of young people,

> [...] show utter contempt for the 'liberal' world, which dismisses an absolute intellectual insistence [*geistige Unbedingtheit*] as a lack of realism; they know that intellectual compromise is the beginning of all vice and all lies.[43]

Krockow deepens such an understanding by pointing out that, within different relations of political-cultural, juridico-political, national-cultural and philosophical meta-foundational normative reasoning, Ernst Jünger, Carl Schmitt and Martin Heidegger, prior to 1933, constructed different versions of the same 'decisionism' which established a content-free— whilst absolute and transcendental-ethical—imperative within its political,

---

42  Sontheimer, 'Anti-democratic Thought;' Walter Bußmann, 'Politische Ideologie zwischen Monarchie und Weimarer Republik: ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der Weimarer Republik,' *Historische Zeitschrift* 190, no. 1 (1960): 55ff.; cf. Scholder, 'Modern German History.'

43  Kurt Sontheimer, *Antidemokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik: die politischen Ideen des deutschen Nationalismus zwischen 1918 und 1933* (Munich: DTV, 1978), 145, tr. DQ.

noetic and 'existentialistic' approach. According to Krockow, Nazi

leadership exemplifies daring decisionistic agency; and in turn, according

to all examined thinkers, Hitler's rise to power is accompanied by a

theoretical shift towards concrete-material and substantial reasoning.[44]

Subsequent, mainly academic-theological research (some of which will be

retraced in greater detail below) widened the scope and depth of

comparative analysis of radical-political and theological theories of action

which emerged in the 1920s, and added further insight into their widely

shared 'inverted' transcendental theory design (drawing mainly upon Kant

and Fichte). Pfleiderer's examination includes (amongst others) the neo-

Marxist Lukács alongside Barth, a social democrat, thus showing that,

although proponents of 'conservative revolution' were predominant, radical

theorists across the political spectrum deployed this theory design of

normative-reflective ethical reinforcement.[45]

---

44  Krockow, *Entscheidung.*

45  Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 29ff.; Trutz Rendtorff, ed., *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975); Falk Wagner, 'Gehlens radikalisierter Handlungsbegriff: ein theologischer Beitrag zur interdisziplinären Forschung,' *Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik* 17, no. 1 (1973): 230ff.; Wagner, 'Politische Theorie des Nationalsozialismus als politische Theologie,' in Manfred Baumotte et al., *Kritik der politischen Theologie* (Munich: Kaiser, 1973), 29ff.; Gunda Schneider-Flume, *Die politische Theologie Emanuel Hirschs 1918–1933* (Bern: H. Lang; and Frankfurt: Lang, 1971).

Despite some recently renewed interest in 'liberal theologies' and a re-emphasising of continuities and influences which arose between these and the new theological developments and voices of the 1920s,[46] many current introductions to the theology of the twentieth century continue to begin with the proposition that, in the transition from the nineteenth to the twentieth century, Barth and 'Dialectical Theology' introduced a sea change to academic theology by rejecting theological liberalism in his introduction of a hope for Christian-moral and cultural-historical progress, alongside a rejection of 'historicism' (Troeltsch) and the ensuing academically refined relativism.[47] Across this generation, way beyond the particular group of young Christian intellectuals who, in the early 1920s, gathered alongside Gogarten and Barth, the rediscovery of divine transcendence sought to establish an 'absolute' point of origin above historical contingencies, as its proponents directed their polemics against

---

46  Kennedy, *Twentieth-Century Theologians;* Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought;* Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology;* Jan Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie der Neuzeit,* vol. 2, *Das 20. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 186ff.; Aune, 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 1;' Aune, 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 2: Rereading Theological Directions, 1900–1914,' *Dialog* 44, no. 1 (2005): 56ff.; Aune, 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 3;' Aune, 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles: Conclusion—Might We Be "Liberals" after All?' *Dialog* 46, no. 2 (2007): 153ff.

47  David F. Ford, 'Introduction to Modern Christian Theology,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 1ff.; Grenz and Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology;* Hermann Fischer, *Protestantische Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002).

an academic theology and wider culture which had established itself in terms of the study of empirical and historical relations.[48]

> [...] within a 'quest (quests) of normativity' and 'authority,' theology, which had previously been an empirically oriented, respectively historical-hermeneutical, studies of Christianity, was now transformed into a deductive, exclusively systematic, "normative science.'"[49]

As Graf points out, the aim was to reintroduce clarity and certainty to Christian-religious reflection, thereby reaffirming normative theology as a facilitating and framing discourse within other fields of cultural studies. The paradigm shift ran deeper within Protestant theology than it did in the discourses surrounding other arts and humanities and, prior to Hitler's rise to power, contributed towards ideological dissociations and an overall disintegration of the intellectual and democratic-political discourse.[50] The examination of this generation's academic contributions to political and theological theory, in terms of 'decisionism' and a practical-transcendental ethics, as considered in the previous paragraph, adds depth and scope to the analysis and comparison of conceptual innovation amongst young

---

48  Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Die "antihistorische Revolution" in der protestantischen Theologie der zwanziger Jahre,' in *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Wolfhart Pannenberg,* ed. Jan Rohls and Guther Wenz, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988), 377ff.

49  Graf, 'Antihistorische Revolution,' 389, tr. DQ.

50  Graf, 'Antihistorische Revolution,' 379ff.

academic theologians of the 1920s.

It was Barth's *Römerbrief* (in the 1922 edition) which, in the aftermath of World War I, came to symbolise both the sense of crisis and the paradigm shift within the academic-theological discourse.[51] From within the early 'Dialectical Theology' movement, within which Barth, Gogarten, Brunner and Bultmann became leading figures,[52] Barth's emerging theological position was informed by Marburg neo-Kantian theorisation (more below in section 3.2)[53] whilst Gogarten studied Fichte's transcendental argument.[54] Tillich's understandings of divine revelation, 'justification' and 'faith' are, in general, structurally identical to those in Barth's *Epistle to the Romans,* notwithstanding that Tillich's understanding is distinctive in that he continued to conceptualise the existential-revelatory

---

51   Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans,* tr. Edwyn C. Hoskyns (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1968).

52   Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 62ff.; Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology,* 39ff.; Stayer, *Martin Luther,* 48ff.; Grenz and Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology,* 63ff.; Fischer, *Protestantische Theologie,* 15ff.; Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 244ff.

53   Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie;* McCormack, *Karl Barth's;* Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 244ff.

54   Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 110ff.; Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 84ff.; D. Timothy Goering, *Friedrich Gogarten (1887–1967): Religionsrebell im Jahrhundert der Weltkriege* (Berlin and Boston, Mass.: de Gruyter, 2017); Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 251ff.

breakthrough of 'divine justification' of sinners—and of doubtful

sceptics—in terms of a universal religious experience.  Although for

Tillich, the fullest and most appropriate understanding of this would be

materially Christian-Christological, it remained established upon a material

continuity (*analogia entis* and 'correlation') between the self-revealing

divine and its human-religious experience of 'divine justification,' in terms

of an existential breakthrough.[55]  Throughout his career, Tillich accordingly

laments the heteronomous 'supranaturalism' of a Barthian Christological-

Trinitarian exclusivity, whilst, at the same time, emphasising that, in the

1920s, he saw himself as belonging to an extended '"subterranean" group

of fellow labourers' of the 'dialectical' theological movement.[56]  There is a

---

55  Petr Gallus, *Der Mensch zwischen Himmel und Erde: der Glaubensbegriff bei Paul Tillich und Karl Barth* (Leipzig: Ev. Verlagsanstalt, 2007), 565ff.; Mark Kline Taylor, *Paul Tillich: Theologian of the Boundaries* (London and San Francisco: Collins, 1987), 11ff.; Werner Schüßler, *Paul Tillich* (Munich: Beck, 1997); Schüßler, '"Gott über Gott:" Ein Zentralbegriff Paul Tillichs,' in *'Was und unbedingt angeht:' Studien zur Theologie und Philosophie Paul Tillichs,* 2nd edn (Münster: Lit, 2004), 133ff.; Schüßler, '"Was uns unbedingt angeht:" Aspekte des religionsphilosophischen Denkens Paul Tillichs,' in *Was und unbedingt angeht,* 143ff.; Schüßler, 'Protestantisches Prinzip versus natürliche Theologie?: zu Paul Tillichs Problemen mit einer natürlichen Theologie,' in *Was und unbedingt angeht,* 161ff.; Kennedy, *Twentieth-Century Theologians,* 101ff.; David H. Kelsey, 'Paul Tillich,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 62ff.; Grenz and Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology,* 114ff.; Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 323ff.; Franz G. M. Feige, *The Varieties of Protestantism in Nazi Germany: Five Theopolitical Positions* (Lewiston, N. Y., and Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen, 1990), 395ff.

56  Paul Tillich, 'What is Wrong with "Dialectic" Theology?' in *Theologian of the Boundaries,* ed. Mark Kline Taylor (London and San Francisco: Collins, 1987), 109.  Tillich, *On the Boundary: an Autobiographical Sketch* (Eugene,

functional equivalent to both, Barth's and Gogarten's (totalising-normative)

transcendental-idealistic form, in that Tillich's background with Schelling's

epistemological continuity became further shaped by the 'analysis of

human existence given by Kierkegaard and Heidegger.'[57] Heidegger's

'decisionism' (Krockow) also became relevant for Bultmann's

'existentialist' interpretation of the New Testament witness.[58] Heidegger

thus forms an important (formal) link with the Weimar Republic era

essential-political theorisations of a 'conservative revolution' (see above).

Emanuel Hirsch, who was arguably the most promising scholar of that

generation and became the leading theological expert of the Nazi 'Faith

Movement,' referred, once again, to Fichte as a theoretical form, in view of

his conceptualisation of a decisionistic public theology and political ethics

which would facilitate radical, 'conservative revolution,' historical change

Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 39ff.; Petr Gallus, *Der Mensch zwischen Himmel und Erde: der Glaubensbegriff bei Paul Tillich und Karl Barth* (Leipzig: Evang. Verlagsanstalt, 2007), 555ff.; Werner Schüßler, 'Paul Tillich und Karl Barth: ihre erste Begegnung in den zwanziger Jahren,' in *'Was und unbedingt angeht:' Studien zur Theologie und Philosophie Paul Tillichs,* 2nd edn (Münster: Lit, 2004), 119ff.

57  Tillich, *On the Boundary,* 48.  Ibid., 47f.; Tillich, 'Existential Philosophy (1944),' in *Main Works/Hauptwerke,* vol. 1, *Philosophical Writings/Philosophische Schriften* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter; Frankfurt/M.: Evang. Verlagswerk, 1989), 353ff.; Schüßler, *Paul Tillich,* 26ff.

58  Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 133ff.; William M. Arnett, 'Existentialism in the Thought of Bultmann and Tillich,' *Asbury Journal* 20, no. 2 (1966), 28ff.

and the overthrowing of the Weimar-Republic democratic-constitutional order.[59]

Subsequent to Karl Holl's rediscovery of Luther's theological reference to the divinity and revelation of God, alongside an explicitly modern-contemporary, individualistic and (formally) Kantian re-reading of Luther's theology,[60] a younger generation of neo-Lutheran scholars including Werner Elert and Paul Althaus gathered in Erlangen, in the 1920s, to re-emphasise divine revelation within dogmatic-theological reflection, as well as the modernity, systematic coherence and general necessity of Lutheran doctrine.[61] Both, Elert and Althaus can thus be subsumed under the 'anti-historistic' and normative-theological turn within academic

---

59 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 90ff.; Schneider-Flume, *Politische Theologie Emanuel Hirschs;* Stayer, *Martin Luther,* 96ff.; Feige, *Varieties of Protestantism,* 84ff. and 291ff.; Robert P. Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch,* (New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1985), 120ff.; Heinrich Assel, 'Die Lutherrenaissance in Deutschland von 1900 bis 1960,' in *Lutherrenaissance Past and Present* (Göttingen and Bristol: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2015), 35ff.

60 Gregory A. Walter, 'Karl Holl (1866–1926),' in *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians,* ed. Mark C. Mattes (Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013), 56ff.; Stayer, *Martin Luther,* 18ff.; Assel, 'Lutherrenaissance,' 24ff.

61 Leading the way was Elert's essay from 1924: Werner Elert, *Die Lehre des Luthertums im Abriss,* 2nd edn (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926). Stayer, *Martin Luther,* 79ff.; Becker, 'Werner Elert;' Schwarz, 'Paul Althaus;' Feige, *The Varieties of Protestantism in Nazi Germany,* 84ff. and 89ff. and 251ff.; Karl Beyschlag, *Erlanger Theologie,* 143ff.

theology, which aimed to support the reflective creation of a self-assertive

counter-modern Christian understanding.[62]  Together with Hirsch, both used

systematic dualisms, which they identified within Luther's writings: of 'the

law' and 'the gospel,' of 'general' and 'special' revelation (the created order

and 'salvation'), and of the divinely ordained 'two regiments' of church and

state, in order to theologically frame and conceptualise their political

concerns with national destiny and a conservative-authoritarian critique of

Weimar-democratic politics.[63]  Althaus, in particular, engaged in learned

dialogue with other theologians of his generation including Barth, Brunner,

Bultmann and Hirsch.  Subsequent to their generationally shared rejection

of a still prevailing cultural Protestantism and historicism, Althaus'

'controversy with Barth had a formative influence on his interpretation of

Luther's theology with respect to the relationship between church and state,

justification and sanctification, and particularly the relationship between

---

62  Graf, 'Antihistorische Revolution;' Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 29.

63  Elert, *Lehre des Luthertums;* Paul Althaus, *Luther's Haltung im Bauernkrieg* (Tübingen: WB, 1952).  Stayer, *Martin Luther,* 79ff.; Gotthard Jasper, 'Die Zwei-Reiche-Lehre bei Paul Althaus: ein Schlüssel zu seiner politischen Ethik?' *Luther* 85, no. 1 (2014): 41ff.; André Fischer, *Zwischen Zeugnis und Zeitgeist: die politische Theologie von Paul Althaus in der Weimarer Republik,* (Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2012); Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler,* 79ff.; Gotthard Jasper, *Paul Althaus (1888–1966): Professor, Prediger und Patriot in seiner Zeit* (Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013).

God and Christ.'[64]  'Like for Hirsch, Karl Barth and Dialectical Theology

provided the foil for the unfolding of Althaus's theology.'[65]  By comparison

with Hirsch's and Barth's more radical and more divisive theological

projects, Althaus' academic judgement demonstrated a thoughtful,

discerning and measured conservativism, albeit that, during the years of the

Weimar Republic, he chose to take an anti-liberal and patriotic-nationalistic

political stance.[66]  Critically engaging within that generation's anti-

historicist redeployment of divine transcendence and theological ('theo-

logical') top-down normativity, Althaus was required to make a

'legislator's'[67] reflectively reinforced, top-down normative and

encompassing effort to define the fields and objects, and to discern its

systemic relations.  Notwithstanding this, Althaus aims to offer a

theological proposition that is quite different from that of Barth and

Dialectical Theology.[68]  By way of both mimetic and normative isomorphic

---

64  Stayer, *Martin Luther,* 90.

65  Feige, *Varieties of Protestantism,* 254.  Cf. Fischer, *Zwischen Zeugnis und Zeitgeist,* 228ff.

66  Ericksen identifies Althaus as the 'mediator' who, among that generation of Protestant theologians, claimed the 'middle ground:' Ericksen, *Theologians under Hitler,* 83 and 98.

67  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters.*

68  In a nutshell, this can be studied in Althaus' normative-dogmatic clarification and defence of his own support of the Ansbach Memorandum (see above, 2.2): Althaus, 'Bedenken zur Theologischen Erklärung;' Jasper, *Paul Althaus,* 242ff.; Beyschlag, *Erlanger Theologie,* 167ff.

pressure (see above, 2.1) within learned discourse, a formal convergence is (more than) encouraged, with regards to the ways in which one may forge a diverging theological proposition and academic style.[69] After World War II, theological hermeneutics, and Ebeling in particular connected Luther scholarship and neo-Lutheran theology with Bultmann's existential hermeneutics, as well as Heidegger's later transformation of his 'transcendental decisionism' in *Being and Time*, on the basis of their shared concern with 'authentic' language.[70]

In the second half of the twentieth century, Barth's theo-logical dogmatics asserted itself as the most influential academic-theological proposition of the era.[71] At the same time however, the party of self-identifying 'Barthians' had always been relatively small in number. Amongst the scholars who referenced Barth within their subsequent theological enquiries and 'translations,' Jüngel and Torrance, for example, remained on the whole, faithful to Barth's original programme.[72] With

---

69 DiMaggio and Powell, 'Iron Cage Revisited.'

70 Menacher, 'Gerhard Ebeling;' Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology,* 117 and 115ff.; Fischer, *Protestantische Theologie,* 139ff.; Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 577ff.

71 Daniel W. Hardy, 'Karl Barth,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 39; Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 109.

72 Daniel W. Hardy, 'T. F. Torrance,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 163ff.;

either more or less forceful moves of disengagement, others contended with what theology emerged from Dialectical Theology and Barth.[73]  Within a new and bolder Roman-Catholic academic theology, Balthasar, Schillebeeckx and Küng engaged with Barth in depth; whereas Rahner developed his transcendental-theological position from an independent engagement with Heidegger, Kant and the Thomistic theological tradition.[74] Within the German-Protestant post-war discourse,[75] academic theologians, as an alternative to Barth, opted for Bultmann's existentialism as their point

Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology,* 179ff.; Fischer, *Protestantische Theologie,* 223ff.; Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 805ff.

73  'The influence of Karl Barth has been so extensive as to be virtually coterminous with the history of theology during and since his lifetime.  Since his work was both so decisive in its method and so comprehensive in its scope, we continue to meet it both in those whose approaches coincide with his, in those who argue—against him—for for other ways, and also in those who extend the topics with which he was concerned within and outside his frame of reference.  So much did he reconstitute and consolidate the state of Christian theology for the twentieth century that he is always a point of departure for others.'  Daniel W. Hardy, 'Karl Barth,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 39.

74  Kennedy, *Twentieth-Century Theologians,* 133ff. and 161ff.; Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 197ff. and 233ff.; Karen Kilby, 'Karl Rahner,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 92ff.; Ben Quash, 'Hans Urs von Balthasar,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 106ff.; Paul D. Murray, 'Roman Catholic Theology after Vatican II,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 265ff.; Grenz and Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology,* 237ff.

75  Fischer, *Protestantische Theologie,* pts. 5–7, 110ff.; Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* pts. 11–12, 498ff.

of departure.[76]  Opposing the new 'neo-orthodox' Protestant mainstream,

some also turned to Bonhoeffer—arguably the most 'unregimented' student

of Barth—and, in particular, some theological fragments of the prison

letters and manuscripts in which Bonhoeffer calls for a 'non-religious'

Christianity, within a secular world which has come of age, and in which he

explores the relations of a radical—potentially subversive—theological

ethics of political responsibility and resistance.[77]  Amongst the many

scholars of the next generation for whom Dialectical Theology and Barth

was their point of departure, two in particular must be mentioned.

Moltmann and Pannenberg force open the previous 'dialectical' and

existential-decissionistic displacement and encapsulation of Christian

eschatology within generalised-reflective transcendental subjectivity,

reintroducing the dimensions of political hope, future and history within

their different salvation-historical (eschatological, respectively

*universalgeschichtlich*) theological frameworks.[78]  Moltmann also creates a

bridge to critical and contextual theologies; the goal of which is political

---

76  See above.  Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 561ff.

77  Kennedy, *Twentieth-Century Theologians,* 85ff.; Livingston and Schüssler Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 96ff.; Wayne Whison Floyd, 'Dietrich Bonhoeffer,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 43ff.; Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology,* 94ff.; Grenz and Olson, *Twentieth-Century Theology,* 145ff.; Fischer, *Protestantische Theologie,* 145ff.

78  Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 666f.

'liberation.'[79]  What has been observed with regards to Althaus'

engagement with Barth (above) remains true for the post-war academic-

theological discourse: even when theologians chose to part ways with the

forms and concerns of Barth and Bultmann, an encompassing top-down

normative reasoning remains intrinsic to the challenge of forging a

systematic-theological argument and position.  Since the concern for

'transcendent' freedom and the independence of the Christian reference to

God and the gospel remained paramount, accounting for God continues to

be an essential theological locus.  It is subsequent to Barth that Rahner,

Jüngel, Pannenberg and Moltmann (amongst others) contributed towards

the further development of Trinitarian theology within the twentieth

century.[80]  Although not all of twentieth-century theology follows a

'dialectical-theological' transcendental-decisionistic theory design, Barth's

theological dogmatics, by way of 'environmental isomorphism,' reinforces

a top-down, encompassing-normative construction of academic-theological

and pastoral agency and reasoning across the twentieth century.  Barth and

---

79  Kennedy, *Twentieth-Century Theologians,* 191ff.; Livingston and Schüssler
    Fiorenza, *Modern Christian Thought,* 273ff. and 342ff.; Christoph Schwöbel,
    'Wolfhart Pannenberg,' in *Modern Theologians,* ed. Ford, 129ff.; Richard
    Bauckham, 'Jürgen Moltmann,' in *Modern Theologians,* 147ff.; Braaten and
    Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology,* 147ff.; Greny and Olson,
    *Twentieth-Century Theology,* 170ff. and 200ff.; Fischer, *Protestantische
    Theologie,* 151ff.; Rohls, *Protestantische Theologie,* 665ff.

80  Braaten and Jenson, *Map of Twentieth-Century Theology,* 179ff.

the normative-theological departures of the 1920s thus continued to set the standard until well into the second half of the twentieth century.

Following these general considerations concerning modern normativity and Barth's role within the twentieth-century academic recovery of theological normativity and control, the remaining sections of the chapter return to the systematic exploration as to how—by what theory features—a Barthian theology, disciplined theological discourse, pastoral identity and habitus facilitated a form of empowerment which was both theological and which, in the twentieth century, had a track record of political relevance.

### 3.3  A radical, counter-modern theory of action

In the radio interview of 1968 (see above, 3.1), Barth points out that his theology facilitates a joyfully relaxed, whilst accountable, political liberalism.  During the Protestant Struggle, Barth's theology and normative-dogmatic stance, indeed, facilitated an educated political resistance and an accountability which helped pastors and church leaders to theologically 'speak truth to power;' more precisely, to address totalitarian

and ideological forms of state politics.  We now explore how, i.e. by what

theory features, was this achieved.

It is well known that, Barth attempts the academic-theological

project in terms of 'theo-logy,' i.e. 'thinking that begins with God'

('Denken von Gott aus').[81]  At the outset of *Church Dogmatics* (*CD,* 1/1),

Barth defines the task of academic-theological dogmatics as creating a

reflective account of the church's witness of divine revelation.  Taking this

into consideration, according to Clegg's and Foucault's power-theoretical

insight, there is an implication of disciplining, not only the Christian

witness, but also the Christian divine.[82]  Theological-reflective

accountability facilitates, in turn, both, the Christian witness *and* the

emergent reality of the Christian divine, in terms of distributed acts of

revelation, and thereby as ethically and relationally disciplined agencies.

The recent combination of research into the development of Barth's

thinking, with a functional interpretation of Barth, in terms of counter-

modern revolutionary enlightenment and ethics, facilitates a systematic

---

81  Karl Barth, *Der Römerbrief (Erste Fassung) 1919,* ed. Hermann Schmidt, Gesamtausgabe, 2/16 (Zurich: TVZ, 1985), 71, tr. DQ.

82  'As a theological discipline dogmatics is the scientific self-examination of the Christian Church with respect to the content of its distinctive talk about God.'  Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* vol. 1, *The Doctrine of the Word of God,* pt. 1, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, tr. G. W. Bromiley, 2nd edn (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975), 3 (hereafter as Barth, *CD,* 1/1).

clarification as to why Barth's theology has the intrinsic capacity to enable

resistance and confront—specifically—totalitarian, overreaching-

ideologies and approaches to state power.  It further allows us to pinpoint

the specific systematic limitations with regards to the direct deployment of

Barth's theology in the current post-ideological global political situation,

which includes the 'rule'—and failure—of 'the global market.'

The goal of this subchapter is to offer a systematic reading of Barth's

theological approach, helping to clarify the overall structure and theoretical

features by which Barth achieves a specific kind of theological-ethical and

noetic empowerment and agency creation.  Pfleiderer's quasi-Foucauldian

understanding of Barth has emerged more recently from two independent

strands of Barth studies.[83]  Since, presumably, some inveterate followers of

Barthian orthodoxy might disapprove of this reading on the grounds of its

methodology, perspective, some of its relating historical propositions and

systematic findings, a decision was taken to introduce the relevant

systematic-ethical and power-analytical findings of this new reading of

Barth by revisiting the two, now integrated, scholarly developments which

support this altered interpretation of Barth.  The reasoning of this chapter is

---

83   More than others, Pfleiderer explores it in full: Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie.*

explored in the following five steps: (1) Recent publications of Barth's smaller publications, lecture notes, sermons and private letters make it clear that 'Dialectical Theology' never introduced a clean break with nineteenth-century theological liberalism: Barth's 'Theology of the Word of God' continues to build upon the thought of his Marburg teachers and (which is important for our purposes) Barth's theology continues to rely upon Marburg neo-Kantian theory design.[84] (2) In the early 1970s in Munich, a group of theological scholars challenged a narrow neo-orthodox, 'churchy'-Protestant use of Barth by pointing out that Barth's thought in the 1920s pursued a program of radicalised-modern emancipation.[85] Controversially, some of the younger researchers amongst them contended that Barth aimed to reach theological *Gleichschaltung* in the same way that the Nazis aimed to eliminate a pluralism of agency formations and points of view.[86] (3) More recent scholarly contributions reaffirm that, in general, these previous findings are accurate, whilst correcting overextended claims and adding

---

84 McCormack, *Karl Barth's.*

85 Trutz Rendtorff, 'Radikale Autonomie Gottes: zum Verständnis der Theologie Karl Barths und ihrer Folgen,' in *Theorie des Christentums: Historisch-theologische Studien zu seiner neuzeitlichen Verfassung* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1972), 161ff.

86 Explicitly so: Falk Wagner, 'Theologische Gleichschaltung: Zur Christologie bei Karl Barth,' in Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* ed. Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975), 10ff.

detail and precision. Korsch is able to show that, within a transcendental-theological layout and without abandoning his generalised-Christological exclusivism, Barth's thought continues to develop and change in ways that the latest version of his theology suitably embraces a pluralisation of theological (and wider) enunciation and discourse. By offering a close exegesis of Barth's explicit text and perspective, Korsch reconciles a more affirmative reading of Barth with the findings of the Munich-group's functional analysis. (4) Pfleiderer represents the most complete and rounded interpretation of Barth to date, synthesising previous (identified) strands and readings whilst contributing additional analytical perspectives and insights into (what this research would consider to be) a 'quasi-Foucauldian' ethical understanding of Barthian empowerment. Eventually (5), Pfleiderer's proposition of a double coding which is explicitly and materially theological and yet transcendental-ethical with regards to its underlying, implicit structure, will be tested against Barth's interpretation of justification and salvation, according to Romans 1:16f.[87]

*(1) Ongoing neo-Kantian influence (Lohmann)*

The Roman-Catholic theologian Balthasar has pointed out, that,

---

87  Barth, *Epistle to the Romans.*

despite all his assertions, Barth continued to frame his interpretation of

divine revelation through the lens of German-idealistic philosophy.[88]  Barth

'preserved (or won back) theology's autonomy' using 'the schemata of

Idealism.'[89]  Bonhoeffer's understanding (two decades earlier) was even

more precise: 'Barth makes use of the philosophical language of neo-

Kantianism.'[90]  More recent interpretations, which trace developments in

Barth's thinking have returned to—and further clarified—these

observations.  Previously, interpretations would have followed Barth's own

narrative: that it was Germany's Protestant elite's—including his

theological teachers'—open support of the war, in 1914, that induced in

Barth *a radical break* with the historical and liberal-theological tradition of

Schleiermacher and Troeltsch; one which brought Barth to the realisation

that, instead of religious experience, divine self-revelation—whilst

humanly impossible, yet factual—had to be at the heart of theological

---

88  'Even as Thomas Aquinas was accused of recasting Revelation in an
    Aristotelian mold, so Barth would be accused of recasting the biblical
    message in the mold of German Idealism.  [...] he uses the conceptual
    framework of idealistic philosophy in his own theological framework.'  Hans
    Urs von Balthasar, *The Theology of Karl Barth,* tr. John Drury (New York,
    Chicago and San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), 180f.

89  Balthasar, *Theology of Karl Barth,* 240.

90  Dietrich Bonhoeffer, 'Die Geschichte der systematischen Theologie des 20.
    Jahrhunderts,' in *Seminare—Vorlegungen—Predigten: 1924 bis 1941:
    Erster Ergänzungsband,* ed. Eberhard Bethge (Munich: Kaiser, 1972), 221,
    tr. DQ.

accountability.[91]  As a result of the publication of Barth's papers,

presentations, letters and private notes, in recent years, our contemporary

understanding of Barth's theological thinking emphasises continuity and

development: Barth's theology of revelation owes more to his Marburg

teachers—to Herrmann, Natrop and Cohen, rather than Schleiermacher

(Balthasar)—than Barth himself was happy to acknowledge.[92]

    During the early part of the Weimar Republic years, Barth reforges

his pre-war academic attempt to deploy Cohen's neo-Kantian rationale, in

the defence and fortification of Herrmann's practical-theological project, in

the form of 'theo-logical' dialectics.[93]  When—in the summer of 1914—

---

91  Karl Barth, 'The Humanity of God,' tr. John Newton Thomas, in *The Humanity of God* (Louisville, Ken.: Westminster John Knox, 1960), 40f. McCormack, *Karl Barth's,* 111ff.; Thomas F. Torrance, *Karl Barth: an Introduction to his Early Theology, 1910–1931* (London: SCM, 1962), 38ff.

92  Johann Friedrich Lohmann, *Karl Barth und der Neukantianismus: die Rezeption des Neukantianismus im 'Römerbrief' und ihre Bedeutung für die weitere Ausarbeitung der Theologie Karl Barths* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995); Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie;* McCormack, *Karl Barth's;* Herbert Anzinger, *Glaube und kommunikative Praxis: eine Studie zur 'vordialektischen' Theologie Karl Barths* (Munich: Kaiser, 1991); Simon Fisher, *Revelatory Positivism?: Barth's Earliest Theology and the Marburg School* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1988); Cornelis van der Kooi, *Anfängliche Theologie: der Denkweg des jungen Karl Barth (1909 bis 1927)* (Munich: Kaiser, 1987); Ingrid Spieckermann, *Gotteserkenntnis: ein Beitrag zur Grundfrage der neuen Theologie Karl Barths* (Munich: Kaiser, 1985). Cf. Bonhoeffer, 'Geschichte,' 221f.

93  Dietrich Korsch, 'Hermann Cohen und die protestantische Theologie seiner Zeit,' in *Dialektische Theologie nach Karl Barth* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 67; Fisher, *Revelatory Positivism;* McCormack, *Karl Barth's,* 31ff.;

Barth despaired of his academic teachers and the German church having

come out in support of the war and began to consider a theological reset,[94]

Cohen's normative objectivism helped Barth to envisage a way in which

'thinking that begins with God'[95] could be rendered academically viable.

By emphasising the role that the young philosopher Heinrich Barth played,

between 1919 and 1922, in the formation of his brother Karl's theological

contribution, Lohmann demonstrates the essential continuity between

Barth's theology of the Word of God and his pre-war liberal-theological

concern with underpinning the practical-theological task of proclaiming the

gospel.[96]  At the time, Heinrich Barth sought to redeploy the Marburg neo-

---

Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 137ff.; Anzinger, *Glaube und kommunikative Praxis,* 16ff.; Spieckermann, *Gotteserkenntnis,* 28ff. McCormack fully recognises Barth's indebtedness to Herrmann and to Cohen; yet fails to fully rebuff Barth's excessive claim of a complete new start: McCormack, *Karl Barth's,* 129f.  Others, too, seem to take the bait: Spieckermann, *Gotteserkenntnis,* 56ff.; Kooi, *Anfängliche Theologie,* 12, 15f. and 38.

94  Barth's letter to Thurneysen, 25-9-1914: 'How will it be, once they will awake from this whole terrible delusion?  From whence will the required new orientation come?  If for once, it is now that one wishes to beseech God to make prophets arise.  It's definitively not *us* with our few big words, even though our sight might go slightly further now than that of those out there. It's neither Kutter and Ragaz.'  Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen, *Karl Barth—Eduard Thurneysen Briefwechsel,* vol. 1, *1913–1921,* ed. Eduard Thurneysen, Gesamtausgabe, 5/3 (Zurich: EZV, 1973), 12, tr. DQ.

95  Barth, *Römerbrief (Erste Fassung),* 71, tr. DQ.  The challenge was posed by Hermann Kutter, co-founder of Christian Socialism in Switzerland.

96  Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 202ff. and 289ff.; Pfleiderer, *Karl Barth's praktische Theologie,* 158f.

Kantian framework, in view of clarifying the troubled ethical situation

which followed killing on an industrial scale.  One of Heinrich's

philosophical papers offered a blueprint (of some description) for Karl's

seminal Tambach address of 1919, in which his theological thought was

introduced to a wider Christian and academic audience.  Subsequently,

Heinrich's neo-Kantian thought had a profound impact on Barth's rereading

of Paul's theology towards publication of the better known second edition

of *The Epistle to the Romans,* published in 1922.[97]

Cohen and Natrop's reading of Kant was non-psychologising and

rationalistic in that the external reality was not—in principle—beyond

understanding.  Concerned to theorise the plausibility of an objective

(mathematical-)scientific truth, Cohen rejected Kant's notion of a humanly

inaccessible, external 'thing in itself;'[98] purporting instead that the

construction/formation of truth—and thus of the human mind and human

agency—derives exclusively from the object of observation *within* the

---

97  Heinrich Barth, 'Gotteserkenntnis,' in *Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie,*
    pt. 1, *Karl Barth, Heinrich Barth, Emil Brunner,* ed. Jürgen Moltmann,
    (Munich: Kaiser, 1962), 221ff.; Karl Barth, 'The Christian's Place in
    Society,' in *The Word of God and the Word of Man,* tr. Douglas Horton
    (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928), 272ff.; Barth, *Epistle to the
    Romans.*  Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 172ff., 206ff. and 317ff.; McCormack, *Karl
    Barth's,* 220f. and 218ff.

98  Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason,* ed. and tr. Paul Guyer and Allen
    W. Wood (Cambridge: CUP, 1998), 161 and passim.

essential relationality of its knowledge. Cohen's conclusion is a resolutely

Platonic-idealistic concept of knowledge. All reality has existence—only

and completely—within the realm of ideas and understanding.[99] 'Only

thinking itself can generate [*erzeugen*] what validly counts as being.' In

addition, Cohen's subject of understanding is thus not an embodied human

*individual* but—in very general terms—'the pure consciousness of an ideal

epistemological subject.'[100] Marburg neo-Kantian thought is thus one of

the sources for Barth's own anti-subjectivism, as well as his rejection of

religious experience as a theological starting point. In line with Marburg

neo-Kantianism, Barth opts to apply a theological-dogmatic lens which

also presumes an objective rationality to the construction of Christian

revelation. Thus, theological-dogmatic understanding can—and must—be

established upon—and as—'an "objective" [...] realisation which is

constituted exclusively in God.'[101] It is by way of such an understanding

that—even with reference to human cognition—Barth, in 1922, was able to

write, 'Only by God can God be conceived, his faithfulness by faith

alone.'[102]

---

99  Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 77ff. and 82ff.; Ernst Cassierer, 'Hermann Cohen, 1842–1918,' *Social Research* 10, no. 2 (1943): 219ff.

100 Fisher, *Revelatory Positivism,* 39 and 47.

101 Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 243, tr. DQ.

102 'Gott ist nur durch Gott zu verstehen, seine Treue allein durch den Glauben.'

With the rejection of Kant's empirical sensation and 'thing in itself,'

Cohen thus needs to derive knowledge in its totality from a general first

principle—the 'origin' (*Ursprung*)—such that, as the single source of

thought, it remains itself completely located within the same realm of

abstract ideas.  'Nothing may count as pregiven to pure thinking; even the

pregiven, it must itself produce for itself.'[103]  Cohen's Platonistic divine

origin gains momentum in Heinrich and Karl Barth's thinking, in that it

relates its other-worldly—thus unavailable—provenance to a this-worldly

effective creativity and critique with regards to the ethical-noetic subject.

In God as the *Ursprung*, the idealistic-transcendental and theological-

transcendent can be 'dialectically' identified and engaged in the human

condition.[104]  In Barth's second edition of *The Epistle to the Romans*

(1922), the language of Cohen's *Ursprung* is prolific: 'We know that God

is He whom we do not know, and that our ignorance is precisely the

problem and the source [*Ursprung*] of our knowledge.'[105]  Barth can thus

---

Karl Barth, *Der Römerbrief (zweite Fassung) 1922,* ed. Cornelis van der Kooi and Katja Tolstaja, Gesamtausgabe, 2/47, (Zurich: TVZ, 2010), 87, tr. DQ.  Hoskyn's translation here misrepresents syntactic connections: Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 112.

103 Hermann Cohen, *System der Philosophie,* vol. 2, *Ethik des reinen Willens* (Berlin: Cassirer, 1904), 97, tr. DQ.

104 Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 199ff.

105 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 45.

be regarded—in Pfleiderer's words—as offering an 'explicitly religious material, which is implicitly (according to its intentions) a transcendental-theoretical practical double coding of theology.'[106] We will return to this matter in due course.

Recent research has shown that the impact of Marburg neo-Kantianism on Barth's thinking is not limited to his early 'Dialectic Theology' phase:  With new textual evidence, which has become available as a result of publication of Barth's academic lectures of the 1920s, Balthasar's proposition of a second substantial shift in Barth's thinking, from 'dialectics' to 'analogy,' as different modes of thought, can no longer be maintained.[107]  McCormack proposes a material shift from Barth's predominantly eschatological/apocalyptic concern, in the early Weimar years, to a Christological focus, from 1924 onwards.[108]  Beintker, however, considers that such a conceptual/material change is simply—for the most part—a reflection of Barth's university appointment in Göttingen, in 1921. Of all the indications, it is Barth's more measured academic approach (in the place of revolutionary agitation), the broad deployment of traditionally

---

106 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 266.

107 Balthasar, *Theology of Karl Barth,* 44ff. and 73ff.

108 McCormack, *Karl Barth's,* 19f., 20ff. and 327f.

dogmatic materials and triadic/Trinitarian and Christological reflection, and—eventually—the discovery of 'analogy of faith,' that denote a turn towards theological dogmatics and diligent academic work.[109]  Despite the fact that, during this process of academic institutionalisation of Barth's theology, neo-Kantian language and thought—over time—appear to fade into the background, Cohen's central concern and objective remain essential to the development of Barth's theology.  Lohmann points out that Barth—incrementally—gave up an earlier idea that theology and philosophy at their (neo-Kantian) best and most sincere—were sufficiently 'congruent' to inform one another.  By the time he came to work on *Church Dogmatics* (*CD*), Barth arrived at the opposite conclusion: that the church's participation in the revelation of God's Word *must completely avoid* building upon—or even engaging with—philosophical justification or argumentative support.[110]  Concerned as he was to establish the knowledge of divine self-revelation, exclusively within the act, proclamation and self-knowledge of the triune God itself, it is precisely Barth's anti-subjectivism and rejection of any philosophical undergirding which provides the

---

109 Michael Beintker, *Die Dialektik der 'dialektischen Theologie' Karl Barths: Studien zur Entwicklung der Barthschen Theologie und zur Vorgeschichte der 'Kirchlichen Dogmatik'* (Munich: Kaiser, 1987), 141f.; Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 164, 376ff. and 389ff.

110 Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 317ff.

evidence that his ongoing concern with divine sovereignty-within-revelation is a continuation of his neo-Kantian theological dialectics of the early 1920s.[111] According to Pfleiderer, Barth's neo-Kantian guiding effort to facilitate theologically—'theo-logically'—self-assured agency and action remains intact. What does change, over time, however, is the subject which Barth projects as his relevant recipient and theological agent, and which his theological enunciations aim to facilitate and empower. In the early Weimar years, Barth's intended agent is a revolutionary-theological and cultural 'avant-garde;' when Barth's theological dogmatics turn academic, his intended recipient-actor becomes professionalised and his university teaching thereby aims to equip a certain professional-ministerial self-understanding with a capacity of meta-reflective normative control of the Christian tradition and its theological resources; during the struggles over the Barmen Declaration, Barth's intended agency becomes historically institutionalised and positive in the Council of Brethren wing of the *BK*; and so it continues.[112]

---

111 Lohmann, *Karl Barth,* 361ff.

112 Georg Pfleiderer, 'Das "prophetische Amt" der Theologie: zur systematischen Rekonstruktion der Theologie Karl Barths und ihres Entwicklungsgangs,' *Zeitschrift für Dialektische Theologie* 17, no. 2 (2001): 112ff.

*(2) Structural totalitarianism? (Rendtorff, Wagner)*

A second line of thought connects with a criticism (one that is not fully accurate) which was first raised by one of Barth's 'comrades in arms' during the Dialectical Theology movement. Friedrich Gogarten criticised Barth, claiming that his *Church Dogmatics* had insulated theological accountability from the political/cultural challenges and responsibilities of the age. Barth had, Gogarten believed, turned his contextually bold, fresh and relevant theological affirmation of the Weimar years into a hermetically sealed, abstract notion of divine revelation, which he understood in terms of 'sovereignty' and 'freedom.'[113] This, in turn— claims Gogarten—removed any understanding of history and of political-responsibility, contingency and content.[114]

Barmen veterans and post-war Barthians would—obviously—

---

113 'This, now, is indeed the solution to the conundrum: the God Barth refers to is a God of whom he knows without biblical revelation; of whom he knows from the "opposite" to revelation; i.e., it is the God of whom—in Barth's language—nothing other may be said except "sovereignty" [Herrschaft] and "freedom."' Friedrich Gogarten, *Gericht oder Skepsis: eine Streitschrift gegen Karl Barth* (Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1937), 89f., tr. DQ.

114 Gogarten, *Gericht oder Skepsis.* Pfleiderer points out that Barth, instead, aims at speaking prophetically into coarsely modelled projections of a changing historical situations; thereby, Barth would not be able, for systematic reasons, to reflect on this task of political analysis and modelling: Pfleiderer, 'Prophetisches Amt der Theologie.'

dismiss such a reading and, against the backdrop of the Confessing

resistance against Nazi totalitarianism, they trace Barth's dogmatic

construction of a positive revelatory freedom.[115]  Recognising Barth's roots

in the Christian politics of Ragaz and Kutter, it is Marquardt who considers

'[t]he *inversion* of Socialism into the theology of Barth' at the outset of the

Weimar Republic era; and with it an alternative, political-contextual,

reading of Barth's dogmatics.[116]  It was not only Barthians who were

outraged when, in the mid-1970s, a group of scholars from Munich

deployed fascist political terminology in the analysis of Barth's

dogmatics.[117]  Of this group, it was Wagner and Graf who claimed that the

theory design of certain Weimar theologians—amongst whom Barth was

prominent—was structurally totalitarian, and therefore comparable to

Stalinism and Fascism.  Their anti-historical dogmatic approach was akin

to those of the highly problematic political and cultural theorists of the

---

115 Ulrich Hendinger, *Der Freiheitsbegriff in der Kirchlichen Dogmatik Karl Barths* (Zurich and Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1962); Timothy Gorringe, *Karl Barth: against Hegemony* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 1999).

116 Friedrich-Wilhelm Marquardt, *Theologie und Sozialismus: das Beispiel Karl Barths,* 3rd ext. edn (Munich: Kaiser, 1985), 37, tr. DQ, orig. emph.

117 Wagner, 'Theologische Gleichschaltung;' Friedrich Wilhelm Graf, 'Die Freiheit der Entsprechung zu Gott: Bemerkungen zum theozentrischen Ansatz der Anthropologie,' in Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* ed. Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975), 76ff.

same generation, amongst whom were: Gehlen, Carl Schmitt and Ernst Jünger, in addition to some openly fascist theorists.[118] A certain frustration and anger can be detected on the part of Wagner and Graf; the kind that is produced when faced with the well-known—structural—intolerance and arrogance with which Barth and Barthians tend to dismiss alternative—more accommodating, more modest—historical and reflective-critical approaches to Christian theology and religion. The relentless denigration and polemics that Barth directs against any alternative Christian-theological concern (and only against theological concerns) must, obviously, be explained. This aside, the Munich group sought to ascertain a counter-modern ethical interest at the heart of Barth's theology.

In a programmatic paper, the group's most senior scholar, Rendtorff, proposes that the aim of Barth's theological dialectics is to lay non-historical—and thereby counter-modern—foundations, so as to facilitate a more radical and more robust collective form of ethical-theological freedom and autonomy. Munich hereby takes up Gogarten's categories and call for accountability, albeit with a twist. Given such an agenda, the Barth

---

118 Falk Wagner, 'Politische Theorie des Nationalsozialismus als politische Theologie,' in Manfred Baumotte, Hans-Walter Schütte, Falk Wagner and Horst Renz, *Kritik der politischen Theologie* (Munich: Kaiser, 1973), 29ff.; Wagner, 'Gehlens radikalisierter Handlungsbegriff;' Graf, 'Freiheit der Entsprechung,' 116.

of the Weimar Republic years must not be conceived as a 'neo-orthodox'

traditionalist, but rather as a modern-liberal practitioner seeking to revisit

and take forward the project of his theological teachers, whilst facing the

apparent breakdown of modern civilisation, both in and after the Great

War.[119]  In line with his teacher Herrmann, Barth claims that the place of

foundational science must not be usurped by critical ethics, but that priority

must be given to modern Christian theology.  At the core of ethical

knowledge—and thereby the foundation of all human knowledge and

action—instead of Christian 'faith' (Herrmann), Barth positions the

dogmatic critique and affirmation of divine knowability: that which is

critically posed and resolved within the relations of self-revelation of God

and in God.  The foundational subject—which is both antecedent and

uncircumventable—of any Christian-material decision and theological

knowledge of world relations is the reflective subjectivity of God revealing

God to God.[120]  Barth thus

> [...] ties the *objectivity* of ethics [...] decisively to the clarification of the
> *subject* of all reality in such a way, that 'the indissoluble subjectivity of

---

119 Rendtorff, 'Radikale Autonomie Gottes.'

120 Trutz Rendtorff, 'Der ethische Sinn der Dogmatik: zur Reformierung des
    Verhältnisses von Dogmatik und Ethik bei Karl Barth,' in Falk Wagner,
    Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, *Die Realisierung
    der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* ed. Trutz
    Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975), 119ff.  Precisely in
    this sense, McCormack understands Barth's dogmatics as 'critical realism:'
    McCormack, *Karl Barth's,* 66f.

God' itself—with regards to method and content—is rendered as the foundation and precondition of theology, both in general and in all its relations.[121]

However, with great precision, Wagner writes,

Since Barth's theology aims at self-explication of the universal and absolute subject, the structure and foundation of this subject must fall into one; insofar the construction of this subject may only be conceived as dependent on such preconditions which it sends forth itself as [its own] conditioned preconditions—and therefore as an unconditioned.

All of Barth's theology is established upon a single foundational principle

of construction: the 'self-determining self-definition of the Word of God.'

For this constructive principle is conceptualised in such a manner that in it, the principle and its contents [lat. *principiatum*], the defining subject [*definiens*] and what is being defined [*definiendum*] fall into one [...].[122]

In particular, Barth endeavours—amongst many efforts undertaken by

young Weimar Republic theorists—to create the counter-modern mindset

of a radical revolutionary elite, by way of transforming the generality and

shape of the German Idealism philosophical critique into a self-sustaining

normative-principled reflective agency.[123]  Wagner thereby finds the

---

121 Rendtorff, 'Ethischer Sinn der Dogmatik,' 123, tr. DQ.

122 Wagner, 'Theologische Gleichschaltung,' 13 and 15, tr. DQ.  Wagner, 'Politische Theorie,' 44f.

123 To Wagner's comparisons of Barth and Tillich, with Hitler and Gehlen (see above); Pfleiderer adds the comparative exploration of political theorists and theologians across the full Weimar political spectrum: the Marxist Lukács,

Dialectical Theology approaches of Barth, Gogarten, Tillich etc. to be more convincing than the others; contending that theorisation concerns itself with eternally self-perpetuating strength and freedom and is thereby not tied to any particular-historical agency but is rather explicitly concerned with the supra-historical, transcendent(al), 'theo-logical' preconditions of human-political freedom within contingent history and politics.[124]

*(3) Reintroducing Christological realism (Korsch)*

In different ways, Korsch and Pfleiderer seek to manage scholarly indignation so as to secure some of the central insights of the Munich group reading of Barth.  These are just some of the reasons as to why Christian scholars would return to the material analysis of Barth's theology as resources in sustaining political resistance, learning, differentiation and play.[125]  Korsch suitably re-engages the material-systematic reconstruction

---

constitutional theorist Carl Schmitt, Nazi-theologian Hirsch, and—to the political right and left of Dialectical Theology—Gogarten and Barth. Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 27ff.

124 Wagner, 'Politische Theorie,' 29, tr. DQ.  Ibid., 44f.

125 E.g.: Hedinger, *Freiheitsbegriff;* Peter Winzeler, *Widerstehende Theologie: Karl Barth 1920–35* (Stuttgart: Alector, 1982); Sabine Plonz, *Die herrenlosen Gewalten: eine Relektüre Karl Barths in befreiungstheologischer Perspektive* (Mainz: Grünewald, 1995); Gorringe, *Karl Barth.*

of Barth's academic contribution with anti-totalitarian theological resistance—as offered by more sympathetic, *BK*-Barthian and other contextual-political readings of Barth—with the Munich group's insight that the aim of Barth's theory design is to facilitating an—even more radical—high-modern strong autonomy and freedom in God.  Korsch considers that Wagner's interpretation of Barth (in particular) makes the mistake of presupposing a single understanding of modern-enlightened 'critical' (which in the Weimar Republic years became 'radical') autonomy and liberty.[126]  Rendtorff and Wagner thus underdetermine both Barth's 'theo-logical' freedom—the liberty of, and in, God-in-revelation—and the Christian-theological act of its account and reflection, according to a Barthian approach and understanding; and Korsch comes to the opposite conclusion as Wagner: that one should not—as Wagner proposes—aim to rid Barth's dogmatics of its positive-revelatory and doctrinal contents and specifics in order to maintain the (allegedly) abstract generality of its radical-reflective freedom.  Instead, Korsch considers it expedient to pursue the material-dogmatic developments in Barth's theology.  In terms of McCormack's identification of Barth's theology as being 'critically

---

126 Dietrich Korsch, 'Christologie und Autonomie: zur dogmatischen Kritik einer neuzeitlichen Deutung der Theologie Karl Barths,' in *Dialektische Theologie nach Karl Barth* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 167f.

realistic,'[127] Korsch could be said to reintroduce Christological realism to Rendtorff's and Wagner's emphasis upon modern critique in their reading of Barth.

Korsch concedes that Wagner—and other scholars of Rendtorff's group—rightly point out that—in some way—Barth's 'dialectical theological' autonomy concept, which consists of the identification of the act or subject ('principle') as well as the contents ('*principiatum*') of divine self-revelation, is perpetuated in Barth's 'doctrine of the election of grace' and his theological anthropology (*CD,* 2/2 and 3/2).[128]  However, Korsch is able to demonstrate that there is a difference between Christological 'principle' and '*principiatum*:' the latter being Christological content, as accounted for by (Barthian) theologians, preachers and—even non-Christian—witnesses who are ordained by God.  He does so with reference to the passages of the 'doctrine of reconciliation' (*CD,* 4/3/1) in which Barth explores the

---

127 Cf. McCormack, *Karl Barth's,* 66f. and 129f.

128 Korsch, 'Christologie und Autonomie,' 154ff.  Barth, *CD,* 2/2; Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* vol. 3, *The Doctrine of Creation,* pt. 2, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, tr. Harold Knight et al. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1960) (hereafter as Barth, *CD,* 3/2).  Walter Sparn, '"Extra Internum": die christologische Revision der Prädestinationslehre in Karl Barths Erwählungslehre,' in Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* ed. Trutz Rendtorff (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975), 44ff.; Graf, 'Freiheit der Entsprechung.'

relationship between Christ 'the light of life' and 'the many lights and words and truths of the world' (which, given their contingently historical places, confer their insights and revelatory truths).[129] Although Jesus Christ, through the direct, biblical witness and the indirect witness of his church, is alone 'the Word of God'[130] and 'the one light of life,'[131] there exist within—and even outside—the church's Christian witness, 'lights' and revelatory words which—in certain situations and at certain times—are reflective of the one witness and light which is Christ.[132] From his analysis, Korsch comes to the following two conclusions: firstly, that Barth's differentiation between the Christological principle (the threefold 'Word of God') and Christian-theological contents/accounts—according to *CD, 4/3*—allows for variation and diversity within the Christian-theological

---

129 Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* vol. 4, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation,* pt. 3, half 1, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, tr. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1961), 151 (hereafter as Barth, *CD,* 4/3/1). Barth, *CD,* 4/3/1, 96ff.

130 Barth, *CD,* 4/3/1, 95ff.; cf. Barth, *CD,* 1/1, 88ff.

131 Barth, *CD,* 4/3/1, 91.

132 'Moreover, there is a history of the gifts and operations of Jesus Christ, and many histories of groups and individuals determined by Him. But neither the history as a whole, nor any one history in particular, is the one Word of God. Jesus Christ [...] stands alone in face of every light which shines in this sphere. And this is even more true, of course, in the outside sphere where this witness does not take place and these impulses are not seen. The positive thing to be noted is that, even though it is perhaps incontestable that there are real lights of life and words of God in this sphere too, He alone is the Word of God even here, and these lights shine only because of the shining of none other light than His.' Barth, *CD,* 4/3/1, 96.

witness of divine (self-)revelation.  The unique singularity of the uniting

'principle' is sufficiently identified by the three attributes of its

'sufficiency,' 'exclusivity' and 'underivability.'  Secondly—against

Wagner's allegations—Korsch reveals Barth's theology to be 'eminently

capable of development.'[133]


*(4)  Inverted practical-transcendental theory (Pfleiderer)[134]*


Korsch also takes account of the changing—meanwhile widely

accepted—understanding of the beginnings of the Weimar-era 'theo-

logical' dialectics, with particular regards to the extent to which Cohen and

Natrop's neo-Kantian philosophy continued to have a formative influence

upon Barth's *Epistle to the Romans* and beyond.[135]  Whilst adding his

detailed studies into the development of Barth's thinking, Pfleiderer

integrates this discovery with concerns raised by Rendtorff's Munich

group.  Pfleiderer thereby also redeploys Marquardt's idea of 'inversion'

within Barth's theology.  In addition, he introduces text-aesthetic and text-

---

133 Korsch, 'Christologie und Autonomie,' 170f. and 177, tr. DQ.

134 Barth's theological dogmatics exemplifies 'the type of an inverted practical transcendental theory' ('den Typus einer invertierten praktischen Transzendentaltheorie'): Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 140, tr. DQ (also hereafter).  Ibid., 450f.

135 Korsch, 'Hermann Cohen.'

pragmatic observations to the interpretation of Barth's theological thought. Adopting a different approach to Korsch, Pfleiderer opts to maintain and refine the Munich theologians' external-functional method and perspective of interpreting Barth.

Pfleiderer introduces a number of important linguistic—aesthetic and text-pragmatic—observations to the interpretation of Barth's theology. In Barth's writings, one often finds rich, multiple layers of interlocking encodings, references (some of which are explicit, others implicit) and meanings, as the theologian draws upon a broad spectrum of symbolic resources including: scripture, theological tradition, devotional language, and—especially during the Weimar years—philosophical or contemporary cultural references. From his many resources, Barth creates powerful '[m]ethodical amalgamations.' 'Theoretical scientification, practical-ethical mobilisation, but undeniably also aesthetic staging here form amalgams.'[136] Systematically, these have been 'brought to great homogeneity' to such a degree that—in large sections of his work—they have the appearance of being 'hermetical' and 'autopoietic.'[137] It is

136 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 451f.

137 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 450, 9, 115 and 128. Cf. Garrett Green, 'The Sociology of Dogmatics: Niklas Luhmann's Challenge to Theology,' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50, no. 1 (1982): 19ff. With Krosch (see above), one could argue that a conceptual change is

precisely because Barth's pronouncements appear to be multifarious and articulate, flexible, reflective and even cutting edge as regards the intellectual, political/cultural situation of his time, that one often discovers his texts to be doubly—even multiply—codified.[138]  Barth's 'over-encoding of texts,' claims Pfleiderer, in a text-pragmatic sense, aims to give readers and recipients an experience of being worn down, overwhelmed and coerced.[139]

Within an exclusively, self-referentially constructed—'hermetical'— theological knowledge, not only does Barth insist on 'recipience-indifferent "objectivity,"' at the same time, he also deploys a 'persuasive and appellative style.'[140]  Moral appellation and denunciation are reflective of an ongoing effort to delegitimise a distanced, critical '*Zuschauertheologie*'—a theological reflection from a spectator's point of

---

introduced in the post-war situation: Barth, *CD, 4, The Doctrine of Reconciliation.*

138 In Barth's *Epistle to the Romans,* for example: 'The text of the Pauline epistle to the Romans is being overwritten by the sketching of a theological acting subject situated in the historical present.'  Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 278.

139 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 452.  Cf. 'surcodage:' Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *L'Anti-Œdipe: Capitalisme et schizophrénie, 1,* new augm. ed. (Paris: Minuit, 1973), 236.

140 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 9; Pfleiderer, 'Das prophetische Amt' 117; tr. DQ (also hereafter).

view.[141]  In the pursuit of complete delegitimisation of (even traces of) external reflection, Barth stops at nothing and is even willing to sharply rebuff a long-standing fellow traveller and good friend.[142]  Pfleiderer is not content to ignore such prevalent polemics and denunciations, which students of Barth—or those engaging with 'confessional' Barthians—often find to be unpleasant or even annoying.  They are reflective of a recipient-oriented staging, the aim of which—through the 'abolition of the spectator'—is 'total mobilisation' (Jünger).  Barth neither permits theology to be studied as a critically distanced academic observation, nor as historically nonbinding Christian-religious—or political—practice.[143]

All of this only makes sense however if one considers that not all of Barth's theological dogmatics take place in the open.  In a private letter to Thurneysen, Barth describes his groundbreaking Tambach address of 1919 (during which his theology was introduced to the wider public) as having become 'a rather complicated kind of machine that runs backwards and

---

141 Karl Barth and Adolf von Harnack, 'Ein Briefwechsel zwischen K. Barth und A. von Harnack,' *Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie,* vol. 1, *Karl Barth, Heinrich Barth, Emil Brunner,* ed. Jürgen Moltmann (Munich: Kaiser, 1977), 328; cf. Barth, *CD,* 1/1, 199ff. and 239.

142 Barth's 'Nein!' aiming at Brunner: Barth, 'No!'

143 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 43 and 44; cf. ibid., 356ff., 377 and passim.

forwards and shoots in all directions with no lack of both visible and

hidden joints.'[144] Pfleiderer compares Barth's theory design with Richard

Wagner's invention of the orchestra pit as a staging device through which

an audience may well hear the sound of music whilst, at the same time,

some of the essential practical means and mechanics of its production

remain hidden from the beholders' eyes.[145] It is here that Pfleiderer

reintroduces Marquardt's idea of an 'inversion,' alongside the new

understanding of the ongoing profound impact of Marburg neo-Kantianism

upon Barth's thinking; yet here, it is with reference to a text-pragmatic

effort at normatively coercing the formation of a generalised and radical

counter-modern agency—not from above, but from within the relations of

its reflective-noetic acts of self-(re)creation.


     Pfleiderer proposes that Barth's theological dogmatics are in keeping

with the 'type of an inverted practical transcendental theory.'[146] Under the

impression of a (seemingly) complete historical collapse of the pre-war

project of critical progress and enlightenment, young intellectuals of

---

144 Barth's letter from 11-9-1919: Karl Barth and Eduard Thurneysen,
    *Revolutionary Theology in the Making: Barth–Thurneysen Correspondence,*
    *1914–1925,* tr. James D. Smart (London: Epworth, 1964), 47. Tambach
    address: Karl Barth, 'Christian's Place in Society.'

145 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 442.

146 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 140.

Barth's generation, including Lukács, Gehlen, Schmitt, Hirsch, Tillich and Gogarten, embarked upon comparable theoretical projects to construct a free and resilient collective subject which—under the conditions of accelerated technological (heteronomous) modernisation—would be able to further self-determine its destiny; and do so despite the (perceived) fact that, historically, the pre-war project had already failed and that the resources which one would need for an ethical or political recovery, were irretrievably lost. All of these theorists chose to resolve this impasse through the 'inversion' of contingent—historical and personal— dimensions, processes and conditions of theory acquisition, in such a manner that one must reflect even upon the contingencies of their endeavours in terms that are framed by the relations of a subjective-transcendental reflection, the general form of which was originally developed by both Kant and Fichte. As the radical-revolutionary 'inversion'—within a subjective-transcendental rationale—dissimulates its contingent preconditions, it self-enforces itself in—and as—an act which is always and already preconditioned—exclusively—through, and as, an act of absolute necessity. This act, thus, establishes itself as the collective agency of sound reflective judgement and autonomy.

Conceptually, there is a challenge since the strong and free collective

subject must be conceived as having already been preposited—normatively and 'transcendentally' in the sense of being a universal necessity and precondition—so that it may also take effect historically, empirically and in concrete individual acts and decisions.

> It must therefore be possible to develop the collective subject from and through the rationale of individual free acts, whilst, at the same time, it must be conceived as preconditioning these.[147]

These early twentieth-century theories can achieve this only 'by way of an authoritarian positing.' From the ultimate foundations of a certain philosophical-theological argument, the collective agency thereby remains grounded in normative reasoning. Furthermore, it becomes established through and within the reflectively self-generating—historically contingent—activities of educated human agencies; by reading, studying and discussing certain treatises and texts within the respective circles of an emergent intellectual vanguard. However, as a result of the particular forms of normative reasoning—alongside moral-appellative pragmatics and disqualification of intellectual observation—and by aiming to reach their respective students/activists, such theories subsequently forget about the historically specific situations and the learning processes, and thus act out—both intellectually and politically—the thus generated normative-

---

147 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 139.

collective subjectivity and ideology.  The created revolutionary elite thus

abandons itself to explicating and enacting the self-enforcing—'more or

less abstract, coercive'—generalised agency on the basis of their

recognition of the general necessity of its theoretical construction.[148]


Pfleiderer argues that Barth achieves a greater purity of theory design

than his contemporaries, on the basis that his version of a counter-modern

empowered agency facilitates a more thorough eradication of the historical-

elitist consciousness.  Barth can revisit the withdrawal of this conceptual

discrepancy by way of a progressive 'radicalisation' and ever more

principled 'inversion,' and by re-emphasising the exclusive divinity of God,

thereby preventing this conceptual gap—the historically contingent nature

of theo-logical consciousness—becoming a matter of *external* meta-

reflection.[149]  Barth's rereading of Romans 9ff. for example, in the revised

edition of *The Epistle to the Romans,* consistently eliminates references to

Christian Socialism—a politico-historical group—and avoids mentioning

the lofty superiority of Barth's pastoral elite; an embodied-habitual attitude

beyond his theology's conscious normative control.[150]

---

148 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 139f.

149 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 141f.

150 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 367ff.

And so, when at its ending the Epistle dissolves itself, when it quite deliberately gives to its sympathetic, understanding, naturally Pauline readers the sharp command, 'Halt!', it does but corroborate itself. [...] For must not the great disturbance be carried through to the krisis of all conscious knowledge, and especially to the krisis of the conscious perception that we are under krisis, if God is to be the Unknown, Hidden God, if He is to remain alone in His eternal power and divinity, the only Strength of the strong? If the krisis be not pressed home to the end, all would be but sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.[151]

*(5) Barth's interpretation of Romans 1:17*

Pfleiderer points out that Barth, by way of a 'double coding,' inter-engages explicit Christian-religious content with an inverted transcendental-ethical rationale.[152] A short passage of the revised edition of Barth's *The Epistle to the Romans* shall be examined to demonstrate how Barth interweaves the (implicit) transcendental-practical argument with a material reinterpretation of the Protestant-soteriological tradition.[153] An examination of developments in Barth's soteriology is not intended.[154]

---

151 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 505.

152 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 266.

153 Barth, *Römerbrief (zweite Fassung),* 11ff.; Engl. tr.: Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 35ff.

154 With regards to Barth's reception of the soteriological tradition, it is beneficial to further consider why Barth later emphasises priority of 'the Gospel' over 'the Law,' and how he aligns Christology and soteriology in *CD,* 4/1: Barth, *CD,* 2/2, 509 and 511; Barth, *Church Dogmatics,* vol. 4, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation,* pt. 1, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, tr. G. W. Bromiley (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956), 47 and 128ff. (hereafter

In the 1922 edition, Barth sees 'the gospel' in terms of a divine

revelation striking us from—and exclusively within the relations of—a

transcendent(al) beyond, which Barth constructs to be radically

discontinuous in its relationship to this world and our human condition. 'It

is the Primal Origin [!] by which they all are dissolved, the consummation

by which they all are established.'[155] In the reinterpretation of Romans

1:16f.—i.e. of the core of the Protestant theological tradition—[156] Barth

rephrases the neo-Kantian argument within his interpretation of Romans

1:16f. He emphasises that the (Cohenian) divine *Ursprung* of everything,

which relates to our world and human condition, also introduces 'the

Resurrection' as 'the limitation of the known world by another that is

unknown.'[157] By virtue of this radical delineation, thus declared (as

revealed), God, even within the relations of divine revelation, remains

unassailable and beyond the need of defence. At the same time, this very

act of divine self-revelation challenges—announces judgement upon—all

alternative powers, ideological and salvific claims by identifying them as

---

as Barth, *CD,* 4/4).

155 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 36.

156 Martin Luther, 'Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings: Wittenberg, 1545,' in *Selections from his Writings,* ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), 10ff.

157 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 35.

this-worldly, thus *not divine* and not life-giving.  'The Gospel is not a truth among other truths.  Rather, it sets a question-mark against all truths.'[158] Here, (alongside religious experience and 'history') all other relations of truth (both 'religious' and 'secular'),[159] and 'ideology,' in particular,[160] become subsumed under the theological-salvific category of 'the law.'[161] Barth, at the time, identified God's 'judgement'—or at least its accepting embrace—with the gospel.

> He affirms Himself by denying us as we are and the world as it is.  [...]
> He acknowledges Himself to be our God by creating and maintaining the
> distance by which we are separated from Him; He displays His mercy by
> inaugurating His *krisis* and bringing us under judgement.  He guarantees
> our salvation by willing to be God and to be known as God—in Christ;
> He justifies us by justifying Himself.[162]

Barth emphasises the priority of God's 'No' which encompasses an even more emphatic divine affirmation of what is merely created.[163]  Barth's

---

158 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 35.

159 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 52.

160 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 77f.; Barth, *Römerbrief (zweite Fassung),* 53.
Hoskyns translates 'a notion:' Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 74.

161 'It is irrelevant whether they possess and are concerned to guard Moses or
John the Baptist, Plato or Socialism, or that moral perception which dwells
in all its simplicity in the midst of the rough and tumble of human life.  [...]
If they have been veritably entrusted with the oracles of God, their claim to
peculiarity and to special attention is not necessarily presumptuous.'  Barth,
*Epistle to the Romans,* 79.

162 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 40f.

163 'Precisely because the "No" of God is all-embracing, it is also His "Yes".'

understanding of the gospel, at the time, thus implies accepting the rejection—and divine affirmation—of human (religious and secular) autonomy and of any alternative-principled foundation of its agency and world practice.

If one aims to give credence to a foundation of human endeavour and its world, within an enclosed transcendent(al) foundation, 'which proceeds from God outwards,' admonishes Barth, any misguided (i.e. alternative) salvific propositions and references to 'religious' or divine (thus transcendental) engagements with, or within, the relations of our human affairs must be eliminated.[164]  Barth, at the time, decided to strategically focus his 'dialectical' theological critique within a rejection of the 'liberal' and 'historicistic' contributions of his Christian-theological teachers and, in 1934, now within a more explicitly Trinitarian-Christological rationale, embarked upon another radical attack of 'natural theology.'[165]  In principle however, Barth's theology could also be easily directed against secular transcendental-'decisionistic' and political-ideological programs and

Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 38.  Cf. Barth, 'Christian's Place in Society.'

164 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 37.

165 Torrance, *Karl Barth,* 33ff. and 53; Robert Morgan, 'Ernst Troeltsch and the Dialectical Theology,' in *Ernst Troeltsch and the Future of Theology,* ed. John Powell Clayton (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1976), 33ff.; Ballor, 'Aryan Clause;' Barth, 'No!'  Cf. also above, section 2.2.

theorisations.[166]  In 1938, Barth theologically reconsidered the Christian

engagement with the wider political order;[167] and, addressing pastors in

prisoner-of-war camps in an open letter in 1945, points out it was a

mistake, during the years of *Kirchenkampf*, not to have made his political

concerns explicit and public.[168]


### 3.4  A Foucauldian rescripting of Barth's practical theology


Building upon research into the neo-Kantian contribution towards

---

166 'No more radical critique of ideology has been developed in the twentieth
century than that made by dialectical theology.  It had in view, and hit hard,
everything that raised an unconditional ideological claim [...].'  Klaus
Scholder, *The Churches and the Third Reich,* vol. 1, *Preliminary History of
the Time of Illusions 1918–1934* (London: SCM, 1987), 51.  Scholder,
'Modern German History.'  In a comparative systematic analysis of Ernst
Jünger, Heidegger and Carl Schmitt's absolute-political 'determination,'
Krockow identifies a shared 'decisionism' of a younger generation of
Weimar conservative theorists who, together, conceptually contributed
towards the Nazi rise to power: Krockow, *Entscheidung.*  According to
Scholder and Pfleiderer, other 'conservative revolutionaries,' but also Barth
and Gogarten, the *DC* theologian Hirsch and the neo-Marxist Lukács deploy
a similar theoretical rationale: Scholder, 'Modern German History;'
Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 27ff.; cf. Sontheimer, 'Anti-
democratic Thought.'

167 Karl Barth, *Church and State,* tr. G. Ronald Howe (Macon, Georg.: Smyth
and Helwys, 1991).

168 Karl Barth, 'An die deutschen Theologen in der Kriegsgefangenschaft:
1945,' *Offene Briefe 1945–1968,* ed. Diether Koch, Gesamtausgabe, 5/15
(Zurich: TVZ, 1984), 50.

Barth's thinking and the Barth interpretation of the Munich group, Pfleiderer argues that Barth's theological dogmatics should be interpreted as a normative effort at facilitating the power relations of a hard-nosed, self-assured and counter-modern agency, embodied in the theological (self-)understanding of a (Barthian) modern-professional preacher or of academic theologians.  The fact that, at the time, radical-totalitarian ideologies and theories of political action were being developed, following the same theory design, helps explain how Barth's 'theo-logical' normative-dogmatic approach could empower trained pastors and church leaders to stand up and speak truth to the totalitarian and ideological 'powers that be.'[169]  At the same time, one must however bear in mind that, amongst the younger Weimar-Republic academics who had developed their theological frameworks according to a comparable design (several of them being Barth's fellow travellers), only a few were found to resist fascism (e.g. Tillich and Bultmann), whilst many—in differing degrees—complied with the Nazis (e.g. Althaus and Gogarten); and some were even deeply complicit (e.g. Hirsch).[170]

---

169 Pfleiderer and Wagner reference political theorists to the left and right; Lukács, Bloch, Schmitt, Gehlen, Jünger and Hitler: Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 29ff.; Wagner, 'Gehlens radikalisierter Handlungsbegriff;' Wagner, 'Politische Theorie.'

170 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie,* 29.

When Foucault transitioned to the research of power relations, he compared the interest and focus of his research to a Kantian framework of critique. Whereas Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* inquired into the general—'transcendental' or '*a priori*'—preconditions and limitations of enlightened knowledge production,[171] Foucault's previous knowledge 'archaeology' explores how contingent 'historical *a priori*s' both facilitate and limit conditions of discursive truth formations.[172] In an interview, conducted in 1977, Foucault identifies '*épistémè*' as a specific, less heterogeneous—and thus less general—case of a '*dispositif*.'[173] Here, Foucault clarifies:

> [...] I would define the episteme retrospectively as the strategic apparatus [*dispositif*] which permits of separating out from among all the statements which are possible those that will be acceptable within, [...] a field of scientificity, [...].[174]

Foucault's formal comparison of Kant's transcendental theory framework with his dispositive power analysis implies that (to refer in advance to that which will be presented in greater detail in chapter 5) within the elements

---

171 Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason,* 156 and passim.

172 Foucault, *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 224.

173 Michel Foucault, 'Le jeu de Michel Foucault' in *Dits et Écrits: 1954–1988,* vol. 3, *1976–1979,* ed. Daniel Defert et François Ewald (Paris: Gallimard: 1994), no. 206, 300f.

174 Foucault, 'Confession of the Flesh,' 197.

gathered into a modern power dispositive—as conceived by Foucault *the*

*formation of (counter-)modern regimes of knowledge and acting subjects*

*are being preconditioned through social-and-discursive practices,*

*techniques and technologies which aim at the human body.* At the bottom

of Foucault's historical *a priori* or 'quasi-transcendental' limiting

preconditions one finds relations of practice and techniques of power and

discourse.[175]

In chapter 5, a Foucauldian power–discourse–agency dispositive

analysis will explain Pentecostal/charismatic experience and breakthrough

as being both an agency as well as truth-creating power relations. Here, it

can be used to rescript Pfleiderer's reading of Barth in terms of a

Foucauldian dispositive analysis. Pfleiderer's reading of Barth as an

inverted-facilitative theory of action, which aims to create counter-modern,

professional and embodied theological agencies—based upon a

transcendental-normative framework—is akin to a Foucauldian power

---

175 Whilst Kolf-van Melis rightly points out that it is not possible to make sense
of Foucault's work on contingent-embodied subjectification *within the
relations of a twentieth-century normative-theological reflection* which
establishes itself upon a transcendental theorisation of human subjectivity,
the reverse task is quite possible, i.e. to engage a transcendental theorisation
of the modern subject within a Foucauldian power analysis: Claudia Kolf-
van Melis, 'Tod des Subjekts?: eine Auseinandersetzung mit Karl Rahner
und Michel Foucault,' in *Tod des Subjekts?: Poststrukturalismus und
christliches Denken,* ed. Michael Zichy and Heinrich Schmidinger
(Innsbruck and Vienna: Tyrolia, 2005), 93ff.

analysis of a specific practice–discourse–embodiment 'dispositive:' i.e. a

structurally stable relationship in which certain social practices/

techniques—together with discursive relations of truth creation/

deployment—aim to impact human bodies.  Here, Barth's normative-

theological agency, noetic framework and existence imposes itself: text

pragmatically, by way of a coercive, moral and normative imposition

which, on the side of the student recipient, correlates to acceptance,

conviction, discerning surrender and re-enactment.


A Barthian normative-theological critique of ideological

totalitarianism and political incursion is equally possible, precisely because

Barth's dialectical counter-modern agency is able to deploy Christian-

soteriological symbolism in the form of a certain anti-totalitarian

understanding of the doctrine of justification within a relational framework

of normative, coercive and totalising power/truth and actor formation; *one*

*which is shared* by the political-totalitarian ideologies and reflective-

embodied identities which were created according to the very same theory

design within the same historico-cultural situation.[176]  With unbending self-

assurance, one may—along with Barth—insist on remaining joyfully

humble, relaxed and corrigible in the pursuit of one's political aims and

---

176 Cf. above, section 3.2.

deployments of power: 'God is in heaven, and thou art on earth.'[177]

In this chapter, as well as in the two subsequent ones, Foucauldian theorisations and his concern with embodied control, resistance and self-invention facilitate an analytical understanding of different forms of 'ethical' empowerment. This is possible because Foucault's power concern is never static and his 'toolbox' is a treasure trove full of theorisations that can support many different purposes. For example, Foucault's 'disciplinary power,' which he studied primarily through the prison system, identifies practices of normalisation that are also at work in many modern institutions including education and higher education. His understanding of the 'means of correct training' can be virtually directly transferred onto an understanding of the, embodied—and ordering—effects at work in the making of Christian ministers and members of the clergy through academic (/modern-professional) formation, examination and ordination in chapter 4.[178] Pentecostal-charismatic Spirit baptism and experiential

---

177 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans,* 10; Ecclesiastes 5:2 (KJV).

178 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170ff. Hoffman, 'Disciplinary Power;' Ladelle McWhorter, 'Normalization,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 315ff.; Havis, 'Discipline;' Rouse, 'Power/Knowledge;' 96ff.; Sara Mills, *Michel Foucault* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003), 42ff.; Alec McHoul and Wendy Grace, *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject,* (New York: New York Univ. Pr., 1997), 66ff.; Link, 'Disziplinartechnologien/Normalität/Normalisierung.'

empowerment, in chapter 5, will be studied through a formal reading of the dimensions of Foucault's sexuality dispositive (more below).[179] The exploration of 'pastoral power,' in terms of doctrinal oversight, the care of souls and professionalism (chapter 4), however, avoids Foucault's theorisation of 'pastoral power'[180] which, due to its 'genealogical'/ subversive-analytical concern and lack of interest in doing justice to Christianity, is imbalanced since it overgeneralises its historical observations and claims (cf. above, the methodological introduction, 0.2.1). In addition to facilitating an analytics of embodied empowerment and ethical formation, Foucault, in his 'biopolitics' lectures, offers an outline of the conceptual resources of classical-liberal and neo-liberal modes of political reasoning (below, 3.5).[181] This will be used below to contextualise both Barthian-theological empowerment and the Pentecostal mode of agency construction through Spirit baptism (3.6 and chapter 5).

---

179 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92ff. and 103ff.

180 Michel Foucault, *Les aveux de la chair: Histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 4, ed. Frédéric Gros (Paris: Gallimard, 2018); Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population;* Foucault, *Courage of Truth,* 5 and 333ff.; Foucault, *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1981–82,* ed. Frédéric Gros, tr. Graham Burchell (Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 45 and 363f.; Foucault, *Use of Pleasure,* 21. Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 130ff.; Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 123, 131ff. and 161ff.; Alexandre Macmillan, 'Michel Foucault's Techniques of the Self and the Christian Politics of Obedience,' *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 3ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 61ff.

181 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.*

Whilst, over time, Foucault's theorisation of power evolved and he added new analytical insights and theorisations to his theory 'toolbox,' since his death, our average understanding has also changed, albeit in a different manner. In the 1970s, Foucault's research into power/truth relations explained historical changes in the modes of truth creation by way of analysing modern-discursive practices/techniques which focus on human bodies. Identifying 'sexuality' and pastoral-confessional practices as the basis of modern control over both bodies *and* populations,[182] Foucault went on to explore 'biopower' and 'governmentality,' i.e. the historical-conceptual resources and modes of today's political reasoning; and eventually, the history of ethical and aesthetical self-formation and freedom.[183] With an ongoing publication of new Foucauldian sources (lectures, interviews and minor contributions), beginning in the 1990s,[184] today's understanding of Foucault is quite different to that of twenty or thirty years ago. More recent engagement often focuses on the 'final Focault.'

---

182 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 139ff.

183 Elden, *Foucault: Birth of Power;* Elden, *Foucault's Last Decade;* Downing, *After Foucault;* Taylor, *Michel Foucault;* Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault;* May, *Philosophy of Foucault;* O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* chs. 7–9, 83ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 21ff.; Davidson, 'Ethics as Aesthetics.'

184 An introduction to the different parts of Foucault's oevre: Kammler, ed., *Foucault-Handbuch,* pt. 2, 9ff.; O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 33ff.

Throughout the 1990s, Foucault's work on the ethico-aesthetics of subjectivity became the linchpin for a wide range of thinkers who were trying to come to grips with the question of resistance in the postbinary post-cold war world that was just emerging.  Foucault, in short, became a central figure in thinking and rethinking identity and the myriad ways in which individual subjects who were armed with specific regimes of practice could reinscribe or resist hegemonic norms.[185]

The publication of the English translation of the lecture series, in which Foucault expounds the rationale of classical-liberal and neo-liberal 'governmentalities,' at the very time of the 2008 financial crash, further focuses the most recent readings of Foucault.[186]  Subsequently, conceptual developments, variations and differentiations in Foucault's mid-career analytics of power can be missed.[187]  When it comes to (systematic-) theological readings of Foucault, the problem is further enhanced by the fact that Foucault's interest in theological and Christian-religious concerns seems to be all but missing in his early-1970s research on power; an interest in the 'confession,' 'pastoral power' and, eventually, 'spiritual' subversion, only begins with the first volume of *The History of Sexuality*

---

185 Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 2.

186 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.*  Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* Brown, *Undoing the Demos;* Zamora and Behrent, *Foucault and Neoliberalism;* Gane, 'Foucault's History of Neoliberalism.'

187 Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 3.  On conceptual differentiation and development in Foucault's theorisations of power: Lynch, 'Foucault's Theory of Power;' Feder, 'Power/Knowledge;' Revel, 'Power;' Rouse, 'Power/ Knowledge;' Bublitz, 'Macht;' Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 146ff.

and intensifies in the 1980s.[188]


## 3.5  Political deployments of *status confessionis*


In the twentieth century, Barth's normative theology of the Word of God and the Barmen narrative played an important role informing political and theological resistance, confronting different ideological and totalitarian forms of political power which were deployed through the means of the modern nation state.  More recently however, this form of theological theory and its political deployments appear to have reached their limits. The chapter (above) seeks to clarify the reason why a Barthian and twentieth-century theological dogmatics suitably empowers the embodied and collective 'theological existence' of a Confessing pastor in such a manner that he (she) will engage in a meaningful political resistance and confrontation within a twentieth-century politics which is totalitarian, ideological, or—at least—normatively reasoned.  The remaining parts of this chapter aim to clarify the reasons why such a theological approach fails to offer orientation within a political situation in which a 'neo-liberal'

---

188 Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight;* Carrette, *Foucault and Religion;* Vintges, 'Freedom and Spirituality;' Bernauer, 'Confession;' Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 161ff.; Foucault, *Religion and Culture.*

globalised-market rationale predetermines state politics.  It thus prepares

the way for the exploration of a distinctively different configuration of

Christian-ethical empowerment (below in chapter 5).

*(1)  Confronting totalitarian dictatorship and apartheid*

At the beginning of the struggles of the German-evangelical church,

Barth's theology informed a theological unmasking—and a practical-

political confrontation—of the Nazi-ideology and tyranny, when a group of

preachers and church leaders, by way of an act of insistent doctrinal

confession (the Barmen Declaration of 1934), outflanked a Nazi-Christian

co-optation of the Christian church and its leadership structures.  De facto,

they excommunicated the other party (see above, chapter 2).  In the later

part of the twentieth century, Barth's theology, as well as Bonhoeffer's

congeneric thought, were repeatedly redeployed to successfully facilitate

and direct theological and political resistance against the ideological

justification of injustice and totalitarian political power.  Dogmatic

theology helped Christian pastors, churches—and even non-Christians—

find a role and take a stance within the formation of the GDR opposition

(Eastern Germany) and during the 'peaceful revolution' of 1989.[189]  Pastors

---

189 Erhart Neubert, *Eine protestantische Revolution* (Osnabrück: Edition

and church leaders contended, in particular, over Barmen and Bonhoeffer's theological and political legacy when making a case, for either cooperation or resistance, in relation to the SED-Socialist dictatorship.[190] Barth's and Bonhoeffer's theology and the narrative of politico-theological resistance also played a role in the fight for an end to South African apartheid.[191] In each of these cases, whereby new political beginnings succeeded confrontation, turmoil and change, representatives of Christian churches and theological thinking were able to make a significant contribution.

---

Kontext, 1990); Neubert, *Unsere Revolution: Die Geschichte der Jahre 1989/90* (Munich and Zurich: Piper, 2008); Neubert, *Geschichte der Opposition in der DDR 1949–1989* (Berlin: Links, 1997).

190 'Ten Articles on the Church's Freedom and Service' and 'Seven Sentences of the Church's Freedom to serve' (1963): Konferenz der Evangelischen Kirchenleitungen in der DDR, 'Zehn Artikel über Freiheit und Dienst der Kirche, erarbeitet im Auftrag der Konferenz der Evangelischen Kirchenleitungen in der DDR und von dieser gemeinsam für alle Landeskirchen verabschiedet,' in *Kundgebungen: Worte, Erklärungen und Dokumente der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland,* vol. 2, *1959–1969,* ed. Joachim E. Christoph, (Hanover: Verl. d. Amtsblattes d. EKD, 1994), 112ff.; Gerhard Besier, *Der SED-Staat und die Kirche: der Weg in die Anpassung* (Munich: Bertelsmann, 1993), 540ff. Gregory Baum, *The Church for Others: Protestant Theology in Communist East Germany* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1996), 83ff.; Wolf Krötke, 'Dietrich Bonhoeffer als "Theologe der DDR": ein kritischer Rückblick,' *Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik* 37, no. 1 (1993): 94ff. Erhart Neubert, *Kirche und Opposition in der DDR,* Rapporte der Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung Vertretung in Polen, 19 (Warsaw: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2010); Neubert, *Geschichte der Opposition;* Neubert, *Unsere Revolution.*

191 Piet Naudé, 'The Reception of Karl Barth in South Africa 1960–1990: Selected Perspectives,' in *Reformed Churches in South Africa and the Struggle for Justice: Remembering 1960–1990,* ed. Mary-Anne Plaatjies-van Huffel and Robert Vosloo (Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 2013), 186ff.

Pastors were voted into parliaments and contributed to early constitutional processes; church congregations facilitating round-table talks (1989/90 in Eastern Germany); church leaders presided over the Truth and Reconciliation process in South Africa.

It would be appropriate to point out that, in international-ecumenical circles, the paradigmatic political narrative of the Barmen Declaration was probably more compelling than Barth's and Bonhoeffer's theology in itself, since it involved a synodal gathering excommunicating major parts of German Protestantism on the grounds of theology and church order and, thereby, indirectly challenging a fascist-totalitarian, racist and—as it turned out—genocidal political leadership and ideology. After World War II, this, in turn, led to contemporary German theology being studied in other parts of the world.[192] In the final quarter of the twentieth century, ecumenical-denominational bodies, in a number of cases, considered and implemented the declaration of schism on theological and political grounds, according to the example of the Barmen Declaration. A statement of the Lutheran World

---

192 'Barmen and the *Kirchenkampf* started to function as liberating symbols, symbols of confession and resistance, for the emerging discourse of Black Theology in South Africa.' Nico Koopman, 'The Reception of the Barmen Declaration in South Africa,' *The Ecumenical Review* 61, no. 1 (2009): 62. On Barmen 1934 as an international and ecumenical event: Keith Clements, 'Barmen and the Ecumenical Movement,' *The Ecumenical Review* 61, no. 1 (2009): 6ff.

Federation (LWF), at its sixth assembly in Dar es Salaam, in 1977, declared

a state of confession with regards to the Christian need to take a decisive

political stance against state-enforced racial segregation in southern

Africa.[193]  On the basis of this common statement, two Caucasian member

churches were suspended at the 1984 World Assembly in Budapest.[194]  In a

similar manner, the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (WARC), at its

1982 general council in Ottawa, declared a state of confession concerning

apartheid and suspended two of its South African member churches.[195]  The

Belhar Confession of the Dutch Reformed Mission Church (drafted in 1982

and adopted in 1986) continues to impact Reformed discourse on racism,

social justice and church unity.[196]  Efforts by the elected leadership of the

---

193 Lutheran World Federation, *In Christ—a New Community: the Proceedings of the Sixth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, June 13–25, 1977,* ed. Arne Sovik (Geneva: LWF, 1977), 180.

194 Lutheran World Federation, 'History of the LWF Assemblies since 1947,' From the LWF Institutional Memory (2014), www.lutheranworld.org.

195 World Alliance of Reformed Churches, *Ottawa 1982: Proceedings of the 21st General Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (Presbyterian and Congregational),* ed. Edmund Perret (Geneva: World Alliance of Reformed Churches, 1983), 176ff.; Lennart Henriksson, 'Many Good Words—Little Action?: the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the "South Africa Question," 1960–1990,' in *Reformed Churches in South Africa and the Struggle for Justice: Remembering 1960–1990,* ed. Mary-Anne Plaatjies-van Huffel and Robert Vosloo (Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 2013), 359ff.; D. J. Smit, 'A *Status Confessionis* in South Africa?' *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 47 (1984), 21ff.

196 Mary-Anne Plaatjies van Huffel, 'The Belhar Confession: Born in the Struggle against Apartheid in Southern Africa,' *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 39, no. (2013): 185ff.; Koopman, 'Reception of Barmen.'

Reformed Federation in Germany, in 1982, to call a state of confession on nuclear armament is reflective of a certain theological-conceptual watering down due to a perceived political urgency.[197] More recently, different ecumenical-denominational international gatherings have considered calling a state of confession on neo-liberal globalised capitalism; deciding however that, though there is clearly a political and economic urgency which demands the churches to respond, a strong enough theological case for a full and formal declaration of *status confessionis* cannot be made.

*(2) Engaging neo-liberal economic globalisation*

Given the globalisation of a neo-liberal market rationale, both the LWF and the WARC, identified the need for a decisive Christian witness but neither decided to formally declare a *status confessionis* as did German Protestants in 1934. Instead, the WARC's twenty-fourth General Council, 2004 in Accra, invoked a '*processus confessionis*:' 'a process of covenanting for justice in the economy and the earth.'[198] According to the

---

197 Rolf Wischnath, 'Bekennen in der Friedensfrage: Eine Erinnerung an die Reformierte Friedenserklärung 1982,' paper presented October 2015 in Hanover and in Hildesheim, www.info-reformiert.de.

198 Patricia Sheerattan-Bisnauth, 'Confessing Faith Together in the Economy: the Accra Confession and Covenanting for Justice Movement,' *International Review of Mission* 97, no. 386–87 (2008), 239; Hans-Wilfried Haase, 'Theological Remarks on the Accra Confession,' *HTS Theological Studies*

Accra Confession, international delegates of the Reformed tradition reject 'the current world economic order imposed by global neoliberal capitalism' on the grounds that it defies 'God's covenant by excluding the poor, the vulnerable and the whole of creation from the fullness of life.' In a quintessentially Reformed manner—with Barthian overtones—the neo-liberal economic order is projected as a form of 'empire which subverts God's sovereignty over life and acts contrary to God's just rule.'[199] In a similar manner, the tenth Assembly of the LWF in Winnipeg (2003) identifies economic hardship and injustice, as well as social, cultural and ecological devastation, as some of the severe consequences of neo-liberal

---

65, no. 1 (2009), www.hts.org.za.

199 A full quote of relevant passages: 'Faith commitment may be expressed in various ways according to regional and theological traditions: as confession, as confessing together, as faith stance, as being faithful to the covenant of God. We choose confession, not meaning a classical doctrinal confession, because the World Alliance of Reformed Churches cannot make such a confession, but to show the necessity and urgency of an active response to the challenges of our time and the call of Debrecen. We invite member churches to receive and respond to our common witness. [...] Therefore, we reject the current world economic order imposed by global neoliberal capitalism and any other economic system, including absolute planned economies, which defy God's covenant by excluding the poor, the vulnerable and the whole of creation from the fullness of life. We reject any claim of economic, political and military empire which subverts God's sovereignty over life and acts contrary to God's just rule.' WARC, 'Covenanting for Justice: the Accra Confession,' *Reformed World* 55, no. 3 (2005): 187f. In a similar manner, Tran interprets economic globalisation in terms of 'a new age of empire' as capitalism is 'totalizing in its effects, and as significantly, in its theorization.' 'Foucault, through Hardt and Negri helps the church rightly despair capitalism while also substantiating her own reasons for hope.' Tran, *Foucault and Theology,* 48f.; cf. Hardt and Negri, *Empire.*

globalisation which the church communion, through witness and action,

must challenge, confront and seek to change.  Unlike their Reformed

counterparts and refraining from using the language of confession, with a

somewhat greater conceptual precision, the LWF undertake to identify

'neoliberal economic globalization' as a:

> [...] false ideology [which] is grounded on the assumption that the
> market, built on private property, unrestrained competition and the
> centrality of contracts, is the absolute law governing human life, society
> and the natural environment.  This is idolatry and leads to the systematic
> exclusion of those who own no property, the destruction of cultural
> diversity, the dismantling of fragile democracies and the destruction of
> the earth.[200]

The LWF's theological 'working paper' on the topic (which was first

published in 2001) equally affirms the destructive effects of economic

globalisation in many regions of the world and identifies the pervasive

ubiquity of its ethical rationale of socially erosive competition and greed

leading to wealth accumulation in just a few places—and depletion in

others—as being reflective of idolatry and sin.  The paper was, however,

less decisive in its moral denunciation of 'globalisation,' which it

considered to be overly paradoxical and too much of a mixed phenomenon.

---

200 Lutheran World Federation, 'Transforming Economic Globalization,' in *For the Healing of the World: Official Report: the Lutheran World Federation Tenth Assembly Winnipeg, Canada, 21–31 July 2003* (Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 2004), 61.

'Engaging Economic Globalization [...]' reflects the understanding of many—at a particular point in time, prior to the 2008 banking crisis—that it was possible to cause global capitalism to work for the good of local communities, social justice and cohesion; and that—notwithstanding the stances which local communities decided to take—there was no point in the wider church seeking to evade engaging with the global market and its rationale. In view of an eschatological horizon, and under the conditions of a fallen world, Christian resistance must be varied, reflecting different local situations and needs. Furthermore, this must be accompanied by a listening and learning of the global church communion which includes and empowers, in particular, those voices who find themselves less privileged as a result of the dynamics of globalisation and who are called, perhaps, to more decisive acts which reflect Trinitarian solidarity.[201]

At no point in the process, have Lutherans concluded that neo-liberal economic globalisation creates a formal 'case of confession' in which there cannot be 'matters of indifference.'[202] In a paper written from a Lutheran-

---

201 Karen L. Bloomquist, with an advisory group, 'Engaging Economic Globalization as a Communion: a Working Paper of the Lutheran World Federation (2001),' in *Communion, Responsibility, Accountability: Responding as a Lutheran Communion to Neoliberal Globalization,* ed. Karen L. Bloomquist (Geneva: LWF, 2004), 21ff.

202 Quote from Formula of Concords, art. 10, epitome: *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 814, tr. from Latin text DQ. Guillermo

ecumenical viewpoint, Hansen proposes that declaring a formal *status confessionis*—as took first place during the controversies surrounding the Augsburg and the Leipzig Interim of 1548, or according to the model of the 1934 Barmen Declaration—would misconstrue 'neo-liberalism' and 'global market' as a power relation and political challenge akin to a confrontation with a tyrannical, relentless and persistent, political adversary vested in the power of the state and interfering with—and jeopardising—the church's proclamation of the gospel. This, however, is not the case. Furthermore, it implies an understanding of neo-liberalism as being not merely a 'false ideology' (Winnipeg), but a 'totalitarian' and tyrannical political program.[203] Hansen contributes some important analytical observations.

> [...] economic neoliberalism associated with globalization does not depend on a totalitarian strategy in the sense of a political program of confrontation and domination, since it acts as the very negation of politics. Its force lies in the ability to penetrate the interstices and fissures of societies undergoing serious economic, political and cultural

---

Hansen, 'Confessing the Triune God in a Globalized Era,' *The Ecumenical Review* 61, no. 1 (2009): 33f.

203 This is what Tran, following Hardt and Negri's reading of Foucault on neo-liberalism and 'biopolitics,' proposes: Tran, *Foucault and Theology,* 48ff; cf. ibid., 123. As McSweeney points out, the ubiquity of neoliberal power does not imply 'absolute control:' John McSweeney, 'Review: Jonathan Tran, *Foucault and Theology* (London and New York: T and T Clark, 2011), ISBN: 978-0567033437,' *Foucault Studies* 14 (2012): 213ff. Fuggle's reading of Foucault through Agamben, Badiou and Žižek introduces greater precision and insight with regards to a both theological and cultural understanding of the neo-liberal governmentality of 'globalisation' as well as its relating ethics of resistance: Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul.*

crises.[204]

Prior to 2008, global capitalism was not accompanied by a direct threat of political totalitarianism or tyranny.  Although it could be rightly identified as 'idolatry' or 'sin,' it does not pose a danger to the integrity and truth of the gospel.  An aim to overcome neo-liberal power by way of principled theological or moral insistence would amount to tilting at windmills, since:

> [...] economic interests and forces have the supreme capacity not only to slip away when directly attacked, but also to ensnare vulnerable areas in the political and cultural spheres.[205]

Neo-liberal capitalism instead 'erodes the cultural substratum within society, and also the state's role in regulating and distributing economic benefits.'[206]  In other words, it is multifaceted civil society, cohesion, and the scope of political disagreement and action which are colonised, taken-over and suffocated by the heteronomous rationale of economic calculation. These are clearly important fields and spheres in which the Christian proclamation of God's Kingdom and Trinitarian life must aim to create and empower a culture of Christian love, hope, justice and peace as appropriate reflections of the gospel.

---

204 Hansen, 'Neoliberal Globalization,' 170.

205 Hansen, 'Neoliberal Globalization,' 171.

206 Hansen, 'Neoliberal Globalization,' 169.

Since the financial crisis of 2008, the destructive dynamics of neo-liberal economic globalisation and extreme inequality has also begun to disrupt life in the global north.  Today, one could be forgiven for concluding that the redistribution of global capital and power has been pushed beyond the point of no return, whereby a rebalancing, which would benefit the majority of people, local communities, cultures, different regions and the natural world, is now no longer achievable.  Is it possible to restore scope for democratic decision-making without destroying the already fragile economy on which we equally depend?  One would, furthermore, need to assess whether—and to what depth—the resurgence of neo-fascist identity agendas adds to the politics and dynamics of globalised neo-liberal power.  Hansen records market globalisation as having a negative impact upon local communities and limiting the scope of governmental action in impoverished parts of the world.  In addition, it should be pointed out that, in post-industrial societies, a neo-liberal political rationale exerts pressure upon families, community cohesion and moral standards; it restrains public funding for healthcare, social security and education, squeezing the very resources which safeguard and support the cultivation of rounded and compassionate human beings within hospitable, safe and culturally rich communities.  Furthermore, Hansen rightly calls for the promotion of citizenship—rather than consumerism—

and the taking of political responsibility—rather than giving in to political disillusionment and cynicism, whereby one disengages with the entire democratic process and with politicians, thus giving way to authoritarianism (or worse).  Nevertheless, despite his efforts, Hansen does not make a strong enough case for reinstating the Lutheran doctrine of the 'two kingdoms.'

Foucault's exploration of (classical) liberalism, as well as his investigation into the neo-liberalism of the Anglosphere—in terms of governmental/political rationale and relating agency formations/ethics—is able to deepen and further clarify Hansen's political considerations and findings.

## 3.6  A Foucauldian analysis of neo-liberal globalisation

Even prior to the UK general election of 1979 and Reagan's first term in office, across four lectures (from 14 March to 4 April), Foucault develops the power rationale of neo-liberalism, according to the Chicago school.[207]  He locates this within a three-fold disposition of the modern 'art

207 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* lectures 9–12, 215ff.

of government' which, together, form the foundation of nineteenth and twentieth-century politics and party-political debate.[208]  The lectures series attracted a great deal of interest when the English translation was published at the time of the 2008 financial crash.[209]  Whilst some see Foucault as offering 'the apology of neoliberalism,'[210] others use Foucault's far-sighted analyses to clarify the contemporary erosion of Western-democratic political culture.[211]  Since, at the point of his death, Foucault had only begun to explore the impact of the Christian tradition within the relations of modern-Western political culture and practice, as well as the ethics of freedom and control, Agamben and others seek to clarify and deepen

---

208 'You can see that in the modern world, [...] a series of governmental
    rationalities overlap, lean on each other, challenge each other, and struggle
    with each other: art of government according to truth, art of government
    according to the rationality of the sovereign state, and art of government
    according to the rationality of economic agents, and more generally,
    according to the rationality of the governed themselves.  And it is all these
    different arts of government, all these different types of ways of calculating,
    rationalizing, and regulating the art of government which, overlapping each
    other, broadly speaking constitute the object of political debate from the
    nineteenth century.'  Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 313.

209 Gane, 'Foucault's History of Neoliberalism.'

210 Becker, Ewald and Hartcourt, 'Becker on Ewald,' 4; Dean, 'Foucault, Ewald,
    Neoliberalism;' Michael C. Behrent, 'Liberalism without Humanism: Michel
    Foucault and the Free-Market Creed, 1976–1979,' in *Foucault and
    Neoliberalism,* ed. Daniel Zamora and Michael C. Behrent (Cambridge and
    Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016)*,* 24ff.

211 Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos;* Daniel Zamora, 'Foucault, the
    Excluded, and the Neoliberal Erosion of the State,' in *Foucault and
    Neoliberalism,* ed. Daniel Zamora and Michael C. Behrent (Cambridge and
    Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016), 63ff.

Foucault's 'genealogy of economy and government' through an exploration

of its Christian-theological contribution.[212]  Leshem proposes that one must

retrace the whole Trinitarian-doctrinal tradition up to the fifth century in

order to understand the contemporary connection between a neo-liberal

governmental politics and the 'free market' economy.  This thesis is not

however the place to engage with this important discussion.[213]  Fuggle, on

the other hand, regards Foucault and, in particular (a Foucauldian reading

of) Paul's soteriology and ethics, as offering a conceptual-theological

understanding and clarification of political-spiritual resistance as it

occurred, for example, in the Occupy protests of 2011.[214]

The following reading aims to show that—within these lectures—

Foucault gathers important conceptual resources needed to undertake an

analytical understanding of: how the forces of economic globalisation,

together with a predominant neo-liberal ethics and political discourse,

initially facilitate cosmopolitan tolerance, and embrace (a certain) cultural

diversity; the reason why the cost of this particular form of 'neo-liberalism'

is the erosion of the resources and foundations of modern civil society and

---

212 Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory.*

213 Leshem, *Origins of Neoliberalism.*

214 Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul*.  On 'political spirituality:' cf. Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 136ff.

its relating local cultures, tribal affiliations, identities and cohesion; the reason why the institutions of a discursive-normalising disciplinary power, which uphold modern-professional and academic standards and rationales, are also undermined (cf. below, sub-chapters 4.4 and 5.4).[215] The following reading aims to furthermore clarify the reason why Barth's Weimar-era radical, dialectic, 'theo-logical' and normative rationale—and its corresponding political agency—fail to engage with a predominantly 'neo-liberal' political power structure/culture. It furthermore aims to prepare a consideration as to whether, within the forms and relations of a Pentecostal-charismatic discursive approach and agency construction, it is at all possible to achieve such an engagement and power confrontation. An analysis of Azusa Street testimonies in part II facilitates an *ethnographic-understanding* of Pentecostal empowerment and agency creation, on the basis of which such a consideration may be pursued further.

*(1) Human capital and self-interested calculation (Robbins)*

In the lecture of 14 March, Foucault demonstrates how the (old)

---

215 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* lecturs 9–12, 215ff.; esp. ibid., 248ff. and 317ff. In these lectures, Foucault's aim is to merely analyse the rationales of (good) modern government insofar they are reflective of changing practices: ibid., 2ff. A full power-analysis of neo-liberal political practice would need to include a consideration of technology and the strategic channelling of funding, services and resources. Cf. Brown, *Undoing the Demos.*

Chicago school of economics had been established upon the theorisation of human capital.[216]  Neo-liberal economic thought in the United States began with theoretical work on the qualitative side of labour which—previously—had neither been duly developed by Smith, Ricardo, Marx nor Keynes.  Robbins defines economics as the study of 'human behaviour as a relationship between ends and scarce means which have alternative uses'—i.e. strategic 'choice' established upon the basis of self-interested informed calculation.[217]  It is in the interest of people to invest in the maintenance and enhancement of their own—as well as their children's—embodied-economic capabilities ('capital-ability'),[218] as a way of earning a decent living thereafter.  This includes maintaining good health and developing soft skills, education, work experience etc.  An income can thus be understood as a return for capital accumulated across a history of investment into oneself and one's children (quality time, education).  Healthcare, migration, mobility become investments into one's own

---

216 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 215ff.

217 Lionel Robbins, *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science* (London: Macmillan, 1932), 15 and passim; cf. Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 268f.  Later neo-liberals add the consideration of irrational behaviour that reacts to environmental challenges or changes:  'Homo œconomicus is someone who accepts reality.'  Ibid., 269.  Gary S. Becker, 'Irrational Behavior and Economic Theory,' *Journal of Political Economy* 70, no. 1 (1962): 12.

218 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 225.

embodied future or the future of a particular population. Consumption can be seen as an 'investment' which 'produces' people's satisfaction.[219] '*Homo œconomicus* is an entrepreneur, an entrepreneur of himself.'[220] At an economic level, productivity and technological innovation relate—for the most part—to investments into people's capabilities. To support economic growth, a national politics should therefore facilitate and encourage people's investment into their human capital. Chicago-school neo-liberalism thus includes *an ethical rationale of self-interested calculation and choice.*

The next step of Chicago neo-liberalism, is to extend and redeploy such conceptual findings beyond the original economic domain, into fields which one would otherwise (outside of the Anglosphere) consider to be non-economic.[221] Instead, Freiburg-school ordo-liberalism and *Gesellschaftspolitik* ensure the free operation of market mechanisms *within*

---

219 Robert T. Michael and Gary S. Becker, 'On the New Theory of Consumer Behavior,' *The Swedish Journal of Economics* 75, no. 4 (1973): 378ff.

220 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 226; cf. Robbins, *Nature and Significance,* 89.

221 Theodore W. Schultz, 'The Emerging Economic Scene and Its Relation to High School Education,' in *The High School in a New Era,* ed. Francis S. Chase and Harold A. Anderson (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1958), 97ff.; Gary S. Becker, *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior,* (Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1976); Becker, 'Nobel Lecture: the Economic Way of Looking at Behavior,' *Journal of Political Economy* 101, no. 3 (1993): 385ff.

*economic relations,* whilst seeking to regulate and strengthen 'society' and other 'external' fields of policy which include: welfare, education, culture, security etc., so as to create expedient conditions for market calculation and economic growth.[222] The approach was compromised by the Hartz-plan labour-market and welfare reforms of 2003/2005. Post-war western-German political theory thereby recognises that it is neither desirable to integrate 'society' nor morality into an economic rationale. Society is set up 'for'—and at the same time, 'against'—the market, since ordo-liberals envisage 'a society oriented towards the market and a society that compensates for the effects of the market in the realm of values and existence.'[223] (Old-)Chicago-school economic policy—the neo-liberalism of Thatcher and of Reagan—is much more radical. It inverses the relationship between society and the economy. Here too, the economic rationale of the market determines the relations of society and politics, but it does so in an absolute, unlimited manner. All aspects of social relations are understood in terms of the market rationale, in terms of supply and demand: the mother–child relationship is an investment in human capital; the individual and every social player is '*homo œconomicus*;' marriage/a family household are understood in terms of a company or production unit

---

222 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 240ff.; ibid., lectures 4–8, 75ff.

223 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 242.

with a long-term contract; criminality, juridical and penal systems become

reorganised according to a utilitarian and economic rationale.  In addition,

government action, in general, is assessed—and denounced as being

inefficient or 'wasteful'—according to a mere cost–benefit calculation.

Whilst government should never interfere with either *homo œconomicus* or

the market, the law of the market rationale is simultaneously deployed so as

to measure and limit governmental capacity, cost and action.  Thatcherite

neo-liberals call for 'lean' and 'cost-efficient' government as they scrutinise

the 'use of taxpayers' money.'  With regards to political reason, this

'economic positivism' operates as a normalising insistence which

eliminates contradiction, inconsistency and nonsense.[224]  In the liberal

economic theory of the eighteenth century, *homo œconomicus* was

established as being completely inaccessible to the state.  The state must

leave *homo œconomicus* alone to pursue her own business for the benefit of

all.  Paradoxically, by responding rationally to modifications in her

environment—within a neo-liberal political rationale—she becomes

'eminently governable.'

> From being the intangible partner of laissez-faire, *homo œconomicus*
> now becomes the correlate of a governmentality which will act on the

---

224 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 242.

environment and systematically modify its variables.[225]

## (2) *Homo œconomicus and penal reform (Becker)*

In his lecture from 21 March, Foucault discusses how American (and British) neo-liberalism extends the rationale of economic calculation into other fields of social-relations. The neo-liberal rationale of penal reform is thereby of particular interest to Foucault.[226] As his students would have been aware, a reconstruction of the Chicago-school understanding of criminality and law enforcement directly engaged with Foucault's own analysis of modern-disciplinary and professional normalising practices of power and knowledge in *Discipline and Punish* (1975). According to Foucault, the 'invention,' intensification and proliferation of 'abnormal' sexual and delinquent identities in the early nineteenth century, was equally based upon institutional modern-discursive practices.[227] A neo-liberal penal reform would reconstruct and reduce the criminal to the ethical concern of *homo œconomicus* with self-interested calculation. At the same time,

225 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 270f.

226 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 239ff.; Gary S. Becker, 'Crime and Punishment: an Economic Approach,' *Journal of Political Economy* 76, no. 2 (1968): 169ff.

227 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 110 and 40. Ibid. 36ff..

society/the state would, in the most cost-efficient manner, deal with the problem of criminality—in neo-liberal terms, a 'market' ruled by a rationale of cost, supply and demand—through straightforward legislation and law enforcement. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, there has been an emergence of many psychological, sociological, pedagogical, pastoral and other areas of professional and academic expertise, specialised knowledge and authoritative bodies in the field of law enforcement, each seeking to assess and reform criminals in their inner-human existence, and each deploying its own set of discursive relations in order to establish and assess the humanity of criminals.[228] Such a development of a neo-liberal understanding would be regarded as 'the parasitic invasion of the sentence in the name of the law by individualizing measures in the name of the norm.'[229] According to the mere-utilitarian calculation of costs, this secondary transformation of the penal system must be reversed. Neo-liberalism thereby changes the construction of both the crime and the criminal. Whereas the previous juridical rationale reasoned that the judge's perspective had to discern criminal action in order to adjust a legal sentence, the neo-liberal rationale adopts the viewpoint of the criminal, constructed as *homo œconomicus*: a calculating actor interested in one's

228 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 11 and 16ff.

229 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 250.

own self-interest.  This, in turn, transforms the understanding of a criminal action into an action which may trigger a penal cost.  In this respect, with regards to a neo-liberal ethical assumption, all kinds of people—criminals, business people, family members, students, as well as people with a different cultural heritage, identity and way of doing things etc.—become indistinguishably similar.  This does not mean however, that differences in self-understanding, attitude, ethics or culture are eliminated.  They only remain unrecognised and irrelevant within the neo-liberal lens and ethical rationale: all human actors are in essence *homines œconomici*.

Furthermore, from a neo-liberal construction of society and state politics, crime is no longer something to be eradicated; as was the case according to the old-liberal layered penal reasoning.  As crime is conceived as a market relation of supply and demand, it is sufficient that the crime rate is lowered to the degree to which it becomes tolerable to the public.  Since, according to Becker's neo-liberal understanding, the law must be seen to be the main instrument of regulating the supply-side of crime,[230] psychological assessments, educational services, social workers and their different relating (expensive) professional expertise and training programmes are to be considered largely irrelevant—if not harmful—and

---

230 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 255.

therefore prime targets for neo-liberal government spending cuts. Unlike, for example, a Kantian or an ideological-ethical outlook, there is no way of directly knowing and determining how each neo-liberal *homo œconomicus* makes decisions on an individual basis. At the same time (and unlike the legally constituted state within classical-liberal governmental thought), a neo-liberal rationale appears to achieve the complete transparency of self-concerned, calculating individuals, under the conditions of a market situation and limited resources, *at the population level.*

> [...] considering the subject as *homo œconomicus* does not imply an anthropological identification of any behavior whatsoever with economic behavior. It simply means that economic behavior is the grid of intelligibility one will adopt on the behavior of a new individual. It also means that the individual becomes governmentalizable, that power gets a hold on him to the extent, and only to the extent, that he is *homo œconomicus*. [...] *Homo œconomicus* is the interface of government and the individual.[231]

It is safe to devise some conclusions which go beyond Foucault's own understanding at the time. A political situation and culture with a predominant neo-liberal bias will initially be reasonably tolerant towards (sub-)cultural identity and self-understanding, as well as towards reasoned modern-professional or enlightened-ethical orientations. At the same time, it will enhance a common (moral) preference and expectation that all

---

231 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 252f.

(others) conform to the habitus, calculation and approach of *homo œconomicus*. Accordingly, in recent years, a slick professional and business-like demeanour, self-caring individualism and—external—social engagement have established themselves as the new global standards. Over time, other—seemingly less relevant—cultural and reasoned modern-ethical orientations become weakened, suffer erosion, and may also resurface as a degenerative and dysfunctional reaction. The erosion of both modern and non-modern culture and understanding is also a result of the repeated cycles of thinning out, underfunding and privatisation of social, educational and cultural spaces, facilities and institutions. This leads us to a second point: Generalising the observation made concerning neo-liberal penal reform (Becker), it is apparent that a neo-liberal governmentality is likely to reduce public funding and question the general justification of broad access to professional training, thereby challenging the requirement to maintain (fund) closely interwoven networks of professional, educational and scientific bodies and institutions, as well as expertise.[232] Recently, a direct political attack has been launched—within the neo-liberal rationale—against 'experts' and 'liberal elites.' If Foucault is correct and the modern state, society and its politics have been established upon a

---

232 Recently, a direct political attack has been launched—within the neo-liberal rationale—against 'experts' and 'liberal elites.'

power regime that is maintained through professional and academic

normalisation, discipline and discourse, such a successful (post-)neo-liberal

political attack would introduce a significant historical shift away from a

(high-)modern, predominantly normalising–discursive–disciplinary power

regime in which professional standards and knowledge, scientific truth,

academic training and innovation play an essential role.


*(3)  Social contract and interest (Hume)*


In his final two lectures, Foucault returns to an exploration of the

elementary systematic relations and differentiations, upon which a

classical-liberal political rationale and art of government, are established.

On 28 March, Foucault distinguishes the different agency constructions and

relating governmental rationales of: 'social contract,' i.e. the founding of

politics within a legal (constitutional) rationale; and respectively, of

individually personal 'interest' or will.  Of particular interest is Foucault's

observation that—according to a liberal understanding— neither

government, nor a player within the market, is in a position to calculate 'the

market' in its totality.  *Homo œconomicus* and the market should not be

interfered with, nor can they be known.[233]  On 4 April, Foucault explored

_____

233 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 267ff.

the difference between the bonds: of 'free association'—the foundation of civil society; and those of self-interested economic calculation.[234]  Foucault not only offers an understanding of the differences between the old liberal tradition and the more recent global neo-liberalism, he also provides the resources from which the deeper systematic reasons can be identified that explain why a predominant neo-liberal power and political rationale cannot do other than—over time—destroy the very modern society, communal identities, localised forms of social organisation and political culture brought about by the older tradition of liberal politics and political thought, in the first instance.

According to Foucault, Hume's construction of the human subject— about a generation before Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*—endowed as it is with irreducible and non-transferable choices which define its (self-) interest, was decisive in the field of (classical-)liberal thinking.[235]  '[T]he idea of a subject of interest' was hereby introduced 'as a form of both immediately and absolutely subjective will.'  Hume claims not only that

---

234 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 291ff.

235 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 271ff.  David Hume, *Enquiries concerning the Human Understanding and concerning the Principles of Morals,* ed. L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975), 293; Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature,* ed. L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 416.

subjective interest and will have precedence over social (legal) contract; but, furthermore, that the—secondary—'juridical subject,' once established, remains dependent upon the 'subject of interest:' according to Hume, we honour the contract precisely because it continues to be in our best interest.  Furthermore, the subject of interest and the juridical subject are constituted in a completely different manner.  'The market and the contract function in exactly opposite ways and we have in fact two heterogeneous structures.'  And both relate to a different kind of (liberal) political reasoning: the economic subject and the subject of rights 'have an essentially different relationship with political power.'  Thereby, *homo œconomicus* emerges in the place where Hume's free subject of interest engages with liberal economic theory.  On the one hand, juridical-governmental reasoning is deployed so as to hinder despotic excess and power abuse through a promotion of the 'rule of law,' of naturally endowed human (individual) rights and of the 'separation of power' (*trias politica*). Good economic governance, on the other hand, must leave aside the market *and homo œconomicus*.  Only then can—and will—the market and its players—'involuntarily'—operate for the benefit of others and for the common good.  According to Foucault, Hume's argument establishes an independence of the liberal-economical argument over and against the juridical theory of political constitution, as developed by Hobbes and

Montesquieu.  The classical-liberal political rationale consists of an accumulative-strategic layering of both approaches.  Thereby, Smith's economical argument exemplifies how a cautious attitude to the deployment of governmental power is able to enhance a nation's prosperity and common good.[236]

*(4)  Homo œconomicus and the invisible hand (Smith)*

The following observation is of special interest for the purpose of this research; and for chapter 5 in particular.  According to Smith's *The Wealth of Nations, homo œconomicus* invests and engages in the market according to a straight forward, transparent and completely self-interested rationale; but precisely because he never relinquishes his own interest, he—allegedly—concludes by involuntarily contributing (in many different ways) towards the growing wealth of society and the public good.

> [...] he is in this [...] led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention.  [...]  By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it.[237]

---

236 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 273 and 276.  Ibid., 271ff. and 308.

237 Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations,* vol. 1, ed. W. B. Todd, The Glasgow Edition of the Works and Correspondence of Adam Smith, 2/1 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 456.

As has been pointed out, it is futile for traders or for government to aim at an understanding of the market totality: both, with regards to accidents that will show influential with regards to one's calculated decisions, and to the involuntary effects of one's market engagements. In other words, with regards to the 'invisible hand,' not so much its provisionality must be emphasised, but *its invisibility.* It

> [...] is that kind of bizarre mechanism which makes *homo œconomicus* function as an individual subject of interest within a totality which eludes him and which nevertheless founds the rationality of his egoistic choices.[238]

It is impossible to arrive at an encompassing understanding of future contingent events that will have an impact upon one's interests and calculations. An intention to consider one's actions within the totality of the market would even be counterproductive. The market would become distorted, ceasing to operate smoothly and to everyone's advantage; which occurs when governments interfere with market mechanisms or actors; or when merchants—as economic agents—refrain from acting 'greedily' with a single-minded focus on their private profit maximisation, and begin to consider the public good or a common economic goal.[239]

---

238 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 278.

239 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 277ff.

The liberal economy as a whole and the relating wider society

(according to the liberal political mindset) emerges from the many self-

interested perspectives and wills of its participant actors as they attend to

their own private business. With *homo œconomicus*—'the one island of

rationality possible within an economic process'—economic understanding

is '[...] not only surrounded by, but founded on the unknowability of the

totality of the process. [...] economics is a discipline without totality;'

which demonstrates 'the impossibility of a sovereign point of view' and

> [...] steals away from the juridical form of the sovereign exercising
> sovereignty within a state precisely that which is emerging as the
> essential element of a society's life, namely economic processes.[240]

Beginning from the individual human subject, juridical political doctrine

(Hobbes) is able to create political unity, a sovereign, and also to contain its

power. Economic interest, on the other hand, is governed by a completely

different rationale in which a sovereign or intelligible unity remains

impossible. Within the sovereign's juridical-contractual rationale, '*homo

juridicus*' may insist upon one's unalienable rights and remind the

sovereign to continue to depend upon people's support. *Homo œconomicus*

will instead point out that the sovereign cannot engage and must not

---

240 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 282.

interfere because he does not understand.[241]

Foucault reiterates: 'There is no sovereign in economics' and aptly points out that the totality of the world cannot be known, thereby implying a Kantian critique.[242] This brings us back to our original concern, as to why Barth's counter-modern, radical agency—one which is established upon a normative theology and which very suitably facilitates a theological-political confrontation with totalitarian ideologies and the state—struggles to engage with the rationale of *homo œconomicus* and the globalised market. In the same way that state politics must not concern itself with economics, a Weimar-era dialectically inverted transcendental theory must—however reluctantly—take heed that:

> Economics is a science lateral to the art of governing. One must govern with economics, one must govern alongside economists, one must govern by listening to the economists, but economics must not be and there is no question that it can be the governmental rationality itself.[243]

Unlike the political sovereign, theologians may have privileged access to an understanding of the divine and thus knowledge of how Christian revelation limits the—juridically and ideologically enforced—political

241 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 282 and 283. Ibid., 281ff.

242 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 283.

243 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 286.

'powers that be' 'from above;' however, political government and theologians alike *do not understand 'the market,'* as theologians must remain equally disengaged when it comes to economic concerns.[244]

> Thus the economic world is naturally opaque and naturally non-totalizable. It is originally and definitively constituted from a multiplicity of points of view which is all the more irreducible as this same multiplicity assures their ultimate and spontaneous convergence. Economics is an atheistic discipline; economics is a discipline without God; economics is a discipline without totality; economics is a discipline that begins to demonstrate not only the pointlessness, but also the impossibility of a sovereign point of view over the totality of the state that he has to govern. Economics steals away from the juridical form of the sovereign exercising sovereignty within a state precisely that which is emerging as the essential element of a society's life, namely economic processes.[245]

Given the nature of economics, neither political government nor a conventional theology, insofar as they both reason from a place of sovereignty (either political or theological, respectively), may interfere with 'the market' and its agents. *This limits a modern-liberal art of government and sidelines twentieth-century normative theological dialectics.* As has been considered above, in points (1) and (2), the new liberalism of the Chicago school goes further and infringes upon the previous rationale and resources available to a liberal-and-juridical

---

244 Cf. Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 292.

245 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 282.

governmentality.  It has also been pointed out that, within an 'economic' governmental rationale, it is possible to recover a direct understanding of the population, insofar as citizens are able to be constructed as *homo œconomicus*.  As yet absent from this chapter is a Foucauldian exploration of the reasons why a neo-liberal politics and market globalisation must eventually erode social cohesion and civil society.

*(5)  Economic self-interest and the social bond (Ferguson)*

In his final lecture, Foucault—with reference to Ferguson's *Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767)—reintroduces 'civil society' as an invention of the modern age.  Within a 'technology of liberal governmentality,' the juridical-constitutional understanding of sovereignty, as well as that of the free 'rule of the market,' can be both established and mediated with one another.  In addition to economy and the law, 'society' thus introduces an understanding of 'history:' historical progress, conflict and change.  Through the interplay of these interrelating concepts and approaches, distinctive (national) styles of liberal-democratic 'governmentality' and modern party-political rationales are formed.[246]

---

246 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 295, 296, 292 and passim.  Ibid., 291ff.; Adam Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society,* ed. Fania Oz-Salzberger (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1995).

With Hobbes and Locke, however, 'civil society' is described as involving a legal-political relationship and order.[247]  Published around the same time as *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) and—according to Foucault's 'genealogical' analysis—structurally correlated with the notion of an unknowable economic whole, Ferguson introduced a conceptual change to the notion of 'civil society' (or 'nation,' according to Smith's *Inquiry*).[248] Unlike Hobbes, Ferguson constructs 'society' as a permanent and indispensable constant of nature.  From the beginning of history— according to Ferguson—'the social bond' underlies all human relations.  It emerges naturally and spontaneously, wherever human individuals freely engage with one another in order to live socially.[249]  'Society' is thus a 'spontaneous synthesis;' i.e. differing greatly from Hobbes' concept, it comes into existence *without* explicit political organisation, or legal

247 Hobbes sees society—the 'body politic'—established by way of social contract, as the end to an alleged 'condition of war of everyone against everyone:' Hobbes, *Leviathan,* 80.  Ibid., ch. 14–17, 79ff.  In Locke's *Second Treatise of Government* (1690), 'civil society' remains legally conceived and established upon natural rights of free individuals; thus, the juridical body politic is identified with 'civil society:' John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government: an Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government,* ed. Richard H. Cox (Wheeling, Ill.: Harlan Davidson, 1982), ch. 7–8, 47ff.  Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 297f.

248 Ferguson, *History of Civil Society.*  In Smith's *Wealth of Nations,* Ferguson's 'society' correlates to 'nation.'

249 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 299 and 300.  Cf. 'bond of society:' Ferguson, *History of Civil Society,* 46.

contract.[250]  Happy, contributing individuals and a healthy society, mutually

strengthen and facilitate one another, with the outcome that—potentially—

every member's happiness is enhanced.

At the grass-roots level of civil society, 'a mechanism of immediate

multiplication' is thus at work; one which is formally comparable to that of

economic relationships and growing markets.  In terms of their elements

and nature however, Foucault points out that the social bond and common

good differ from—and equate to more than—economic relationships,

'overflowing them and being irreducible to them.'  Members of society,

according to Ferguson, are *not* linked by economic self-concern that aims at

profit maximisation, but by 'disinterested interests.'[251]

> [...] what links individuals to each other in civil society is instinct,
> sentiment, and sympathy, it is the impulses of benevolence individuals
> feel for each other, but is also the loathing of others, repugnance for the
> misfortune of individuals, but possibly the pleasure taken in the
> misfortune of others with whom one will break.[252]

The self-interested 'economic bond' and disinterested social bond are also

different in scope.  Traders have always engaged in relationships which

---

250 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 298.

251 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 301.  Ferguson refers to 'disinterested
      benevolence,' 'disinterested passion:' Ferguson, *History of Civil Society,* 20.

252 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 301; cf. Ferguson, *History of Civil Society,*
      21ff.

connect distant locations, often across regional and political borders. 'There is no localization, no territoriality, no particular grouping to the total space of the market.' According to Ferguson, society, on the other hand, 'does not coincide with humanity in general' as it 'leads the individual to enlist "on the side of one tribe or community."'[253] The economic bond arises within—and is facilitated by—civil society; with which it shares 'this form of immediate multiplication which does not involve the renunciation of rights,' in that 'it brings individuals together through the spontaneous convergence of interests.'[254] At the same time, economic relations always undermine and weaken the communal bond of society.

> The economic bond is a principle of dissociation with regard to the active bonds of compassion, benevolence, love for one's fellows, and sense of community, inasmuch as it constantly tends to undo what the spontaneous bond of civil society has joined together by picking out the egoist interest of individuals, emphasizing it, and making it more incisive. In other words, the economic bond arises within civil society, is only possible through (civil society), and in a way strengthens it, but in another way, it undoes it.[255]

True community spirit makes people stay and commit to one another in challenging times. Without having to take a principled politico-ethical decision, self-interested *homo œconomicus* simply moves on when security

---

253 *Foucault, Birth of Biopolitics,* 301; cf. Ferguson, *History of Civil Society,* 16.

254 *Foucault, Birth of Biopolitics,* 302.

255 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 302.

and abundance can only be found in another place.

From Foucault's reconstructions of old liberalism and neo-liberalism, it has been possible to draw a number of conclusions:  A neo-liberal political agenda pushes the liberal tradition, of defending civil society and a free economy against despotism, much further; systematically delegitimising economic and social policy making, as well as public spending.  As the socio-political generalisation of *homo œconomicus*, it colonises all aspects and dimensions of modern politics, social life and the human condition.  Over time, a predominant neo-liberal globalisation—for many different reasons—erodes and destroys the layered, modern-liberal political tradition and rationale of contemporary democratic politics; it undermines public support and funding of public spaces, general access to education, health, social care, cultural memories and modern public institutions.  With regards to the latter, even the disciplinary normalising-and-discursive power, upon which modern professions, academic standards and innovation were once established, are at risk.  The structural difference between a self-concerned economic and a disinterested social bond, implies a progressive erosion of the organisational forms and resources of local communities, grass-root level social/civic engagement, social cohesion, and

local/group identities.  Neo-liberalism might—at first—seem tolerant towards different identities and appreciative of rich cultural environments; however, since it constructs such as being merely incidental, it contributes little towards their maintenance and the safeguarding of their future.

Finally, Smith's exposition of the unknowability of economic agency and the free market, from a place of sovereign (juridical) oversight, rules out governmental interference.  By way of the same reasoning however, a conventional twentieth-century normative-theological account of the Christian divine—or a transcendental ethics—must be sidelined so that it cannot interfere with either 'the market' or self-concerned *homo œconomicus*.

### 3.7 *Homo spiritualis* and *homo œconomicus*

*(1)  The strength and limitations of Barth and Barmen*

In this chapter, modern-normative theology has been considered as a power relation.  In particular within the Weimar-dialectical tradition, Barth's 'theology of the Word' facilitates a radical, counter-modern agency

which by way of accounting for God according to the Christian witness of divine self-revelation, takes charge over the individual's totality of self-understanding, decision-making and reality. As such—on the basis of structural equivalence—a Barthian normative-theological approach is particularly well positioned to facilitate a resistance to—and confrontation of—totalitarian, ideological and principled-ethical forms of power/knowledge. Such a theology can suitably engage government-political discursive forms that correspond to a legally/constitutionally sovereign understanding of political power; or equally engage a reflectively self-enclosing ('independent') concept of individualised subjectivity and agency. Foucault's discernment of the three independent layers of a liberal governmental rationale: juridical sovereignty, civil society and a free economy, clarifies why the ubiquitous neo-liberal ethical incursion of an economic rationale does more than starve the modern state and political decision-making of its necessary resources. Foucault's analysis also explains why—aside from accelerated destruction caused by the practices, pressures and disciplines of austerity politics—modern civil society and social cohesion cannot survive the monoculturally neo-liberal proliferation of *homo œconomicus*. In the face of globalised market forces and a predominantly neo-liberal conception of the powers that be, it has become structurally impossible to formulate compelling positions and courses of

action from previous-conventional resources that are drawn from the European/Western ethical and political tradition. It is no wonder that their corresponding, structurally comparable, twentieth-century normative-theological frameworks also cease to offer a suitable ethical orientation and political critique.

*(2)  Conceiving homo spiritualis*

One could ask whether it is possible to conceive of a different ethical and Christian-theological empowerment that has a capacity to counter neo-liberal *homo œconomicus* and his/her neo-liberal market rationale—and thus establish/strengthen—local and para-contextual social connections; such that resilience is built up against current efforts to reforge identity politics which are—at best—reactionary, in that they build upon the worst and most divisive dimensions of Ferguson's social bond.

Along the lines of Foucault's examination of a modern-liberal political rationale, such a '*homo spiritualis*' would need to take a different direction to resist the pastoral control of '*homo legalis*' within the church.[256] The personally embodied spiritual account of *homo spiritualis* would not

---

256 *Foucault, Birth of Biopolitics,* 250.

be disciplined according to a totalising, normative and hierarchical power practice and structure. To achieve functional-structural comparability with *homo œconomicus*—and post-liberal 'micro-fascistic' identity formation,[257] *homo spiritualis* would need to be established upon the personally embodied and distributed formation of understanding, calculation, decision-making and identity; a formation occurring in such a manner that its essence/totality—at least initially—eludes conventionally political, ethical or theological comprehension and control. *Homo spiritualis* would need to be cautious about taking the impossible viewpoint of sovereignty, which is reserved for the previous divine of theological tradition. Accordingly, in the context of post-Barthian eschatology and pneumatology, it has been pointed out that—although God's innermost moves and motifs may be revealed—the totality of the Kingdom of God must remain unknown and beyond reach of concrete locations within the historical process.[258] Prior to the introduction of a messianic-eschatological lens, a biblical (and shared-ancient) understanding of 'heaven' as creation emphasises that human beings and communities are impacted— strengthened, blessed, empowered and threatened—by natural, historical

---

257 Cf. DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 10.

258 Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope: on the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology,* tr. James W. Leitch (London: SCM, 1967).

and socio-cultural force relations which are often beyond their localised grasp and control.[259] Is it possible to conceive of a *homo spiritualis* that would not be self-interested, but would aim at oneself, others, communal and para-communal relations, so as to reflect the presence, justice, mercy, peace, love and glory of God; that would shape his/her understanding, decisions, self-affirmation and local-communal engagements on the basis of trust, within the proximity, power and love of a divine that one believes to have charge over the forces of politics and 'the market?'[260] On such a foundation, *homo spiritualis* would seek to engage—and resist—locally and from distributed places, the realities, challenges, politics and market forces, both within and beyond one's immediate reach. Is it conceivable that, by pursuing a priestly and prophetic understanding and enactment of 'Kingdom relations,' *homo spiritualis* could contribute towards the strengthening, renewal and new creation of mutually conducive relations, within and across localities, groups, interests and identities, without walking into the traps of either economic self-interest and greed, or an exclusive—and all too narrow—group identity?[261]

---

259 Michael Welker, 'Creation as the Heavens and the Earth,' in *Creation and Reality,* tr. John F. Hoffmeyer (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999), 36f.

260 Welker, 'Creation as the Heavens and the Earth.'

261 Welker, *God the Spirit,* 108ff.

*(3) Counter-modern Pentecostal Christianity*

In the 1990s, following the revolutions of 1989 which saw the fall of Marxism–Leninism as a state ideology, after the end of the apartheid system in southern Africa, around the time when some declared liberalism and free-market capitalism to be the next 'end of history,'[262] and at the time when Thatcher's insistence that 'there is no alternative' seemed to have become politically unquestionable, another part of the academic community, from multi-disciplinary perspectives, became aware of Pentecostal world Christianities.  From the perspective of sociology of religion, scholars such as Martin and Cox revisited the theory of secularisation.[263]  Cox finds Pentecostal religiosity to be exciting and vibrant: as it manages to simultaneously embrace 'primal'-indigenous forms of religiosity and courageous and creative modernisation;[264] whilst, at the same time, also developing local-yet-global expressions.[265]  Also in the

---

262 Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man,* (London and New York: Free Press, 2006).

263 Martin, *Tongues of Fire;* Cox, *Fire from Heaven.*

264 Cox, *Fire from Heaven.*

265 Roland Robertson, 'Glocalization: Time-space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity,' in Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, *Global Modernities,* ed. Mike Featherstone (London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1995), 25ff.

1990s, a new academic-Pentecostal theology emerged;[266] and researchers in contextual theologies continue to be baffled by the creative polyphony and inconsistencies of its grass-root theological positions and possibilities. Provocatively, Jenkins declared the new Pentecostalism(s) from the global South to be, not only the 'new kid on the block,' but the 'next Christendom' to take the baton on from European and Western-historical Christian traditions.[267]

Since this new interest in Pentecostal Christianities appears to coincide with a shift within the late-modern power situation, perhaps one should consider the possibility that the Pentecostal form of Christianity and agency formation has sufficient structural similarity with neo-liberal *homo œconomicus*, and that Pentecostal/charismatic constructions of invisible fields and realms of divine power are not dissimilar to the force relations of the 'free market.' Obviously, it would be quite preposterous to claim that Pentecostal/charismatic identity formation, calculation and power—in themselves—are sufficient to resist the neo-liberal power relation and game. As has already been observed, it was only in some cases that the

---

266 Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism.*

267 Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: the Coming of Global Christianity* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2002).

pioneering dialectic 'theo-logical' form of theory construction in the

Weimar days led to resistance against the Nazi regime. The structural

equivalence of facilitating political revolution, ideology and totalitarianism

amounted to the possibility of either falling for and coming to the aid of—

*or* resisting—the claims and actions of totalitarian ideology/politics. In a

similar way, there is by now a significant body of research which evidences

Pentecostal Christianities and leaders contributing to their local

communities' social and economic construction and empowerment, and the

raising of believers' personal aspirations; yet equally, Pentecostal leaders

fall for neo-liberal self-interest, corruption and greed. Not infrequently

were Pentecostal preachers and organisations found supporting dictators,

and dubious and corrupt politics; in North America and the UK, some

within the (classical-)Pentecostal movement continue to be influenced even

by Anglo Israelism, with proximity to the Ku Klux Klan. There is thus

little reason to suspect that, today, Pentecostal/charismatic Christians will

be immune to falling for the current resurgence of right-wing populism and

neo-fascism.[268]

---

268 Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism,* 283ff.; Cox, *Fire from Heaven,*
    171ff. and 228ff.; Marshall, *Political Spiritualities,* 166ff.; Kate Bowler,
    *Blessed: a History of the American Prosperity Gospel* (Oxford and New
    York: OUP, 2013); Allan Anderson, 'The Dubious Legacy of Charles
    Parham: Racism and Cultural Insensitivities among Pentecostals,' *Pneuma*
    27, no. 1 (2005): 51ff. Cf. from a systematic-theological interest: Luke
    Bretherton, 'Pentecostalism and Political Witness: Framing Pentecostal

It is thus not the argument of this research that Pentecostal/ charismatic Christianities *are likely* to resist neo-liberalism/post-neo-liberal, reactionary identity politics; the aim rather, of chapters 5 and 6, is to present a Foucauldian-analytical understanding—based upon a selection of paradigmatic sources—of the Pentecostal-charismatic capacities to facilitate and construct different highly personal embodied identities with relating practical/theological rationales, based upon Pentecostal/charismatic Spirit experiences; and to examine how revivalists perceive, construct and understand the Pentecostal divine as a relation of power that might—potentially—facilitate the recovery and new creation of personal, economic and symbolic resources in some of the post-prosperous wastelands of our day and age. Before this, an examination shall be undertaken regarding the tensions and challenges which arise within a conventional ecclesiastical order and academic professionalisation of the Christian ministry and pastoral care, as one seeks to encourage charismatic empowerment and a Pauline discipline of love.

---

Responses to Capitalism and Democracy,' www.academica.edu.

# 4 Never Fully Charismatic: Ministry of a Modern Pastor

Within the purpose of this thesis, in order to facilitate an accountability of all power relations relevant to Christian ministry, this chapter offers a subversive description of doctrinal and pastoral oversight in mainline church contexts. The practical-theological concern with accountability coincides with the question of compatibility of normative/ professional oversight within a charismatic-ecclesial ordering of Christian relations; a first understanding of which will be introduced in section 4.1 of this chapter through NT scholarship.

At the same time, chapters 3–5 offer a Foucauldian analysis of 'religious' modes of empowerment. Chapter 3 explored pastoral and academic empowerment through modern-normative theology. More specifically, the chapter examined the systematic capacities and limitations of Barth's inverted-transcendental, counter-modern construction of reflective-theological agency (Pfleiderer). Barthian dogmatics, of course, is only one amongst several normative-discursive possibilities to regulate a

modern-professional pastoral understanding and empowerment. In the consideration of alternative, normative-theological facilitations of pastoral empowerment, social control and world engagement, such as Lutheran confessionalism,[1] North-American evangelical fundamentalism,[2] or Schleiermacher's theology and ethics,[3] one should not argue for an all-too-far reaching generalisation of a Barthian-transcendental agency construction. Instead, a (Deleuzean) 'repetition' and creation of descriptive-analytical 'multiplicities' should be considered.[4] Simultaneously, as already indicated (cf. above, 0.1 [1] and 3.2 [1]), the normative-hierarchical nature and power/truth relations of the doctrinal and practical-theological facilitation of Christian oversight are overall comparable across catholic and Protestant-ecclesiastical traditions.[5]

---

1   Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther: Einführung in sein Denken,* 5th edn (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Elert, *Lehre des Luthertums;* Ebeling, *Dogmatik des christlichen Glaubens,* 3 vols. (Tübingen: Mohr, 1979); Paul Althaus, *Die christliche Wahrheit: Lehrbuch der Dogmatik,* 7th edn (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1966).

2   Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture;* Harris, *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals;* Dorrien, *Remaking of Evangelical Theology;* Utzinger, *Yet Saints;* Miller, *Piety and Profession.*

3   Schleiermacher, *Christian Faith;* Schleiermacher, *Schleiermacher's Christian Ethics;* Herms, 'Schleiermacher's *Christian Ethics;*' Mariña, *Transformation of the Self.*

4   'A theory does not totalize; it is an instrument for multiplication and it also multiplies itself.' Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power,' 208. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition;* Roffe, 'Multiplicity.'

5   Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault,* 15f.; Cochrane, *Reformed*

Therefore, the specific theological formation and orientation of a pastor, preacher or a congregation or denominational group is only of subordinate relevance with regards to the nature of a conventional-ecclesiastical power/truth deployment.

The overall purpose of this chapter 4 is to identify and portray some of the major rationales and resources which contribute to the empowering of mainline-modern pastoral work.  Ministerial empowerment—and its subsequent costs and limitations—are, again, explored within an overall-Foucauldian power concern with ethics and agency creation.  The power analysis of the ecclesiological establishment of the Protestant ministry, according to the Augsburg Confession (*CA*) in section 4.3, owes a great deal to Clegg's and Bauman's observations regarding the nature (and limitations) of 'legislatory'-normative power accounts, as presented above (3.2 [1]).[6]  It is due to previous selections of historical and theological case materials that their relating Lutheran and continental-Protestant ecclesiological tradition has been chosen for a more detailed analysis.  The exploration of empowerment through modern professionalism (section 4.4)

---

*Confessions;* Church of England, 'Thirty Nine Articles;' Avis, *Anglican Understanding;* Second Vatican Council, 'Dogmatic Constitution on the Church;' Ratzinger, *Called to Communion;* Haight, *Christian Community.*

6    Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.; Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters.*

relies upon Foucault's exposition of disciplinary normalisation in *Discipline and Punish.*[7]

In this chapter, the discussion of Käsemann's paper in section 4.1 introduces a practical-theological and dogmatic-ecclesiological challenge to the relations of a mainline-Christian (post-war Protestant) ministry practice and poses the question as to whether, or in which manner, a conventionally constructed *ministerium verbi divini* can facilitate the charismatic ordering of Christian life, as well as the respective practical-theological accountability with regards to the deployment of pastoral power. This (4.1) paves the way for a three-step analytical exploration in 4.3 to 4.5: Subchapter 4.3 analyses the 'normative' ecclesiological-conceptual power/truth relations which establish the ministry of pastoral and doctrinal oversight; section 4.4 then considers (embodied) 'professionalism' and the relevance of professional techniques and technologies as a common modern form of pastoral empowerment;[8]

---

7   Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170ff.; Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault.*

8   The sequence of 4.3 and 4.4 mirrors Foucault's two-fold concern 'with the representation of power and with the actual functioning of power.' Arnold I. Davidson, 'Introduction,' in Michel Foucault, *"Society Must Be Defended:" Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975–76,* ed. Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana, tr. David Macey (London and New York: Penguin, 2004), xvii.

eventually, 4.5 returns to reconsider concerns raised at the beginning of the chapter (4.1) as to how rendering pastoral empowerment, and the construction of laity and non-professionals, can feature within inner-Christian relations, and whether and how pastoral empowerment can be rendered a 'charisma' which would support a Pauline ordering of the Christian ministry and church life.

Section 4.2 presents some interesting and relevant historical background to Käsemann's paper (4.1), although it is not essential for the (thus identified) overall power-analytical concern with (Foucauldian) empowerment, nor the theological-analytical reasoning of this chapter. It is introduced here since the exploration of the phases of *Kirchenkampf* in chapter 2 (section 2.3) focused on studying systemic volatility and change—thus organisation-ecological 'pressure' and 'innovation' but did not provide appropriate case material to show the consolidation of an organisational field, i.e. the workings of DiMaggio and Powell's 'isomorphism' within Clegg's theorisation of social and systemic integration. Of course, isomorphism was introduced in 2.1 as an essential contribution to Clegg's organisation-political analytics. In subchapter 4.2, organisational isomorphism accounts for the incredibly swift and virtually encompassing restoration of a previous and traditional-hierarchical

ecclesiastical order within German Protestantism, even though the Council of Brethren *BK* (amongst others) had hoped for a more fundamental structural-organisational change.

## 4.1  Only considering a charismatic ecclesiology: Käsemann's lecture of 1949

At a time when German-Protestant Christianity sought to draw lessons from the tremors of the *Kirchenkampf*, biblical and historical theologians revisited the Sohm–Harnack debate regarding the relation between charisma and office in the New Testament and subsequent historical developments.  Notable contributions were published by the Swiss biblical scholar Schweizer and by the church historian von Campenhausen.[9]  By October 1949, Ernst Käsemann had already given an early, provisional contribution to the debate in a lecture entitled 'Ministry

---

9    The earliest research is a doct. diss.: Friedrich Grau, 'Der neutestamentliche Begriff Charisma, seine Geschichte und seine Theologie' (doct. diss., Tübingen Univ., 1947).  Eduard Schweizer, *Das Leben des Herrn in der Gemeinde und ihren Diensten* (Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1946); Schweizer, *Church Order in the New Testament,* tr. Frank Clarke (London: SCM, 1961); Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries,* tr. J. A. Baker (London: A. and C. Black, 1969).  Mainline systematic-theological resonances have been traced from a Roman-Catholic perspective: Nardoni, 'Charisma in the Early Church.'

and Community in the New Testament,' which he presented 'before the old students of Marburg,' i.e. then mostly ordained ministers of the German-Protestant churches.[10] From 1934 onwards, Käsemann had been a member of the anti-Nazi *BK* (in 1937, he even spent a few weeks in a Gestapo prison). The paper considers an historical theologian's contribution which serves to challenge and equip Christian leaders in a socio-politically, ecclesiastically and theologically, as yet, unsettled situation—albeit one which is rapidly consolidating—following the fall of the Hitler regime.[11]

### *(1) Charismatic order and discipline*

In order to fully conform with a Pauline understanding of the gospel, Käsemann argues that the church needs to be fully 'charismatic' in her identity, order, practice and reality perception. If, in Romans 5:15f. and 6:23, 'grace' and 'gift' (χάρισμα/χάρις, δορεά/δώρημα) identify the eschatological life and justification given through Christ, a charismatic ethics, ecclesiology and ontology is the outworking of this freely offered

---

10 Ernst Käsemann, 'Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament,' *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen,* vol. 1, 2nd edn (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960), 109ff.; Engl. tr.: Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 63.

11 On Käsemann's life and career: Karl Friedrich Ulrichs, 'Käsemann, Ernst,' in *Biographisch-biliographisches Kirchenlexikon,* vol. 18, ed. Friedrich-Wilhelm Bautz and Traugott Bautz (Herzberg: Bauz, 2001), 775ff.

saving grace. Being a transformative-eschatological impartation, not only

of forgiveness, but also of joy, power and sanctification in the Spirit,

justification by faith implies a physical coming out from under the rule of

this world and a coming under the dominion and discipline of the crucified

and risen Lord. According to Käsemann's understanding, all aspects of life

are brought under the obedience of Christ, so that there is a

> [...] strong and indeed decisive penetration of every area of Pauline
> theology by the doctrine of charisma and of the clarity with which the
> Apostle's basic conception emerges from it. [...] we must at least note
> that the various statements of the charisma doctrine are only rendered
> theologically possible and necessary in the light of the central Pauline
> doctrine of justification by faith and that, conversely, they themselves
> demonstrate the immense scope of this central doctrine.[12]

Paul's Spirit empowerment is thus holistic. According to Käsemann, the

nature of 'Gnosticist' and Corinthian 'Enthusiasm' consists of the

segmentation of the intended 'total reality of our life' by overextending the

value of oracy, knowledge and exceptional empowerment which includes:

healing, faith and prophetic speech.[13] Whilst all are given their respective

charismata, there are some people who carry more exceptional impartations

of the Spirit gift, and may even be called to (apostolic) leadership.[14]

Käsemann sees Paul introduce ἀγάπη (love) as the divine discipline that

---

12 Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 75.

13 Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 71f.

14 Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 76.

rules in individually embodied powers, as the church is built up into unity

to recognise the lordship and love of God in Jesus Christ (1 Corinthians 13;

Romans 12:9; 13:9f.; Ephesians 4:16).  Thus, spiritual greatness does not

lie in one's sense of empowerment or calling, but with the blessing that is

released into the life of others in the church as the 'body of Christ.'[15]


## (2)  *Heresiological polemics*


At a meta-analytical level, one must not fail to note the accumulation

of morally charged—even contemptuous—theological categories which

Käsemann deploys in his systematic-exegetical interpretation.  Käsemann

reveals himself to be a 'Confessing' Protestant who would seek to clarify

and authoritatively secure 'true doctrine' by normative affirmation.[16]

Throughout his lecture, Käsemann makes sure that he develops and deploys

---

15  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 73.

16  From the point of view of more recent NT scholarship, Käsemann over-extends the systematic relevance and reach of the theological loci which he perceives as being central.  The idea of 'justification by faith' is a late addition to Paul's theological thinking: Jürgen Becker, *Paul: Apostle of the Gentiles,* tr. O. C. Dean, Jr (Westminster, Kent.: John Knox, 1993).  More recent NT scholarship tends to dis-align charismata and 'body of Christ' from Romans 5 and 6.  Paul's ecclesiology is multi-layered and embedded in a wider flow of pre-Pauline and extra-Pauline motifs, images and metaphors: James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1998), 533ff.; similar Luke Timothy Johnson, 'Paul's Ecclesiology,' in *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul,* ed. James D. G. Dunn, (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2003), 199ff.

a category scheme of moral oppositions.  Käsemann pursues 'the polemic found' in passages across the NT 'against claims of domination and to positions of power.'  That Paul—says Käsemann—'usually displaces, or rather forcibly removes, the term πνευματικά and substitutes for it the idea of charisma,' amounts in itself to 'a theological critique.'[17]

Many of Käsemann's dualised categories are drawn from the Lutheran dogmatic tradition.[18]  Pejorative references to: 'all the powers of miracle and ecstasy;' 'Gnosticism;' Paul's (alleged) ending of 'the confusion between Church and mystery cult' and his 'bringing the Enthusiasts back down to earth out of their fantasy-heaven;' 'combating the self-will of the charismatics;' and the affirmation of 'sober practicality,'[19] together, deploy the morally evaluative categories of the heresiological and polemical writings of Irenaeus and of Luther.  This, however, comes at a cost:[20] Käsemann's interpretative categories are mainly reflective of the

17  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 63 and 66.

18  '[T]he doctrine of the iustificatio impii' and 'the manifestation of grace, of the Spirit, of eternal life, of the divine calling [...] eschatologically in Christ' versus 'the sacred office of the sanctuary [...]  The fenced-off boundaries of "religion"' and administration of 'the depositum fidei.'  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 75, 65 and 87.

19  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 66, 86, 67, 84 and 83.

20  On the recent re-evaluation of early non-catholic ('Gnosticist') Christianities: Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: the Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2003); Johanna

stance and self-understanding of the historically successful party; the historical and theological (mis)representation of the Christian 'heretical other' remains beyond methodical control.[21]

*(3) Paul's ongoing challenge*

Käsemann contends that Paul's soteriology and charisma ecclesiology, whilst affirmative of the (Protestant) doctrine of the church as 'the communion of saints' created by gospel proclamation and the sacraments (article 7 of the Augsburg Confession),[22] is—in principle— incompatible with a set-apart, ordained clergy. In early NT Christianity, all believers contribute—in their distinctively different ways—to the public, eschatological witness of the lordship of Christ. Käsemann emphasises that their communal 'carrying out [of] the *ministerium verbi divini*, the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς of II Cor. 5.18' is 'in direct contradiction to the modern Lutheran understanding of ecclesiastical office.'[23] Already on the fringes of

---

Brankaer, *Die Gnosis: Texte und Kommentar* (Wiesbaden: Marixverlag, 2010); Klaus Berger, *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums: Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1994).

21 Consider Ehrman's (equally unjust) counter-polemics: Ehrman, *Lost Christianities.*

22 *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 61, tr. DQ.

23 Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 81.

the NT, some Christians within the Pauline tradition felt challenged to position themselves differently. Some decided to secure the 'apostolic' witness by transferring the pluralised-charismatic powers of proclamation onto: an 'apostolic' tradition and doctrine, a deposit of grace, ministerial charisma and the institutionalised order of oversight.[24] Others would, in the prevalent understanding of the times, be 'swallowed up by Enthusiasm,' 'falling a prey to religious individualism and leaving the Church as a whole to disintegrate.' Was Paul's charismatic vision of the gospel and the church causing this 'triumph of Enthusiasm?' Käsemann leaves this question unanswered. Instead he points to the task of each generation, to decide and begin 'all over again,' since 'the Church can only exist as the community of Christ in so far as grace repeatedly lays hold of us and recreates us as instruments of his service.' In the end, it is Christ 'who alone is able to ensure the continuance of grace' among Christians as they constitute the church.[25]

With this final thought, Käsemann also gave an historical indication that, by the time this paper was presented, the die had already been cast.

---

24  Cf. Fuggle pointing out how Foucault and Paul had 'failed in their mission:' Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 195.

25  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 93 and 94.

The new beginnings ('*Stunde Null*') of 1945 had not delivered any meaningful 'charismatic' reorganisation of the German-Protestant church. By way of a brief recourse to a Cleggian-analytical and church-historical consideration (as explored in chapter 2), it is possible to clarify some complex and heterogeneous relations and fields of power which, collectively, at the time, established a very swift retrieval and consolidation of what amounted to—in many ways—the previous ecclesiastical order and pastoral approach (4.2).  Many of these contributing factors arose from the churches' inter-engagement with an external (secular) political situation. The recovery of a hierarchical and normative-disciplinary approach to pastoral care came at a cost; at least if one's aim was to encourage charisma and spiritual empowerment amongst worshippers 'in the pews,' as well as amongst parishioners.

Before considering the nature, resources, capacities and limitations of pastoral empowerment (4.3 to 4.5), some historical context to Käsemann's paper shall be presented which exemplifies systemic consolidation within organisational fields, respectively 'isomorphism,' according to Clegg's theorisation of organisational power.  How did it happen that, immediately after World War II, a previous-ecclesiastical order was re-established, even though the *BK* pastors and leaders from

'destroyed' churches had hoped for a 'bottom-up' reorganisation of Germany's Protestant Christianity, founded upon theologically renewed 'confessing' congregations?

## 4.2  Restoration of top-down church order in 1945

If one were to limit oneself to an historically narrow consideration within Clegg's dispositional circuit alone—and considers that the Council of Brethren wing of the *BK* had long hoped for a rebuilding of inter-parish relationships and ecclesiastical structures, beginning from the renewed life and witness of living congregations, it could seem counter-intuitive to think that the matter was settled even by the end of the summer of 1945. Niemöller had publicly declared this need and hope as early as 1934;[26] detailed plans for discussion had been drafted in 1941, in preparation for the expected radical changes of the Nazi state–church policy after the war;[27] and following his release in the summer of 1945, Niemöller

---

26  Martin Niemöller, 'Kirche?—Kirche! ein Wort zur Stunde ernster Entscheidung,' *Junge Kirche* 2 (1934): 139ff.; Hartmut Ludwig, '"Die Kirche gehört ja nicht uns ...": Zur Bedeutung der Gemeinde im Wirken Martin Niemöllers,' *Die Zeichen der Zeit* 36, no. 1 (1982): 26ff.; Jürgen Schmidt, *Martin Niemöller im Kirchenkampf* (Hamburg: Leibniz, 1971), 171ff.

27  'Ein Trinitatis-Gespräch.'

reaffirmed this hope in his written conversations.[28] However, at the church-

leaders conference in Treysa (August 1945), Niemöller and the *BK* Council

of Brethren wing felt the need to sacrifice some of their original concerns

in order to see others accomplished, through an alliance with the

Württemberg bishop Wurm, against those (Lutheran) church leaders that

pursued an ecclesiastical unification of Germany's denominationally

Lutheran regional churches alone.[29] Once again, the political play of power

occurred within the (second) dispositional circuit; all be, there were

significant impacts from both the first and third power circuits, which were

the driving forces behind many of the church-historical decisions, as well

as underpinning the formation and success of players within the game. In

the episodic/agency circuit, relevant church-political parties played an

---

28   Letter to Otto Fricke, 18-7-1945: Gerhard Besier, Hartmut Ludwig, Jörg
     Thierfelder and Ralf Tyra, ed., *Kirche nach der Kapitulation,* vol. 2, *Auf dem
     Weg nach Treysa* (Stuttgart, Berlin and Cologne: Kohlhammer, 1990), doc.
     143A, 139f.; letter to Wilhelm Niemöller, 10-11-1945: Marin Niemöller,
     'Zur Gestaltung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland,' in *Reden 1945–
     1954* (Darmstadt: Stimme-Verl., 1958), 56ff.

29   Gerhard Besier, Hartmut Ludwig and Jörg Thierfelder, ed., *Der Kompromiß
     von Treysa: die Entstehung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD)
     1945: eine Dokumentation* (Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1995);
     Fritz Söhlmann, ed., *Treysa 1945: die Konferenz der evangelischen
     Kirchenführer 27.–31. August 1945; mit einem Bericht über die Synode der
     Bekennenden Kirche in Berlin-Spandau 29.–31. Juli 1945 und über die
     unmittelbar vorangegangenen Tagungen des Reichsbruderrates und des
     Lutherischen Rates* (Lüneburg: Heliand, 1946); Beckmann, *Kirchliches
     Jahrbuch* 72–75, 1ff.; Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, *Die Kirchenversammlung von
     Treysa 1945* (Hanover: Lutherhaus, 1985).

important role in the re-establishing and adapting of a united *Bruderrat* church-political policy and party, which, in turn, won over—and created an alliance with—Wurm, being one of the leading Lutheran bishops. The outcome of this extremely fast-moving process which lasted only a few days, was—in essence—the general outline of a future ecclesiastical structure of post-war German Protestantism. Alongside a nationally united Lutheran church, an evangelical church would come into existence, at a national level, which would bridge the Lutheran, Reformed and Prussian-Union confessional divides; and, in 1948, both the *VELKD* and the *EKD* were formally established. Players such as Niemöller were clearly exceptional at this church-political game, played out as it was, in the first and second circuits. However, from his published speeches and letters, it also is clear that Niemöller does not take into consideration the distributed factors by which selective-environmental—in this case, mainly isomorphic-adaptive—pressures are created which would—in addition to limiting the numbers of possible church-political players—have been highly favourable for an overall-traditional and retrospective approach to ecclesiastical leadership and order.[30] The environmental selectors at the time included the following three: Firstly, the Allied military administrations' church

---

30  Martin Niemöller, *Reden 1945–1954* (Darmstadt: Stimme-Verlag, 1958). Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 225ff.; DiMaggio and Powell, 'Iron Cage Revisited.'

policy—wherever possible—gave political preference to the return of Christian politics, administration and order to the Weimar situation.[31] Secondly, the legal experts within church houses and consistories voiced opinions that were largely similar: With regards to the churches' (internal-)legal situation, the *DEK* foundation—and therefore any subsequent developments and alterations of ecclesiastical law—had been unlawful; whilst only Barmen and the *BK* could rightfully speak and act on behalf of Germany's Protestant churches, the church law that was applicable in 1945 would have been reflective of the situation prior to 11 July 1933.[32] Finally, deeper—perhaps even more compelling—*theological* reasons were to be found with the counter-ideological political success of Barthian dogmatic 'theo-logy' and the Barmen Declaration as a church-political strategy (cf. chapter 3). Since the days of crisis were clearly not yet over, bishops and church leaders managed to recover sufficient moral

---

31  Explicitly so in the church politics of the US military administration: Armin Boyens, 'Die Kirchenpolitik der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht in Deutschland von 1944 bis 1946,' in Armin Boyens et al., *Kirchen in der Nachkriegszeit: vier zeitgeschichtliche Beiträge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979), 7ff.; Jörg Thierfelder, 'Die Kirchenpolitik der vier Besatzungsmächte und die evangelische Kirche nach der Kapitulation 1945,' in *Evangelische Kirche nach dem Nationalsozialismus,* ed. Wolf Schieder (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992), 5ff.; Frederic Spotts, *The Churches and Politics in Germany* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1973), 47ff.

32  Especially: Erik Wolf, 'Gutachten über die rechtmäßige Neuordnung der Leitung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland,' in *Treysa 1945,* ed. Söhlmann, 181ff.

authority to be able to speak to the nation and to the occupying forces.[33]

What thus happened in 1945, was the swift recovery of the previous top-down relations of ecclesiastic/ ministerial oversight and pastoral care. The policy of military governments, a workable legal opinion, a political and moral need for—and capacity to exercise—national leadership, and functional administrative structures were amongst the external reasons which—within pending church-internal decision-making processes, in the fields of church order and ecclesiological accountability—fixed in place certain decisions regarding the churches' order, organisation and leadership (apparently 'naturally,' with the greatest possible ease), for them never to be questioned again. By way of contributing towards—and benefiting from—these developments, Barth's theologically (and even politically) 'tried and tested' totalising-normative and material-doctrinal approach came to prevail in the Protestant pulpits and within their theological

---

33 Spotts, *Churches and Politics,* 89ff. and 119ff.; Martin Greschat, *Die evangelische Christenheit und die deutsche Geschichte nach 1945: Weichenstellungen in der Nachkriegszeit* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002); Gerhard Besier, Jörg Thierfelder and Ralf Tyra, ed., *Kirche nach der Kapitulation,* vol. 1, *Die Allianz zwischen Genf, Stuttgart und Bethel* (Stuttgart, Berlin and Cologne: Kohlhammer, 1989); Beckmann, *Kirchliches Jahrbuch* 72–75. Martin Greschat, ed., *Im Zeichen der Schuld: 40 Jahre Stuttgarter Schuldbekenntnis: eine Dokumentation* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl., 1985); Martin Niemöller, *Reden 1945–1954* (Darmstadt: Stimme-Verl., 1958), 10ff.; Gerhard Besier and Gerhard Sauter, *Wie Christen ihre Schuld bekennen: die Stutgarter Erklärung 1945* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985); Armin Boyens, 'Das Stuttgarter Schuldbekenntnis vom 19. Oktober 1945: Entstehung und Bedeutung,' *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 19, no. 4 (1971): 374ff.

seminar rooms.

These historical and organisation-political (Cleggian) considerations build upon what was discussed above in chapter 2 (cf. 2.1 and 2.3).  This chapter now delves further into the analytical understanding and concern which began to unfold in chapter 3, namely: to develop a Foucauldian analysis of different forms of empowerment and agency creation that are relevant to the Christian ministry.  A top-down and totalising-normative power/knowledge approach to theological discourse and ministerial practice (as pursued by Barth) has its limitations and comes at the cost of some areas relating to pastoral practice and its practical-theological accountability.

### 4.3  The power relation of the Protestant pulpit

In the pursuit of a more complete understanding of the theological and professional power capacities of the modern clergy, the reconstruction of normative doctrine as a power relation, in chapter 3, must now be complemented by a reconstruction of the ecclesiological and professional power capacities of a minister of religion.  In this section, the power

relations of a Protestant minister shall be reconstructed from a doctrinal base, as established by Lutheran (and German-Protestant) theological 'legislators' (Bauman).[34]  Thereafter (4.4), empowerment through academic-training and modern professionalism will be assessed.

This section (4.3) refers to Foucault and the Augsburg Confession (*CA*) so as to demonstrate how Protestant pastoral ministry is established by normative decrees in terms of a twofold power relation: one itself top-down, legislatory and normative; the other being the move of God's Spirit 'from below' and 'from within.'  It is argued that this combination of two incongruous and incompatible forms of power is at the heart of the Pauline-charismatic challenge which Käsemann proposes in his paper.

*(1)  Ministry in the Augsburg Confession*

Historical forms of Christian ministry, in their many variations, continue to derive from the Catholic magisterium—or ministry of doctrinal oversight—and thus establish themselves in a double relation of power: of (1) a mono-hierarchical facilitation and protection of (2) the work of God's

---

34  Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters*; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 24f.

Spirit within a worshipping congregation of attending believers.[35]

According to the Lutheran (and shared German-Protestant) theological tradition and doctrinal standard, in *CA*, article 7, church is defined as the 'communion of saints' with two distinguishing features: 'pure' gospel teaching an 'correct' administration of the sacraments ('*in qua evangelium pure docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta*').[36] Article 5 of the *CA*, establishes the pneumatological/soteriological counterpart:

> So that faith may follow, the ministry of teaching of the gospel and administering the sacraments has been instituted. Because through the Word and the sacraments as instruments the Holy Spirit is given who brings about faith where and when it is revealed by God [...].[37]

Article 14 forbids the public preaching or administration of the sacraments by those without a regular calling and ordination ('*nisi rite vocatus*').

---

35  By way of engaging Foucault with Luther, Parsewark distinguishes the top-down power of domination from the pervasive and life-giving power of divine grace in terms of the 'communication of efficacy' which Pasewark identifies: Pasewark, *Theology of Power.* This distinction has been further developed towards a 'Foucault-influenced' understanding of power within the relations of local-church communities; respectively, a call for greater institutional accountability, higher professional standards, and changes to leadership and identity formation, to facilitate spaces of freedom creativity and 'freedom:' Kearsley, *Church, Community and Power;* Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault.*

36  'Therefore, church is the congregation of saints, where the gospel is taught purely, and the sacraments are administered rightly.' *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 61, tr. DQ. Ibid., 31ff.

37  *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 58, tr. from the Latin version DQ.

Here, the notion of doctrinal 'purity' serves as an alternative 'myth'[38] of

origin which, although developed in the context of theological heresiology,

was redeployed by theologians of the Reformation to cover the loss of

'apostolic succession.'[39]


*(2) Two rationales of power*


According to the Augsburg Confession, one side of the double power

relation of the pulpit consists of a top-down normative, apologetic and

heresiological movement of doctrinal oversight, deployment and control.

The 'legislatory' provision of a ministry of oversight, according to *CA* 7

and 14, and the exclusion—or limitation—of charismatic empowerment for

witness amongst those in the pews, argues the case by pointing to the

necessity of safeguarding the very places of access to the divine, the grace

---

38   F. G. Bailey, *Morality and Expedience: the Folklore of Academic Politics*
     (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977); Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 26 and 30.

39   Among the Anglican Thirty-nine Articles, 19 and 23; and in the Scottish
     Confession of Faith of 1560, ch. 18, 22 and 25; offer comparable normative
     provisions: Brian Cummings, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer: the Texts of
     1549, 1559, and 1662* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2011), 674ff.; 'The
     Confessioun of Faith Professit and Belevit be the Protestantes within the
     Realme of Scotland.  Publisched be Thaim in Parliament.  And be the Estatis
     thairof Ratifeit and Apprevit, as Hailsum and Sound Doctryne Groundit upon
     the Infallible Treuth of Goddis Worde,' in *Bekenntnisschriften und
     Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche,* ed. Wilhelm
     Niesel, 2nd edn (Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verl., 1938), 79ff.

of forgiveness and the public account of the gospel, which are represented

by the pulpit, communion table and baptismal font.  Whether vested in the

ministry of the bishop, pastor or a group of elders, the church's ministry—

in the language of Foucault—takes on the form of 'the juridical monarchy.'

As such, the 'insistence of the rule' is an utterly 'negative relation' in which

power's only resource is to permit, forbid, limit, stop or deny.[40]

> [...] this power is poor in resources, sparing of its methods, monotonous
> in the tactics it utilizes, incapable of inventions, and seemingly doomed
> always to repeat itself.  Further, it is a power that only has the force of
> the negative on its side, a power to say no; in no condition to produce,
> capable only of positing limits, it is basically anti-energy.[41]

In the relations concerning gospel proclamation and the administration of

the sacraments however—one hopes—that there is another salvific,

creative and empowering power relation at work: one which operates,

admonishes, empowers or lifts people up—depending upon one's

understanding of the gospel—either from within, or from without, causing

the renewal of the social grass roots and inner workings of society.


In this other, messianic-eschatological movement, divine grace and

transformative presence may be perceived and received within the relations

---

40  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 89 and 83.  Cf. Ogden, *Church,
    Authority, and Foucault.*

41  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 85.

of one's experience, understanding, course of action, identity, culture and social context; as a preacher might phrase it: 'in' and 'by the power' of the Holy Spirit.[42]  Together, these two movements and relations of power—one normative and top-down, the other creative and 'from within'—constitute the *ministerium divini verbi* (ministry of God's word) as being a normative doctrine of the church which establishes the power and control of ministerial oversight upon the second, salvific-messianic relations of empowerment and transformation.  However, the second, foundational, soteriological or pneumatological, 'bottom-up' relation of power and the secondary, top-down, normative, restrictive relation of pastoral/doctrinal oversight, remain alien to one another.  Although a normative ecclesiology establishes the first upon the second, both remain completely different in kind.  Though deployed to be subservient to the latter, the first continues to operate according to its own, thoroughly negative top-down rationale.  By way of contrast and in semblance to the κένωσις (self-emptying) of the divine Son all the way down to the abandonment of the cross (Philippians 2:6ff.), the life-giving, empowering, creative power of God in the Spirit always operates from underneath.  Within mainline-Christian soteriology, the Holy Spirit *is Christus praesens*, the work and 'presence of Christ.' That such is the case, re-emerges in the '*ubi et quando visum est Deo*' of

---

42  Cf. Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 117.

*CA* 5 which highlights that the only certainty which a Protestant theologian, pastor or preacher has, is that, 'amongst those who hear the gospel,' God's Spirit may decide to 'somehow' effect faith and salvation 'where and when God wills it.'[43]  The vagueness of a traditional Protestant pneumatology, which all too often begins—and ends—with John 3:8, is a result of this impasse.[44]

*(3)  Limitation to charismatic empowerment*

Käsemann considers that, in a biblical, charismatically ordered, community—though in different forms and to different degrees—all believers have received God's eschatological grace and power in Christ; and that subsequently, all—in their different God-given ways—share in the ministry of bearing witness to the church's eschatological grace, love and glory.  In Käsemann's understanding of Pauline-charismatic order, proclamation and sacrament remain 'at the very heart of the life of the

---

43  *Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche,* 58, tr. DQ.

44  A new Foucauldian study of Anglican ministry relations comes to similar conclusions but, instead of considering structural limitations of charismatic empowerment and order, calls for the pastoral facilitation of Christian spaces of creative imagination and freedom: Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault.*  Carlsson Redell however proposes that mainline-Christian 'representation' will always suffocate any challenge of true difference and creative innovation: Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt.*

community and of the Christian assembly.'  However, it is 'the self-manifestation and the manifold presence of the *Kyrios* who takes up yet again his lordship over his own' and therefore it is not the 'representative actions and duly authorized persons' that distinguish the worship of the church.  All believers 'are "office-bearers"' and 'living stones in God's building and representatives of him who is *the* Living Stone.'[45]  In one sense, Käsemann's Paul affirms *CA* 7 and rejects *CA* 14.

> We must not ignore the fact that such a statement is in direct contradiction to the modern Lutheran understanding of ecclesiastical office; [...] There is not even a prerogative of official proclamation, vested in some specially commissioned individual or other.  For the Pauline community, the diversity of charismatic functions is normative even for the ministry of preaching; all in their different modes, according to their different grades and within mutually recognized limits, are bearers of the Word of God and contribute to the edification of the community.[46]

With the complete difference/incompatibility of both dynamics and power relations, that have been poorly brought together to create the historical ministry of doctrinal/pastoral oversight remains an undue limitation and a threat to both spiritual-charismatic creativity and the empowerment of believers 'in the pews.'

---

45  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 78f. and 80, orig. emph.

46  Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 81.

## 4.4 Professionalism

It has been argued that the ecclesiological-doctrinal conception of the Protestant ministry (in its historical form) interlinks a movement of creative empowerment by divine grace operating 'from within' with a hierarchical/top-down movement of normative-doctrinal oversight.  It thereby renders theological accountability of the ministry to be systematically difficult; and establishes as a permanent structural danger to the charismatic empowerment and 'priesthood of all believers,' should one choose to pursue this for a practical-theological paradigm.  In order to facilitate theological accountability of the ministry of theological oversight, not only with regards to its normative necessity, but also with regards to its operations, non-hierarchical/non-normative approaches of describing power must be deployed.[47]

In the remaining sections of this chapter, ANT and Foucauldian insights and perspectives are employed to—very briefly—clarify the importance of 'non-theological' professional tools, technologies, resources and academic perspectives for the professional running of a church

---

47  Ogden accounts for 'epistemic hubris' and calls for changing the formation ('subject formation') of church 'leaders and followers:'  Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault,* 4, 53f. and 83; cf. ibid., 159.

ministry.  Following this, is exploration as to the kind of embodied identity creation and empowerment which modern clergy experience as the effect/outcome of professional training.

*(1)  Technologies and resources*

Foucault's work on power, in the 1970s, was concerned with following the supplementation of a modern generalised-juridical concept of 'sovereignty,' alongside an understanding of 'the microphysics of disciplinary power.'[48]  Other analytical-ethnographic power theories also make enquiries into the technologies and materials through which discipline, reliability and dimension may be introduced to the network relations of a modern 'Leviathan.'[49]  As his research into power relations progressed,[50] Foucault began to emphasise that whilst—in practical terms and left to its own devices—a hierarchical-normative ('juridical-discursive') power, by virtue of its inner structure, must remain prohibitive,

---

48  Michel Foucault, *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1973–74,* ed. Jacques Lagrange, tr. Graham Burchell (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 27; cf. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 137f.; Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 153ff., 191ff., 225 and 232ff.

49  Callon and Latour, 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan;' Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 153ff., 191ff., 225 and 232ff.

50  Overview and analysis of relevant writings of Foucault's, including lectures on power: O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 42ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 37ff.

suppressive and straight forward.  In high modernity—according to

Foucault—under the guise of this power, other forces and power relations

began to operate.  If Foucault was right and, within a hierarchical-

normative understanding, the operations and relations which contribute the

most to shaping the modern age can no longer be readily observed and

accounted for,[51] problems would surely be created with regards to the

normative-theological account of the distributed practices and means of

power within the Christian ministry.

According to Foucault, Clegg and ANT, one must explore how

power has been created by specific, historically dispersed micro-practices/

techniques, which may eventually become strategically interconnected.

Such distributed relations of micro-power are heterogeneous and inter-

engage both discursive and non-symbolic elements.  According to Foucault,

their remit is the human body; whilst ANT research introduces material

objects and technology to the relevant elements that facilitate the increase

of creativity, capacity, discipline, knowledge and identity formation within

the modern power situation.  A Foucauldian understanding helps explain:

why, in the mainline-liberal tradition, religious-pedagogical training and

---

51  Clegg, *Frameworks of Power,* 21ff.  Latour makes the same point with
    regards to the unaccountability of 'hybrids' after the modern dichotomisation
    of matter and 'spirit,' nature and culture: Latour, *Never Been Modern.*

clinical counselling feature prominently within ministry formation; why academic practical theology aims to engage—but often fails to fully integrate—sociological research perspectives with a normative-theological understanding; and why it is possible for pastoral leadership, with a charismatic concern for empowering—and integrating—a multifaceted lay contribution, to hinder, stop, and even undo a distributed spiritual build-up, tragically in many cases, against a pastor's declared will and without her/his understanding that this is what they have brought about. ANT invites one to consider—within the power relations of a ministry—the relevance of: running a church office; availability of stationery, photocopier, printer, telephone, internet and intranet; having access to sets of data, professional resources and a theological library etc.

In addition, contemporary forms of pastoral ministry and its power relations, cannot be understood without taking into account the effects that academic training and modern professionalism have upon human bodies. Here, Foucault's ethnographic-theoretical explorations of relations of power/discourse offer further illuminating insights.

*(2)  Academic formation*

In modern-historical forms of Christianity, ministerial power is constructed, and institutionally established, in such a way that theologically trained professionals, with a charge of theological discernment and pastoral leadership, are being created.  One subsequent effect of creating a professional clergy is that the laity is also established as its counterpart.  As Foucault pointed out in *Discipline and Punish,* modern education and professional formation is one of the typical locations where disciplinary-discursive power creates embodied roles, identities and individualities.[52] Theological training and examination establishes theological experts and empowered professionals and practitioners.  Foucault demonstrates how social difference and modern individuality are created in such a way that simultaneously social, objective and individually internalised identities emerge.[53]  In a non-hierarchical historical-descriptive analysis, Foucault clarifies the way in which modern 'power/ knowledge' operates.

---

52  For the following: Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 135ff. and 170ff.; Oksala, 'Freedom and Bodies.'

53  'These processes of power operate through the bodies of prisoners, but they are also essentially objectifying: through processes of classification and examination the individual is given a social and a personal identity.'  Oksala, 'Freedom and Bodies,' 88f.

Foucault examines how, in the later-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century, a modern-disciplinary power was established which reached much further than the mere systematic creation of skilled/competent bodies who produce expected—standardised and graded—behaviour, efficiency and economic utility.[54] '[A]ppropriate formative training,'[55] according to Foucault, operates through 'hierarchical observation,' 'normalising judgement' and 'examination.' At an academic level—together with academic and relating-professional discourses—it not only facilitates the creation, embodiment and enhancement of intellectual/professional discipline, productivity, specific skills and self-reflectivity; it also facilitates the creation of differentiated identities.[56] Through the named power resources of education and examination, discipline:

> [...] separates, analyses, differentiates, carries its procedures of decomposition to the point of necessary and sufficient single units. [...] Discipline 'makes' individuals [...].[57]

Modern-pastoral authority is, therefore, not only established through

---

54  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 137f. and 145ff.

55  Title of Foucault's chapter on training and examination: '*Les moyens du bon dressement;*' Foucault, *Surveiller [...]* 200, tr. DQ; Sheridan's translation: 'The means of correct training;' Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170.

56  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170ff.

57  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 170.

ordination which—according to a normative-theological order following a juridical-hierarchical rationale—gives privileged access to the places (pulpit, communion table) from which the presence/grace of God is administered (4.3); it is also facilitated by the process of academic training and the acquisition of modern-professional skills. Assessed-theological competence is certified through academic levels of achievement, degrees and classifications (B.A., M.Div., Ph.D.) and through ministerial license.[58] Not only does this establish the level and quality of one's professional qualification—and this, 'according to the records;' the examination connects 'an apparatus of observation, recording, and training,' in the words of Foucault, and thereby associates a certain objective 'visibility' to the exercise of power. Through examination, as a technique, disciplinary power compels individuals to undergo assessment 'in a mechanism of objectification.'[59] Within and alongside this normalisation and objectification, a differentiation and individuation is facilitated.

> [...] the examination is at the centre of the procedures that constitute the individual as effect and object of power, as effect and object of knowledge. It is the examination which, by combining hierarchical surveillance and normalizing judgement, assures the great disciplinary functions of distribution and classification, maximum extraction of forces and time, continuous genetic accumulation, optimum combination of aptitudes and, thereby, the fabrication of cellular, organic, genetic and

---

58  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 145ff. and 180ff.

59  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 191f., 173 and 187.

combinatory individuality.[60]

On the external-objective side, this can open up positions in relevant professional fields and institutional hierarchies. However, it also subjectifies by creating specific, individually embodied capacities and identities—and thus self-experience and self-knowledge—alongside objective social difference. Foucault's ongoing research concerning power and ethics provides evidence that there is more to modern people's internal life, sense of self and inner freedom.[61] At an awards ceremony or ordination, for example, in the eyes of everyone else—as much as in one's own estimation—one is being re-made, in some way; one becomes a different person.[62]

Professional training and deployment usually imply an objective expectation and a subjective preparedness to pastorally instruct and work with—and on—people from a place of a higher professional authority, within the field and responsibilities of one's (pastoral and theological)

---

60  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 192.

61  Foucault sees the modern 'soul' evoked alongside and through disciplinary power/knowledge: Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 16ff., 23f. and 29f. Foucault's subsequent research on power and ethics gives evidence that there is more to modern people's sense-of-self, internal life and freedom. Cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 212.

62  Cf. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 181f.

training/expertise.  It also implies a readiness to engage in professional

discourse, according to acquired expectations and behavioural standards: to

share and discuss cases, insights and challenges in professionally enclosed

settings; and furthermore, to read, listen and learn from relevant experts.

By default, trained professionals are likely to engage and listen to their

equals or academic experts, with a different expectation and in a different

way.  Setting aside the specific juxtaposition of clergy and laity, trained

modern ministers are likely to prefer engaging with—and relying upon—

other (secular) professionals, when it comes to shaping and developing

areas of the ministry, for example.  Where trained pastors manage to

engage effectively with untrained members of laity on (apparently) equal

terms, they are likely to hold their capacities of professional and academic

judgement in reserve.  Many of these attitudes and expectations are

acquired, invested and internalised, even to the embodied dimensions of

one's habitual dispositions, dress code, taste, demeanour and posture.

People—both oneself and others—see, perceive and know who one is and

how to engage.  Therefore, there exists an habitual mutuality.  Within

reason, a minister can expect people under his/her pastoral care to be ready

to listen, learn and be 'ministered to.'  Furthermore, a Christian context

does not suspend common social expectations and status which relate to

professionalism, education and class.[63]

Thus, in a church setting, as much as in wider society, education and professional training, being a member of an institution, body of clergy—or being given a professional role—is empowering: it creates specific effects at the grass-roots level of people's experiences, expectations and social engagements.  In this respect, academic/professional empowerment is comparable to—but not the same as—'charismatic' empowerment by God's Spirit, which is explored below, in chapter 5.  Professionalism creates a difference between those who are trained, educated, empowered, and those who are not: between professionals and the unlearned.  In itself, professionalism is also likely to cause difficulties as one aims to facilitate the building up of a charismatic 'body of Christ' (Romans 12:5, 1 Corinthians 12:27, Ephesians 4:15f.).[64]

---

63  Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice,* tr. Richard Nice (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1977).

64  Ogden nevertheless continues to believe that different subjectivities and socio-organisational relationships can be transformed through normative suasion and changing Christian-professional training and ministry formation: Ogden, *Church, Authority, and Foucault,* 159.

## 4.5 Transforming theological competence into charisma

It has been proposed (4.3) that the ideas of normative-hierarchical oversight—in principle and of themselves—are contrary to the move and ministry of 'God in the Spirit,' which is created through manifold experiences and processes (depending upon one's soteriological understanding) of empowerment, liberation, revelation, grace, faith, love or hope.[65]  In each—and all—of these forms, 'salvation' is established in a non-hierarchical manner 'from within' or 'from below,' and is dispersed across people, nations, times and places.  In addition, pastoral ministry, in its traditional form, tends to be further distinguished, empowered and enclosed through academic training and professional-discursive practice.  If this is the case, how could theologically equipped and professionally trained-and-deployed believers—should they choose to pursue such a course—transfer and transform their theological and professional competence into 'charisma'—i.e. a blessing which empowers fellow Christians of *every* background and kind—and impart a spiritual

---

65   Cf. Fuggle's observation that Paul's search for authority and order does not follow a model of (Foucauldian) pastoral supervision and control and is 'revolutionary' in that it aims at encouraging the emergence of innovative forms of social organisation, 'since charisma actively seeks new forms of social organization that are conducive to the new mode of existence it is promoting:' Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 164f.; cf. Bengt Holmberg, *Paul and Power: the Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2004).

contribution and 'gift' towards the building up of the church from the local grass-roots level?

Paul challenges members of his churches to sacrificially sanctify their charismatically empowered bodies to God, the giver of all gifts (Romans 12:1). In relation to one another—and especially towards those who are less generously equipped—this implies an acknowledgement and honouring of the grace/gift ('measure of faith') endowed upon them: recognising and advancing *them* and holding *their* 'gift of grace' in even higher esteem than one's own (verse 3). In mutual submission (Ephesians 5:21) and love (Romans 12:9ff., 1 Corinthians 13), one acknowledges that fellow Christians also carry their gift, liberty, contribution in the representation of the risen Lord. Paul's charismatic authority—that of others and one's own—resides not in individually embodied capacities, but socially and functionally—according to Käsemann: *exclusively*—within the context of the shared act of public witness to Christ.

> My brother Christian has also received his endowment, his liberty, his charge and is thus in his station the representative of the ascended Lord. The virtue of ταπεινοφροσύνη [humility, DQ] must be exercised in face of the *praesentia Christi* even when—indeed, precisely when—I encounter this presence embodied in the person of my brother who has also his charisma. This means concretely that authority and charisma go together in the community and, as charisma is only manifested as genuine in the act of ministry, so only he who ministers can have

authority and that only in the actual exercise of his ministry.[66]

Liberating and empowering others in their gift/calling to contribute to mutual service and a common witness is important.

A charismatic order of the church's witness/ministry would—in some way—need to include and empower, not only the contribution of already disciplined and well-equipped professional people, but equally, the (probably rather different) contribution of the rough edged, unlearned, ill-equipped, out of work, unconventional and destitute, with all the problems, rebellion and resistance which they carry and bring.  It would undoubtedly require pastors and privileged people in the church to step back and patiently endure the misguided, rebellious and foolish—to an even greater extent than pastoral leaders already do—in the hope that God's power of love and Spirit would simply take control and have its way.  Such a project however, is very likely to fail.  Against the backdrop of Foucauldian insights into the dimensions of embodied learning and formation within power/truth and power/discourse formations, Käsemann's mere-formal, i.e. non-embodied understanding cannot be maintained.  Neither those who have undergone theological—or other—training and taken on an *embodied*

---

66   Käsemann, 'Ministry and Community,' 78.

and disciplined professional persona and self-understanding, nor those who

are, more or less, excluded from such privileges, and forced to establish

their sense of self and reflective identity in the margins of—and in rebellion

against—the predominant play of modern-professional power/discourse,[67]

will easily perform within—and according to—a different, 'exclusively'

functional and actualised, rationale of charismatic connection/contribution.

Further to Käsemann's understanding, dimensions of spiritual-embodied

learning/formation must, therefore, be included in preparation of such a

performance in which Christ as 'head' and Lord of a social body—

comprising of all revelation and salvation—may be charismatically

established.

In an extended series of case studies, in part II of this thesis, which

relate to the Pentecostal revival of 1906 in Los Angeles, such concerns

shall be pursued in greater detail.

## Conclusion

Chapter 3 and 4 of this thesis deployed Foucauldian power-analytical

---

67  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 38ff.

perspectives and insights to pursue ethical concerns relating to the Christian ministry and the kind of ministerial agency which gets facilitated, empowered and sustained by a mainline-historical—whilst contemporary-modern—theology, ministry rationale and professional/academic formation.

Thereby, in chapter 3, a systematic study explored how Barth's normative-'theo-logy' deployed an inverted (neo-)Kantian theory design to facilitate successful counter-modern resistance to ideological and state-totalitarian forms of politics (3.2). Barth's theological dogmatics was a game-changer, and groundbreaking with regards to a great deal of twentieth-century academic theology. In addition, it has been pointed out that intellectuals and political theorists of the Weimar Republic years used this same theory paradigm as a way to forge an intellectually highly disciplined vanguard of counter-modern radicals who, with every reflective and self-reflective act, would recreate the eternal (pre-)conditions of their politico-cultural reflection. It is due to this shared theory design, that Barth's theology facilitates counter-modern resistance to ideological and state-totalitarian forms of politics; and it is for the same reason that it fails to engage, in any significant or meaningful manner, with a more recent—predominantly neo-liberal—power situation and politics. Once again,

many 'dialectical' theologians who had been sympathetic towards Barth's project in the 1920s—some of them were even close to him—failed to resist the National Socialist 'awakening.' The recent Ecumenical discussion of *status confessionis* (3.4) demonstrates that 'market forces' and neo-liberal globalisation—although highly pervasive and increasingly destructive, even with regards to post-industrial societies—do not amount to political ideology or tyranny. Although Hansen rightly points out that neither neo-liberalism, nor the market, interfere directly with the church's internal facilitation of gospel proclamation, there is a clear indication of a theological crisis and a need to fashion a politically relevant Christian voice for the twenty-first century. The exposition of both the neo-liberal and the (old-)liberal—layered—political rationales of Foucault's 'governmentality' lectures of 1979, facilitate a systematic clarification as to why, over time, a politically prevailing (Chicago-school) neo-liberalism must erode much of what constitutes a previously modern politics and culture. This includes: the legitimacy and funding of more or less essential governmental capacities and functions; a previous modern-liberal 'art of government' and its culture of democratic political discourse; the modern social bond, and alongside it 'society,' social cohesion, and a safe, hospitable and culturally rich environment; alternative and pluralistic forms of ethical and political accountability, as well as those of cultural identity formation; and even

disciplinary-normalising power itself, alongside its professional, academic and technological standards. Adam Smith's notion of a distributed ethics of calculating self-concern that is complemented by the unknowable market totality, clarifies the non-ideological nature of the economic—or neo-liberal—rationale. It also explains why—alongside the modern state, Barth's normative understanding of a sovereign divine is unable to grasp either element of the economic power relation. A Foucauldian reading and comparison of Barth's theology—in Foucauldian terms, an historically preconditioned discursive truth formation (cf. subchapter 3.3)—re-contextualises and 're-embodies' Barth's inverted-transcendental and hyper-Platonic theory and ethics, with regards to its historico-political *Sitz im Leben*, text-pragmatic power practice; and thus also its practical limitations as a political tool and strategic deployment of a particular nature. Furthermore, a Foucauldian reading of Barth's dogmatic-theological doctrine—in terms of power, ethics, resistance and an (inverted-)transcendental theory design—further prepares the ground for its comparison with the Foucauldian theorisations and analytical explorations of (different forms of) Pentecostal/charismatic empowerment and revivalist ethics in part II (chapters 5f.). On the material side, the speculative construction of '*homo spiritualis*' (3.5)—based upon the systematic findings in chapter 3—contributes towards this preparation for a further

exploration which, in part II, will take the form of an ethnographic-analytical examination. Based upon witness accounts from the Azusa Street revival, it aims to further clarify Pentecostal/charismatic empowerment, and forms of agency formation/ethics, as well as the constructive work which facilitates a Pentecostal charismatic divine.

Chapter 4 considered practical-theological weaknesses: a systematic impossibility of theological accountability with regards to the pastoral power deployment and of facilitating a charismatic-spiritual empowerment and Christian order. Arguably, it was due to external reasons—the theological-strategic engagement with an historically specific political situation, as well as formal reasons within ecclesiastical law—that, after the Second World War, German Protestantism returned to a hierarchical ordering of the Christian ministry (4.2). Within mainstream Christianity—both historical and modern—the ministry is generally empowered through two correlating power deployments/rationales. The first resource of pastoral empowerment consists of the—historically fixed—normative-doctrinal account of a church-family's ministry/order and relates to Clegg's considerations on the nature and limitations of 'legislatory' power theory (4.3). The second major source of modern pastoral power is academic/professional discipline and identity formation, according to Foucault's

*Discipline and Punish* (4.4).  Obviously, there are many other resources,

practices and strategies which, in historical-and-modern mainstream

Christianity, empower a pastoral ministry: e.g. above, 1.3, considers the

dynamics of parish politics; and 4.4, the use of organisational resources.

The power structure of a professionally equipped ministry of oversight

results in impasses, of which two have been identified: firstly, the

combination within the traditional-ecclesiological self-understanding, of a

salvific Spirit power working 'from underneath,' with a legislating-

prohibitive, top-down power deployment, *hinders practical-theological*

*accountability;* and secondly, a hierarchical-theological accountability and

power deployment which—together with professional/academic

demarcation and pride—creates *problems within pastoral efforts to*

*facilitate distributed-charismatic empowerment,* ministry and Christian

order 'in the power of the Holy Spirit.'[68]  Some initial considerations

concerning this second challenge of transforming theological/professional

competence into charisma (in 4.5) will be taken up in chapter 6 (from 6.5.4

and onwards).


So, in a certain way, the two chapters of part II correspond to the

---

68   Consider also Justaert's Deleuzean and liberation-theological ecclesiological
      proposition: Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 126ff.

questions posed in chapters 3 and 4, in that they consider the very different, alternative, manner of Christian agency formation and its capacities to facilitate counter-modern resistance and charismatic order.  In chapter 5, our understanding of Foucauldian power-theoretical concerns and analytical concepts will be advanced along the lines of Foucault's quest into the possibility/conditions of counter-modern embodied-sensual resistance.[69]  Chapter 6 leaves Foucault's ethical-embodied analytical perspective behind and translates insights and gains of chapter 5 into a Deleuzo-Guattarian theory concern with experimental ontology.  It will be proposed that the invisible realm, power relation and divine which engages with Pentecostal/charismatic experience and practice, should be understood in terms of DG's rhizome analysis.[70]  The choice of Christian spirituality, and of God as relation of power according to modern-Pentecostal/ charismatic experience, as a *distinctively* different field of study, in the second part of this research, owes to the power-analytical interest with exploring the possibility of analysing *all kinds of* power relations relevant to Christian ministry, within a single non-normative, descriptive-analytical approach.

---

69  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1.

70  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.

blank page

# PART II

## GOD AS RELATIONS OF POWER ACCORDING TO PENTECOSTAL-CHARISMATIC EXPERIENCE

## 5  Embodied Experience as Counter-Modern Power Dispositive: Spirit Baptism in Azusa Street Testimonies

It is one of the widely acknowledged features of Pentecostal and charismatic Christianities that, for the last hundred years (or so), and in particular in the last 30 years, their ministries have displayed an unprecedented capacity to expand and pragmatically adapt to many different world contexts and late-modern conditions.  They thereby initiate, incorporate and adapt to bewilderingly manifold—and contradictory—theological, organisational, economical and political situations, strategies and identities.  Research into Pentecostal Christianities took off in a major way in the 1990s.  Most contemporary (and without a doubt, often insightful) sociological/ethnographic perspectives continue to make Weberian and Berger-informed paradigms their point of departure: 'charisma' and 'routinisation,' 'modernisation,' 'secularisation,' 'fundamentalism,' and 'globalisation' etc.  It is only recently that researchers have begun to deploy embodied, 'material-semiotic' and objective-ontological perspectives in the exploration of this 'new,' late-

modern form of ever-innovating Pentecostal Christianity.[1]

The central concern of this chapter is to explore the idea that this Pentecostal capacity to embrace adaption, innovation and proliferation, under the conditions of a late-modern power situation, is due to—and facilitated by—the particular nature and creative diversity of *embodied experiences of religious power, presence and breakthrough.* A Foucauldian analytical paradigm can be applied to analyse the characteristics of Pentecostal religious experiences as a complex relation of power, created from disparate and distributed elements. Furthermore, it can help clarify whether Pentecostal experience could potentially facilitate the creation of a Christian agency that is able to operate successfully at the very point when common top-down, normative-dogmatic approaches have become unable to facilitate a Christian-theological challenge to a political power which no longer follows a generalised-ideological rationale (cf. chapter 3, above). Chapter 6 introduces a theoretical shift, away from the Foucauldian-ethical perspective of this (and previous) chapters, towards a related Deleuzo-Guattarian objective-ontological perspective.[2] In doing so, one is able to transform a Foucauldian-analytical concern with embodied sensation,

---

1    See above, introduction and chapter 1, and below, section 5.1.

2    Cf. Harman, *Tool-Being.*

power, transformation and creativity, in such a way as to conceptualise the assemblage and non-linear development of Pentecostal-spiritual capacities and powers, which include: the ability to 'carry revival,' 'signs and wonders,' prophetic intercession etc., and eventually, facilitating the distributed-charismatic power, presence and movement of the Pentecostal divine.

Similar to the way in which Barth's theology is regarded as being seminal in terms of twentieth-century theology, today's Pentecostal-academic theologians continue to consider the developments which took place—both during and after—this particular revival, as being paradigmatic as regards today's world Pentecostalisms. Obviously, this does not imply that there is a single Pentecostal origin and line of descent. In recent years, historians have explored this point in quite some detail[3] and the following two chapters offer a systematic understanding as to why, in accordance with the inner power structure and nature of Pentecostalism, this would be the case. With regards to methodology, in chapter 2, a significant body of historical research was revisited and evaluated from an organisation-theoretical perspective, whilst chapters 3 and 4 pursued the construction of an argument from the basis of social theory and systematic-theological

---

3  Anderson, *Spreading Fires.*

analysis. The remaining chapters of this thesis aim to facilitate a further step in response to questions and lines of reasoning that emerge from the previous chapters, by means of an—albeit text-based—ethnographic power analysis of Pentecostal experience, practice and understanding. It is necessary to change methodology as one is not aware of any suitable research into the social, spiritual and discursive processes *that lead to* a Pentecostal-revival breakthrough. However, unlike the Pentecostal beginnings of non-European and non-Western parts of the world, there is a significant body of published primary materials from the revivalist contributors and worshippers who attended the Azusa Street mission during the revival's early phase.[4]

Within—modern-'secular'—organisation-political theorisations, God and 'religious' forms of power can create specific problems which, in chapter 2, were identified as relating to unknown-contingent changes within disciplinary regimes and systemic environments of the political and organisational game. Ultimately, it is the self-imposed normative-secularist nature of a Hobbesian-modern approach to politics and organisation theory

---

4    Much is easily accessible e.g. via the webpage of the Flower Pentecostal
     Heritage Centre in Springfield, Missouri: ifphc.org.

that is the root-cause of such issues.[5]  Chapters 2–4 touch exclusively upon the religious forms of power/empowerment, within historical and modern forms of Christianity, that are compatible with a modern-organisational and political rationale, including: parish politics (2.1); the establishing of a basis of theological reasoning in order to support a political course of action (2.2 and 3.5); state interference in inner-religious affairs, state–church constitutional concerns, church administration and political grass-root mobilisation (2.3); theological and transcendental-ethical formation (3.3); the doctrinal 'fixing' of the ministry, professionalism, examination and ordination (4.3 and 4.4).  In the early chapters, the power relations of a doctrinally disciplined God and gospel were only examined in passing (2.1.1 and 3.3).  In this chapter (as well as chapter 6) some conceptually more interesting relations of religious power will be added to the list, including: Pentecostal forms of embodied empowerment, creativity and agency creation (chapter 5); and the facilitation of a living-divine power, presence and agency that moves, both within and across, distributed and inter-engaging relations of religious-charismatic perceptions/performances (chapter 6).

---

5    Consider the significant effort Hobbes needs to put into neutralising the political powers and rationales which can emanate from divine, theological, ecclesiastical and revelatory sources: Hobbes, *Leviathan,* pts. 3 and 4, 245ff. Clegg, *Frameworks of Power.*

Why, then, does this thesis have a second part and how does it relate

to the first part?  The formal-analytical research question behind this

research explores the possibility of consistent analytical theorisation of all,

or at least distinctively unconnected and disparate, power relations which,

collectively, are relevant to the Christian ministry in its different guises.

Part I offered a power-analytical exploration of several disparate, whilst

historically and practically inter-connected, relations: (1) of Barthian

agency construction, i.e. the power/truth relations of a seminal twentieth-

century academic dogmatics (chapter 3); (2) of its capacities and

limitations when engaging (twentieth-century and contemporary) political

powers (chapters 2f.); (3) of organisation-political concerns relating to

Christian organisation and church politics, modern 'secularism' and how

state-political relations/order can impact the conditions within which

Christian (church-political) organisation and leadership emerge and engage

(chapters 1f.); and finally (4), of normative power/truth relations and

practical resources which create and facilitate every conventional pastoral

ministry (chapter 4).  In line with the (re-)stated aim above, it makes sense

to widen the scope of power-analytical explorations of disparate relations

and plunge, as it were, into a rather different field of relations, with regards

to their history and Christian practices; which is why the remaining two

chapters of part II consider distinctively charismatic-Pentecostal forms of

empowerment and power. Whilst part II adds to the understanding generated and tested in part I, the findings in chapters 2–4 are not really essential for the analysis of Pentecostal forms of power that is presented in part II. However, insofar as Pentecostal Christianities also have their clergy, ministry network and Christian politics, as well as managing access to the platform and entertaining theological schools and seminaries, comparable concerns and power relations (as explored in part I) obviously matter just as much, with regards to the relations of power of their Christian ministry and practice.

Whilst, as a field of historical and practical power analysis, part II is separate from part I, it simultaneously (in a number of ways) correlates with—and mirrors—research in part I: Firstly, chapters 3 and 4 have already used a Foucauldian analytics of (embodied) empowerment and agency construction through theological normativity, hierarchical-legislative power and professionalism. Chapter 5 will now add Pentecostal Spirit baptism as another, yet different, form of Christian empowerment and ethical facilitation; the relations of which can be clarified through Foucauldian analysis. In a similar way, the organisation-political analysis of chapters 1 and 2 is mirrored through the Deleuzo-Guattarian exploration of the emergent creation of Pentecostal field relations in chapter 6; in that

both Clegg's circuits framework and DG's rhizomatic ontology share a distributed, multi-perspective, complex and objective-ontological analytical perspective which, furthermore, allows them to engage and integrate analytical insights from a Foucauldian-ethical analytical perspective. In view of this correlation and mirroring of chapters 1 and 2, one should be attentive as to how power concerns with modern organisation, politics, secularism, professional discipline, pastoral privilege and order engage (in chapter 6) with the construction of pentecostal power and order 'in the Holy Spirit.' Finally, at the end of chapters 3 and 4, specific questions were asked: Chapter 3 concluded with the question as to whether it was possible to conceive of a '*homo spiritualis*' which, differing from (juridical-monarchic) state politics, as well as from (modern-academic) normative-theological power/truth relations, would be in a position of structural comparability such that *homo spiritualis* could undercut, engage and resist neo-liberal *homo œconomicus* and his/her unknowable totality. Chapters 5 and 6 explore both the ethical formation (one will find, a twofold ethical formation) of a Pentecostal and charismatic *homo spiritualis,* as well as considering her/his powers and capacities; furthermore, chapter 6 (with the help of DG's theorisation of immanent-rhizomatic creativity) will retrace the construction of a distributed-charismatic divine presence and 'Kingdom' reality with non-conclusive and ever-evolving (i.e. non-total)

biblical-and-meaningful capacities, possibilities and relations 'in the Holy Spirit.' Chapter 4 asked whether and how a top-down order, together with modern-normative and academic-professional forms of power, agency construction and empowerment, can be both accountable and co-engage with a non-hierarchical distributed-charismatic empowerment and order of the Christian ministry. At the end of analysis of chapter 6, a preliminary answer will be attempted.

Section 5.1 considers the particular nature of Pentecostal Christianity, according to a contemporary-academic understanding, as well as alternative theory tools for a Foucauldian analysis. In sections 5.2 and 5.3 of this chapter, Foucault's understanding of sexuality, in terms of a (nineteenth-century) modern relation of dispositive power, will be introduced as a rationale for an analytical description of spiritual experience—including 'baptism in the Spirit'—according to Pentecostal/charismatic forms of Christianity.[6] The Foucauldian analytical

_____

6   Queer theology and Carrette have pointed out that concern with modern sexuality and a Foucauldian theological (embodied-spiritual) critique are interrelated: Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 73ff.; Marcella Althaus-Reid, 'Class, Sex and the Theologian: Reflections on the Liberationist Movement in Latin America,' in *Another Possible World,* ed. Marcella Althaus-Reid, Ivan Petrella and Luis Carlos Susin (London: SCM, 2007), 23ff.; Althaus-Reid, *Queer God;* Stephen V. Sprinkle, 'A God at the Margins? Marcella Althaus-Reid and the Marginality of LGBT People,' *Journal of Religious Leadership* 8, no. 2 (2009): 57ff. Foucault's 'religious question' amounts to 'a strategic struggle to reclaim the silent aspects of religion (the body and

programme will then be deployed for a detailed analysis of a small selection of published personal witnesses of Spirit-breakthrough experiences which emanated from the Azusa Street revival in Los Angeles in 1906 (5.4).  Whilst the more vocal self-accounts, as well as those containing a greater level of detail, are a natural choice for analysis, the selection presented in this chapter is also representative of both the nature and range of embodied experiences, processes and practices at the Azusa Street mission, as they relate to spiritual preparation, breakthrough, and their discursive understanding.  A concluding evaluation (5.5) considers the deployment and creative facilitation of theological and pastoral discourse which arise from experiences of divine presence/power in which not all aspects can be easily managed and contained; the relevance of self-practice and embodied process towards spiritual breakthrough experiences; the capacity of Pentecostal/charismatic breakthrough to unlock change and facilitate creative innovation with regards to embodied experiences and self-experiences, self-identities and courses of action; and finally, in accordance with the structural equivalence with Foucault's sexual, 'criminal' and 'insane' deviation, the Pentecostal capacity of facilitating counter-modern resistance—but also trap falls of religious delusion.

---

sexuality)' and to expose 'the implicit political nature' of all theological and spiritual enunciation: Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 37.

## 5.1 A Foucauldian analysis of Pentecostal empowerment

This chapter formulates the counter-modern form and rationale of Pentecostal empowerment, along the lines of Foucault's dispositive of 'sexuality.'[7] The nature of Pentecostal Christianity has been called 'illusive;' and has been identified in terms of a 'great diversity'—and ongoing proliferation—with regards to different theologies, practices and organisational forms.[8] Participatory practices of worship, a longing for divine presence and an expectation of miraculous divine interventions and orality have been identified as defining features; alongside a 'playful' engagement of, on the one hand, scripture, order, theological traditions and understandings, and, on the other hand, 'the Spirit,' which, on occasion, has been compared to jazz improvisation.[9] Furthermore, Cox identifies

---

7   Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, 105f.  Tim Dean, 'Foucault and Sex,' in *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018): 141ff.; Oksala, 'Freedom and Bodies;' Cressida J. Heyes, 'Subjectivity and Power,' in *Michel Foucault,* ed. Taylor, 159ff.; Olivia Custer, 'Sex,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 449ff.; McHoul and Grace, *Foucault Primer,* 76ff.; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Focuault,* 168ff.; Hania Siebenpfeiffer, 'Körper,' in *Foucault-Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 266ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexicon,* 44f. and 183ff.

8   Robeck and Yong, 'Global Pentecostalism;' Anderson, *Introduction to Pentecostalism.*

9   Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism;* Jean-Jacques Suurmond, *Word and Spirit at Play: towards a Charismatic Theology,* tr. John Bowden (London: SCM, 1994); Cox, *Fire from Heaven*, 143ff.

'Pentecostal spirituality' as being subversively rooted in (different world-regions' pre-Christian and counter-modern) 'primal' religious practices as well as, at the same time, being a formidable modernising force.[10] 'Spirit baptism' (with reference to Acts 2) continues to be paradigmatic for academic-theological accounts of the particular Pentecostal mode of spiritual experience/practice;[11] however, with its roots (mainly) in 'classical' North-American Pentecostal church traditions, academic-Pentecostal theologians tend to follow Hollenweger's proposition of rendering early post-Azusa Street developments and decisions as being normative thereby creating a quasi-denominational particular for the movement as a whole.[12] This surely recognises the central importance of an embodied experience/practice 'of' and 'in the Holy Spirit' (including 'Spirit baptism' and the Pentecostal 'miraculous') for Pentecostal/charismatic-Christian movements. At the same time, as Latour points out, the nature of (especially innovative) heterogeneous-network relations are best studied through their controversial assemblage and construction.[13]

---

10  Cox, *Fire from Heaven.* Cf. Martin, *Pentecostalism;* Martin, *Tongues of Fire.*

11  Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit;* Yong, *Spirit Poured Out;* Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality;* Smith, *Thinking in Tongues,* 22ff.

12  Hollenweger, 'Pentecostals and Charismatic Movement;' Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 14f.

13  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 88ff.; Latour, *Science in Action.*

Land's understanding of 'Pentecostal spirituality,' in terms of 'affection' and millennial 'passion,' is structurally not dissimilar to Foucault's understanding of sexuality in terms of 'pleasure' and 'desire;' both, 'affection' and 'desire' gather experiential, personal-practical, discursive-symbolic, social and ethical dimensions into a single, embodiment-focused power relation.[14]  This thesis experimentally ('playfully') deploys a generalised understanding of the constituting dimensions of 'sexuality' as a modern power dispositive (according to Foucault)[15] so as to facilitate a clearer analytical understanding of Pentecostal/charismatic experience and empowerment, especially with regards to their capacities of both discursive-conceptual and organisational variation, adaptability and innovation.  Similar to Pentecostal Spirit baptism, Foucault's sexuality dispositive is innovative and constructive as it: takes hold of bodies 'from within;'[16] resists, evades and outperforms both juridical and modern-disciplinary modes of control; eventually emerging as a distributed-relational power strategy in its own right.[17]  In the first volume of *The*

---

14  Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 1, 2 and passim; Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 5 and passim; Foucault, *Use of Pleasure,* 5 and passim.

15  Foucault and Deleuze, 'Intellectuals and Power,' 208; Foucault, 'Interview with Foucault,' 240; Knibbe and Droogers, 'Methodological Ludism.'

16  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 57.

17  Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 150f.  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92ff.

*History of Sexuality,* Foucault comes to understand 'sexuality' in the

following way:

> It is the name that can be given to a historical construct: not a furtive
> reality that is difficult to grasp, but a great surface network in which the
> stimulation of bodies, the intensification of pleasure, the incitement to
> discourse, the formation of special knowledges, the strengthening of
> controls and resistances, are linked to one another, in accordance with a
> few major strategies of knowledge and power.[18]

Such an understanding of modern sexuality resonates (no more than that!)

with Pentecostal embodied-revivalist experiences of the Holy Spirit, as it

challenges common assumptions concerning both sexual desire *and* Spirit

baptism.  A Foucauldian power analysis of Spirit baptism thus promises to

clarify how exceptional spiritual experiences may impact the perceptions,

understandings and self-understandings of revivalist worshippers; and,

eventually, how Pentecostal-charismatic empowerment facilitates its double

feat of being culturally pre-Christian, 'premodern' and 'primal' whilst, at

the same time, becoming a contributor towards modernisation (Cox).


Amongst others, researchers, political activists and theologians who

engage with questions of gender, feminism, racism, LBGTQ and related

emancipatory/minority political concerns continue to refer to Foucault's

---

18   Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 105f.

theorisations of embodied subjectivation.[19]  In the introduction to the

second (and third) volume of *The History of Sexuality* (published in the

year of Foucault's death), Foucault emphasises that the 'three axes' which

constitute his understanding of modern 'sexuality' (scientific knowledge—

power/practices—'forms' of subjectification) remain in place, as he

introduces another shift in his research which now focuses on the historical

reasonings and techniques that facilitate changing modes of

'ethical'/aesthetical self-formation.  Foucault's 'genealogy' of the

modern-'desiring' self begins in antiquity and was supposed to include an

analysis of Christian-confessional identity formation as an essential

contributing factor.[20]  Several readings interpret Foucault accordingly, not

just in terms of a shifting research focus and methodology (from

'archaeology' via 'genealogy' and eventually to 'ethics') but, thereby, as a

progressive conceptual enlargement and 'intensification' (Nealon) which

---

19  Contributions by Huffer, Chow, Davis, and Greco and Savransky in
    Downing, ed., *After Foucault;* Oksala, 'Freedom and Bodies;' Mehlmann
    and Soine, 'Gender Studies/Feminismus;' Kamitsuka, *Feminist Theology;*
    Butler, *Gender Trouble.*

20  Foucault, *Use of Pleasure,* 4ff.  Foucault, 'Subject and Power.'  Foucault's
    manuscript to the final volume of *The History of Sexuality* has now been
    released: Foucault, *Aveux de la chair.*  Khalip, 'Foucault's Ethics;' Greco and
    Savransky, 'Foucault's Subjectivities;' Gary Gutting, 'Ethics,' in *The
    Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale
    (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 136ff.; Edward McGushin,
    'Foucault's Theory and Practice of Subjectivity,' in *Michel Foucault,* ed.
    Taylor, 127ff.; O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 109ff.; Davidson, 'Ethics and
    Ascetics.'

adds 'power' (practices) to 'discourse;' and, eventually, adds

subjectification ('technologies of the self') to power and discourse.[21]

Bernauer points out that Foucault's final research into different pre-modern

modes of self-formation sets its sights on a moral experimentation and

liberation which both bypasses and subverts a modern-embodied,

scientific-discursive and ethical normalisation.  In this sense, a 'final-

Foucauldian' ethics and 'ecstatic thinking' amounts to a secular-modern

form of mysticism and 'negative theology' which bypasses both the

conventional and sanctioned discursive routes as Foucault engages in his

personal-experimental experimentation and quest for truth.[22]  Fuggle

successfully engages Foucault, Deleuze and Agamben with Paul in order to

clarify the ethical possibility and mode of a political-celebratory resistance

which can colonise and widen the 'cracks' of a neo-liberal-ubiquitous

(non-)politics and economic administration.[23]  However, in addition to the

already named difficulty that the counter-modern, subversive nature of a

Foucauldian theoretical analytics often leads to a skewed or (seemingly)

21  Contributions by McGushin, Stone, Heyes and Taylor, in Taylor, *Michel Foucault,* pt. 3, 125ff.; O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault;* Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 2; McHoul and Grace, *Foucault Primer;* cf. Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 162ff.

22  Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 178ff.  Bernauer and Mahon, 'Michel Foucault's Ethical Imagination.'

23  Sophie Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 185ff.; cf. Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory,* 239ff.

biased historical description, for example, of Christian-ecclesial relations, Carrette deems Foucault's understanding of 'spirituality' (cf. Bernauer's 'mysticism') not simply to be multiple, but even conceptually inconsistent, in that it conceptualises the modern 'rupture' by which a (philosophical) 'spirituality' is to be distinguished from the Christian theological tradition; whilst Foucault, at the same time, also argues—and discovers, through historical analysis—that there is an undisrupted persistence of Christianity in the tradition of 'spiritual' self-formation/resistance which, just as it is in pastoral practice, cannot be divorced from its entanglement with a Christian-theological understanding.[24]

It is due to the fragmentary nature and the relativism of specific analytical functions and perspectives, as well as to these analytical-conceptual inconsistencies, that this research does not consider conceptualising Pentecostal-charismatic experience/practice and ethical (self-)formation through a direct reading of Foucault's own research into Christian self-practices and 'spirituality' which took place during the final years of his life.  Instead, this research develops a generalised and

---

24  Carrette, 'Rupture and Transformation.'  Vintges, 'Freedom and Spirituality;' Edward McGushin, 'Spirituality,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 472ff.

formalised understanding of the relevant dimensions of power/discourse,

embodied empowerment and identity formation from Foucault's

understanding of 'sexuality' as a modern relation of power.

## 5.2  Foucault's theorisation of power

*(1)  Dispositive*

Foucault developed and popularised 'dispositive' as a central concept

of his descriptive analyses of concrete interlinkings of power, practice,

discourse and embodied personality and identity.[25]  A sufficiently close

---

25  DG first referred to an 'Oedipal dispositive' ('Oedipal apparatus') in their
'schizoanalytical' counter-draft to structuralist Freudo-Marxism of the
human condition and of capitalist production: DG, *Anti-Oedipus,* 94, 96,100
and 109.  On 'dispositive:' Giorgio Agamben, 'What Is an Apparatus?' in
*What is an Apparatus?: and Other Essays,* tr. David Kishik and Stefan
Pedatella, (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2009), 1ff.; Jeffrey
Bussolini, 'What Is a Dispositive?' *Foucault Studies* 10 (2010): 85ff.; Gilles
Deleuze, 'What is a *dispositif?'* in *Michel Foucault Philosopher: Essays
translated from the French and German,* ed. and tr. Timothy J. Armstrong
(London and New York: Routledge, 1992), 159ff.; Jürgen Link, 'Dispositiv,'
in *Foucault-Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 237ff.; Lawrence Olivier, 'La question
du pouvoir chez Foucault: espace, stratégie et dispositif,' *Canadian Journal
of Political Science* 21, no. 1 (1988): 83ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 101f.;
Paul Patton, 'Foucault's Subject of Power,' in *The Latter Foucault: Politics
and Philosophy,* ed. Jeremy Moss (London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage,
1998), 64ff.; Stephen Legg, 'Assemblage/ Apparatus: Using Deleuze and
Foucault,' *Area* 43, no. 2 (2011): 128ff.; Joannah Caborn, 'On the
Methodology of Dispositive Analysis,' *Critical Approaches to Discourse
Analysis Across Disciplines* 1, no. 1 (2015): 112ff.; Siegfried Jäger and

English word is missing; and there is a notable lack of consistency in the translation of the French '*dispositif de pouvoir.*' Proposed renditions include: 'device,' 'deployment,' 'apparatus,' 'construction,' 'organisation,' 'machinery' etc.[26] Uneven translation of the term—often within a single published text—hinders the recognition of systematic-textual relations and of the concept's centrality within Foucault's power-analytical interest in the 1970s.[27]

What is Foucault's understanding of 'dispositive of power?' An explanation which he gave at an academic conversation, in the period

---

Florentine Maier, 'Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis,' in *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis,* ed. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edn (London and Los Angeles: Sage, 2009), 34ff. The conceptual importance of 'dispositive' ('apparatus') seems not to be recognised in important 'philosophical' readings of Foucault; in such cases, Foucault's systematic-analytical interlinking of power, knowledge and bodies tend to be considered within reconstructions of Foucault's 'genealogical' analytical method: Lash, *Sociology of Postmodernism,* 55ff.; Gutting, *Foucault;* Hubert L. Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault;* Kögler, *Michel Foucault.*

26  Bussolini, 'What is a Dispositive?'

27  Foucault mainly uses 'dispositive' in two of his monographs: Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1. Its development can also be traced across his lectures: Foucault, *Psychiatric Power;* Foucault, *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975,* ed. Valerio Marchetti and Antonella Salomoni, tr. Graham Burchell (New York: Picador, 2003); Foucault, '*Society Must Be Defended;*' Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population;* Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics.* He clarified the concept in a published verbal exchange, 1977: Foucault, 'Confession of the Flesh.'

between the publication of *Discipline and Punish* and the first volume of

*The History of Sexuality*, comes close to a formal definition.  A dispositive

is:

> [...] a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions—in short, the said as much as the unsaid. Such are the elements of the apparatus [*dispositif*].  The apparatus itself is the system of relations that can be established between these elements.[28]

In accordance with a common French understanding, Foucault's dispositive

is a gathering of heterogeneous elements—both meaningful and

otherwise—into a relationship which is specific in kind, and relatively

stable.[29]  Dispositives can thus, be transferred into—and redeployed in—a

range of alternative situations and ways.  With regards to its intensity,

mobility and flexible use, a dispositive is comparable to a stock cube,

although a variety of its condensed forms and redeployments must also be

conceived.

> Thus, a particular discourse can figure at one time as the programme of an institution, at another it can function as a means of justifying or masking a practice which itself remains silent, or as a secondary re-interpretation of this practice, opening out for it a new field of

---

28   Foucault, 'Confession of the Flesh,' 194; French: Foucault, 'Le jeu de Michel Foucault,' 299.

29   Carrette proposes a different reading of 'the said as much as the unsaid' in terms of regulated discourse and its relating 'silence:' Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 25ff.

rationality.  In short, between these elements, whether discursive or non-discursive, there is a sort of interplay of shifts of position and modifications of function which can also vary very widely.[30]

In addition, English translations fail to recognise the military connotation of *dispositif* which refers to a functional battle formation.[31]  Foucault's dispositives become dislocated, 'translated' (in an ANT understanding); they proliferate and become integrated within overarching-political strategies, and eventually the power regime of an age.[32]

Alongside such a rather specific analytical-descriptive understanding, a higher-generalised—and analytical— understanding of dispositive can also be found.  Foucault's explorations into relations of power began with an historical question: 'How have domains of knowledge been formed on the basis of social practices?'[33]  Here, a power dispositive is 'a productive instance of discursive practice' and 'precisely the point

---

30  Foucault, 'Confession of the Flesh,' 194f.

31  Link, 'Dispositiv,' in *Foucault-Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 238.

32  Analogous to 'epistemes' informing historical ages, according to Foucault's 'archaeological' explorations: Thomas Flynn, 'Foucault's Mapping of History,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault,* ed. Gary Gutting, 2nd edn (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2006), 29ff.; Friedrich Balke, 'Episteme,' in *Foucault-Handbuch,* ed. Kammler, 246ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 106ff.; Kögler, *Michel Foucault,* 36f.

33  In a lectures series in 1973: Michel Foucault, 'Truth and Juridical Forms,' in *Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984,* vol. 3, ed. James D. Faubion, tr. Robert Hurley et al. (London and New York: Penguin, 2002), 1.

from which it should be possible to locate the formation of discursive

practices.'[34]  Whilst 'power produces knowledge,' discourse and knowledge

contribute to the facilitation of power.[35]  Furthermore, 'domains of

knowledge,' with their 'new objects, new concepts, and new techniques'

also give rise to new human subjectivity.[36]  Power—in all its forms—

according to Foucault, is physical and its focus is the human body.[37]

Throughout the 1970s, Foucault thus explored the many ways and forms in

which, historically, practices of power and discourse have contributed to

the emergence and formation of modern subjectivity, in its many layers and

facets.  It is from here, that Deleuze offers an analytical-strategic reading of

Foucault's dispositive as the interlinking, inter-engagement of three or four

curves/'lines.'  Deleuze proposes a penal-panoptic analytical frame,[38]

according to which a power dispositive is the inter-engagement of four

dimensions: visibility (in the literal as well as figurative sense), discursive

knowledge, force relations and subjectification.  It is of relevance to this

chapter that Deleuze suggests that (even though Foucault ceases to refer to

---

34  Foucault, *Psychiatric Power,* 13.

35  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 27.

36  Foucault, 'Truth and Juridical Forms,' 2.

37  Foucault, *Psychiatric Power,* 14.

38  Cf. Foucault, *Discipline and Punish.*

the concept in the late 1970s) one is justified in systematically extending

Foucault's understanding of power dispositive, with regards to its impact,

into his explorations concerning the possibility and conditions of ethical

liberation of the 1980s: how—through techniques, and 'care of the self'—

mature, free and rounded subjectivity may be facilitated within dense and

invasive external relations of power and knowledge.[39]

*(2) Power relations*

Foucault's theoretical analytics of power relations developed

throughout the 1970s.[40]  Foucault's theory and thought have been described

as 'at root ad hoc, fragmentary, and incomplete;'[41] ever-evolving and full of

'contradictions;'[42] 'selective and strategic,'[43] fluid and conceptually

---

39  Deleuze, 'What is a *Dispositif*?'

40  O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 41ff.; Rouse, 'Power/Knowledge;' Dreyfus and
Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* pt. 2, 101ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 37ff. and
146ff.; Raffnsøe, Gudmand-Høyer and Thaning, *Michel Foucault,* 38ff.;
Kögler, *Michel Foucault,* 74ff.  Several readings interpret developments in
Foucault's theory against his political action: Elden, *Foucault: Birth of
Power;* Elden, *Foucault's Last Decade;* Hoffman, *Foucault and Power;*
Mills, *Michel Foucault,* 11ff.

41  Gary Gutting, 'Michel Foucault: a User's Manual,' in *The Cambridge
Companion to Foucault,* ed. Gary Gutting, 2nd edn (Cambridge and New
York: CUP, 2006), 2.

42  Mills, *Michel Foucault,* 3.

43  Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 142.

dynamic.[44]  Still, a sense of systematic-conceptual coherence can be achieved, for example, by reading Foucault normatively against the backdrop of the predominant philosophical tradition whilst emphasising developments of Foucault's understanding within his overarching topical concerns.[45]  Across different chapters of this research, Foucault's work on power has been selectively mined for a range of relevant concepts and analytical 'tools'.[46]  Subsequently, the succession of chapters 3 to 6 of this thesis creates a 'thick' and more complex Foucauldian-descriptive power analytics which, in a limited way, replicates Nealon's 'intensification,' as well as Carrette's method of an 'inter-textual reading' which interprets Foucault 'in the spirit of Foucault rather than in the constraints of disciplinary practice' by retrieving and folding Foucauldian perspectives together.[47]  In view of the research purpose of chapters 5 and 6, it is not expedient to put a great deal of effort into retracing systematic

---

44  Jeremy R. Carrette, 'Foucault, Strategic Knowledge and the Study of Religion: a Response to McCutcheon, Fitzgerald, King, and Alles,' *Culture and Religion* 2, no. 1 (2001): 135.

45  Gutting, *Foucault;* Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault;* Kögler, *Michel Foucault.* Alternatively, Foucault has been presented in terms of a normative-systematic analytics of the present or as a critical theorist of political action: Raffnsøe, Gudmand-Høyer and Thaning, *Michel Foucault;* Mills, *Michel Foucault.*

46  Cf. O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 50ff. and 96ff.

47  Nealon, *Foucault beyond Foucault,* 5 and passim; Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 3, xii and x.

developments and variations, coherences and inconsistencies, within

Foucault's theorisations of power.[48]

It is with the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1976) that his

conceptualisation of power reached such a degree of richness and

flexibility, that it becomes interesting for our understanding of divine

power and action.  By this point, Foucault had developed a strategical

understanding of power which appreciated the great richness, pluriformity

and malleability of its relations.[49]  The dispositive remains central to

Foucault's power concept as a strategic effect and possibility.  Foucault

now understands power as being operative in a non-hierarchical,

decentralised manner, through local micro-practices, tactics and techniques

which—in a range of ways—aim at human bodies.  Power is 'exercised

from innumerable points, in the interplay of non-egalitarian and mobile

relations;'[50] one needs to 'understand the multiplicity of force-relations that

are internal to the field where they are developed, and that are constitutive

---

48  Overview of Foucault's power-analytical theorisations and 'tools:' O'Farrell,
*Michel Foucault,* 96ff.; Rouse, 'Power/Knowledge;' Mills, *Michel Foucault;*
Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* pt. 2, 101ff.; Bublitz, 'Macht;'
Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon,* 37ff., 80ff., 146ff. and 157.

49  Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon*, 150.

50  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 94.

to their organisation.'[51]  Also, the exercise and existence of power 'depends

on a multiplicity of points of resistance' which become the 'adversary,

target, support, or handle in power relations.'[52]  Through a 'game' of

struggle, confrontation and political alliance, local relations of power are

'transformed, reinforced, inverted;' relations of force find 'support' in one

another 'in such a way that they form a chain or system, or respectively, a

mismatch, a contradiction that isolates one against the other.'[53]  Distributed,

locally devised power events are

> [...] connected to one another, attracting and propagating one another, but
> finding their base of support and their condition elsewhere, [they] end by
> forming comprehensive systems: the logic is perfectly clear, the aims
> decipherable, and yet it is often the case that no one is there to have
> invented them, and few who can be said to have formulated them; [...].[54]

Foucault eventually points out that power is to be found in those

overarching, perhaps institutionally solidified, strategies that become

incorporated into forms including the state, law and social hegemony.

Differing from Machiavelli's theorisation—and obviously that of Hobbes—

---

51  Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 1, 121f., tr. DQ.  The force relations
     that are internal to the dispositive in its original location predetermine
     emerging strategic relations of power.  Hurley's translation is misleading in
     that it suggests self-organisation: Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92.

52  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 95.

53  Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 1, 121f., tr. DQ; cf. Foucault, *History
     of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92f.

54  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 95.

Foucault concludes that power is to be theorised without unification by an acting/powerful agency and relating monarchic-legal and quasi-physical conception: one must 'do without the persona of the Prince, and decipher power mechanisms on the basis of a strategy that is immanent in force relationships.'[55]  Power relations are 'both intentional and nonsubjective.'[56]

## 5.3  A Foucauldian power analysis of embodied-spiritual experiences

*(1)  Sexuality dispositive*

In the first volume of *The History of Sexuality* (1976), Foucault develops a theory paradigm for the analytical description of 'sexuality' as a modern dispositive of power, which, from the early-nineteenth century up until the time of the Hippie counterculture and student unrest of the late 1960s and 70s, emerged as 'an especially dense transfer point for relations of power.'[57]  The central proposition of this chapter is that *Pentecostal-embodied experiences of religious power, presence and breakthrough*—that

---

55  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 97.  Cf. also the well-known quote, 'In political thought and analysis, we still have not cut off the head of the king.' Ibid.*,* 88f.

56  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 94.

57  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 103.

which modern-Pentecostal Christians often call 'anointing,' the 'presence of the Holy Spirit' or the 'glory of God's Kingdom'—can be described along similar lines, as *a counter-modern Foucauldian power relation and dispositive.*[58] 'Sexuality,' writes Foucault—almost, by way of definition—is:

> [...] a historical construct [*un dispositif historique*]: not a furtive reality that is difficult to grasp, but a great surface network in which the stimulation of bodies, the intensification of pleasures, the incitement to discourse, the formation of special knowledges, the strengthening of controls and resistances, are linked to one another, in accordance with a few major strategies of knowledge and power.[59]

Foucault's analysis of 'sexuality' comprises of six dispositive elements and effects that become established in a mutually interconnected, mutually supportive way: (1) bodies are stimulated and pleasure is intensified; (2) discourse is incited and knowledge/truth is formed and deployed; (3) hierarchical-relational micro-practices and self-practices 'from below' become both embodied and discursive; (4) a network of distributed, but pervasive, power relations and embodied micro-resistances emerges; (5) human identity, individuality, agency and a capacity to feel, act and know oneself, emerge as power operates upon the human body; (6) finally, power

---

58  Fuggle points out that, as one compares Paul's soteriology with Foucault's understanding of modern power and politics, the Pauline affirmation of life through God's Spirit is structurally equivalent to biopolitical sexuality: Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 100 and 166.

59  Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 105f.; Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 1, 139.

emerges as 'a great surface network,'[60] operating—in particular—through such relatively stable, heterogeneous ensembles 'from below,' and 'exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations,'[61] as a distributed 'multiplicity of force-relations that are internal to the field in which they have been developed, and that are constitutive to their organisation.'[62] Power/knowledge strategies, from across the political spectrum, engage with these practice—experience—discourse dispositives, thereby creating the competing sets of force relations, political positions, institutional rationales and hegemonies of the 'powers that be.' As Foucault sees it, the power dispositive of sexuality becomes intertwined with dispositives, strategies and overarching

---

60  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 105. In some literature, the interlinking of concerns with relations of truth, fields of power and ethical formation/the body has been considered within retracings of Foucault's 'genealogical' method of historical analysis: Michel Foucault, 'On the Genealogy of Ethics: an Overview of Work in Progress,' in *The Foucault Reader,* ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 351f.; Robert Gillett, 'Foucault's Genealogy,' in *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century,* ed. Lisa Downing (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018), 17ff.; Michel Mahon, *Foucault's Nitzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power, and the Subject* (Albany, N.Y.: State Univ. of New York Press, 1992); Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* pt. 2, 101ff.

61  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 94.

62  Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 1, 121f., tr. DQ. The force-relations that are internal to the dispositive in its original location pre-determine emergent strategic relations. Hurley's translation is misleading in its suggestion of self-organisation, whereas the French text emphasises the foundational importance of original practices that are internal and distinctive to dispositives of power: Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 92.

rationalities that describe the shifting power situation of the modern age.

## *(2) Pentecostal empowerment*

In an interview (published in 1977) Foucault sums up his concern

with sexuality as a power dispositive, using the following words:

> What I want to show is how power relations can materially penetrate the body in depth, without depending even on the mediation of the subject's own representations.  If power takes hold of the body, this isn't through its having first to be interiorised in people's consciousness.[63]

Through the modern dispositive of sexuality and embodied pleasure, the

operation of power has direct access to the human body and is able to

evoke all kinds of effects in the 'modern soul.'[64]  Thereby, human self-

understanding—and thus consciousness—may be bypassed.[65]  Precisely the

same is to be said of Pentecostal/charismatic power in the experience of

divine 'anointing,' 'glory' or 'presence,' as it operates upon—and

impacts—human bodies/emotions.[66]  As will be demonstrated, the economy

---

63  Foucault, 'History of Sexuality,' 186.

64  Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 23.

65  Foucault, 'History of Sexuality,' 186; French: Foucault, 'Les rapports de pouvoir passent à l'intérieur des corps,' in *Dits et écrits 1954–1988,* vol. 3, *1976–1979,* ed. Daniel Defert and François Ewald (Paris: Gallimard, 1994), no. 197, 228ff.

66  'To use Foucauldian terms, the Holy Spirit [...] generally represents a form or "technology" of divine power that operates on and through individuals.'

of Spirit presence in Pentecostal/charismatic contexts may also operate

*directly,* and with deep/pervasive impact, upon human bodies and

embodied sensations/emotions—without requiring reflective mediation, i.e.

often bypassing people's conscious understanding and self-understanding.

This occurs e.g. in those powerful formative experiences which

Pentecostals/charismatics refer to as Spirit baptism or personal spiritual

breakthrough, often inducing processes in which Pentecostal seekers

perceive themselves to 'come' and 'move,' both in and under, 'the power of

the Spirit,' experiencing a spiritual-embodied 'refreshing,' 'renewal' or

'transformation.'  Though Pentecostals/charismatics also experience

'lighter,' less forceful forms of encounter and revelation of the divine, they

have a tendency to treat 'deeper'-going and more significant breakthrough

experiences—i.e. those which are life transforming and create meaning as

being formative and paradigmatic.

---

Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 117; cf. James D. G. Dunn, *Theology of Paul,* 76f. Fuggle's subsequent consideration that 'spirit [sic!] can be regarded as embodying a discourse of power that defines individual existence and as such is contrasted to flesh, which is also a discourse' identifies one—and only one—relevant relation between embodiment, 'technology,' discourse, identity formation and power, according to pentecostal spiritual experience/ practice: Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 117.  Here a cost is paid for Fuggle, with Deleuze and many post-secular political philosophers who turn to Foucault, Paul and the Christian-doctrinal tradition, opting for a 'univocal concept of power' whereas Foucault's research engages 'at the level of specific power relations and operations, and consequently his project never extends beyond challenging the identities and truths produced by such operations with alternative identities and truths:' Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 178; cf. Agamben, *Kingdom and Glory;* cf. Leshem, *Origins of Neoliberalism.*

Pentecostal-religious experience is obviously different from modern sexuality, as Foucault understands it. However, one may redeploy Foucault's interconnected analytical dimensions as a means of guiding an analysis and understanding of Pentecostal anointing, i.e. embodied experience of divine presence/power. A Foucauldian interpretation is helpful in clarifying that which is characteristic concerning Pentecostal-embodied experience within the wider 'surface network' of late-modern power relations. It can be applied to: analyse e.g. historical self-witness accounts of Spirit baptism and religious breakthrough; and to show how, in spiritual journeys which lead from embodied liminality to religious breakthrough, disparate dispositive dimensions become interlinked. These can be analogously identified with the structure of Foucault's 'sexuality' as being: (1) embodied experience; (2) discourse/truth creation; (3) religious self-practice; and (4) resistance to power. The dispositives and wider power relations of embodied-Pentecostal experiences and knowledge, again, create heterogeneous-relational surface networks (6). Upon these, a distributed-divine power, presence and agency 'in the Holy Spirit' may emerge—'where it chooses' (John 3:8)—alongside other strategic (Pentecostal) power relations of all kinds. Chapter 6 ventures deeper into an exploration of the living power relations of such an emergent-divine presence, power and move. This chapter will conclude with considerations

on the remaining dispositive dimension (5): On the basis of a Foucauldian understanding of Pentecostal(-embodied) anointing as a modern dispositive, one can expect both opportunities, as well as a need, for theological/pastoral discourse to emanate; and also for embodied-Pentecostal identities, ministries and courses of action to evolve or be transformed. In terms of methodology, it is by determining changes and relational links, among these six analytical dimensions, that one comes to an understanding regarding the workings of the Foucauldian dispositive of Pentecostal experience/power and how, along with its relating discursive relations and perceptions of divine presence, it facilitates the construction of Christian-Pentecostal agency (identity, ministry, course of action).[67]

One could argue that volume one of Foucault's *The History of Sexuality* demonstrates how (since the late 1960s) a contemporary sense that liberation, purpose, community, 'love' and joy emanating from 'good sex'—or, less scandalously, from 'enjoying oneself'—subverts a previous,

---

67  Carrette points out 'how his [Foucault's] critique of the discourse of sexuality is equally applicable to religious concepts.' As with 'sexuality,' theological discourse connects with power to facilitate embodied-religious practices and the formation of self, 'both at the macro level of institutional order and at the micro level of individual subjectification.' However, Foucault's understanding of Christianity 'is [...] diminished by his over-dependency on confession as the central and most important tenet of the religion.' Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 149, 145 and 28.

normalising-disciplinary power regime and paradigm of the 'good life.'[68]

Spirit baptism and Pentecostal/charismatic spirituality operate in exactly

the same way, and bring about comparable effects. It will be shown below,

that Pentecostal breakthrough and embodied resistance—at least

momentarily—disturb the hold of modern-normalising, disciplinary and

hierarchical power practices and strategies. The 'sexual revolution,' Hippie

rebellion and counterculture were overtaken by hedonistic consumerism

and a hard-nosed rationality of economic self-interest[69] which—now also

past its sell-by date—has spawned neo-fascist rage and narcissism.

Obviously, this is an unduly rough sketch of today's political situation.

However, if today, we are living—once again—through some kind of

epochal transition with regards to the predominant power regime, a

question must be asked that corresponds to the one which 'Dialectical'

theologians had to answer in 1933 and 1934: Whether or not Pentecostal

and charismatic-embodied calculation and courage, precisely because of its

comparable power structure/rationale, has the potential to facilitate—or

strengthen—*another* empowered and salvific resistance, liberation and

counterculture which engage today's 'powers that be.' This research is

only able to take some preliminary steps towards such an exploration.

---

68  Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 156f.

69  Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics,* 226 and 268ff.

## 5.4  Spirit baptism in Azusa Street testimonies

To come to an understanding of the nature of Pentecostal experience and its relevant power dimensions, a small but characteristic selection of testimonies and published personal accounts of Spirit baptisms shall be reviewed, which emerged from the 1906 Los Angeles revival.  Many were published by the Azusa Street mission at the time, and can be accessed via the web page of the Flower Pentecostal Heritage Centre (Springfield, Missouri).[70]  Events at an obscure mission in down-town Azusa Street eventually led to the creation of denominational church bodies of classical Pentecostalism, and had an impact on Pentecostal and charismatic movements in other parts of the world.

The three testimonies which have been selected for a more detailed examination are representative of both the general nature and general variety of testimonies published in the mission's monthly newspaper, as well as in other places.[71]  This includes different ethnic and gendered

---

70  [Apostolic Faith Mission], *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles), 13 iss. (1906–1908), ifphc.org.

71  As one considers later Azusa Street accounts and testimonies, further theological differention is added.  Republication of Azusa Street testimonies, also from other sources: Larry E. Martin, ed., *The True Believers: Holy Ghost Revival on Azusa Street* (Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 1998); Martin, ed., *Saved and Sanctified: Formerly Published as* The True Believers

perspectives: two female, one male and one black voice.  The analysed

texts are amongst the more reflective—more vocal and more detailed—

voices.  Crawford and Moore were amongst the first to join the revival;

Durham joined early in 1907.  All became key members of Seymour's

ministry team and were influential in their different Pentecostal groups

when the movement split.[72]  Of course, the Azusa Street Revival of 1906–

1908 continues to be seen as paradigmatic and significant by Pentecostals

and charismatics all around the world, including in today's (largely North

American) Pentecostal academic-theological discourse.[73]  This remains to

be the case although Anderson convincingly argued that the narrative of

Los Angeles as the single point of origin of a 'latter-rain Pentecost' is

historically unsustainable and, in recognition of the culturally informed

diversity—Hollenweger's 'black root'—[74]of global Pentecostalisms, would

appear to be inappropriate and unhelpful.[75]  One must not feed American

Part 2; *Holy Ghost Revival on Azusa Street* (Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2005); Martin, ed., *The Chosen Vessels: Holy Ghost Revival on Azusa Street* (Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2010).  Robeck introduces Spirit baptism at the mission through six testimonies, including Durham's: Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 177ff.

72  Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 67ff., 91, 99ff., 173, 214ff., 299ff. and 315ff.

73  Robeck, 'Origins of Modern Pentecostalism;' Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism,* 18ff.; Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality;* Macchia, *Baptized in the Spirit;* Smith, *Thinking in Tongues.*

74  Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism,* 18ff.

75  Anderson, *Spreading Fires.*

exceptionalism; and neither should one overextend the possibilities of generalisation:  Taking Deleuze's differential-metaphysical proposition into account, one would be better to avoid analogical 'representation' and instead consider creative-analytical 'repetition' and multiplication ('difference') of occurrence, as well as its understanding.[76]  One, therefore, should not expect the conclusion of this chapter to be that of an analogical transferability of an analytical understanding of 'Asuza Street Spirit baptism experiences,' in terms of a generalisable paradigm that is 'representative' of global-Pentecostal empowerment.  One would, instead, be better to consider a distributed, ethnographic-descriptive testing—a multiplication of learning—which analyses and accounts for both specific and different global-Pentecostal experiences/practices and modes of empowerment.

---

76  'This is a complete reversal of the world of representation, and of the sense that "identical" and "similar" had in that world.  This reversal is not merely speculative but eminently practical, since it defines the conditions of legitimate use of the words "identical" and "similar" by linking them exclusively to simulacra, while denouncing the ordinary usage made from the point of view of representation.  [...]  The true distinction is not between the identical *and* the same, but between the identical, the same or the similar—it matters little which, once these are posited as primary on various grounds—and the identical, the same or the similar understood as secondary powers, but all the more powerful as such, turning around difference, being said of difference itself.'  Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition,* 301, orig. emph.

*(1) Florence Crawford*

Florence Crawford published her testimony in 1909 in the Portland *Apostolic Faith.*[77] It is almost completely paradigmatic to the three-stage blessing of the Holy Spirit which was taught at the Azusa Street mission (and later in Portland, under her leadership): conversion, subsequent sanctification and eventual the Spirit baptism of Acts 2.[78]

*(a) First Spirit breakthrough*

Leading a self-confident, secular life as an educated young woman, Crawford repeatedly witnessed an audible inner voice—'from heaven,' she writes—asking her to consecrate her life to God ('Daughter, give Me thine heart.'). She went through a period of inner struggle ('for three days and nights, I prayed and wept and wrestled for my salvation'). This was

---

77 [Florence Crawford], 'A Witness to the Power of God,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Portland, Or.) 21 (1912): 3, ifphc.org. A second version was published 1936, repub. in Florence Crawford, 'The Light of Life Brought Triumph,' in *Saved and Sanctified,* ed. Martin, 95ff. Early versions of Crawford's testimony: Crawford, 'Testimony and Praise To God,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 9 (September 1907): 4, ifphc.org; Crawford, 'A Cheering Testimony,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 11 (January 1908): 4. On Crawford: Estrelda Y. Alexander, *Limited Liberty: the Legacy of Four Pentecostal Woman Pioneers* (Cleveland, Oh.: Pilgrim, 2008), 29ff.

78 [William J. Seymour], 'The Apostolic Faith Movement,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 2; Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 119ff.

followed by a conversion experience under the guidance of a Christian whom she knew: 'I fell on my face where I was, [...] and we prayed and God saved my soul.'[79] Crawford writes that she experienced her 'soul' being 'flooded' by 'rest,' 'peace' and 'quietness;' and she 'wept for joy.' One should expect an emotional reaction at the sudden end a period of emotional distress; however such an observation misses the point; at least from the point of view of Pentecostals seeking to identify evidence of the work and presence of God's Spirit.[80] According to her narrative, the Christian lady saw Crawford's spiritual-emotional distress in her countenance; now her friends back at home could see 'the light of another world on my face,' in line with Crawford's own sense of internal change. The new inner presence of God is further corroborated by a visible change of Crawford's appearance and way of life ('The flowers went, the feathers, the jewelry [sic!], the fine clothes').[81] This, Crawford writes, also proved to be convincing and compelling to others around, and, with a new love for 'lost souls' which led her to tears, Crawford gave an effective witness by which others too were 'saved.' Testified personally embodied experience and external observation affirm, together, the new truth about the new

---

79  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

80  Cf. James, *Varieties of Religious Experience,* 1ff.

81  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

convert's story and embodied-inner sense of change. Alongside this, it also

reaffirms (and changes) a knowledge of God and the appropriateness of a

theological-teaching paradigm. Crawford's truth—experience—identity

dispositive contains the power not only to prompt processes of inner

change, but also to prompt change in others.[82]

Luhrmann proposes that Pentecostals experience God via sets of

specific experience, sensations and imaginations which they have learned

to construct as 'not-me.' By way of 'sensory override,' a voice, image or

sense of embodied presence can be perceived as external, manifest and

alive.[83] Such an explanation seems also to be plausible here. However, one

should take into account that the experience of a divine presence which can

be explained, may be—or become—real to the Pentecostal seeker.

Explanation with reference to psychology and formation of the brain does

not resolve concerns with religious truth.[84] At the same time, Pentecostal

seekers and worshippers are not simply 'believers' who engage the divine

as if God was existent, relevant and true, with regards to all their inner and

external experiences, in exactly the same way and manner on every

---

82  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

83  Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 40f., 216f. and 231ff.

84  James, *Varieties of Religious Experience,* 1ff.

occasion.[85]  Researchers looking into spiritual experience as power—

although theologically or sociologically trained to disagree—should take

heed when their Pentecostal informants introduce subtle differentiations in

the way in which they relate/qualify a divine presence, relevance,

engagement or realm, in different sections of their account.[86]

Crawford's conversion and subsequent Pentecostal-breakthrough

experiences (below) imply a shift in the power regime, self-perception and

emotional life, attached as they were to her body.  Induced by an inner

voice, the young convert went through processes including emotional

struggles (weeping and wrestling), and a breaking open—in part—of her

previous attitudes, knowledge and identity.  Crawford's embodied-spiritual

journey culminated in tears of compassion at conversion breakthrough:

moving from emotional crisis to release.  To Crawford, God, through some

form of audible voice, had induced the process in which she fostered the

hope for a religious breakthrough.  However, in her testimony, she *self-*

*attributes* her anterior crisis experience as the outcome of an emotional

---

85  Bruno Latour, 'Cult of the Factish Gods;' Latour, 'Thou Shall Not Freeze
    Frame.'

86  '[...] sociologists of associations should keep as their most cherished treasure
    all the traces that manifest the hesitations actors themselves feel about the
    "drives" that make them act.'  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 47; ibid.,
    46ff.  Cf. James*:* 'God is real since he produces real effects.'  James,
    *Varieties of Religious Experience,* 517.

journey of disassembling and the reduction of her previous embodied

confidence and personality.  She attributes the subsequent experience of

breakthrough and release however, to the work/presence of God.  Up until a

certain point, she references psychological processes before introducing a

divine power and actor.  Crawford's accounts of a change in the relations of

power which attached to her body: a power takeover, relating to divine

presence or some kind of invisible-spiritual realm.  If Crawford's

experience of peace and joy, during the initial moment of finding God's

love, is experienced and interpreted as a filling with the Holy Spirit, then

the joy and encouragement of witnessing an external impact that correlates

with her 'changed' inner person, as well as an embodied compassion for

others and the (externally) effective witness by which 'lost souls' get saved,

can be seen as a consequential work of God; or as further Pentecostal

evidence that it must truly have been God who had filled her 'heart.'

People's reactions to Crawford's renewed person—presence even—in turn,

qualifies and further enhances the conversion process, experience and its

understanding in terms of 'being filled by the Spirit.'


*(b)  Second Spirit breakthrough*

At a later point, Crawford records that she became emotionally 'so

hungry for God.'[87]  At a Holiness tent meeting, this 'hunger' was directed

towards pursuing (Wesleyan) 'complete sanctification;' however, for a

prolonged time, Crawford did not experience her breakthrough.[88]

'Sanctification' also, as an embodied-emotional experience of a filling by

divine 'power' (Crawford identified hers as 'fire' rather than a 'flood')[89]

was prepared through a journey of seeking and by 'consecration,' i.e.

surrender of her entire human existence.  It was a result of a prolonged and

frustrating pursuit of a sanctification experience, of spiritual 'hunger' and

'thirst,'[90] that Crawford attended meetings at the Azusa Street mission.

There, she experienced embodied-emotional resonances in her spirit

reflecting that which occurred spiritually in the worshipping community in

the locality, at the time.[91]

> Finally a big black man got up on his feet and said, 'Hallelujah!'  It just
> went into my soul.  He waited a minute and again he said, 'Hallelujah!'  I
> said, 'God, I have heard the voice from Heaven.  I have heard it at last.'
> You say, 'Is there anything in a Hallelujah?'  Yes, there is a lot in it when

---

87  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

88  Crawford, 'Light of Life,' 96.

89  'Oh, it was wonderful, the rest, the peace, the quietness that flooded my soul.
    [...]  And while I lived a consecrated life, yet the fire had not fallen on the
    sacrifice.'  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

90  'The hunger, the craving, the thirst that was in my heart, no human could
    know unless they had it.'  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

91  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

it has the Spirit back of it.[92]

An interweaving occurs between the perceptions of external and inner-embodied realities which produces an experience of enchantment and change, impacting both the internal and external—as well as their connection—within a single realm, reality and play of the Spirit, as it arises from the internal—external experience and recognition.[93] At the meeting, it was in a preacher's 'Hallelujah!' that Crawford felt God's Spirit engage with her. 'The first "hallelujah" I heard echoed down in my soul.'[94] In the longer quote above, Crawford identifies the preacher's praise with the voice of God. She is however aware that a reference to a contingently embodied, private perception, in terms of divine action, always remains ambiguous and open to scepticism.[95] In her testimony, Crawford text-pragmatically restages the play of controversy: this was just a black preacher's 'Hallelujah!' but the Spirit's resonance and embodied witness made it be so much more. To some extent, the credibility of this kind of controversial religious claim depends upon the social credibility and

---

92  Crawford, 'Light of Life,' 97.

93  Luhrmann's exceptional ethnography misses to account of the interweaving of external events and observations: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back.*

94  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

95  Piette, *Religion de près,* 95ff.; Latour, *Rejoicing,* 19ff.; Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* xiiif., 69, 71 and 73ff.

reputation of the person who is recounting the event. At the same time, the mere contemplation of the possibility of divine action, in relationship to Crawford's experience (and witness), induces even Pentecostal readers to participate in a certain embodied-Pentecostal attentiveness/openness towards divine presence and interaction.

'Consecration' plays a central role in Crawford's understanding and self-practice relating to the preparation for spiritual breakthrough. Sanctification relates to self-consecration, but is a distinctive, subsequent experience:

> You surrender your will, your innermost soul and being to God for time and eternity; and that brings the *fire of God,* the holy, sanctifying flame down on the sacrifice. And your whole being is saturated with the presence and power of another world.[96]

Crawford had not only rejected convenient spiritual/theological fixes that were ready to hand; but her higher-religious and biblical expectations, convictions and hopes were frustrated and eroded. After a prolonged period of unsuccessful longing, seeking, doubt and self-doubt, her consecration brought her even deeper into a place of personal vulnerability, liminality and need.[97] Self-consecration to God is a hierarchical self-

---

96   Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

97   Consider the Deleuzean liberation-theological concept of 'becoming-minoritarian:' Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 48ff. and 123f.; Barber,

practice by which Pentecostals submit to an invisible-divine power, prophetic revelation or biblical truth.  It requires a degree of undoing/ unlearning of hierarchical self-possession and assertive-reflective self-knowledge, which makes a Pentecostal breakthrough experience in a liminal place more likely.  A person's embodied identity, self-understanding and emotions becoming unsettled at a deeper level, allowing for a subsequent spiritual experience to be more overwhelming; to penetrate deeper into more essential layers of embodied identity formation; to facilitate more fundamental and further-reaching embodied changes of a seeker's experience and course of action.

Crawford's embodied experience of being filled by consuming 'fire' may, again, correspond to the previous, prolonged, emotional struggle and 'hunger' for God's work in her; yet it also carries an emotional excess and an excess of meaning.  Emotionally, Crawford is overwhelmed by what, subsequent to consecration, she experiences as coming from the outside.

---

*Deleuze,* 91ff.; DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 275ff. and 291ff.; Paul Patton, *Deleuze and the Political* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 78ff.; Ian Buchanan, *Deleuzism: a Metacommentary* (Durham, N. C.: Duke Univ. Press; Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press; 2000), 93ff.; Patrick McLane, 'Majoritarian/Minoritarian,' in *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 111f.; Cliff Stagoll, 'Becoming,' in *The Deleuze Dictionary,* ed. Adrian Parr, rev. edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010), 25ff.; Verena Conley, 'Minoritarian,' in *Deleuze Dictionary,* 166ff.

The bodily experience at the Azusa Street mission of being filled by God's Spirit—which radical-Holiness Pentecostals understand to be 'complete sanctification'—was distinctly physical. 'The fire fell and God sanctified me. The power of God went through me like thousands of needles.'[98] Crawford connects the baptism of 'power'/'fire' with further biblical-symbolic meaning. The believer's whole life and body is understood—and experienced—to be consumed on God's altar as 'a living sacrifice' (Romans 12:1); her body and soul became purified, transformed by 'fire;' which prepares her for the eschatological meeting with Jesus, the church's 'bridegroom' (cf. Song of Songs and Ephesians 5:22ff.). The symbolism of virginity, intimacy and desire resonates with the young, unmarried woman:

> It is the purity that God demands for the wife of His Son. [...] The holy, living flame burns through every fibre of your being. Oh, how I thank God it was for me.[99]

From a place of previous emotional vulnerability and doubt, Crawford experiences 'hunger'/'thirst' for God's presence and work within; the self-attribution of this biblical symbolism, which is remarkable and rich in its own right, extends and further enhances an already powerful emotional experience.[100] Whilst the knowledge that embraces a certain biblical

---

98  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

99  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

100 Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

teaching could be considered to be self-attributed, its overawing experience may no longer be perceived or described as coming from a self-contained within.[101]  Accordingly and appropriately, the baptism in sanctifying 'fire' is experienced as being 'poured out' and 'poured in'—this imagery, again, resonating with scripture—from the outside and from above.  In the following days, Crawford, still 'in the presence,' continues to reaffirm (to herself) the falling and inpouring of the Spirit-as-fire; believing that it has created a lastingly different state of affairs in her body, person and soul.[102]

The 1936 version of Crawford's testimony provides more detail which, in a peculiar way, reconnects with her 'hallelujah' experience earlier that evening.  During her tram journey home, Crawford records that she 'spiritually' mishears the announcement of the different stops:

> As I went home on the streetcar that night, I didn't know whether I was walking on the earth or in the air and it didn't matter.  When we would come to a street, the conductor would seem to call out, 'Praise the Lord!'  The next street would be 'Glory to God!'  I wondered what my street would be.  When we came to it, I heard, 'Hallelujah!'  'Oh,' I said, 'That is my street!'  I went to my home, and I just threw up my hands and cried out, 'He sanctified me!'[103]

---

101 Cf. Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 234f.

102 '"He sanctified me" were the only words I could speak for days after the fire fell on my heart.'  Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

103 Crawford, 'Light of Life,' 98.

The embodied and external channels, modes and means by which—according to Pentecostal accounts—the Spirit impacts, reveals, operates and acts can be of a great variety, even within a single processual relation. Here, as often occurs, coherence was created discursively, through symbolic—biblical, theological or prophetic—relations of meaning. Coherence can also emerge, on the side of continuity or repetition of embodied mode, sensation and flow, in which Pentecostals perceive divine presence and revelation (with varying messages and meanings). For a number of days, Crawford experienced herself to be in an uninterrupted flow of divine presence.

New knowledge and self-knowledge emanate from a Spirit baptism. In her Spirit experience, Crawford embraced a 'biblical'-theological understanding whilst, at the same time, experiencing a deeply personal and embodied-emotional reality. Like many others at Azusa Street, she accounts that this made it impossible for her to ever go back. 'If you get what I got, you will never deny it. It will stand when you face all hell. You can weather any storm.'[104] As a Pentecostal blessing and divine move is received from a place of 'hunger' and humility, concluding in an embodied experience of being filled, renewed and empowered, it also induces or

---

104 Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

facilitates changes in the seeker's sense of standing and calling, and a self-affirmed resilience in adversity. (*'[...] voilà les éléments du dispositif.*')[105] Although some aspects of such a transformed self-knowledge and embodied resilience remain questionable, unbalanced or flawed, it is nevertheless biblical and holistic in the sense that it encompasses: a renewed-embodied experience; reactivated ('translated') embodied memories of previous spiritual experiences/journeys; a (self-appropriated) biblical and prophetical understanding; and within—and across—these interwoven dimensions, a trust, hope and embodied experience of God's living power and love.

*(c) Third Spirit breakthrough*

The Acts 2 Spirit baptism which Crawford experienced a few days later, as a subsequent (third) Spirit filling was also prepared by a (Spirit induced?) sense of 'great hunger,' a spiritual/embodied understanding, tarrying, prayer, and consecration going 'deeper and deeper.'[106] It would appear that previous spiritual and breakthrough experiences have the

---

105 Foucault, 'Jeu de Foucault,' 299.

106 'Three days later, after living with Jesus alone, a terrible hunger seized me and down I went before God. And He showed me I must be baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire. [...] And how I plead with Him and prayed and praised God and consecrated. Yes, I consecrated again deeper and deeper and sought for the power to tell the world what great things God had done for me.' Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

capacity to inform the way in which subsequent, further-reaching experiences are prepared and created. Crawford accounts for the falling of the Spirit in a language which recalls Acts 2:2. From her account, it is not clear as to whether she was alone, or whether other were present, who bore witness as 'a rushing mighty wind filled the room.' Besides her 'speaking in Chinese'[107]—in the 1936 booklet, she claims that this was confirmed by a Chinese-born man—[108] Crawford's embodied experience seems to have been similar to that of her sanctification experience. Crawford would reason that 'clean vessels' must be prepared through 'sanctification' to receive the Holy Ghost; she would emphasise that this final breakthrough, only, was the Spirit baptism of an 'Acts 2 Pentecost.' At the same time however, her third experience of spiritual breakthrough—just as much as her preparatory self-practice and understanding—were also informed by her previous embodied Spirit encounters. In this third embodied breakthrough experience, Crawford witnessed a shaking of her 'being' (body?) and, once again, a water-like infilling as 'rivers of joy and divine love flooded my soul.' In accordance with the Azusa Street official teaching, Crawford claims that in this third baptism 'I had received the

---

107 Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

108 Crawford, 'Light of Life,' 99.

power to witness to lost souls that they might find Jesus.'[109]  Thereby, Crawford does not record the evidence of her evangelistic effectiveness 'in the Spirit' of her empowered witness and embodied presence, even after her (stage-one) conversion breakthrough.

*(d)  Bodily healing*

After this, Crawford asked people to pray for her health.  She claims restoration of her eyesight (loss due to meningitis), and later prayed for herself concerning 'lung trouble' (asthma or bronchitis?) and other health issues.  Crawford recounts this night of prayer for healing as another journey in emotional proximity with God, together with embodied experiences of presence.

> As I lay on my bed, I would open my soul to God, and every avenue of my life, to the heavenly streams that seemed to flow through every fibre of my being.[110]

Crawford's experience of God's presence and her methods of approach— seeking, prayer, consecration, standing in God's manifest presence—appear to routinise.  Crawford's healings would seem to be accompanied by a sense of a healing power or healing streams which 'flow' through her body or its relevant body parts, that, as an experience of Spirit presence, are not

---

109 Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

110 Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

too dissimilar from her previous Spirit-breakthrough experiences.  There

seems to be repetition and evolution at each point of a new tapping into the

reservoirs of previous spiritual practices, processes and experiences.[111]

Crawford's biblical-doctrinal frame of reference is different in each case:

justification, sanctification, Spirit baptism, seeking healing.  Again in line

with the Azusa Street theological position, Crawford in conclusion of her

testimony claims, she was completely healed and restored in her body.[112]


In its four parts, Crawford's Portland testimony reproduces the 'three

works,' plus seeking healing in the Spirit, that Seymour had repeatedly

republished and distributed as the mission's official statement of faith.[113]

Crawford presents her personal journey as a paradigm that substantiates

that which, according to her understanding, is a standard biblical-

experiential order of Pentecostal-Christian experience.  Crawford notably

omits some of her biographic embodied challenges, e.g. that she was left by

her husband when she became a revivalist.  Perhaps this did not fit the

---

111 Cf. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition.*

112 Crawford, 'Witness to the Power.'

113 [William J. Seymour], 'The Apostolic Faith Movement,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 2; Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 119ff.

doctrinal paradigm or the narrative rationale. Early versions of her

testimony evidence that, to Crawford's way of thinking, biblical-

theological affirmation may take precedence over biographic content and

ordering.[114] It is therefore more than a possibility that Crawford selects and

formalises her experiences to fit a doctrinal mould. What is happening

here, is a lesser form of what DG call 'overcoding;'[115] a less violent and

less destructive form, since the doctrinal sequence—in some sense—had

temporal priority and directed much of the embodied quest for Spirit

baptism at Azusa Street; and undoubtedly, it also suited Crawford's

spiritual journey at large. Some of Crawford's embodied experiences 'in

the Spirit' however remain contingent and cannot be contained within the

standard mould of their framing: Pentecostal experience cannot be fully

contained: After her 'sanctification,' Crawford spiritually mishearing

streetcar-stop announcements, was completely unexpected and—in a

strange way—beyond biblical precedence. For this reason precisely, it is

possible to interpret this as evidence of a divine that is active and alive.

---

114 Crawford, 'Testimony and Praise To God;' Crawford, 'Cheering Testimony.'

115 'All the coded flows of the primitive machine are now forced into a bottleneck, where the despotic machine overcodes them. Overcoding is the operation that constitutes the essence of the State, and that measures both its continuity and its break with the previous formations: the dread of flows of desire that would resist coding, but also the establishment of a new inscription that overcodes, and that makes desire into the property of the sovereign, even though he be the death instinct itself.' DG, *Anti-Oedipus,* 199.

However, its spiritual-revelatory relevance can only be maintained on the basis that it reasserts a previous message/impulse which had already been accepted as the Spirit's voice accompanying a recognised biblical-salvific work. Many possibilities of discourse—relevant biblical insight, teaching paradigms, testimony narratives, church gossip—emanate from more common—or freak—religious experiences. Only those Pentecostal experiences, practices and enunciations that can be interwoven within a network of biblical reference, theological and pragmatic plausibility, are likely to be stabilized—thus secured—for future and distributed Pentecostal practice. This includes the emergent creation of innovative power dispositives.

*(2) William Durham*

A greater level of deviation from the Azusa Street teaching standard can be found in the other two testimonies which shall be examined. Durham's testimony was published in March 1907 in the Azusa Street *Apostolic Faith* journal.[116] It also follows the conversion—sanctification—Azusa Street Spirit baptism paradigm. However, there is significant

---

116 W[illiam] H. Durham, 'A Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 6 (February/March 1907): 4.

difference.

## (a) Conversion

Durham identifies his conviction, repentance and finding divine mercy, as being mediated 'through the Bible and the Spirit moving upon me,' in line with the Methodist paradigm.[117] According to his testimony, this again implies: a spiritual-experiential and embodied—albeit 'Pentecostal'—dimension and journey; a 'deep conviction' leading to 'earnest seeking' and a 'true repentance,' pleading for mercy and eventually an embodied-inner (emotional) revelation; the marrying of this experience with the audition of a revelatory word; and—similar to Crawford's conversion—the accompanied infilling of peace and joy.

> He revealed to my heart Christ dying on the cross, and His voice whispered to me, 'Christ died for your sins.' Instantly my heart believed, and His peace flooded my soul, and the joy of His salvation was wonderful to me.[118]

Furthermore, this assembled dispositive is very much in line with Wesleyan theological teaching.

---

117 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

118 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

*(b) Empowered ministry and growth*

Durham initially embraced subsequent sanctification as a normative biblical teaching, which then began a spiritual-experiential process. Whilst Durham honours the common Holiness teaching paradigm, he does not seem to consider his sanctification to be a significant breakthrough experience and does not provide much detail. He eventually experienced a call to ministry. Even before the Azusa Street revival, Durham could be considered a 'Pentecostal' by virtue of several interconnected features of his experience and ministry. He was already a successful travelling evangelist preacher who saw significant numbers of people coming to faith, seeking sanctification and even experiencing bodily healing. Durham emphasises, '[...] all these years the Spirit has been with me in a wonderful way. Sometimes I would be overcome by His power.'[119]

*(c) Painful revelation*

Despite his Spirit experience and evident ministry success, Durham records that he became dissatisfied in himself: 'for a year the heart hunger has increased.'[120] Again, a time of embodied struggle with a pervasive engagement of relations of power prepared him for an experiential-spiritual

119 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'
120 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

breakthrough.  Durham points out that the Azusa Street revival opened up a

power which moved him spiritually beyond the processual development

that one can expect; further than that of his experience of progress in

sanctification thus far, 'and the anointings and fillings that followed.'[121]

Durham had immediately identified the revival as the work of God.  But it

took him some time to embrace the Azusa Street teaching concerning the

Spirit baptism and glossolalia of Acts 2.  Perhaps as a result of his cultural

background—Durham was a Caucasian male who had undergone

theological training and worked successfully in the capacity of a Holiness

preacher—doctrinal acceptance took priority over the embarkation upon a

spiritual-experiential journey ('not understanding it I rejected it').[122]

Durham also mentions an encounter with a preacher, H. L. Blake from

Minnesota,[123] who, at first, had also held on to traditional Holiness beliefs.

It would seem that the power dispositive of doctrinal knowledge, together

with professional standing, educated self-understanding and a relating inner

pride, accounts for such a difficulty.  Bartleman points out that

pastors/preachers, in general, experienced a difficulty in playing a

---

121 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

122 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

123 Cf. H. L. Blake, '"Everywhere Preaching the Word,"' *The Apostolic Faith*
(Los Angeles) 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 1.

constructive role in the spiritual processes at the Azusa Street mission.[124]

Durham nevertheless identified glossolalia as a blessing to reach out for and prophetically—in a mode which he does not clarify—writes that 'the Lord impressed me' to visit Los Angeles.[125] When it comes to prophetic revelation, symbolic relations—the content/meaning of the message—often matters more than the channels and means by which it is perceived/received.

Durham provides an account as to the way in which atmospheres and relationships were special at the mission. Overall, Durham's appraisal stresses very similar points to those highlighted by Bartleman in his well-known Azusa Street revival witness account.[126] For example, Durham was impressed by 'the love of unity' which he witnessed, but fails to point out the black leadership and cross-racial unity. Could his mention of 'the heavenly sweetness that filled the air that I breathed' be more than figurative language? After all, Durham makes explicit reference to a (quasi-)physical sensation of divine power: he writes that, even at Holiness camp meetings and conventions, he had 'never felt the power and glory that

124 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 60.

125 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

126 Bartleman, *How Pentecost.* This should not surprise, considering both were partners in ministry, for a season.

I felt in Azusa Street Mission.'[127]  In view of the general ambiguity of often

unfamiliar—yet powerful—phenomena and the absence of appropriate

normative-theological controls, it is the display of biblical, ethical, and

otherwise desirable features/effects (here: love, unity, 'sweetness,' power,

glory) through—or alongside—new religious experiences, outpourings and

movements, which count for evidence towards a theological assessment

that affirms whether or not a new move or phenomenon derives from God

and 'the Spirit.'[128]

Durham also recounts the apparently spontaneous-collective practice

of the gift of 'new song,' 'when about twenty persons joined in singing the

"Heavenly Chorus."'[129]  So imbued with a degree of holiness was the

singing (the atmosphere?), giving the impression of deriving from an other-

worldly place, that worshippers were only able to join in when they

themselves were 'in the Spirit.'[130]  It was the external—internal witness and

127 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'  Cf. Bartleman's emphasis on
    humility and love as the key to Seymour's leadership and to God taking over
    at the Azusa Street revival: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58ff.

128 Cf. criteria on the discerning of prophetic-Pentecostal impulses: Martin
    Wells Knapp, '*Impressions,'* 4th edn (Cincinnati, Oh.: Revivalist Publishing
    House, 1892).

129 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

130 '[...] it was the most ravishing and unearthly music that ever fell on mortal
    ears.  It seemed and still seems to me, I could not sing in that chorus.  I know
    it came direct from heaven.'  Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'  Cf.

experience of exceptional density of presence, heavenly glory and awe ('I

could not sing in that chorus') that helped Durham embrace a foreign

teaching, and tarry at the mission daily for the Pentecost which they

experienced and preached.  For the next two weeks, Durham engaged in

'earnest,' ongoing prayer.  He received revelation about himself which—to

him—appeared to be a response to his engagement with God.  Durham's

preparatory experience—although he had already prayed from a place of

humility—was a spiritual process of further stripping, involving prophetic

revelation, the mode and experience of which, Durham does not clarify.

This was then personally/emotionally embraced in a process of inner

experience.

> He showed me myself as He saw me.  I can never forget the state of utter
> helplessness to which He reduced me.  He even took away the spirit of
> prayer, my testimony was removed from me, I saw myself apart from
> Christ as it were, and it made me desperate.[131]

This intellectual and experientially embodied process of stripping and

reducing of Durham's assurance, self-perception and acquired capacities

(theological understanding, ability to give public account and prayer) is

---

Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56ff.; cf. [Clara Lum], 'Pentecost Has Come,'
*The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1; Bartleman,
*How Pentecost,* 56; J[enny] M[oore], 'Music from Heaven,' *The Apostolic
Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 8 (May 1907): 3.

131 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

comparable to Crawford's self-practice of consecration.[132]  Only from a

place of deeper, even more comprehensive humility and liminality, could

Durham experience—and receive—a deep encounter with God's Spirit: a

place in which he no longer had reflective control over his ministry,

witness, life and embodied capacities; where a more complete transparency

as to what he and his life were in God's eyes—devoid of that which had

been given by God—is achieved.[133]  Durham's reductive 'stripping'

---

132 Cf. Foucault's reading of de Sade:  'When theology and anthropology have
    provided a conceptual matrix to assert the power and domination of man, the
    collapse of such a structure threatens the whole of male identity and
    precariously throws man back to the reality of his own body.'  Carrette,
    *Foucault and Religion,* 80.  Different to a Foucault's 'spiritual corporality,'
    the pentecostal experience 'of death, discontinuity and isolation' and
    subsequent 'explosion of desire' remain contained by an—albeit
    inconceivable, uncontrollable—divine presence and action: ibid.

133 According to Foucault, there is the possibility of enlarging human potential
    based on a qualified ignorance regarding one's reflective identity: John D.
    Caputo, 'On not Knowing Who We Are: Madness, Hermeneutics and the
    Night of Truth in Foucault,' in *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of
    Religious Experience,* ed. James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette (Aldershot,
    Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004), 117ff.  Consider also
    'becoming-woman,' according to DG facilitating 'imperceptibilit:'  'It is a
    process whose effect consists in destroying both generality and particularity,
    Man and *the* man, but also Woman and *the* woman.  Not even that is enough,
    however, to become properly imperceptible because self-inspection still
    remains; one needs to push past this point too, and only then does one reach
    the blue yonder of imperceptibility, a close-up so extreme that even the one
    of oneself disappears from view.  This is the ultimate aim of all becoming,
    pushing beyond something unbearable to the new, oceanic sensibility and
    logic.' Buchanan, *Deleuzism,* 93, orig. emph.  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,*
    275ff.; Patton, *Deleuze and the Political,* 78ff.; Philip Goodchild, *Deleuze
    and Guattari: an Introduction to the Politics of Desire* (London and
    Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1996), 169ff.; Colebrook, *Understanding
    Deleuze,* 155f.; Holland, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 104ff.; Adkins, *DG's A
    Thousand Plateaus,* 141ff.  On the feminist reception and discussion of the

however, occurred by way of inner revelation by an active divine transferring Durham to a place of embodied desolation, despair and being 'apart from Christ.'  By way of his autobiographic narrative, Durham unpacks the compelling theology of the 'hidden divine' which he experienced; without rendering it reflective or normative, and without engaging the church's doctrine and tradition.[134]  The fact that, amongst all Azusa Street pioneers, Durham is the one who had the ability to do just this, seems relevant to the formation of his journey experience itself.

*(d)  Spirit baptism*

The two-weeks' process of painful reduction was eased and facilitated through the ministry and intercession of a few 'faithful' mission helpers amidst an atmosphere of divine presence and love.  Similar to Crawford's sanctification (!) experience, it was after Durham had been

---

'becoming-woman' concept: Claire Colebrook, 'Introduction Part 1,' in *Deleuze and Gender,* ed. Claire Colebrook and Jami Weinstein (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2008), 1ff.; Verena Andermatt Conley, 'Becoming-Woman Now,' in *Deleuze and Feminist Theory,* ed. Ian Buchanan and Claire Colebrook (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2000), 18ff.; Elizabeth Grosz, 'A Thousand Tiny Sexes: Feminism and Rhizomatics,' *Topoi* 12 (1993): 167ff.

134 Cf. theological readings of Foucault according to which the demise of modern human agency, in terms of the modern control of reality and (male) identity, following the 'death of God,' opens up a space for a new spiritual-embodied engagements with the divine: Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 79ff.; James Bernauer, 'Prisons of Man.'

rendered a blank canvas—step by step—and had his sore need in the absence of God revealed, that his Spirit-baptism experience became emotionally overwhelming. '[...] on a Tuesday afternoon, when very much disheartened, suddenly the power of God descended upon me, and I went down under it.'[135] The experience, symbolism and imagery which Durham invokes is different from Crawford's. He shields the intimacy, meaningful exceptionality and sanctity of the encounter by emphasising that (allegedly) language cannot do justice to the experience, before providing a remarkably detailed account with regards to his bodily sensations during the three meetings in the days that followed. When lying on the floor, he experienced the following:

> It seemed to me that my body had suddenly become porous, and that a current of electricity was being turned on me from all sides; and for two hours I lay under His mighty power, and yet I knew I was not baptized yet, though I literally felt transparent, and a wonderful glory had come into my soul.[136]

Whilst the sense of embodied transparency/permeability could be understood as the direct effect of the inner stripping during the two weeks prior to this, it also corresponds with a filling of body and soul by something like an electric current, respectively 'a wonderful glory.' The

---

135 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

136 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

fact that it was (physically and) emotionally overpowering—again—makes

it near impossible for the seeker to self-attribute the Pentecostal experience.

At the same time, biblical-doctrinal expectation attributes the Pentecostal

filling of one's body, soul and self to divine activity: as the filling, presence

and work of the Holy Spirit.

Two days later, Durham seemed to have—more or less—the same

experience, which amounted to 'a great spiritual uplift,' as he describes it.

Doctrinally, he identifies it as being something other than the Acts 2 Spirit

baptism.  The next evening, Durham's experience was different:

> [...] His mighty power came over me, until I jerked and quaked under it
> for about three hours.  [...]  He worked my whole body, one section at a
> time, first my arms, then my limbs, then my body, then my head, then
> my face, then my chin, and finally at 1 a.m. [...], He finished the work on
> my vocal organs, and spoke through me in unknown tongues.[137]

Crawford provides a list of dimensions of her life which she 'consecrated'

in preparation for her sanctification experience.  Durham, instead, offers a

detailed sequence of his limbs and body parts which the Spirit 'worked,'

took possession of and physically-experientially transformed.  What

exactly occurred remains somewhat mysterious.  Whilst the doctrinally

encouraged hope/expectation was for 'xenolalia'—the speaking in foreign

---

137 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

languages (see Acts 2)—the sequence of strange embodied occurrences did not necessarily lead towards that end.

The psychology of the process of Durham's Spirit baptism—again—is clear:  Lines of displaced dispositive power connect Durham's pre-empowerment embodied processes of being spiritually stripped/revealed with the intensity of his Spirit experience as 'electricity,' 'fire' and 'glory.' Together, both are reactivated in the holistic performance of a sanctified and transformed way of life; empowered from within by an ongoing embodied sense of fire, power, peace and joy.  A Pentecostal seeker/worshipper is the embodiment and concrete realisation of an experiential journey that includes episodes of being awash and overwhelmed by emotion, which appear—and are understood—to flow from an other-worldly, external source; to be 'not me,' which—whilst hoped for with desperation, seems simultaneously foreign and impossible.  In addition, such exceptional experiences affirm a discursively established biblical paradigm and expectation; as distributed and heterogeneous dimensions, aspects and elements are assembled and amalgamated within a single dispositive and power relation which aims at a specific Pentecostal embodiment.

*(e)  After-effects*

From the Pentecostal dispositive emanate different personal-embodied certainties and knowledge relations.  Durham accounts for three: He now had an assuredness of his Spirit baptism beyond the possibility of doubt; that God/the Spirit is 'a living Person;' who 'had come into me, and that He possessed even my physical being, in a literal sense' to do and make happen whatever was God's will.  Furthermore, Durham points out that, over the next few days and weeks, he experienced an embodied-experiential continuity, progress and 'deepening.'[138]

> Then I had such power on me and in me as I never had before.  [...] I had a depth of love and sweetness in my soul that I had never even dreamed of before, and a holy calm possessed me, and a holy joy and peace, that is deep and sweet beyond anything I ever experienced before [...].[139]

In addition to these experiences of ongoing and 'deepening' inner presence, Durham experienced further moves and an ever-renewing strength of the Spirit within.  'My soul is melted over and over again, and many times I feel as if there were, and I believe there is, a dynamo of power in me; [...].'  One should take note as to how truth is asserted discursively on the basis of embodied sensation, amidst a play of words, immediately after its problematic and questionable nature has been established in principle ('I

---

138 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

139 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

feel as if there were, and I believe there is'). The plausibility—truth—of any Pentecostal claim relies upon this acknowledgement of initial ambiguity (more below in chapter 6).[140]

Durham's expression of amazement, 'And O! such victory as He gives me all the time,' connects his embodied experiences at the Azusa Street mission with successive experiences of breakthrough and progress in Spirit-empowered sanctification.[141] With the success of ministry no longer due to one's own professional efforts and work, but to the power of the divine working—in a more profound, more powerful manner—in and through one's Pentecostal body, performance appears effortless; flowing is now from the inner place of 'a holy calm [...], and a holy joy and peace.' In addition, Durham's new witness and message seems to have found a Christian audience who were ready to engage. Following his Azusa Street breakthrough, Durham preached—location after location—in packed meetings, with crowds responding to his altar calls; 'and several came through and spoke in tongues.' In contrast to Durham's difficult and prolonged struggle before his Pentecost, others under Durham's ministry now appear to make Pentecostal experiences much easier. '[...] the Spirit

---

140 Cf. Latour, *Rejoicing.*

141 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

falls like rain wherever I preach His word, and it seems there is no effort on

my part.'  Durham however does not inform us as to how he perceived, and

accounts for, the link between a socially distributed Spirit 'rain' in a church

setting and his own embodied, previous, Spirit experience.  Durham's

ministry practices also remain obscure.  Did he pray for congregations or

for individuals?  Was physical touch involved?  What role did a ministry

team play?  ...  Whatever else was going on, to Durham it was clear that the

inner Spirit filling and change transformed his ministry and its effects

within meetings and congregations.[142]

Durham's fellow Holiness evangelist Crawford also experienced a

notable increase of conversions and Spirit baptisms during meetings after

her Azusa Street breakthrough.[143]  How some of this became possible: how,

e.g., Pentecostal seekers following Azusa Street found it easier to reach

---

142 Consider the practical—and power-analytical—challenge of facilitating the
 Hobbesian 'Leviathan:' Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Callon and Latour,
 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan.'

143 [Clara Lum], 'The Pentecostal Baptism Restored: the Promised Latter Rain
 Now Being Poured Out on God's Humble People,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los
 Angeles) 1, no. 2 (October 1906): 1; [Lum], 'Spreading the Full Gospel,'
 *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 3 (November 1906): 1; The
 Apostolic Faith Mission Winnipeg, 'Winnipeg, Can.,' *The Apostolic Faith*
 (Los Angeles) 1, no. 12 (January 1908): 1; Florence Crawford, 'Minneapolis
 and St. Paul, Minn.,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 12 (January
 1908): 1; J. R. Conlee, 'The Lord Is Speaking in the Earth Today,' *The
 Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 12 (January 1908): 1.

their Pentecostal breakthrough, how ministry became easier, and how people were now ready to receive God, merits further research. However, such questions would also be a concern amongst Pentecostal pioneers. They would seek to encounter the witness of God's Spirit, both within, as well as, without: in other people, other places and other situations. On the basis of their own experiences, observations and understandings, they would explore connections and resonances between such dimensions. Not always being able to account for the surface network and mechanics which facilitate spiritual orchestration, is likely to contribute to a Pentecostal sense and understanding that the divine is alive and in charge.

By today's standards, if 'speaking in tongues' was not constructed as the essential (classical-)Pentecostal marker, revivalists like Durham would be considered 'Pentecostals.' Today's Pentecostals/charismatics would easily identify features of his ministry, teachings and experiences as being 'Pentecostal' in kind. Early Azusa Street testimonies were 'recoded' and 'over-coded,' according to the Holiness-Pentecostal theological paradigm fixed by the mission's leadership. At the same time, authorised teaching could not fully contain the significant variety of highly individualised embodied experiences and journeys; and neither was the leadership in a position to fully manage the theological understanding of seekers from

many Christian backgrounds.  It is known that Durham later proposed to substitute the Holiness paradigm of three consecutive experiential works with an alternative soteriological understanding.[144]  This introduced a first doctrinal split to the emerging 'classical'-Pentecostal movement.

*(3)  Jenny Moore*

Moore was a member of the first group who met at the Bonnie Brae Street cottage and who, on 9th April 1906, experienced the breakthrough of glossolalic (xenolalic?) Spirit baptism.  A young—then single—woman with an African-American Holiness background, who, even before this breakthrough, had already known and pursued bodily encounters of the presence of God.

> For years before this wonderful experience came to us, we as a family, were seeking to know the fullness of God, and He was filling us with His presence until we could hardly contain the power.[145]

Moore's testimony takes us right into the first Pentecostal breakthrough which took place around the ministry of William Seymour, the then

---

144 Allen L. Clayton, 'The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography,' *Pneuma* 1, no. 1 (1979): 27ff.; Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century,* 2nd edn (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997), 143ff.

145 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'  On Moore: Estrelda Alexander, *The Women of Azusa Street* (Cleveland, Oh.: Pilgrim, 2005), 153ff.

rejected pastor of a small African-American Holiness mission.  Her Pentecostal breakthrough is interesting for two reasons:  In addition to glossolalia, it included spiritual singing and making music which does not derive from an Acts 2 biblical expectation or extended Holiness paradigm of spiritual progression; and it also references preparation by prophetic foreknowledge.

*(a)  Prior prophetic insight*

Moore records that 'months before' the Bonnie Brae 'Pentecost,' she experienced her first ever prophetic inner vision ('before me') of six words, 'French, Spanish, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Hindustani,' written on cards.[146] According to his expositions concerning Acts 2 (at the end of February), Seymour would have nurtured an understanding that speaking 'with other tongues' referred to known human languages.  Moore may have received her inner picture around this time, although her account suggests that it may have happened at an even earlier juncture.  A Pentecostal readership, tuned into detecting vestiges of a sovereign divine, would have probably been prepared to run with the second prospect, whilst not denying the

---

146 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'  During the time of tarrying for the breakthrough, Seymour's host Edward Lee, in a dreamlike vision, saw Peter and John shaking in the Spirit and speaking in tongues: Emma Cotton, 'The Inside Story of the Azusa Street Outpouring,' in *Saved and Sanctified,* ed. Martin, 42.

possibility of doubt.[147]  It is also not clear from Moore's testimony as to whether, prior to that night of breakthrough at Bonnie Brae Street, she had been able to make sense of the inner vision, and whether she had shared it with others in the group.  What *is* clear however, is that her vision inter-engaged with events of that night, and reaffirmed expectations within the group, that xenolalia would facilitate preaching in foreign tongues.  It is also clear, from Moore's spiritual process and evolving Pentecostal understanding, that it is only through connection with the subsequent experience of breakthrough that night—only with hindsight—that a previously opaque vision is able to take on concrete relevance and meaning.  Pentecostal witnesses (Moore, the Lee family, Pastor Seymour) would not (fully) understand how such prophetic foreknowledge was possible, given its degree of precision, in particular during the events of 9th April.  To contemporary Pentecostals/charismatics, that which leaves a researcher intellectually dissatisfied, would be (further) evidence of the *divine* power of foreknowledge and of God's freedom/agency in the Spirit. As prophetically revealed knowledge, it is likely to give rise to further confidence in a person's (Moore's) general prophetic/spiritual disposition. Further, discursive exploration of all kinds may arise: biblical teaching, ethical concern, theological quest, pastoral decision-making,

147 Acquisition of a Pentecostal mindset: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back.*

congregational gossip ...


During the evening meeting of 9th April, Moore, together with others who were in attendance, 'was baptized in the Holy Ghost and fire, with the evidence of speaking in tongues.' The rather formulaic and condensed wording used in her account (in particular the post-positioning of 'with the evidence of speaking in tongues') reflects the acquired normative-discursive doctrinal position of the Azusa Street core group. Moore's Spirit-baptism experience was, again, distinctively different from Crawford's and Durham's. Moore remembers her vision:

> As I thought thereon and looked to God, it seemed as if a vessel broke within me and water surged up through my being, which when it reached my mouth came out in a torrent of speech in the languages which God had given me.[148]

There is a great deal of interpretation of the experience, informed by biblical teaching and a journey of prayerful expectation. Does the embodied-experiential difference reflect a difference of personality, calling and culture? Moore is convinced that the sequence of languages which she had seen weeks earlier ('before' her inner eye) are the languages that she spoke on the night. Meditating upon the vision led to her breakthrough.

I remembered the names on the cards: French, Spanish, Latin, Greek,

---

148 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'

Hebrew, Hindustani, and as the message came with power, so quick that but few words would have been recognized, interpretation of each message followed in English, the name of the language would come to me.[149]

Even Moore's published account confers to us the sense of pace, loss of self-willed control and meaningful density within the event. The concept that the prophetic words received in the English language in-between passages of glossolalic speech, draw upon an experiential and emotional-inner plausibility; when delivering the English 'interpretation,' Moore felt that the Spirit reminded her prophetically of which language she had spoken in. At the same time, it aligns experientially with 1 Corinthians 14:13 and 27—and perhaps Seymour (or another preacher) might have taught upon these scriptures. Moore's account remains silent. Moore's glossolalic interpretation can only appear plausible, alive and true *from within* the complex relations of her Pentecostal process—and that of the group's—insofar as: the perception that it was possible for their relating glossolalic events to have been interpreted accurately can be maintained; relevant connections of the Pentecostal situation remain intact; and the processual-spiritual flow of events, overall, remains unchallenged. An obvious difficulty presents itself in that the accuracy and truth of Moore's interpretation of her glossolalic message can only be accepted, yet not

---

149 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'

scrutinised and tested independently. Amongst charismatics/Pentecostals, methodological atheism and overly zealous scepticism can be perceived as undermining 'faith' and stopping an emerging move of the Spirit. Differing from the element of positive scepticism/hesitation, which is fairly common amongst Pentecostals (see above), a principled insistent unbelief would undermine, and cut across, the essential network of distributed-Pentecostal connections, upon which spiritual moves and flows may occur. Pentecostal hesitation understands that—at certain times—radical unbelief and—at others—unwavering religious insistence, must be suspended.[150] This is to be explored further in chapter 6, in terms of facilitating the development of Pentecostal-rhizomic relations of power/presence.[151]

*(b) Spiritual preparation*

There are significant differences between the Pentecostal-embodied journeys and experiences of first-generation revivalists. Subsequently,

---

150 'Taken in the sense of trust, everyone agrees, belief is as indispensable as the air we breathe. We definitively need to give credit if we want to exchange, live, think, speak. The agnostic, in this sense, would be an asocial, autistic lunatic. But taken in the sense of a *demand for access that has been stripped of its practical means of acceding to anything at all,* belief is an artefact engendered by the conflict—also artificial—between Science and religion. In which case, nothing could be more indispensable than becoming agnostic.' Latour, *Rejoicing,* 29, orig. emph. On the learning of a positive-agnostic Pentecostal mindset: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back.*

151 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.

these impact and facilitate variations with regards to their respective future self-understanding, embodied ministries, witness, theology, biblical understanding and religious journeys.  Differing from Crawford and Durham, Moore does not seem to have undergone a major *personal* struggle, a period of spiritual 'dryness' of 'hunger.'  As an early member of the Bonnie Brae Street group however, Moore shared Seymour's burden of prayer.  To what degree are major preparatory struggles reflective of differences in personalities, cultural backgrounds and social standing?  This research considers (also using the findings in chapter 6) the possibility that the nature and intensity of the liminal-religious struggle, which prepares the way for an embodied-Pentecostal breakthrough, is linked to the different ways in which people's embodied lives and selves inter-engage with the predominant power regimes of their respective historical situations.  As a Caucasian, male and professionally trained minister of the Progressive Era, Durham was—generally speaking—intensively and directly invested within the normative-disciplinary, top-down, encompassing power regime of both the secular and Christian culture of the age.  Moore was from the Jim Crow era of enforced racial segregation; she was an African American, unmarried, young, female and formed in a holistic Wesleyan-Holiness Pentecostal tradition, with its very own economy of interlinking bodies,

discourse, identity and power.[152] Moore would have already been more thoroughly imbued with the kind of lowliness, humility and brokenness which—according to Bartleman—was a requirement for engaging with the Azusa Street outpouring.[153] Marginalised on many counts, women such as Moore could only survive and thrive if they learned to find/cultivate some 'ecological niche' through resilience, an art of evasion and resistance; and all this against the backdrop of reductive, normalising and, all too often, violent impositions and public scrutiny, to which ministers, professionals and white males, in general, would be expected to conform. It is thus also relevant that Moore—at the time—did not prepare for public preaching and pastoral leadership, but to be a sanctified vessel for worship and spiritual singing. Furthermore, it is conceivable that (in some way, alongside others in the group) she gained a spiritual advantage from the struggles and liminality which others experienced at the time, in particular Seymour, the locked-out pastor who had found himself stranded in a foreign city.

---

152 Estrelda Y. Alexander, *Black Fire: One Hundred Years of African American Pentecostalism* (Downers Grove, Ill.: 2011), 28ff. and 61ff.

153 Bartleman, the revival's most prominent early commentator, points out that in the preparation for one's personal Azusa Street Pentecost, pride, arrogance and all sense of achievement had 'to die.' 'The rich and educated were the same as the poor and ignorant, and found a much harder death to die. [...] He could not use the self-opinionated.' 'The preachers died the hardest. They had so much to die to. So much reputation and good works.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58f. and 61. Cf. Althaus-Reid, 'On Wearing Skirts without Underwear;' Justaert, 'Liberation Theology,' 156f. and 158; Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 114f., 121f. and 125f.

Moore did not go through a process of liminal decomposition, but neither did she come unprepared on the night of 9th April. Back at home, she had already praised 'the Lord from the depth of my heart,' i.e. in a spiritual, embodied, personally engaged and intense manner. Moore did not fortify her practice/experience of worship into a self-reflective understanding and identity in the same (European-American) way as evangelist teachers such as Crawford and Durham. Though this makes reconstruction more difficult, it is also indicative to the self-practice and acquired-embodied attitude that is particular to Pentecostals/charismatics with a worshipping focus and routine. Moore points out that she had hoped 'to sing under the power,' but prayerfully left it to God as to whether this would happen.[154] It is proposed that 'under the power' relates to a Pentecostal self-practice which imagines one's Pentecostal body in worship to be spatially/socially positioned 'under' the divine, with Spirit power both imagined and perceived as being 'on top of,' 'above' or 'around' one's body. There is a certain decentred reflexivity in the prayer practice which identifies one's wishes and hopes, by way of conversation; and deposits them 'externally,' in an invisible realm (e.g. God's 'throne room'), with an invisible agency (God). Moore's desire to sing spiritually will no longer be self-attributed, but it nevertheless maintains a powerful and affectively

---

154 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'

valid existence alongside the performatively acknowledged divine agency, as well as within the imagined-invisible realm.[155]  As a religious self-practice, praying and leaving the outcome to God, is comparable to the self-consecration which Crawford exercises, in that it facilitates an imagined self-emptying of an embodied-human self, whilst contributing to the emergent establishment of an external divine realm, agency and structured power relation, around and above a Pentecostal/charismatic body, time or space.

Although it is not explicitly expressed in Moore's testimony, Pentecostal readers might like to notice the fact that Moore's prayerful preparation at home must have occurred at the very moment when—a few streets away—Edward Lee experienced his glossolalic breakthrough.  Later that evening, it would be Lee's speaking in tongues and Moore's sung worship which—together—shaped the Spirit experience at the Asberry's family home and, soon afterwards, the Azusa Street mission.  Since, according to a conventional understanding, both the processes which took place in the lead-up to the evening's events would have been spatially and socially independent from one another, even the observation of unplanned concurrence could evoke a Pentecostal consideration of divine

---

155 On imagining and performing God: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 72ff.

orchestration. Pursuing such considerations however, moves us beyond the analysis of personal anointing as an embodied power dispositive (which is the focus of this chapter) and towards an analysis as to how God-in-the-Spirit becomes assembled as a living rhizomic relation, created from distributed experiences, practices, observations and biblical reflection (more below in chapter 6).

*(c) Spiritual song*

That night, after receiving her baptism of foreign tongues, Moore records that after her Spirit baptism she 'sang under the power of the Spirit in many languages,' in words and tunes which were unknown to her. Without clarifying the mode of her guidance, she relates that 'the Spirit led me to the piano, where I played and sang under inspiration, although I had not learned to play.'[156] It was necessary for many different spiritual self-practices, disciplines and experiences—each complex in themselves—to be brought together in order that Moore could achieve this, including: prophetic listening and obedience in response to inner guidance; a routine of informal prayer and sung worship 'under' a bodily felt spiritual presence/power; and the teaching, expectation and reception of a 'baptism' of tongues. Whilst experiencing an altered state of mind, in a place of

---

156 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'

intensified religious presence and symbolic excess, Moore was able to access the non-acquired skill of spiritually improvising on the piano. It is here, on the site of a collective-religious Spirit outpouring, that the external, supra-individual, 'objective'-religious dimension takes over from—and takes precedence over—the personal, subjective and embodied-religious dimension. This, again, begins the kind of analysis which will be further explored below.[157]

With Moore's involvement, the gift of music 'in the Spirit'—that which Durham (and others) called 'new song' or the 'Heavenly Chorus'—was birthed. Though not uncontroversial, many visitors to Azusa Street identified this as being more remarkable, moving and awe-inspiring than the speaking in tongues.[158] 'Singing in the Spirit' was not what Seymour and the group had tarried for, however, it became embraced and valued at the mission. This was possible on the basis of a multifaceted-summative reasoning which includes (at least) the following strands: Moore was a

---

157 Moore, 'Music from Heaven.'

158 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost;' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56ff.; [Clara Lum], 'The Old-Time Pentecost,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1; Glenn A. Cook, 'The Azusa Street Meeting: Some Highlights of this Outpouring,' in *True Believers,* ed. Martin, 5; Los Angeles Examiner, 'Negroes at Revival Talk in Strange Tongues' (11 June 1906), repub. in *Wild and Weird: Azusa Street and Early Pentecostals as Viewed by Los Angeles Newspapers,* ed. Larry Miller (Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2012), 30f.

respected original member of the mission's core group; she—and others— affirmed this kind of song as Spirit-given; and the spontaneous singing was organically intertwined with 'speaking in tongues,' the spiritual gift that the group had pursued; a plausible biblical interpretation was possible (considering e.g. Isaiah 6:2ff. and Revelation 14:3) that would facilitate a discursive-theological understanding and biblical shaping of the practice; at meetings, the processual flows of spiritual worship was perceived to contribute towards emergent movements of God's Spirit and presence; spiritual song ministered to people; it continued to have conducive and 'biblical' effects upon attendant worshippers/visitors; a sense of awe, beauty, holiness and wonder emanated from such song ... This contrasts with 'the gift of writing in unknown languages'[159] the practice of which, under divine presence, some comparably influential people claimed they had received, alongside—or following—their Spirit baptism. Initially, this 'gift' was also embraced. However, a year later, Seymour saw the need to discourage pursuing such spiritual writing and to introduce biblical precedence as a normative criterion.[160] It is of equal importance that, over time, this gift appeared to be less fertile and conducive. 'Writing in the

---

159 [Clara Lum], 'The Old-Time Pentecost,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1.

160 [William J. Seymour,] 'The Ordinances Taught by our Lord,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2.

Spirit' did not seem to lead anywhere; and controversy emerged around the spiritualist practice of 'psychography.' This made Seymour introduce clearer, more restrictive, theological/pastoral guidance.[161] Interestingly, the dogmatic settling of the matter also caused the experience/practice to disappear. Findings in chapter 6 will clarify as to why this would be the case.

## 5.5  Findings, evaluation and further observation

*(1)  Pentecostal experience, pastoral practice, discourse*

Azusa Street texts and testimonies reveal a number of ways in which theological/pastoral discourse and—in more general terms—the creation and deployment of knowledge/truth relate to embodied-spiritual experience.[162] The following evaluation aims to deploy a more explicit

---

161 Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 111ff.

162 Bernauer emphasises the role Foucault's (selective) investigations into Christianity play as he engages, and further develops, the connection of his previous research into the modern power/knowledge relations with a concern with 'technologies of self,' subjectification, embodied freedom and aesthetics: Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 161ff.; cf. Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 131 and 132ff. Foucault, 'Subject and Power;' Greco and Savransky, 'Foucault's Subjectivities;' O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 109ff.; Elden, *Foucault's Last Decade;* Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 253ff.

Foucauldian rationale and includes observations which refer to other Azusa Street testimonies and published texts. These include Bartleman's accounts of the revival which—in the final chapter—shall be explored in much greater detail, from a different analytical concern and theory perspective. The following paragraphs briefly consider: the biblical-eschatological metanarrative which frames a (classical-)Pentecostal understanding;[163] the holistic approach taken as a result of the deep roots within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition;[164] some preliminary observations regarding the pastoral management of charismatic-Pentecostal processes (more below in sections 6.5.4 to 6.5.6); the fundamentally non-hierarchical relation between a distributed spiritual experience and its pastoral-discursive management; and the creative potential of an embodied Spirit baptism with regards to a person's journey, identity, ethics and world approach.

Firstly, it can be seen that the symbolic relations of an eschatological-messianic biblical 'big narrative' play their role in igniting and shaping the hopes and expectations of, both individual and collective, experiential breakthrough. Thereafter, such a biblical understanding contributes towards the framing/guiding of Pentecostal experiences, their

---

163 Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality.*

164 Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism,* 182ff.

discursive interpretations and newly emerging lines of Pentecostal

creativity and understanding.  With regards to the Azusa Street revival, the

overarching symbolic hope was that of: a 'latter-rain' Spirit outpouring

(according to Acts 2 and Joel 2:23/Zechariah 10:1); a relating restorationist

primitivism; and a peculiar doctrinal emphasis on a third 'Pentecostal' work

of the Spirit evidenced by a glossolalic(/xenolalic)-manifestation.[165]

At the same time, testimonies and the doctrinal statement

demonstrate that the mission's pastoral-theological teaching was

*thoroughly saturated by embodied experiences* of divine presence, power

and engagement.  Often, the seekers who attended Azusa Street for a new

and deeper spiritual breakthrough were already well established within the

Methodist-Holiness tradition.  Even prior to the 'Los Angeles Pentecost,'

many of those amongst its pioneers would be considered to be thoroughly

'Pentecostal' insofar as this relates to: having undergone a personal journey

of embodied 'hunger' and struggle, leading to 'being filled by the Spirit;'

knowing/experiencing spiritual capacities such as an embodied sense of

divine presence, prayerful deployments of faith and divine power, prophetic

---

165 Douglas Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 2003), 134ff.

perception and facilitating miraculous healing.[166]

Thirdly, the team around Seymour did much more than to merely provide dogmatic-normative and pastoral guidance, according to the traditional role of a Christian minister. During the revival, they allowed for—and pastorally managed—the many communal and personal ambiguities of: obscure embodied-spiritual experiences; doubtful claims to divine presence/workings; and people's corresponding personal-discursive affirmations. They also had to manage people's quiet resistances to: Pentecostal experiences, observations and claims; as well as face doctrinal challenges and even outspoken attacks by pastoral leaders and a hostile press. In the early stages, it was endemic of the revival to embrace a *'hands-off' leadership approach* which refrains from interfering—too early and too forcefully—from a place of top-down normative pastoral charge, when the processes, possibilities and 'works of the Spirit' are at an early, vulnerable stage of budding and therefore not yet fully established and not yet fully understood.[167] Some of the basic mechanics of prayerful hands-off

---

166 Synan, *Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition.*

167 'Brother Seymour generally sat behind two empty shoe boxes, one on top of
 the other. He usually kept his head inside the top one during the meeting, in
 prayer. [...] The meeting did not depend on the human leader. God's
 presence became more and more wonderful.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58.
 'No amount of confusion and accusation seemed to disturb him. He would
 sit behind that packing case and smile at us until we were condemned by our

leadership—if only for a limited time—shall be explored in chapter 6.

Fourthly, with regards to Pentecostal-experiential power dispositives, *embodied-experiential plausibility, process and consistency* are of equal importance as the reaffirmation and discovery of biblical/theological truth relations.[168]  From the beginning—despite the mission's efforts—there were alternative theological/doctrinal framings of experiences and events.[169] Eventually, the movement fissured, partly, along the lines of doctrinal differences.  Alternatively, the work of God's Spirit at Azusa Street could, for example, be described as the experience of 'the tide of blessing' rising and falling.[170]  Amongst a second generation, connections would be established between: God's presence in the place, the process of time, as

own activities.'  Cook, 'Azusa Street Meeting,' 53.  On Seymour's leadership: Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 87ff.

168 According to Bialecki, Pentecostal pliability requires 'the constituent elements that make up Christianity, the set of concepts, practices and entities (fictive or otherwise),' as much as their ever-evolving—at times shifting— connections, to have 'plasticity.'  Both texts and embodied-sensory experiences (among other relevant elements) contribute towards a sense of changing modalities and degrees of divine presence and absence: Bialecki, *Diagram for Fire,* 5f.

169 'Not all, however, who gladly attended the meetings and derived profit thereby, fully or at all accepted this teaching.'  A. W. Ortwig, 'My First Visit to the Azuzu [sic!] Street Pentecostal Mission, Los Angeles, California,' *The Weekly Evangel* (St Louis, Miss.) 131 (18-3-1914): 4, ifphc.org.

170 Zelma Argue, 'Memories of Fifty Years Ago,' *The Pentecostal Evangel* (Springfield, Mo.) 2814 (22-4-1956): 6, ifphc.org.

well as, both, collective and individual experiences in—and with—God's Spirit.[171]  The Pentecostal truth creation is facilitated, in particular, by a 'practice of testimony' and this can be compared to the practice of 'confession' which—according to Foucault—exposes individuals and their most intimate experiences to the truth controls of a modern *'scientia sexualis.'*[172]  Accordingly, in Pentecostal/charismatic-Christian milieus, spiritual performances, claims, testimonies and autobiographical accounts are scrutinised and explored through pastoral and congregational discourse. In a contemporary church context, one might consider the post-event debriefing of a ministry team, and congregational 'gossip' in the coffee area.[173]  Even in a place such as Azusa Street, the pastoral leader-in-charge

---

171 'As we came within a block of the two-story, white-painted wooden building, I felt a "pulling sensation."  I couldn't have turned away if I wanted to.  [...]  As we moved toward an open spot on a rear bench, I suddenly felt a chill.  How could that be?  It wasn't cold at all.  Then the hair on my arms, legs and head began to stand on end.  I felt as if I were surrounded by God.  I was trembling.  So was mother and everybody else.'  A. C. Valdez, Sr., 'Fire on Azusa Street,' in *Saved and Sanctified,* ed. Martin, 49.

172 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 58.  A predecessor of both practices: Augustine, *Confessions,* 2 vols., ed. and tr. Carolyn J.-B. Hammond (Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 2014 and 2016).

173 'The community does not stand in for the truth; nor, in my experience, does the group presume to know the real truth of whether God has spoken to any particular person and if so, what God had said.  But they gossip, and the gossip is important, as it always is when rules and meanings are ambiguous. Gossip circles around people who think they have heard God and— according to the gossipers—have not.'  Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 62.  Cf. Piette, *Religion de près.*

had been theologically trained (however low-key), had his specialist knowledge, as well as privileged access to the platform.  Nevertheless, in consideration of the fact that Pentecostals sometimes claim to identify a (potential) presence, move and work of God, the generalised priority of an abstract, theological discursive truth and judgement over and against spiritual experience/practice can neither facilitate nor support an appropriate understanding of the latter.  The same is true vice versa: one should not prioritise a concern of religious experience over and above its understanding.  An experiential-Pentecostal Foucauldian dispositive is created by the dense and concrete interweaving of embodied-religious experiences with multiple and rich biblical-theological and cultural symbolic relations.  Prophetic-revelatory truth also plays a certain role, but only alongside other forms/practices of truth creation and 'play.'[174]  Given this non-hierarchical nature of essential dispositive connections, it can be seen that Pentecostal continuity and innovation are made possible, as much through embodied experience as it is through theological meaning. Continuity/innovation may be facilitated through each relevant element of a Pentecostal dispositive: spiritual experience, its discursive truth relations and interpretations, social practice and self-practice, interpretation of scripture, new prophetic insight, changing contextual conditions, and

---

174 Cf. Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism;* Droogers, *Play and Power.*

challenges and pressures ...

Eventually, published Pentecostal testimonies reveal the wide diversity of Pentecostal/charismatic experiences and journeys. Embodied-spiritual breakthrough (Spirit baptism) brings about a number of changes: it introduces thoroughly embodied change in people's spiritual/emotional lives and their sense of self; it advances new Pentecostal capacities and empowers in existing ministries; it induces an assurance in people that they are 'in God,' and encourages them to pursue a chosen course of action with boldness and an unswerving knowledge of God. It was 'in the power of the Spirit,' that many left the Azusa Street mission to preach in foreign countries and remote parts of the world; and whilst some succeeded, others failed. Although it is never possible to fully contain the effects of embodied baptisms and breakthrough experiences, they—in a subsequent step—can nevertheless be rendered reflective and thereby fortified. In principle, this would also imply a discursive multiplication of holistic and journey/ministry-specific biblical understandings/theologies. Any (specific) Pentecostal experience, urge, narrative, message, identity or calling may, further, impact an even wider range of future embodied decisions, Pentecostal/charismatic processes and journeys.

*(2) Liminality, self-practice, innovation, identity*

Concerns with resistance to pervasive power practices—and with power operating even through resistance against it—are central to Foucault's research on power and agency creation.[175]  Within the context of the Azusa Street revival, it can be seen that Pentecostal power—in general—engages the pervasive disciplinary and normalising power of both the modern-industrial age and mainline Christianity.  Confrontation and resistance occurs, for example, within embodied-experiential processes of spiritual 'dryness'/'hunger' and prolonged waiting for divine empowerment

---

175 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 95f.  Even in the mode of resistance to power, 'Religion, according to Foucault, creates "subjects" through a strategic alliance of power, discourse and truth.'  Carrette, *Foucault and Religion,* 40.  Bernauer goes too far in proposing that it was the study of Christian religious experience which inspired Foucault to pursue 'the ecstatic renunciation of the modern relation to the self:' Bernauer, *Foucault's Force of Flight,* 160.  In her pursuit of conceptualising political action and existence within the fissures of an impossible 'no-alternative,' late-neoliberal, politics, Fuggle attends to Foucault, Deleuze and Paul: Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 151ff.; cf. Todd May, 'Philosophy as a Spiritual Exercise in Foucault and Deleuze,' *Angelaki* 5, no. 2 (2000): 223ff.  In his concern with subjectivation, the 'final Foucault' emphasises an opposition to an oppressive deployment of the Christian 'confession' over and against liberating Greek-philosophical traditions of 'self-care' and 'courageous speaking of the truth: Foucault, *Aveux de la chair;* Foucault, *Use of Pleasure;* Foucault, *Care of the Self;* Foucault, *Hermeneutics of the Subject;* Foucault, *Courage of Truth.*  Greco and Savransky, 'Foucault's Subjectivities;' May, *Philosophy of Foucault,* 96ff.; O'Farrell, *Michel Foucault,* 109ff.; Dreyfus and Rabinow, *Michel Foucault,* 168ff.; McHoul and Grace, *Foucault Primer,* 91ff.; Mark Poster, 'Foucault and the Problem of Self-Constitution,' in *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions,* ed. John Caputo and Mark Yount (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1993) 63ff.

and a move of God. There is a commonality in tarrying for God and letting go of self-control, allowing for a Spirit takeover; however, as has been examined, embodied experiences and spiritual processes of preparation and breakthrough also differ. In only three Azusa Street testimonies, does one find breakthrough being prepared: by self-abandonment in worship, by self-consecration, or by the revelation of one's inner state of being from a divine perspective; each of which imply a spiritual emptying and leading towards a place of vulnerability/liminality in which one's personal standing, capacities, pride and self are challenged and reduced. Such processes eventually lead towards religious eruptions of accrued spiritual-embodied energies, of different intensities, qualities and kinds.

At the moment of Spirit breakthrough/'baptism,' common embodied regimes of disciplinary normality are suspended.[176] There is more taking place than mere collective-behavioural 'frenzy' and emotional discharge.[177] Accumulated and externalised affective-libidinal energy is released, *alongside* discursive considerations which draw upon biblical, prophetic, and other meaningful relations. Thereby, discursive relations create

---

176 Cotton 'Inside Story.'

177 Consider the press' claim that at the Azusa Street mission people 'work themselves into a state of mad excitement in their peculiar zeal:' Los Angeles Daily Times, 'Weird Babel of Tongues,' 25.

symbolic—practical focal points for the instant recrystallisation of a (sometimes initially 'frantic') embodied performance of in-flooding externalised passions.  By including the preparatory processes of Azusa Street pioneers, one may clarify how Spirit baptism energises that which, after all, amounts to the possibility of an embodied counter-modern power economy and distributed course of action.  Prior to their Spirit-baptism experiences, Pentecostal seekers underwent an intensely challenging and prolonged embodied process of engaging, resisting and struggling with the distributed power practices of their milieu and age that pervaded the relations of people's bodies, emotional lives and self-understandings.  Thus, it can be seen that the hold which the powers that be have on a person's embodied processes and identity relations become weakened, loosened, and even eroded (to a certain degree).  Subsequently, the powers of the person's altered spiritual perceptions, their ways of performance and relating truth relations are gathered, invested and consolidated within the Pentecostal body.  In the cases of Progressive-Era Los Angeles and also traditional-European Christianity, the dominant culture/power is modern disciplinary and 'normalising' in nature.  The multifaceted and distributed charismatic-Pentecostal resistance/confrontation takes the form of spiritual journeys, through liminal vulnerability towards breakthrough, from 'hunger' towards empowerment; and eventually a movement may emerge that is both 'in'

and 'through' the power of the Spirit.

Caucasian church leaders/preachers, in particular, testify that they have experienced external and inner challenge. This relates to the fact that they find themselves under the permanent ('panoptic') view of top-down, modern-normalising public scrutiny. At Azusa Street, modern-disciplinary power was present in the form of the—often derisive—secular print media, the police and the magistrates; but also through the public-professional criticism, scepticism and rejection which came from church pulpits and appeared in religious publications.[178] Since Christian ministers find themselves professionally positioned to contribute to normative public scrutiny from a theological perspective, the challenge is not merely external, but also pervades their own bodies, identities and standing. It is no wonder that, according to Azusa Street sources, ordained ministers in particular struggled with pride, concerns for their reputation and doctrinal disagreement, each of which would hinder them becoming part of the movement and completely entering into their Spirit-baptism experience.[179]

---

178 A selection of newspaper sources repub. in Larry E. Martin, ed., *Wild and Weird: Azusa Street and Early Pentecostals as Viewed by Los Angeles Newspapers* (Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2012); Martin, ed., *Sceptics and Scoffers: the Religious World Looks at Azusa Street: 1906–1907* (Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2004).

179 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58ff.; cf. [Adolph] Rosa, 'Bro. Rosa's Testimony,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 2 (October 1906): 1;

Whilst, according to Foucault, *'scientia sexualis'*—based upon 'confession'—is at the centre of the creation of modern control over (human) life,[180] Pentecostal experience and truth creation by way of 'testimony' occurs at the fringes—rather—of modern-scientific, professional and theological scrutiny: it is in half-sheltered spaces of refuge and trust, that—at least in the first instance—Pentecostal, alternative-modern, relations of experience, discourse and power may emerge. Self-consecration after times of spiritual struggle (Crawford); the counteracting and undoing of the personality effects of permanent public-disciplinary scrutiny and reflective self-construction,[181] by a revelatory stripping in the eyes of God (Cook); or fostering a Pentecostal attitude of prayer and worship (Moore), are just three of the hierarchical self-practices by which relations 'in God' and an invisible 'Kingdom' reality—that is equally determined by a sense of divine presence and biblical-symbolic relations—are invited to take hold of people's bodies, emotions, capacities and their external world.

---

[Bro.] Hill, 'Get Into the Cornfield,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 2 (October 1906): 1; G[lenn] A. Cook, 'Receiving the Holy Ghost,' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 3 (November 1906): 2; Cook, 'Azusa Street Meeting.'

180 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 135ff.

181 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish,* 195ff.

Unusual and exceptional religious self-practices/experiences change and shape discourse and the discovery of truth, and facilitate invisible relations of power and agency. They allow Pentecostal power relations to have a pervasive impact upon people's lives and bodies. Each Pentecostal breakthrough, empowerment and innovation creates rich theological-symbolic and discursive needs and possibilities. Furthermore, it allows for the refashioning of human identities and courses of action in ways which are holistic and structurally deep.[182]

*(3) Counter-modern resistance, religious delusion, insanity*

There is a structural comparability between the power dispositive of Pentecostal experience, self-claim and resistance; and equally holistic forms of delusion, criminal deviation and insanity, which Foucault made a

---

182 'It is inevitable, however, that such practices do not effect a permanent deactivation [of normalising-disciplinary power] as they quickly become reabsorbed by new identities, new discourses, and new strategies of power.' Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 187. In this respect, consider also the Deleuzean differentiation between 'the actual' and 'the actualised,' with the former being the endpoint of the actualisation process which becomes re-connected to this process, whereas 'the actualised' is disconnected from this process and 'plane' of immanent virtuality: Barber, *Deleuze,* 57f.; Gilles Deleuze, 'Immanence: a Life,' in *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life,* tr. Anne Boyman (New York: Zone Books, 2005), 25ff.; Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, *Dialogues II,* tr. Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam, rev. edn (New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press, 2007), 148ff.

focus across the breadth of his research.[183]  Bartleman discerns two

directions of attacks/challenges to the revival in its early days: one external

and the other internal.  Remarkably, this matches a fundamental distinction

that governs Foucault's research, even across shifting analytical concerns.

In the early days of Azusa Street—according to Bartleman—the group

experienced an *'[o]utside* persecution' by the 'curious and unbelieving:'

mockery from the press, and the rather rationalistic, mainline pastorate of

white middle-class, respectable churches—both liberal and conservative.

Together, these are important representatives of an establishment—both

secular and religious—in charge of wielding a standard-modern, top-down

discursive power and normalising discipline.  From another angle,

'hypnotists and spiritists,' as well as 'religious soreheads, crooks and

cranks,' in their different ways, sought to connect with the emerging divine

---

183 Michel Foucault, *Mental Illness and Psychology,* tr. Alan Sheridan (Berkeley,
Cal., and London: Univ. of California Press, 1987); Foucault, *History of
Madness,* ed. Jean Khalfa, tr. Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa (London and
New York: Routledge, 2006); Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Foucault,
*History of Sexuality,* vol. 1; Foucault, *Abnormal.*  O'Farrell, *Michel
Foucault,* 33ff.; Lynn Huffer, *Mad for Foucault: Rethinking the Foundations
of Queer Theory* (New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press,
2010); Feder, 'Power/Knowledge;' Gary Gutting, 'Foucault and the History
of Madness,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Focuault,* ed. Gary Gutting,
2nd edn ed. (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005), 49ff.; Dianne Taylor,
'Abnormal,' in *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* ed. Leonard Lawlor and
John Nale (Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014), 3ff.; Paolo Savoia,
'Madness,' in *Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* 273ff.; Ruoff, *Foucault-
Lexikon,* 223ff.

move, *from the inside,* so as to engage with its powers and dynamics.[184]

These different deviant individuals and groups emerge as modern-empowered bodies, by way of reacting to hierarchical power/discourse practices through creative—whilst defiant—self-practices alongside (counter-modern) discursive inventions and self-inventions.[185]  As an effect of distributed practices, self-practices and resistances, invisible relations of power take hold of bodies and facilitate certain embodied capacities, perceptions, self-perceptions, identities and ethical orientations.  The discursive practices, embodied experiences, identities and actions, of both the spiritists and religious 'crooks and cranks,' as well as the Holiness Pentecostals, can become interlinked as emergent power networks based upon distributed micro-resistances which—from many places, in creative-and-subversive ways—engage from within with the modern power situation.  Together with a recognition that: not all holistic power relations are equally wholesome, not every affirmed truth is a biblical truth, and not every spirit which people can come under is a life-affirming spirit; it is this structural similarity which creates a necessity for every Christian movement, at the cutting edge of Pentecostal change, to develop practices of discerning 'spirits;' methods/skills to identify that which is divine,

---

184 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 49, emph. DQ.  Ibid., 44ff.

185 Foucault, *History of Sexuality,* vol. 1, 36ff.

natural or demonic, as well as a concern for embodied-emotional healing and spiritual deliverance.

Pentecostal self-consecration with its subsequent significant experiences of embodied impact (Spirit baptisms and moves of God)—whether perceived as coming 'from the outside,' or 'from above'—allow God and the invisible world to emerge amongst Pentecostals as living relations of power/presence.  Such experienced relations of an invisible realm of the divine are alive, in that they may sometimes be unexpected, but are always new and astonishing—and often awe-inspiring.[186]  At the same time, as introducing new/unexpected experiences, they remain structured by biblical-symbolic relations and expectations.  To a significant extent, they continue to incorporate previous personal and communal-experiential relations.  Subsequently, they never appear completely unreliable or unfamiliar.

## Conclusion

In this chapter, a Foucauldian paradigm—sexuality as a 'dispositive'

---

186 Bialecki, 'Does God Exist.'

of modern power which consists of an interlocking of several dimensions (embodied sensation, discourse, distributed practices, resistances, identity formation) has been deployed to analyse Azusa Street testimonies. The aim of this was to clarify a number of concerns relating to power and discursive truth: on what basis can innovative-Pentecostal theological teaching and ministries emerge through the distributed realisation and reinforcement of strategic connections within—and through—competitive environments? and in which ways are Pentecostal experiences of Spirit power/presence constitutive to the creation of individually embodied 'anointing' as a counter-modern power dispositive? At its best, the Spirit baptism of Pentecostalism facilitates distributed courageous engagement, adaption *and* resistance from within the power situations that one encounters. Furthermore, it has been shown how Spirit baptism empowers, emanates and facilitates embodied confidence and change, altering individualised identities, ministry capacities, profiles, callings, and contextual theologies.

Foucault aims to clarify individualised-embodied, modern identity as an effect of distributed practices of power and discourse. It is difficult to progress from such a human-individualistically centred concern to an understanding of the relationally conceived 'invisible' world of a distributed divine which carries and implies its own power and agency.

518

The task of the final chapter is to conceptualise how—through and across the inter-weaving of individually embodied Pentecostal perceptions, ministries and practices—a complex rhizome-like power may be assembled 'in' and 'of the Spirit' so that it encompasses socially and time-spatially distributed dimensions as well as external relations; and that, in addition, it might develop capacities of demonstrating itself to be compelling, active and alive in its emergent processes and moves. Findings of a Foucauldian power analysis must be re-conceptualised within the theory perspective and through analytical capacities of a Deleuzo-Guattarian rhizome ontology.

# 6 RHIZOMIC RELATIONS OF THE SPIRIT: BARTLEMAN'S JOURNEY AND MINISTRY

After deploying a Foucauldian analytics to explore empowerment according to Azusa Street testimonies, this chapter turns to Frank Bartleman's ministerial accounts and Deleuzo-Guattarian ontology to develop an analytical understanding of the assemblage and emergence of Pentecostal-charismatic power in the build-up towards a revival and move of God's Spirit, according to Pentecostal practice. After considering the need for a theoretical shift from an embodied-ethical perspective back to that of an experiential ontology in section 6.1; and assessing the capacities and systematic limitations of today's Pentecostal academic-theological discourse in section 6.2; section 6.3 offers a conventional biographic introduction to Bartleman's ministry. Thereafter, 6.4 introduces DG's six constructive 'principles,' by which they distinguish creative-rhizomatic construction from 'arborescent' organisation. These features are then used to organise an analytical understanding of the creation of the power of Pentecostal-charismatic capacities and ministries, as well as of an emergent

move and 'outpouring' of God's Spirit.  The Pentecostal-rhizomatic build-up of practice and power is described, in the case of Bartleman's conversion, as having already begun 'from the middle' (6.5.1).  It is constructed from a range of heterogeneous Pentecostal-rhizomic nodes (6.5.2).  Rhizomic 'asignifying' disruption, eruption and displacement establish the starting point for the innovation, travelling along and conducting an ever-increasing distribution of Pentecostal practices (6.5.3).  It is by way of creating 'multiplicities' through the interweaving of already existing rhizomic networks that new Pentecostal-charismatic capacities and possibilities emerge: both, within a single Pentecostal revivalist, but then also across the many distributed engagements and processes which contribute towards an emerging fresh build-up, presence, move and action of God's Spirit in the (early) days of a revival (6.5.4).  After assessing, in terms of an ANT analytics of power, both the rhizomes of Pentecostal-embodied capacities and those of the Spirit moving across the distributed contributions in charismatic worship (6.5.5), the chapter eventually returns to the concerns of both an embodied operative ethics and the deployments of theological discourse which, according to Bartleman's accounts, create charismatic-Pentecostal pioneers and revivalists (6.5.6).

## 6.1  From embodied ethics to experiential ontology

The previous chapter—following on from a line of exploration in chapter 3—focused on agency creation by Pentecostal-disciplinary practices, resistances, embodied anointing and related discursive formations.  To consider divine power, according to charismatic and Pentecostal performance, an 'ontological turn' must now be undertaken, as proposed by Bialecki.  Not only does this allow for a consideration as to 'how God is real;'[1] external, material and objective relations may also be taken into account.  So far, within a Foucauldian analytics, which is concerned with personality formation and embodied ethics being power effects, these have remained beyond the observational horizon.  It is only once distributed-external, real and objective relations can be seen to connect to embodied experiences, practices and relating discursive formations, that the divine may become plausible as an invisible realm, network, flow or distributed agency; i.e. the divine can be accounted for as a relation of power.  Law proposes a set of concerns for an analytical description of modern-organisational power relations from an ANT perspective.  (1) The chief task is to describe 'precarious' organisational 'mechanics' whereby different elementary 'materials' become mobilised

---

1    Bialecki, 'Does God Exist,' 34 and 33.

and connected by certain means; and resistances overcome. There is always ample reason for organisational failure; material durability and mobility must therefore be engineered. (2) What overarching strategies are being deployed? 'How far do they spread? How widely are they performed? How do they interact?' (3) Does organisational reflexivity— 'calculation'—come into play; where and how does it become relevant for organisational practice? How are centre—periphery effects, if they occur, being created? What recognised representatives may speak and act on behalf of organisation? Through what resources, deployments and strategies do they act and exercise their managerial powers? (4) What emergent effects derive from material connections interacting with the means and strategies deployed to overcome resistances? Organisational capacities and character are established upon such emergent effects.[2] An analysis of divine relations of power, based upon Pentecostal/charismatic experience/practice—as pursued in this chapter—must progress along similar lines: beginning with the observation and analysis of elementary materials, mechanisms and connections; progressing through an examination of how then chains and overarching rationales are deployed or emerge; to arrive at an understanding as to how the capacities and nature of the charismatic-Pentecostal divine are being constructed/created as an

---

2   Law, 'Notes on the Theory,' 389f.

interweaving set of effects and relations of power.

The shift from ethics to metaphysics (and other constructive-conceptual differences) aside, the theoretical transition from Foucault's sexuality dispositive to DG's conceptualisation of 'desire' as a productive—and potentially creative—force is not impossible.  The political philosopher Negri, as well as a few theologians, who are interested in the subversion of predominant relations of power and truth, engage rather fluidly with both Foucault and Deleuze, within a single argument and theoretical concern.[3]  After Foucault's death, Deleuze points out that, in his view,

> [...] there are a lot of parallels between our work [DG's] and his, although they're kept apart, as it were, by their widely differing methods, and purposes even.  This makes the parallel all the more important to me, invaluable; there was a common cause.[4]

Morar and Gracieuse convincingly show that the difference between Foucault and Deleuze as to whether one should replace 'desire' with 'pleasure' (as Foucault had done in the first volume of *The History of*

---

3    Antonio Negri, 'How and when I Read Foucault,' in *Marx and Foucault: Essays Volume 1,* tr. Ed Emery (Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2017), 155ff.; Negri, 'Gilles Deleuze: the How and When of Deleuze-Guattari,' in *Marx and Foucault,* 166ff.  Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt;* Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 173ff.  Through a more eclectic mode of reception: Althaus-Reid, *Queer God.*

4    Deleuze, 'Breaking Things Open,' 85.

*Sexuality*), does not amount to an 'incompatibility,' as Grace has argued.[5]

Gros points out that Deleuze is willing and able to translate Foucault's

theorisation of ethics/power/discourse relations *accurately* into his own

metaphysical concern.[6] Although Foucault's decision to recategorise

(Freudian) 'desire' in terms of (discursively determined) 'pleasure' is

irrelevant for the generalised deployment of Foucault's analytics of the

modern-'sexuality' dispositive in chapter 5 of this research, DG's

schizoanalytical re-conceptualisation of 'desire' in *Anti-Oedipus* remains

illuminating with regards to the deployment of DG's characteristics of

rhizomic creativity and growth (in chapter 6). The first volume of

*Capitalism and Schizophrenia* develops a relativistic-ontological

conceptualisation of embodied socio-economic facilitation and creativity,

on the basis of a reformed, subject-centred (psychological-ethical),

understanding of libido within the human condition.[7] Following Smith's

analysis, DG's 'desire,' as an ethical force that has already been socially

and discursively formed, directs any (ethically rationalised and 'economic')

---

5   Morar and Gracieuse, 'Against the Incompatibility Thesis;' Wendy Grace,
    'Faux Amis: Foucault and Deleuze on Sexuality and Desire,' *Critical Inquiry*
    36, no. 1 (2009), 32ff.

6   'What Deleuze summons is Foucault's double: that which Foucault *is,* if he
    had been a metaphysician.' Gros, 'Deleuze's Foucault,' 129. Deleuze,
    *Foucault;* Deleuze, 'Michel Foucault's Main Concepts.'

7   DG, *Anti-Oedipus.*

decision making, interest or will from an embodied-emotional within.[8]

'Underneath all reason lies delirium, and drift.'[9] So far, DG's (capitalist)

'desire' operates precisely like Foucault's (modern-)sexual 'pleasure' in the

first volume of *The History of Sexuality.* Moving beyond Foucault's

embodied-ethical mode of analysis, DG can show how distributed libidinal

flows and forces facilitate the *external* ordering and construction of our

modern-capitalist society: 'underneath' people's and organisation's

rationally defined 'interests' and decisions, one finds 'an enormous flow, all

kinds of libidinal-unconscious flows that constitute the delirium of this

society.'[10] 'Desire' is thus to be understood, not so much as a 'lacking' (as

Freudian psychoanalytics teaches) but, instead, as being the distributed and

embodied force which 'causes'—and brings forth—'the entire socio-

political field' of one's external (capitalist) 'reality.'[11] This research is in

line with (often earlier) interpretations of *A Thousand Plateaus* (the second

volume of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia*) which emphasise the accessing

of DG's immanent and relativistic ontology through a critique of Freudo-

Marxian ethical formation in *Anti-Oedipus,* since such a reading facilitates

---

8    Smith, 'Deleuze and the Question of Desire,' 136f.

9    DG, 'On Capitalism and Desire,' 162.

10   DG, 'On Capitalism and Desire,' 163.

11   Smith, 'Deleuze and the Question of Desire,' 138.

connecting a Foucauldian understanding of embodied empowerment

(chapter 5) with DG's understanding of ontic-sociological innovation and

construction (chapter 6).[12]  More generally, a higher generalised, abstract-

metaphysical interpretation should be recommended which accesses *A*

*Thousand Plateaus* through Deleuze's reading of Spinoza and through

*Difference and Repetition.*[13]

 

    Despite a growing academic-theological interest in Deleuzean

metaphysics, a theological reference to DG's 'rhizome' is hardly

referenced.  Ward refers to 'the subterranean complexity of the rhizome: a

root-stock growing in no particular direction and without detectable

regularity,' so as to evoke a perception as to how 'postmodern' culture is

---

12  Buchanan, *Deleuzism;* Goodchild, *Deleuze and Guattari;* Aurel Schmidt, 'Gilles Deleuze und Félix Guattari oder Der Anti-Ödipus und die molekulare Revolution,' in Jürg Altwegg and Aurel Schmidt, *Französische Denker der Gegenwart: Zwanzig Porträts* (Munich: Beck, 1987), 62ff.

13  '*A Thousand Plateaus* is [...] profoundly concerned with thinking through the implications of a metaphysics of continuity.  If one could characterize Deleuze's early work as seeking out exemplars of this metaphysics of continuity, then *Difference and Repetition* and *The Logic of Sense* become a positive outworking of this fundamental idea.  In a similar vein *Anti-Oedipus* appears to be a scathing critique of the deployment of a metaphysics of discontinuity of both the individual and society, whilst *A Thousand Plateaus* pursues the positive expression of the metaphysics of continuity.' Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 10.  Holland, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus;* Barber, *Deleuze;* Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology.* Gilles Deleuze, *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza,* tr. Martin Joughin (New York: Zone Books, 1990); DG, *What Is Philosophy?*

different from 'arborescent' modernity.[14]  The researcher is not aware of an

explicitly theological use of the concept.[15]  How may one justify the

poststructuralist-experimental deployment of DG's rhizome paradigm and

'rhizomatic' analytics in an analytical-descriptive exploration of

Pentecostal-revivalist and charismatic construction, ordering and

innovation 'in the power of God's Spirit?'[16]  Four strands of reasoning

come to mind which, together, amount to a justification.  (1) Initially, the

imaginations and exemplifications of rhizomic relations which Deleuzeans

deploy (e.g. a mycelium, mind mapping or neural networks) resonated with

the researcher's—then untested—Pentecostal-charismatic practical

understanding: that, in general, an engagement with a 'flowing' in, as well

as an understanding of (what Pentecostals could see as) a 'move' or action

of God's Spirit, within—and across—the experiences/engagements of a

---

14  Ward, 'Postmodern Theology.'

15  In his discussion of Deleuze's rejection of absolute-divine judgement,
Hinlicky refers to a 'rhizomatic anarchy of natural life [...] what "God has
stolen from us" in the name of organizing us;' Hinlicky's theological
response is, however, limited to a commendation of a (fully) Pauline (and
Lutheran) understanding of 'justification' and 'justice;' thereby missing a
deeper-transformative theological engagement with Deleuze: Adkins and
Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 191; Deleuze, 'To Have
Done with Judgement.'

16  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.  Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 22ff.;
Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,* 72ff.; Kruger,
'Rhizome/Arborescent;' Colman, 'Rhizome;' Colebrook, *Understanding
Deleuze,* xix, xxviif. and 76f.; May, *Gilles Deleuze,* 133ff.; Lambert, 'Notes
from a Thought Experiment;' Bogard, 'Sense and Segmentarity.'

charismatic worshipping congregation, would be non-hierarchical in nature, establishing living 'weaves' of ever-developing, ever changing relations that connect experiences, practices and knowledge relations that are both disparate in nature and distributed across those revivalists who gather to reach out for a divine encounter and blessing. (2) Such an experimentation is further encouraged by Drooger's double, material-conceptual and anthropological-methodological proposition: that 'religious' (Pentecostal) practice—as much as its ethnological exploration—proceeds best in the mode of experimental 'ludism.'[17] (3) The rhizomic proposition of a Pentecostal-charismatic innovation and ordering 'in the power of the Spirit' (as Pentecostals might say) further aligns with the need for a 'post-structuralist' subversion within modern-Pentecostal practices of 'spiritual' empowerment and power, since they are confronted by both modern and pastoral disciplinary-normalising power and control. DG achieve such a post-structuralist, subversive, theorisation (amongst others) by contraposing 'arborescent' and 'rhizomic' modes of reasoning, engagement and construction. (4) The final success of the experimentation would require DG's analytical 'principles' of rhizomatic organisation and growth to facilitate a convincing understanding of the emergent construction, creative capacity and power of the divine Spirit, according to Pentecostal-

---

17 Knibbe and Droogers, 'Methodological Ludism.'

charismatic experience/practice and understanding.[18]

The exploration of Pentecostal-embodied experience, along the lines of Foucault's conceptualisation of 'sexuality' as a modern power dispositive, in chapter 5, has clarified how—amongst Pentecostals at their best—Spirit-baptism experiences individualise and empower by facilitating embodied confidence and renewal, as well as facilitating practical and discursive innovation.  Nevertheless, a Foucauldian analytics of spiritual experience/ power cannot theorise the presence, power and agency *of the divine,* according to Pentecostal-charismatic experience.  For this task, Foucault's consideration of experience, discourse and practice remains all too closely directed towards his concern with the creation of *human* identity, agency and inner sense of self.[19]  The result is that the following kinds of emergent processes and acting agencies remain impossible to conceive: those that are 'invisible' and non-human (those of God, the Spirit, angelic and demonic forces), and those which—within, behind and above such distributed relations of power—take on an 'external' and (quasi-)'independent' reality of their own.  Furthermore, Pentecostal

---

18  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 7ff.

19  This is the case, although Foucault theorises power in (Machiavellian-) strategic terms, and even with 'the King's head' thoroughly severed: Foucault, 'Truth and Juridical Forms,' 121.

pioneers often account for their experience of Holy-Spirit action/presence, as though they are received from the outside with a bearing upon their individually embodied perceptions; but also in terms of God's action/power having a socially distributed real impact, e.g. in the context of a revival-meeting. Conceiving of heterogeneous relations and processes of an invisible—but externally real—divine in which the distribution of human bodies is relevant, but not centre stage, and in which the creation of human agency, knowledge and practice are not foundational, but remain secondary—non-essential—effects, is precisely what an ANT or Deleuzo-Guattarian rhizomatic power analysis has to offer. This chapter, thus, aims to show that *the presence and power 'of the Kingdom' and 'of God in the Spirit' is 'rhizomic,'* precisely according to the understanding of DG's methodological introduction of *A Thousand Plateaus.* To give rhizomatic analysis preference over ANT stands to reason, in that DG's experiment in metaphysics follows on from DG's schizoid 'desiring machines:' i.e. embodied-and-distributed desire, that is seen to be *externally* productive and creative through chains of complex and interlocking states.[20]

Along the lines of a rhizomatic analysis, God's Spirit, or invisible 'Kingdom,' are both facilitated as a spiritual presence and power relation

20  DG, *Anti-Oedipus*.

531

on the basis of the interweaving of distributed performances which inter-engage with one another through 'translations' (ANT)—respectively 'deterritorialisations' (DG).  As a result of their ever-subsequent 'translation'/deterritorialisation, new times and places of an emergent, charismatic-Pentecostal presence, action, or move can be spiritually impacted, further strengthened and enhanced.[21]  Holy-Spirit presence as a Pentecostal-charismatic power relation—its capacities, its characteristics, its nature, its management and its reach—[22] would be determined, according to a Deleuzo-Guattarian understanding, as capacities of rhizomatic possibilities, developments, reliabilities, innovations and growth.  It is not only its manifold relations with the Christian-biblical divine which renders Pentecostal presence/power peculiar amongst DG 'schizoid'/'nomadic' rhizomes.  In addition, charismatic-embodied practices/perceptions, which are reflective of 'Spirit gifts' (χαρίσματα), take hold of—and inter-engage with—*relations of an external reality* in a range of innovative ways.  A Pentecostal sense of a divine presence, agency or purpose at work derives, not only from the depth of embodied-spiritual experience, but also—in equal measure—from an understanding of

---

21  ANT 'translation:' Callon, 'Sociology of Translation,' 223f.; Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 9, 106ff. and 128ff.  'Performance:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 12f. and 92f.  'Deterritorialization:' ibid., 9ff. and passim.

22  Cf. Law's power-analytical concerns, above.

verifiable/external relations of such embodied performances. Due to the modern-Cartesian epistemological 'bifurcation' of matter and mind,[23] contemporary research into Pentecostalism—including Pentecostal theology—continues to undercut such external-and-real dimensions as they reconstruct Christian spiritualities. A full descriptive analysis/ understanding is possible on the basis of a non-modern, rhizomatic realist metaphysics and ontological perspective, as advocated by DG and Latour (amongst others).[24]

## 6.2 Translations of Spirit power into theological discourse

Amidst the questions to be asked concerning power from an ANT perspective is to identify the 'who' and 'how' of speaking and acting on behalf of religion and the Christian divine. Scholars/students of theology, also engaged in professional-pastoral training, are amongst those who set themselves up as 'spokespeople' with regards to the account of God in

---

23  Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 10f., 29ff. and 55ff.; Whitehead, *Concept of Nature,* 30f.

24 DG, *Thousand Plateaus;* Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus;* Harman, *Prince of Networks.* Cf. Whitehead, *Science;* Whitehead, *Process and Reality: an Essay in Cosmology: Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of Edinburgh during the Session 1927–28,* ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne, corr. edn (New York and London: Free Press, 1979); Robinson, *Deleuze, Whitehead, Bergson.*

relation to society, culture, Christian experience, and all ecclesial and Christian relations. Since Barth's dogmatics aims to direct and discipline the Christian discourse of God,[25] this simultaneously implies a facilitative disciplining of the possibilities in and of the divine as relations of power. More modestly, today's (classical-)Pentecostal academic theology seeks to engage reflective-theological accounts of Pentecostal/charismatic experience(s)/practice(s) with ongoing academic, historical and ecumenical-theological discourses. Pentecostal scholars regard the Pentecostal-theological contribution as being just one voice amidst an ecumenical chorus; and more importantly, are aware that, although appreciated in a great majority of places, professional/academic training is not the only—let alone privileged—route towards becoming a Pentecostal 'spokesperson.' Others, arguably, may lay more of an original claim to speaking/acting on behalf of emergent moves of the Pentecost Spirit. This chapter considers the ministry and journey accounts of Frank Bartleman, a Pentecostal pioneer, revivalist preacher and prophetic intercessor who believes himself to have contributed towards moves of God in many places, including the Azusa Street Pentecost of 1906–09. Before this exploration, a brief review shall be given of how academic-Charismatic and Pentecostal discourses translate spiritual experience, practice and power into academic-

---

25  Barth, *CD,* 1/1.

theological contributions.

## *(1) Charismatic accountability (Mühlen)*

In the 1960s to 1980s, academically trained theologians and clergy from different church traditions began to engage with the ecumenical 'Charismatic Renewal' which acknowledged a pluralised-embodied empowerment by the Holy Spirit. However, against the backdrop of the respective normative-doctrinal traditions of their churches, as well as their ministerial practices and concerns with order, theologians and clergy struggled to provide appropriate and consistent theological accounts of Pentecostal phenomena and experiences.[26] Tellingly, it was in the context of pastoral theology, not theological dogmatics, that the distinguished systematician Mühlen engaged in theological experimentation so as to eventually integrate a (domesticated) Pentecostal-charismatic challenge with the reflective practice of his Roman-Catholic tradition.[27] Although

---

26 See the very brief and partisan documentation of ecumenical Charismatic conventions initiated by Arnold Bittlinger and others in the 1960s and 1970s: Gerhard Bially, Carola Kieker and Klaus-Dieter Passon, ed., *Ich will dich segnen ...: Einblicke in den charismatischen Aufbruch der letzten Jahrzehnte* (Düsseldorf: Charisma; Asslar: Projektion-J; and Ravensburg: D-und-D; 1999), 17ff. Also instructive is Mühlen's Christian initiation course: Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology.*

27 Wolfgang Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen: His Theology and Praxis: a New Profile of the Church* (Lanham, Mar., and Oxford: Univ. Press of America,

Mühlen's Christian-renewal induction course (1976) affirms a Pauline

understanding of charismatic 'gifts' as *pluralised* empowerment (cf. below,

chapter 4.1),[28] his theological understanding of God's Spirit and church

hinders a full analytical description of the complex connections,

transformative effects and power in and of the Spirit:[29]

In his main dogmatic-theological contributions, Mühlen conceives

the mainline-theological discussion of Christological and Trinitarian

doctrine (Boethius, Thomas Aquinas and Richard of St. Victor) as

anchoring 'incommunicable' individuality, independence and self-

existence—in an inherent, albeit secondary, tension with a dialogistic

dependence on ('important') others—even in the foundational 'definition'

of personhood.[30]  Drawing on St. Victor and von Hildebrand, Mühlen's

---

2004).

28  Heribert Mühlen, *Einübung in die christliche Grunderfahrung,* 2 vols. (Mainz: Grünewald, 1976); Engl. tr.: Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology.*

29  In the light of Mühlen's importance for major parts of the Charismatic Movement of the time, real effects were generated in the context of worship and pastoral practice.

30  Mühlen understands (human/divine) 'existence' in terms of 'being in oneself out of another' (*'Aus einem anderen heraus in sich selbst sein, der Substanz nach aus einem anderen sein.'*): Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person: In der Trinität, bei der Inkarnation und im Gnadenbund: Ich—Du—Wir,* 5th edn (Münster: Aschendorff, 1988), 39; Engl. tr.: Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 54.  Mühlen, *Heiliger Geist als Person,* 26ff.; Mühlen, *Sein und Person nach Johannes Duns Scotus: Beitrag zur Grundlegung einer Metaphysik der Person* (Werl, Westf.: Coelde, 1954); Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 50ff. and 69.

Trinitarian understanding of God's Spirit of spiration by the 'we' of the Father and the Son is based upon a naively romantic notion of togetherness in human friendship and procreation which, as a construction of 'transcendental' inner-Trinitarian relations are constructed in terms that exclude all external, i.e. this-worldly, relations.[31] Mühlen's subsequent understanding of the progression of the Spirit fails to appropriately conceptualise *the difference* ('the gap') between (active) spiration through which the Spirit emanates, as a Deleuzean divine 'becoming,' from the 'we-union'[32] of the divine Father and Son, and the 'self-existence' of the Spirit which, expanding upon the Western theological tradition, Mühlen understands as being the perichoretic 'bond of love' between the Father and the Son.[33] Initially within exclusively other-worldly relations of the Godhead and without foundational relations to the this-worldly environment of divine generation, Mühlen originally conceives of the Spirit as being 'one person in two persons' and the 'we in person' which facilitates the unity among the persons of the Trinity.[34]

---

31  Mühlen, *Heiliger Geist als Person,* 59f., 75ff., 116ff. and 132ff.; Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 64f. and 70f.

32  Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 76 and passim.

33  Mühlen, *Heiliger Geist als Person,* 156ff.; Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 71 and 74ff.; cf. Barber, *Deleuze,* 65ff.

34  Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 77.

Mühlen's theology of salvation and the church are constructed as an analogy of the sequence and relations of inner-Trinitarian originations of the divine persons: subsequent to the sending of the incarnation of the eternal Son, the sending of the Spirit, at Jesus' baptism, marks the beginning of messianic ministry of both Jesus and the church.  Within the this-worldly (social/organisational), *as well as* other-worldly (theological or 'mystical') reality of the church, the Spirit is 'the principle of unity:' '[o]ne person (one Spirit) in many persons (in Christ and in us),' which facilitates the mystery of human believers' engagement with the persons of the divine realm, as well as the union amongst believers and with Christ.[35]  According to Mühlen, Christian unity is conceptually underwritten by 'corporate personality' which, according to a biblical use of language, allows for the individual 'I' and the person of Christ, at any point, to reference the fullness of a social or historical gathering which derives its existence from belonging to, or being connected to, Christ as a person.  Mühlen's 'great-I' (corporate personality) identifies the possibility of conceptually switching between an individualised and pre-existing 'I' and a socially encompassing accumulation of which, other than being an accumulation of individuals, remains undifferentiated; what is missing however, is some form of

---

35  Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona,* 168 and 169, tr. DQ.  Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 77ff., 99, 105, 114f. and 124ff.

sociological and constructive consideration about what happens in-between

these two poles of social organisation and emergent becoming, as well as

the politics involved in calling for 'togetherness,' 'unity' and a 'corporate

personality.'[36]

On the basis of such sociographic-ecclesiological decisions, Mühlen

can theologically re-engage with transcendence, namely the inner-

Trinitarian relational conceptualisation of spiration with the Spirit-baptism

of Jesus and the ministry of the church, prior to charismatic empowerment

of ecclesiastical offices and believers at large.  On the basis of a self-

subsisting, whilst relational, concept of person, divine grace is conceived in

terms of a supranatural and personal union of (the person of) God's Spirit

and a human individual.[37]  Already within the Trinity, the Spirit is the 'we

in person' and now, the following ecclesiological conclusion is possible:

'The pneuma is the principle of unity of the charismatic gifts and the

principle of unity of the body of Christ.'[38]  To Mühlen, the biblical

language of corporate-ecclesial unity 'in Christ,' has thereby, not just

---

36  Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 106 and 107.  Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona,* 75ff. and 134ff.

37  Mühlen, *Heiliger Geist als Person,* 16ff. and 292ff.; Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 57ff.

38  Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona,* 168, tr. DQ.

meaningful independence, but an encompassing normative-hierarchical priority over and against the creation of ecclesiastical offices and the challenges of charismatic difference.[39] All these—and many other—soteriological and ecclesiological conclusions, through biblical, traditional and lifeworld conceptualisations or direct deduction, re-engage with inner-Trinitarian imaginations and decisions as a precondition. In addition, it once again becomes clear that, on the practical side, such an elaborate hierarchical-theological construction and engagement of a strictly other-worldly transcendence with this-worldly Christian relations cannot be maintained without professional-doctrinal oversight and a structure of pastoral and liturgical administration; the rationale of which Mühlen develops within his theory of Spirit baptism ('participation [...] in the anointing of Jesus').[40]

When Mühlen, in the chapter of a book published in the 1970s, considers late-modern socio-cultural developments and changes within Christianity and wider society, he redeploys his Trinitarian-

---

39 Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona,* 119ff., 158ff. and 161ff.; Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 110.

40 Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona,* 329, tr. DQ. Ibid., 329ff.; Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 126ff.; cf. Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology,* 123ff. and 294ff.

pneumatological and soteriological categorical decisions.[41]  Allegedly, a

pre-modern agraic and monotheistic concern with individualism, private

utilisation and the domination of nature made way for the industrialisation,

humanisation and socialisation of the world.  Mühlen claims that a

consistently pneumatological-Trinitarian reconsideration of the divine

mystery, which begins with the 'we' of the Spirit, allows one to inform,

integrate and enhance late-industrial and late-modern imaginations and

concerns with society (Mühlen explicitly alludes to Marxist collectivism!)

as well as with philosophical-transcendental, dialogistic and spiritual self-

transcending dynamics within personal (self-)formation.[42]  Mühlen's

declared aim, in terms of analogical-transcendental knowledge formation,

is 'to describe the mystery of the Trinity as the foundational We Act which

establishes all that is external to the Godhead;' in linguistic terms, it is,

accordingly, 'to address Spirit experience in such a manner that it can

become a feature of our [common] use of language.'[43]  The rationale of

dialogisitic, familial, covenantal and transcendental-analogical relationality

of 'I—thou' and 'we' is supplemented by a number of totalising-

---

41  Mühlen, 'Soziale Geisterfahrung als Antwort auf eine einseitige Gotteslehre,'
in *Erfahrung und Theologie des Heiligen Geistes,* ed. Claus Heitmann and
Heribert Mühlen (Hamburg: Agentur des Rauhen Hauses; Munich: Kösel,
1974), 253ff.

42  Mühlen, 'Soziale Geisterfahrung,' 259f.

43  Mühlen, 'Soziale Geisterfahrung,' 255 and 159, tr. DQ.

essentialistic (and apparently 'common-sense') categories which refer to ecclesiological, modern-philosophical and political theorisation as (seemingly) encompassing realities. In addition to the corporate 'I' which is 'the Church,' imagined in terms of 'covenant,' 'the body of Christ,' as well as other biblical and sociographic analogies,[44] Mühlen's chapter refers to: 'the experience of the self and the world' (*'Selbst- und Welterfahrung'*); 'the question of the Being of that which exists' (*'mit der Frage nach dem Sein des Seienden'*); 'the technical-industrial age' (*'[d]as technisch-industrielle Zeitalter'*); 'the reality of life' (*'in der Wirklichkeit des Lebens'*); '"nature," in the broadest sense' (*'[d]ie "Natur" im weitesten Sinne'*); and 'the plural We of humanity' (*'[...] in seinem Verhältnis zum pluralen Wir der Menschheit'*).[45]

The (thus outlined) mono-hierarchical organisation and categorical-conceptual austerity of Mühlen's theological dogmatics and ecclesiological imaginations results in characteristic blind spots, misconceptions and undue

---

44  Cf. Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona,* 261ff. and 102ff.

45  Mühlen, 'Soziale Geisterfahrung,' 253 and 265, tr. DQ. Mühlen's ongoing over-reliance upon conceptual-ethical and political universalisation can be observed as he, at the end of his academic career, attends to the task of writing a transcendental philosophy of the 'we:' Mühlen, *Im-Wir-sein: Grundlegung der Wir-Wissenschaft: Beitrag zu einer wirgemäßen Lebens- und Weltordnung,* ed. Wilhelm Maas (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008); cf. Mühlen, 'Soziale Geisterfahrung,' 259.

generalisations with regards to: the disparity and distribution of pneumatological and Pentecostal-charismatic contributing factors; the means, methods and strategies of their assemblage and network building; the relational creativity, dynamics, possibility and innovation 'in the Holy Spirit,' within (equally more complex) socio-political and cultural relations and processes; and thereby eventually, the nature of the divine, according to Pentecostal-charismatic experience and practice.[46] As Mühlen becomes involved with the Charismatic Renewal movement across historical denominations, the disruptive and innovative dimension of charismatic empowerment remains conceptually contained by a functional understanding that connects an individually embodied Spirit practice to the exclusive purpose of edification of one's local congregation, 'church and society,' or simply 'others.'[47] When the tide of the Charismatic Renewal ecumenical movement went out, Mühlen attended to the development and introduction of contemporary-evangelistic services of self-dedication and blessing within the Roman-Catholic tradition which centred on the concept of biblical covenant. Through encouraging conscious and personal engagement with one's baptism and an 'ongoing renewal of confirmation' (sanctification), 'affirmation and renewal of marriage covenant' and a

---

46  Cf. Welker, *God the Spirit,* 40ff.

47  Mühlen, *Charismatic Theology,* 126ff.

'deeper acceptance of the grace of ordination/consecration,' Mühlen's reform liturgy not only focuses on 'covenant' but also Spirit presence, according to Roman-Catholic theological construction.[48]  This also re-affirms the relationship of the eternal, inner-Trinitarian, 'I—thou' and 'We,' thereby conceptually reintroducing the very dialogistic-sociographic understanding of personality formation within (incurved-)familial and (exclusive) friendship relations to pastoral practice; the very same concept which, by way of this-worldly analogies, had facilitated Mühlen's theorisation of inner-divine relationality.  As Mühlen's theorisation comes full circle, his previous concern with charismatic empowerment of ordinary Christians appears to be a mere appendix.  Pastoral leaders must not consider access to Spirit gifts as a general given; their outpouring and a newly emerging charismatic life in the church cannot be planned for, but only prayed for and received on the basis of believers' personal self-dedication to God.[49]  The generalisation within Mühlen's admonition ('This is for everybody.') as he calls '*all* members of the one Church, both office holders and lay people' to personally submit to the Spirit's work of salvation 'from within' again, reflects the conceptual austerity of Mühlen's

---

48  Mühlen, *Kirche wächst von innen,* 260, 263 and 266.  Ibid., 250ff.; Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen,* 1ff.

49  Mühlen, *Kirche wächst von innen,* 268ff.

understanding.[50]  With regards to both spiritual imagination and practice, theological-transcendental analogy—even in Mühlen—pursues a predominant concern 'to ensure that the "temporal intrusion of difference," or contingent possibility, not be allowed to undermine the hierarchy that is already in place.'[51]

## (2)  Regulated spirituality (Land)

According to Land's (more recent) theological exposition, 'Pentecostal spirituality,' 'a passion for the kingdom,' aims at 'affective' integration of Christian understanding, action and deep sentiment.  It is, in turn, regulated, within an apocalyptic narrative frame, towards the divine.[52]  A prevalent—though not exclusive—emphasis on embodied-experiential disruption, intensity and transformative change, is reflective of an 'apocalyptic' focus of Pentecostal spirituality.  At the same time however,

---

50  Mühlen, *Kirche wächst von innen,* 270, tr. DQ, orig. emph.

51  Barber, *Deleuze,* 102.  It is with reference to—and against—Milbank, that Barber shows how theological analogy introduces a hierarchical ordering to 'being' which, politically, requires giving priority to continuity of sameness and (alleged) good, harmonious order and 'peace.'  This requires the assent of even those minorities and individuals who experience the analogical-hierarchical ordering in terms of violence, suffering and incentive to resistance.  'The only way analogy's order could remain peaceable, in light of such desire and experience, is to demand their stifling.  [...]  It is in this sense that the ethics of analogy are majoritarian.'  Ibid., 101.

52  Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 127ff.

priority is given to prayerful experience and engagement with the Spirit,

over theological reflection.  Hereby, Land's 'Pentecostal' spirituality is in

line with a Foucauldian power analysis of Pentecostal embodiment (chapter

5), and surpasses previous 'Charismatic' efforts at theological

accountability (Mühlen).  Land, however, underdetermines externally 'real'

relations of Pentecostal experience and practice.  In addition, he follows

Hollenweger's proposition of constructing a quasi-denominational

particular by determining the journey and decisions of the post-Azusa-

Street years as constitutive for the movement as a whole.[53]  This normative-

denominational identity would be: that of a North-American Pentecostal

churchmanship (with a capital P), soteriologically focused in a 'fivefold'

understanding of the 'full gospel,'[54] and encompassing a normalised

'corporate-individual spirituality' and practice of worship.[55]  Doctrinal

formalisation occurs in conjunction with the introduction of normalising

---

53  '[...] the first ten years represent the "heart" and not the infancy of the
     movement.'  Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 14f.; cf. ibid., 37 and passim.
     Cf. Hollenweger, 'Pentecostals and Charismatic Movement,' 551.

54  The fivefold 'full gospel' encompasses justification–sanctification–healing–
     near return–Spirit-baptism: Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 6, 51ff. and pass.;
     David William Faupel, *The Everlasting Gospel: the Significance of
     Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought* (Sheffield: Sheffield
     Acad. Press, 1996).

55  Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 183.  By their *communal* practices of prayer,
     worship and witness, congregations and church communities facilitate and
     regulate and individual(ised) Pentecostal affections: ibid., 163ff.

regulation of a certain 'Pentecostal'-religious performance.[56]  This,

however, curtails the capacity to facilitate and take hold of charismatic, i.e.

interpersonally distributed, heterogeneous—and often uncertain—forms of

divine presence/power, which is characteristic of new Pentecostal/

charismatic movements in their initial-'hot' and subsequent-'liquid' phase:

'one way or other your rhizome will be broken.'[57]

 

    Pentecostal theologians have extended Land's proposition in two

opposite—whilst related—directions.  Archer further emphasises

communal normativity in the form of a 'Pentecostal' apocalyptic-

soteriological narrative, as he deploys his Spirit—'text'—community

triad.[58]  Others aim instead at a Pentecostal contribution to the ecumenical

and academic-theological discourse.  Vondey proposes that, as a movement

---

56  '[D]iscernment and discipline for the identification, cultivation, and
preservation of true affections' in individuals and worshipping communities:
Land, *Pentecostal Spirituality,* 120.  Indirect pastoral discernment and
discipline: ibid. 159ff.

57  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 14.  Cf. Shults referencing the two poles of
'anthrophomorphic promiscuity' and 'sociographic prudery' within the
emergence of religious understanding/practice and calling to reject a
communal and classical-theistic (two-natures 'Christological') genesis of
thought: Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology,* 98f. and 113.

58  Kenneth J. Archer, *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic: Spirit, Scripture and
Community* (Cleveland, Tenn.: CPT, 2009).  Spirit–text–community: ibid.,
196ff. and 213ff.; cf. John Christopher Thomas 'Women, Pentecostals and
the Bible,' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 5 (1994): 41ff.  Yong, similarly,
'Spirit—Word—community,' but with a Christological implication in the
second member of the list: Yong, *Spirit—Word—Community.*

of the Spirit, Pentecostals may introduce imaginative 'play' to the more

highly formalised theology and practice of the wider church.[59]  In a similar

manner to Land, Smith begins with 'spirituality,' as an 'embodied set of

practices and disciplines,' implicit of a 'worldview' that gives orientation

and rise to religious practices and beliefs.  In its affective processes, it is

narrative-based and implies shared-and-embodied ethical orientations

which are 'carried in images, stories, and legends.'  Smith engages the

implications of Pentecostal spirituality, worldview and practice with

selected philosophical discourses, but fails to integrate these into a coherent

epistemological and metaphysical proposition.[60]

This is precisely what Yong provides by aligning pneumatological-

Trinitarian exploration with Peirce's categories of enquiry, with a view to

forging a theological hermeneutics and methodology.

*(3)  Peircean method (Yong)*

Yong correlates the persons of the triune God with his 'hermeneutical

---

59  Vondey, *Beyond Pentecostalism.*

60  Charles Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries* (Durham, N. Carol., and London: Duke Univ. Press, 2004), 23.  Smith, *Thinking in Tongues,* xviif.; Taylor, *Modern Social Imaginaries,* 23ff.

trialectic,' i.e. 'the continuous interplay of Spirit, Word, and Community.'[61] Thereby, Yong combines 'Spirit'—which he understands as encompassing the experience of Spirit baptism, but also the possibility-in-God of Alexandrian-theological speculation—with the Peircean-pragmatic notion of an immediate, embodied-experiential perception which urges undertakings of enquiry. Yong combines 'Word'—with the double connotation of Christology and truth (John 1:1ff. and 14:6)—with specific-conceptual determination and proposition making, e.g. through theological normativity. Finally, 'community,' which Yong combines with the notion of God as 'Father,' determines discursive and contextual agreements regarding truth conditions and acceptable methodologies of theological quest.

Two positive—and two problematic—ways must be identified in which it is possible to show that Yong's Peircean-academic pragmatism is both suitable and insufficient, in terms of capturing a fully Pentecostal-charismatic approach to constructing God, oneself and one's Pentecostal reality. On the positive side, Yong locates 'basic theological intuitions' at the beginning—and 'pneumatological imagination' at the centre—of the

---

61  Yong, *Spirit—Word—Community,* 7; cf. Archer, *Pentecostal Hermeneutics.*

theological-epistemic situation.[62] Yong also references Peirce's recognition

of 'fallibism:' that knowledge and its encompassing coherence—though

optimistically pursued—may be misguided and must remain partial and

under review.[63] From Pentecostal-charismatic grass roots, both Peircean

recognitions resonate a mature (whilst less academic) quest for prophetic

understanding and guidance. However, Yong's all-too-ready alignment of

embodied Spirit experience with the Neoplatonic speculations of the

catholic fathers[64]—alongside Peirce's hopeful-academic pursuit of true and

comprehensive knowledge through a Pentecostal Spirit eschatology—[65]

comes at a cost: the Pentecostal embodied-experiential dimension lacks

protection from abstract-idealistic—respectively lofty-academic—

theological speculation. Secondly, Yong's different guises of 'community'

---

62  Yong, *Spirit—Word—Community,* 25 and 123ff.

63  Charles S. Peirce, 'The First Rule of Logic (1898),' in *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings,* vol. 2, ed. Peirce Edition Project, Nathan Houser et al. (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 1998), 42ff.; Yong, *Spirit—Word—Community,* 100, 104 and passim; Yong, 'On Divine Presence and Divine Agency: toward a Foundational Pneumatology,' *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3, no. 2 (2000): 167ff.; cf. Christopher A. Stephenson, *Types of Pentecostal Theology: Method, System, Spirit* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2013), 87.

64  Yong, *Spirit—Word—Community,* 28ff.

65  Cf. the merging of pneumatological eschatology into the Roman-Catholic doctrine of the church; respectively into Pannenberg's concept of a single, future totality of history: Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Systematic Theology,* vol. 1, tr. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991), 227ff. and 230ff.

remain conventionally constructed as fields which normalise and discipline the production and discourse of (theological) knowledge. Yong references Tracy as a way of adding congregational, ecumenical and academic communities to Land's (and Archer's) denominationally 'Pentecostal' community.[66] However, he does not resolve the problem of a normative and normalised spiritual performance and knowledge production. A specific (academic-theological) power/truth economy remains superimposed upon the relations of divine power/presence according to a distributed Pentecostal-charismatic performance.

As far as the researcher is aware, only one contemporary-Pentecostal scholar addresses this problem of methodological normalisation and 'domestication' of the Pentecostal Spirit.

---

66  Yong, *Spirit—Word—Community,* 275f.; David Tracy, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 5 and 55ff. Peirce's triadic, epistemic correlation resonates with Clegg's power-framework in such a way that Yong's theological method can be interpreted in terms of a Cleggian 'three-circuits' analytics of a Peircean-theological enquiry. Located within Clegg's facilitative-disciplinary circuit, Yong's relevant 'communities' of the theological quest determine the shared—normative and disciplinary—conditions within which 'God' and theological truth can be accounted for.

*(4) 'God on the loose' (Davies)*

Davies corrects Archer's hermeneutic communalism and normalisation by introducing the disruptive dimension of Pentecostal experience to its distinctive use of scripture.

> [...] Pentecostalism requires a God on the loose, involving himself with the fine details of our earthly existence and actively transforming lives. I think Pentecostal theology, in both its systematic and more popular forms, requires a degree of uncertainty.[67]

From this point, a creative pluralisation of biblical-theological meaning must be permitted, prior to its communalisation. Pentecostals 'prefer to interpret Scripture by encounter more than exegesis,' and do not object to new, different, meanings; a 're-experiencing' of the biblical text, mediated by the Spirit.[68] Not to undermine the possibility of the emergence of distributed-charismatic/Pentecostal relations of power, one should, however, be careful not to declare incompatibility and disconnection as a matter of principle of a historical hermeneutics—as Davies does—but instead describe these as shifts and alterations in meaning that are reflective of new divine re-engagements with evolving and changing contexts and

---

67  Andrew Davies, 'What Does It Mean to Read the Bible as a Pentecostal?' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 18, no. 2 (2009): 220.

68  Davies, 'Read the Bible,' 221 and 225. Cf. Smith pointing out that by 'hermeneutical courage' experiences and events become identified with prophetical or biblical enunciation: Smith, *Thinking in Tongues,* 22ff.

spiritual relations.[69]

*Evaluation*

Overall, current contributions to academic-Pentecostal theology

follow Land in that they begin from embodied-spiritual experience and

intuition, which they construct as disciplined and normalised through the

collective-communal narratives, identities and practical routines of a

'Pentecostal'-denominational family engaging with a wider-theological

(traditionally or academically) normative and peer-reviewed accountability.

Since the time of the Charismatic Movement across historical

denominations (1960s–80s), progress has been made with regards to a more

sophisticated integration of embodied-religious performance and

theological discourse; however, the rich conceptual resources of a Pauline

distributed-charismatic pneumatology and member-body ecclesiology (1

Corinthians 12 and 14; Romans 12; Ephesians 4) were dropped from the

'canon within the canon' of Pentecostal/charismatic theology. A number of

---

69  In the current 'Foucault and theology' discourse, Beaudoin calls for a
    different pluralisation; respectively, the liberation of subjugated-alternative
    modes of embodied-theological understanding, learning and identity
    construction: Thomas Beaudoin, 'From Singular to Plural Domains of
    Theological Knowledge: Notes toward a Foucaultian New Question,' in
    *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience,* ed.
    James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette (Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington,
    Verm.: Ashgate, 2004), 171ff.

important insights have been noted, as follows: that Pentecostal spirituality is holistic and 'affective'-eschatological in nature (Land); that the Pentecostal quest for (theological) truth is experimental, 'playful' and accepts the provisional nature of its claims and findings; that 'Pentecostal community' is not a good point of reference, as it conceptually reinforces problems of normativity and normalisation; and that Pentecostals can embrace a pluralism of truths and conceptual innovation, especially when it comes to God (Davies).

The considered scholarship falls short in a major way, in that it refers to Pentecostal performance from a conventionally modern perspective, which is subject-centred epistemological or hermeneutical; and this leads to certain problems with regards to the relations of Pentecostal experience/practice, truth production and the Spirit of God. Due to modern subject—world, knowledge—experience and subject—object dichotomies, Pentecostal perception and emerging understanding of divine activity are considered only in their individualised human-embodied dimensions (as 'affections' or 'spirituality'), whilst their 'embarrassing,' external, objective and 'hybrid,' claims, relations and residual observations remain unaccounted for.[70] Even the most sympathetic and careful efforts at

---

70   'Hybrids' as embarrassment: Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 30, 34, 41ff. and

integrating spiritual-embodied experiences, and subsequent constructions and flows, into and under the normative-discursive regimes of modern and mainline theology, fall short in that they, too, cut across some of its most vital connections, to harm the delicate structural 'weave' by which a Pentecostal-charismatic Spirit or Kingdom rhizome may begin to move, vibrate, breath and live.[71]

The power-analytical observations of this chapter are made possible on the basis of allowing for unexpected-'hybrid' (Latour) or 'heterogeneous' connections 'against the oversignifying breaks separating structures or cutting across a single structure.'[72] Where theological understanding falls short, even the best pastoral practice will follow. The aim is therefore to contribute towards a clarification of relations of Pentecostal power and presence 'in the Spirit.' Instead of observing and supporting the creation of readily retraceable denominational clichés— subsequent to Pentecostal/charismatic breakthrough and revival, with power economies of their own—[73] the distributed-spiritual journey and

---

112.

71  On 'weave:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

72  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 7 and 11.

73  DG's principle of 'decalcomania:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 12ff.

process *towards* a Pentecostal-revivalist move of God shall be examined. The Spirit experience and understanding of Bartleman, a first-hand 'spokesperson' for Pentecostal presence, power and revival in the Progressive Era of the United States, provides particularly rich material for such an analysis and interpretation.

## 6.3  Biographical sketch of Bartleman's spiritual journey

Bartleman offers a compelling and most detailed eyewitness account of events at the Azusa Street mission which many Pentecostals continue to treat as authoritative.  Academic historians have, however, pointed out that Bartleman's narrative is not always historically accurate and clearly not even-handed.  Bartleman downplays Seymour's (black) leadership and overplays the significance of his contribution.  Recent critical accounts rightly choose to tell the Azusa Street story from the perspective of Seymour's group.[74]  In addition, Bartleman provides us with published material from which—beginning with his early years—his own spiritual-

---

74  Douglas J. Nelson, 'For Such a Time as This: the Story of Bishop William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival: a Search for Pentecostal/Charismatic Roots' (doct. diss., Birmingham, 1981); Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission;* Vinson Synan and Charles R. Fox, Jr, *William J. Seymour: Pioneer of the Azusa Street Revival,* ed. Harold J. Chadwick (Alachua, Fl.: Bridge-Logos, 2012).

experiential journey and ministry understanding can be reconstructed.[75]

Though one should always keep in mind that Bartleman's account is

intensely subjective and self-reliant as it follows its very own objectives, it

may, however, prove to be beneficial for the purposes of this research.

Like the theological framing of Pentecostal experience, historical

judgement comes with the precursory introduction of normative limitations

which prematurely limit one's capacity to observe the creation of

Pentecostal links and possibilities. In this sense, DG's positing of

---

75 Similarly analytic-ethnographic reconstructions of Pentecostal power
relations could, alternatively, be developed from healing evangelist Carrie
Judd Montgomery's published and unpublished source materials: Jennifer
Ann Miscov, 'Life on Wings: the Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie
Judd Montgomery (1858–1946)' (doct. thesis, Birmingham, 2011); Carrie
Judd Montgomery, *The Life and Teaching of Carrie Judd Montgomery,* ed.
Donald W. Dayton (New York and London: Garland, 1985). John G. Lake's
writings would facilitate a reconstruction of power relations of faith—
healing as a Pentecostal power relation: John G. Lake, *The Complete
Collection of His Life Teachings,* ed. Roberts Liardon (New Kensington,
Penn.: Whitaker House, 2005). Due to a tendency to propagandist-strategic
overstatements and misrepresentations, which are not uncommon amongst a
certain species of faith-healing evangelists, his self-accounts and reflections
however, lack reliability: cf. Barry Morton, '"The Devil Who Heals:" Fraud
and Falsification in the Evangelical Career of John G Lake, Missionary to
South Africa 1908–1913,' *African Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (2012): 98ff.
Alexander Boddy's and T. B. Barratt's published accounts, reflections, and
private texts would allow for a more European-evangelical take on God in
Pentecostal experience; bibliographies: Gavin Wakefield, *Alexander Boddy:
Pentecostal Anglican Pioneer* (London, Colorado Springs and Hyderabad:
Paternoster, 2007); and: Kyu-Hyung Cho, 'The Move to Independence from
Anglican Leadership: an Examination of the Relationship between
Alexander Alfred Boddy and the Early Leaders of the British Pentecostal
Denominations (1907–1930)' (doct. thesis, Birmingham, 2009). T. B.
Barratt, *The Work of T. B. Barratt*, ed. Donald W. Dayton (New York and
London: Garland, 1985).

'asignifying rupture,' allows for the (embodied-biological) growing of rhizomic links, 'against the oversignifying breaks separating structures or cutting across a single structure;' in addition, Latour polemicises against beginning an enquiry with methodological-normative enclosure of one's categories and object.[76] 'Balanced' historical judgement thus, is not the aim of reconstruction of Pentecostal power which limits itself to pursuing and reflecting upon *Bartleman's* embodied experience, journey and perspective. After all, the Pentecostal concern with power remains focused on the ongoing pursuit of a 'living,' ever evolving, divine presence and transformation. Bartleman presents himself as a Pentecostal prophetic intercessor and revivalist who, in a personal and embodied manner, sought to abide in, what he perceived to be, an unfolding within the moves and seasons of God's Spirit, 'always looking for something which he believed God would do.'[77] In his writings, Bartleman perceives and presents himself to be amongst the bringers and (embodied) carriers of a revival Spirit without whose contribution 'Azusa Street' may not have occurred, or taken the course it did, when it hit Los Angeles before impacting other outpourings and revivals across the globe.

---

76 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9; Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 29f. and 33f.

77 Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, 'The Writings and Thought of Frank Bartleman,' in Bartleman, *Witness to Pentecost,* vii.

Based on diary entries and previously published flyers and articles which Bartleman had written for the religious press, two versions of his story were printed. A more detailed and autobiographic narrative, from the mid-1920s, aimed to inform—indeed inspire—a second generation of (classical) Pentecostals. In 1908, at the height of events in Los Angeles, Bartleman wrote a less well-known account of his prophetic-revivalist witness to challenge, and draw yet more, people into this unfolding move of God.[78] The act of writing for a religious audience introduces a selective bias towards *exceptional* experiences and an affirmed-Pentecostal understanding, whilst the problematic, controversial, unclear, unconnected or merely unspectacular tends to feature less. Actors 'clean up [...] their own mess' to manage uncertainties and introduce stability into their accounts.[79] In addition, one must remain cautious of Bartleman's reading of initially uncertain perceptions and considerations which—in hindsight— gained a clarity of meaning, only on the basis of a subsequent connection. Nonetheless, Bartleman's published narrative provides us with sufficient traces of first-hand experience to facilitate the reconstruction of—if not in

---

78  F[rank] Bartleman, *My Story: 'the Latter Rain'* (Columbia, S.C.: John M. Pike, 1909), www.ccel.org. Four of Bartleman's titles, first published 1924 and 1925 were reprinted as facsimile for academic purposes: Bartleman, *Witness to Pentecost;* of these, relevant for this chapter: Bartleman, *From Plough to Pulpit: from Maine to California* (Los Angeles: self-pub., 1924); and: Bartleman, *How Pentecost*.

79  Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 161.

every aspect—at least the nature of Pentecostal experience, understanding and practice. By undertaking a rhizome-ontologically informed analysis which focuses on observing connections and takes care to include those of a mixed—material and embodied—nature, this research hopes to clarify the means by which Pentecostal/charismatic powers and realms of the divine are being constructed. Unlike most Pentecostal theology and scholarship to date, the focus of this study is how Pentecostal-spiritual power *is assembled,* i.e. the *journey towards* Spirit breakthrough and revival (Azusa Street), rather than the outcome/legacy. Tracking the initial making of network relations is, of course, in keeping with a 'post-structuralist' concern regarding the descriptive-subversive (historical) analysis of bottom-up *constructions* of power relations and their subsequent modes of operation and capacities; the very same concerns that ANT researchers, in particular, have explicitly emphasised.[80]

For an initial overview and frame of reference by which to locate analytical reconstructions, in terms of rhizomatic power relations (6.5), a brief sketch of Bartleman's spiritual journey shall be given.[81]

---

80  Latour, *Science in Action;* Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 88ff.

81  Bartleman, *From Plough to Pulpit;* Bartleman, *How Pentecost;* Bartleman, *My Story*; Robeck, 'Writings and Thought;' Robeck, 'Bartleman, Frank,' in *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements,* ed. Stanley M. Burgess (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan,

*(1)  Evangelist, pastor, prophetic-intercessor*


Born in 1871, Bartleman grew up in rural Pennsylvania; a middle child, introverted and suffering from bad health, he was under the harsh discipline of his father who was of south-western German descent and who struggled to make ends meet.  In order to find work and education, Bartleman went to Philadelphia where he attended Conwell's evening college and Grace Baptist congregation.  Attracted by the example of his friends, he began reading the Bible and, in autumn 1893, experienced a full Methodist conversion, without preparation or guidance—Bartleman emphasises—from his church or friends, but on occasion of a prophetic inner voice.  Recognising his calling, Conwell licensed Bartleman to preach.  Rejecting funding offers to attend a theological seminary, he felt drawn to evangelistic ministry in the slums.  Emphasising his independent calling and his being 'naturally independent,'[82]  Bartleman embraced a life of poverty and hardship, learning to rely upon prayer and grace for the provision of his basic needs.  Hardship, Bartleman felt, deepened and accelerated his spiritual growth and intimacy with God.  He had initial successes as evangelist and revival preacher.

---

2002), 366.

82  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 22.

After evening college (1897), Bartleman joined a Salvation Army corps in one of Philadelphia's working-class districts. Within a few weeks, a significant congregation of around 170 new converts had gathered. Struggling with leading a disunited team and a difficult congregation in Johnstown, within weeks, Bartleman had deserted his first captain's charge to attend D. L. Moody's Bible Institute in Chicago. He became a travelling evangelist with the Bible Institute 'Gospel Wagon,' venturing to the Southern States. There, in addition to regular, severe headaches, neuralgic pain and generally poor health, Bartleman contracted malaria. In the summer of 1899, Bartleman was given temporary care of the Hope rescue mission in Pittsburgh. Here, Bartleman experienced a Pentecostal breakthrough. For health reasons, he was no longer able to sustain a public ministry and returned to Pittsburgh as a mission worker, focusing on intercession. Prophetic perception now came swifter and was more precise, and he appeared to—quite reliably—enter a place of divine presence and glory as congregations headed for their spiritual breakthrough. Ahead of exceptional struggles, Bartleman would experience quasi-embodied visitations by either 'the devil' or Jesus.[83]

In May 1900, Bartleman married Anna Ladd and became a

---

83  Cf. Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 132ff.

Wesleyan-Methodist minister in rural Erie County, Pennsylvania. Bartleman could lead one of his congregations into revival. Major confrontations and challenges now emerged from within the Holiness movement. As workers of a Denver mission home, Bartleman's family experienced spiritual/emotional abuse at the hands of the influential but overpowering Holiness preacher and church founder Alma White.[84] In Colorado and California, Bartleman encountered 'Burning Bush' followers denouncing more accommodating Christian leaders and taking over missions and churches.[85] Bartleman's theological outlook now changed. The uncompromising pursuit of holiness and revival became subordinated to non-sectarianism, focusing on Jesus and love. In the summer of 1903, after a conflict with a 'Burning Bush' worker and with Bartleman's health deteriorating once again, he was forced to leave full-time ministry at the Sacramento Peniel Mission. Bartleman struggled to find suitable employment that would feed his family. He became worn down and depressed ('the spirit of heaviness').[86]

---

84  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 89 and 90ff. For a sympathetic reconstruction of Alma White's leadership practice and point of view: Susie Cunningham Stanley, *Feminist Pillar of Fire: the Life of Alma White* (Cleveland, Oh.: Pilgrim Press, 1993).

85  On the Metropolitan Church Association ('Burning Bush'): William Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America* (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2010).

86  Bartleman, *My Story,* 16.

*(2)  Towards a Californian Pentecost*

During Christmas 1904, Bartleman's family arrived in Los Angeles. Over his child's grave (Esther died at the age of four) Bartleman experienced a recommissioning.  At the Pasadena Peniel Mission, other congregations and Holiness meetings, Bartleman saw how prayer ushered in God's presence.  Bartleman found other intercessors and revivalists who—taking account of what was happening in Wales—hoped, prayed and prepared for a similar move of God.  Meetings at Pastor Smale's Los Angeles First Baptist Church began to open up to more liquid and organic processes of self-organisation which were 'unguided by human hands.'[87] Bartleman communicated revivalist expectations by way of sharing at meetings, flyer distribution, and writing for the religious press.  By the end of 1905/beginning of 1906, Bartleman had discovered that Smale's ministry would not fully commit to the divine move which was underway. They learned that on 9th April 1906, 'the Spirit of Pentecost' had fallen on a cottage prayer meeting of black revivalists hosted by an obscure preacher, William Seymour.  When the San Francisco earthquake struck on 18th April, the meetings had moved downtown to the stables of a derelict chapel in Azusa Street.  Whilst fasting, Bartleman wrote and distributed a final

---

87  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19.

tract on the divine purpose of earthquakes.  The shaking of Progressive-Era confidence contributed to people, from across the city and surrounding areas flocking to the mission.  Bartleman became one of the many visitors who immersed themselves in the Spirit presence and processes.  All that had been prophesied and hoped for—and more—now seemed to come together.  Bartleman was impressed by how Seymour's mixed-race team, in prayerful sincerity, allowed for God's Spirit to lead; like many, he experienced a sense of intense love and convicting presence in—and even outside—the building; he noticed the overcoming of racial differences; and was awestruck by the gift of a 'heavenly chorus' which ministered to his soul.  The Spirit breakthrough was spread by mission teams across the city and the wider region.  Like many others, Bartleman began Pentecostal meetings in a nearby church building which he rented.  As Christians arrived from overseas, missionaries went to places abroad.  The Azusa Street Spirit move disintegrated into groups and ministries.  For a time, Bartleman aligned with Durham, who introduced a doctrinal split.  Bartleman travelled internationally as a preacher and engaged with inner-Pentecostal theological controversy.

The nature of Bartleman's accounts clearly change as his family reaches southern California, due to a significant expansion of the

rhizomatic network with which he now engaged, ahead of the Azusa Street

Pentecost. Even before this outpouring, it is possible to see how changes to

the capacities (i.e. power relations) of Bartleman's ministry relate to

rhizomic developments: as his Pittsburgh Pentecostal breakthrough

unlocked embodied-prophetic dimensions of intercession, for example, or

as marriage and being given a rural charge, slowed down—yet enhanced

and deepened—the effects of Bartleman's revivalist engagement and work.


## 6.4  Rhizomic power


In order to explore the power relations of Bartleman's Pentecostal

journey and ministry, the concept of rhizome must first be introduced.[88]

Choosing to access DG's 'Rhizome' chapter in: *A Thousand Plateaus* via a

Foucauldian analysis of sexuality/desire, makes it possible to conceptualise

the power of a living and ever-growing weave from 'deterritorialized flows

of desire.'[89]  It is thus possible to translate DG's concern for a

---

88  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 3ff.; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 22ff.;
    Holland, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 37ff.; Kruger, 'Rhizome/Arborescent;'
    Colman, 'Rhizome;' May, *Gilles Deleuze,* 133f.; Colebrook, *Understanding
    Deleuze,* xxviif. and 76f.; Buchanan, *Deleuzism,* 117ff.; Bogard, 'Sense and
    Segmentarity;' Adkins and Hinlicky, *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology,*
    72ff.; Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 80ff.

89  DG, *Anti-Oedipus,* 136, 277 and 314.

metaphysical-philosophical exploration into that of a power-analytical

perspective and tool which is suitable for our purposes.[90]  Furthermore,

DG's pragmatic-experimental—both practical and conceptual—exploration

of possibilities of rhizomic connection and innovation, is congenial to the

creation and developments of—in Bartleman's case—literally 'nomadic'[91]

prophetic-intercessory ministry capacities and their relating discursive

understandings.  This chapter demonstrates that, alongside DG, radical-

Pentecostal pioneers such as Bartleman share an interest in the 'whether,'

'to what degree' and 'how' it is possible to create 'consistency without

imposing unity, identity, or organization—without resorting to bare

repetition of the same.'[92]  If Pentecostal presence and power (God's Spirit,

God's Kingdom) were rhizomatic, in a Deleuzo-Guattarian understanding,

it should be possible to demonstrate that emergent capacities and power

---

90  The Deleuzean metaphysical programme contains its own power concern;
    one which is obliged to Nietzsche and Foucault.  Innovative or possible
    propositions are powerful according to their intrinsic capacity and vigour
    with which they push for distributed and varied repetitions, i.e. according to
    the quality and depth of their connections with the 'interstice' within the
    relations of the previously known.  Such a specific-ontological and micro-
    political power concern inter-engages with those of ANT and Foucault.
    Barber, *Deleuze,* 45ff., 56f. and 86f.; Patton, *Deleuze and the Political,* 49ff.;
    Claire Colebrook, 'Power,' in *The Deleuze Dictionary,* ed. Adrian Parr, rev.
    edn (Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010), 215f.

91  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 380f.

92  Holland, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 9, orig. emph.; Deleuze, *Difference and
    Repetition;* cf. Welker, *God the Spirit,* 23ff., 37f., 141, 149f. and 228f.

effects of a Pentecostal-charismatic divine are best explained through the very nature of rhizomic relation building and growth.

As an image, 'rhizome' derives from the field of botany and refers to the creeping rootstocks developed by many grasses, bulbous and tuberous-root plants.  DG contrast rhizome with different kinds of root/branch systems of trees which stand for an old-European understanding; one which progresses from a first totality or principle, or is gathered into a subsequent unity, and very often fans out by way of a binary rationale.  Systematic assessment, planning and organisation—in a conventional-Aristotelian vein—is just one of the examples; and one which also exemplifies the identity of modern-hierarchical knowledge production, its ethics of control and mandatory structural power.  Rhizomic development, however, is unprincipled, unsystematic, non-hierarchical and non-unified, having 'another way of travelling and moving: proceeding from the middle, through the middle, coming and going rather than starting and finishing.'[93] DG refer to other images and examples to clarify and extend their understanding of rhizome, including burrows, packs of rats, the brain, seeds and local accents spreading along valleys and streams, the 'aparallel evolution' and the symbiosis of orchid wasps and their relating orchid

---

93   DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 25.

species, viral-genetic transfers sideways from baboons to cats, and certain books—e.g. Kleist and Büchner—in their relationship with the world. The understanding of 'rhizome' is finally determined by six analytical-conceptual 'principles' which are: 'connection,' 'heterogeneity,' 'multiplicity,' 'asignifying rupture,' 'mapping' and 'tracing.'[94] DG clarify the meaning of these rhizomatic principles over and against their respective—conventionally 'arborescent'—counterpart principles. In section 6.5, DG's rhizomatic principles facilitate an ethnographic analysis of the power relations of Bartleman's pioneering Pentecostal ministry and journey.

*(1) Connection and heterogeneity*

'Principles of connection and heterogeneity' should be considered together: 'any point of a rhizome can be connected to anything other, and must be.' Rhizomatic connection differs from disconnected, arborescent unities, and regimes of enclosed order. Further, DG's rhizome is 'an essentially heterogeneous reality;' in that—like Foucault's dispositives of power and actor networks—it combines linguistic, as well as material,

---

94 Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2* (Paris: Minuit, 1980), 13ff.; Engl. tr. Massumi: DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 7ff.

practical and other non-linguistic elements.[95]  However, as a result of DG's

'and must be,' one is morally urged to delve deeper into densely

interwoven, fluid relations which facilitate creative innovations.  In this

way, occasional connective nodes, and repeatable, more dependable, tubers

of Bartleman's Pentecostal journey, and ministry practice can be seen as

'heterogeneous.'


*(2)  Multiplicity*


> A multiplicity has neither subject nor object, only determinations,
> magnitudes, and dimensions that cannot increase in number without the
> multiplicity changing in nature [...].[96]

With rhizomatic growth, either the increase in rhizomic connections, areal

spread, or the interweaving of two independent rhizomes into a single

'multiplicity,' it is the rhizomatic capacities which multiply.  What a

rhizome 'can do:' depends upon what further connections and innovations

are facilitated and become possible.[97]  Therefore, with the increase of

---

95  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 7.  Loosely, DG reference Foucault's work on
    power/discourse.  'A rhizome ceaselessly establishes connections between
    semiotic chains, organizations of power, and circumstances relative to the
    arts, sciences, and social struggles.'  Ibid., 7.  Cf. also: Law, 'Actor Network
    Theory.'

96  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

97  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 256f.; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 4, 26
    and 29.

dimensions, the very nature of a rhizome changes.  As rhizomic growth

occurs 'from the middle' ('au millieu'): from a place within its contextual

situation, as it strategically engages with surrounding possibilities, realities

and objects;[98] it, accordingly, cannot be appropriately understood—i.e. it

will be subjected to violence—if approached by any of the following

rationales: one and many, full picture and its constitutive elements, modern

normative or systematic organisational.  'Unity,' where it occurs, is

introduced from the outside by way of a discursive 'overcoding' or 'power

takeover.'[99]  'Multiplicity' denotes the rhizomic feature that new

connections/growth have the potential to introduce new capacities and

possibilities, thereby changing the very nature of a rhizome.  For the

purposes of this research, I shall overlook the fact that DG's multiplicity

concept has a more precise, metaphysical, meaning.


Like Latour, DG specifically point out that neither subject nor object

is given ontological priority over the other.[100]  DG clarify this

---

98  DG, *Mille Plateaux,* 34; DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 23.  Cf. Callon's
consideration of the efforts, difficulties, processes and risks involved in
processes of 'translation,' and the creation and reinforcement of actor
networks: Callon, 'Sociology of Translation.'

99  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

100 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.  In ANT, objects as 'mediators' and actor
networks in their own right have agency: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,*
70ff. and 74f.  Human subjectivity, having the same ontological status, is

consideration, pointing out that 'the weave' of strings and rods by which

marionettes are brought to life form a multiplicity with the other 'weave'

which is the puppeteer's brain: 'which forms another puppet in other

dimensions connected to the first.'[101]  Latour pushes the puppeteering

paradigm still further.  Puppets surprise skilful puppeteers by taking control

of their movements, words and courses of action.

> He makes the puppet do things that cannot be reduced to his action, and
> which he does not have the skill to do, even potentially.  [...] we are
> *exceeded* by what we create.[102]

Latour regards the image in two ways.  Many external attachments are

prerequisite to facilitating and resourcing action; only by an increased

complexity of the weave—and not by cutting ties—may the 'inner

freedom' of a competent, cultured and rounded (human) personality be

achieved.[103]  Latour also transfers the motif to the construction of religious

artefacts and powers.  Worshippers or priests of a cult can find themselves

taken over by a power or divinity that, without their action and

---

equally externally facilitated and constructed: ibid., 207ff., 213ff. and 260.
Reference to process metaphysics: ibid., 218; cf. Whitehead, *Science,* 141ff.
and 151f.; cf. Latour, *Never Been Modern,* 55ff.

101 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

102 Bruno Latour, 'On Interobjectivity,' *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 3, no. 4
(1996): 237; Latour, 'Factures/Fractures: from the Concept of Network to the
Concept of Attachment,' *RES* 36 (1999): 25.

103 Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 214ff.

engagement, would not even exist.[104]  According to Piette, with regards to parish life in France today, God may thus be seen to circulate in, through, above and across his many modes of relevance and presence as familial love.[105]

*(3) Asignifying rupture*

DG's principle of 'asignifying rupture'—the bursting, erupting and running of rhizomic shoots, even from broken-off tubers and fractions of a stem—contrasts with the violence of 'all too signifying cuts' by which modern-analytical and organisational approaches separate and destroy even essential heterogeneous connections.[106]  This principle relates to: Pentecostal rupture and Spirit breakthrough under—or after—duress; Bartleman's itinerancy; and also to 'revival' finding—when rejected—a different outlet, vessel or community.  That a rhizome 'acts on desire by

---

104 Latour, 'Cult of the Factish Gods;' on puppeteering: ibid., 7.

105 One is 'to consider together the human constructive work of the religious act and the independence of an external and autonomous divine being, such that he surpasses those humans who have constructed him, who have render him present.' Piette, *Religion de près,* 57, tr. DQ.  Cf. ibid., 56ff. and 75ff.  Cf. Latour's experimentation with evoking a sense of divine presence by performance of a religious speech-act: Latour, *Rejoicing;* Latour, 'Thou Shall Not Freeze Frame.'

106 Quote: DG, *Mille Plateaux,* 16, tr. DQ.

external, productive outgrowth' is reflective of Pentecostal desire ('spiritual hunger') being sublimated into the pursuit of an externally distributed divine. A rhizome is 'a process that is perpetually prolonging itself, breaking off and starting up again.' It '[...] may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will rebound time and again after most of it has been destroyed. You can never get rid of ants [...].' Rhizomes become 'stratified, territorialized, organized, signified, attributed, etc.' along 'lines of segmentarity'—consider pastoral practice, theological/sociological discourse—but will find ways to erupt, escape and undermine efforts to bring about the 'signifying' categorical fixing of their legitimate relations of meaning and practice (John 3:8).[107]

The 'lines of deterritorialization' of rhizomic escape are not determined by meaningful signification and unity, but are of a different, elementary vitality. New heterogeneous connections are created, just as they are between the orchid and its wasp, by way of 'the *aparallel evolution* of two beings that have absolutely nothing to do with each other:' each being becoming a part of the other being ('deterritorialization')—on condition that the other being makes the first a part of itself

---

107 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 14, 20 and 9. DG point out that among cancerous rhizomatic relations there are also 'microfascisms just waiting to crystallize.' Today this a most relevant point to make: ibid., 9f.

('reterritorialization').  Thereby, as is the case with viral genetic transfer, code—elements of meaning which induce evolutionary change—travel sideways between species so that, although now rhizomatically connected, they remain otherwise—genealogically—foreign to each other.[108]

*(4)  Mapping and tracing*

DG's 'principle of mapping and of tracing' duplicates the central concepts of rhizomic and arborescent strategy, with 'tracing' relating to the unsophisticated use of tracing paper or 'stickers' (Adkins); and 'mapping' referring to creative processes of identifying, representing and creating relations across a city/landscape—in such a way that the experience of the external space itself becomes enhanced.[109]  The best contemporary reference to use as an example is mind mapping.[110]  'What distinguishes the map from the tracing is that it is entirely oriented toward an

108 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 10.  DG reference the entomologist and counter-Darwinian evolutionist Rémy Chauvin: ibid., 10f.  Cf. 'translation' in ANT: Callon, 'Sociology of Translation;' Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 108f.

109 DG, *Mille Plateaux,* 19, tr. DQ; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 29. Massumi's translation for 'décalcomanie' is unfortunate.  DG do not refer to 'decalcomania,' an artistic technique that creates evocative, rhizome-like effects; DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 11.  Equally, 'cartographie' does not relate to the scientific-mathematical transfer of geometric relations from a landscape onto its representation—which would be 'tracing.'

110 Popularised as a learning technique: [Tony Buzan,] 'Tony Buzan: Inventor of Mind Mapping,' www.tonybuzan.com.

experimentation in contact with the real.' Both, tracing *and* mapping, are

principles of rhizomic exploration. 'There are knots of arborescence in

rhizomes, and rhizomatic offshoots in roots.' It matters however, how both

principles are combined: '[...] *the tracing should always be put back on the*

*map.* This operation and the previous one [tracing rhizomic maps] are not

at all symmetrical.'[111] As one frames rhizomatic relations within

arborescent structures, creative innovation is hindered, even curtailed.

However, as one interweaves stable and resistant, tree-like knowledges and

structural relations within the ever-evolving, ever-growing sequences of

rhizomic connection making, creative innovation and change in the

rhizome and in its interconnecting environment may be further enhanced

and stabilised. DG demonstrate this difference by revisiting two canonical

psychoanalytical case studies: little Hans and little Richard seeking—and

failing—to outmanoeuvre their therapists' efforts at encasing their

imaginative (rhizomatic) performances within the limiting prefabricated

possibilities of the Oedipus syndrome. It is epistemologically important

that it is only from the children's rhizomatic point of view that both sides of

the picture can be observed and represented. On the basis of a Freudian-

Oedipal overcoding, 'only the impasses, blockages, incipient taproots, or

points of structuration' will be identified and made to fit the preconceived

---

111 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 12, 20 and 13, orig. emph.

paradigm.[112]  In relation to spiritual innovation, which was facilitated by Pentecostal pioneers in pursuit of the next move of the Spirit, DG's proposition clarifies how Weber's routinisation of charisma can be avoided by fostering a rhizomatic-pastoral and cognitive approach.[113]  Organised, legitimised, reflective, crystalline and stable forms of previous Pentecostal/charismatic flows and movements may indeed be remobilised, re-liquefied, and spawn rhizomic escapes and transformations.

These ever-evolving landscapes include areas of both rhizome and arborescence, so that areas of faster-flowing creativity engage with areas of greater structural stability.  A rhizome is thus an interconnected and stratified 'continuous, self-vibrating region of intensities,' and of 'flows.'  'Comparative rates of flow, along these lines, produce phenomena of relative slowness and viscosity, or, on the contrary, of acceleration and rupture.'[114]  Imagination and language are also suitable for Pentecostal-charismatic accounts of the presence/power of God's Spirit and Kingdom: here, burning like a fire, there flowing like a river; now falling as rain, then

---

112 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 14 and 13.

113 Cf. Drooger's methodological ludism: Droogers, *Play and Power,* 311ff. and 339ff.; and Latour's methodological admonishment 'to follow the actors themselves:' Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 12 and passim.

114 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 22f. and 3f.

spluttering like a well; taking the form of a gentle breeze, a wind or a

raging storm; vibrating over the deep, brooding like a hen; at times, a quiet,

unobtrusive presence, waiting like a gentleman, at times, the roaring of a

lion, the violent shattering of rocks, the shaking of mountains ...


## 6.5  Developments in a rhizome of Pentecostal power


### 6.5.1  Growth from the middle—from the outset


*Bartleman's conversion*


A rhizome 'has neither beginning nor end, but always a middle

*(milieu)* from which it grows and which it overspills.'[115]  Bartleman's

conversion includes some elements of a compact beginning, from which

further downstream, more complex spiritual understandings and practices

have the potential to evolve or become intertwined.  For example,

Bartleman emphasises the solitude and individualism of his spiritual quest,

his first exploration of scripture and his eventual recognition of the gentle

---

115 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 21.

intimacy and love in God's dealing with him.[116]  Bartleman relates this to

having been a sensitive, often misunderstood child, struggling with ill

health and his father's harshness.[117]  Intelligence, a vivid imagination and

introversion, predispositioned Bartleman for intense inner experiences of

God, later on in life.[118]  Of greater importance to Bartleman, his being

'naturally independent' resonated with his decision to embrace hardship

and minister to the poor, when he could have had his seminary training

funded;[119] it also resonated with Bartleman's calling to be 'God's free man,

to obey Him,' pursuing his spiritual journey as a 'lone wolf,' wherever the

Spirit led.[120]  When coming under 'a fanatical spirit' of abusive

manipulation at the Pentecostal Mission home in Colorado, it was this

quality which saved Bartleman's independent judgement and standing in

---

116 'I began to follow the light that sprung up before me desperately.  I felt it
was leading me to the goal my heart desired.  [...]  I would trust no one to
advise me.  And so I stumbled on.  But God was leading, unconsciously to
me.  He knew me.  And He knew how to reach me.  Human instrumentality,
aside from the lives of my young friends at the Church and College, seemed
to count little in the process.  I think He wanted no mistake to be made in the
handling of my soul.  He had a purpose in my life and would lead me
Himself.  This has made me independent, in His service.'  Bartleman, *From
Plough,* 17f.

117 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 5ff.; Bartleman, *My Story,* 8f.

118 Luhrmann suggests that natural or acquired capacities of imagination and
absorption ('flow') relate to embodied-Pentecostal capabilities of
experiencing God as real: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 189ff.

119 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 22, 24, 27 and 80.

120 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 22 and 35; Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 48.

God.[121]  In other ways however, Bartleman's conversion puts one into the complex middle of many heterogeneous relations; the kind which would become characteristic of his journey and ministry.  These include *prophetic obedience* and the core sequence of Bartleman's *ministry dispositive.*

Already in the pre-conversion process, Bartleman acknowledges an initially undetermined inner-embodied 'hunger' for that which was in the life of his Christian friends;[122] for pursuing the direction of 'the light that sprung up before me desperately' and, in recognition of God's gentle love, a sense of 'getting closer' and a 'yielding' of the heart.[123]  Could one call this 'prophetic?'  Reflective clarity of the account was achieved with post-conversion hindsight.  On the occasion of Bartleman's conversion breakthrough, a quasi-embodied capacity of prophetic listening is supplied:[124]

Suddenly something seemed to say to me, 'It must be settled now.'  [...]

---

121 'I dared not cast away my confidence in my individual leading.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 90.  Ibid., 90ff.

122 'Their lives made me hungry.  They had something I needed.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 17.

123 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 17 and 19.

124 'Suddenly something seemed to say to me [...]  Then a voice seemed to say to me [...].'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 19f.  Note 'seemed,' the 'as if' notion of virtuality, which is fairly common in the Pentecostal engagement with the divine.  Cf. Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* xix, 70f., 95 and 141f.

> As I sat there my life seemed to pass before me like a panorama. It was so empty. All my habits, everything, trooped past before me. Then a voice seemed to say to me, 'Will you give up all these for peace with God?' I gladly answered, 'Yes!' I felt I would rather die now than live a moment longer without God. I told the Lord He could take me to heaven in thirty minutes if He wanted to, if He would only reveal Himself to me. And that moment He entered powerfully into my soul.[125]

It was two voice-of-God interventions which initiated and structured, in Bartleman, a complex process of inner revelation which led to a prayerful response, the formalising of his conversion, and the releasing of fulfilling peace and joy. Immediately afterwards, Bartleman perceives another prophetic impulse; this time a nonverbal, embodied push or pull alongside a sense of pre-reflective understanding. 'The impression that I must tell some one was overwhelming. I felt I would hold God in that way.'[126] Only with hindsight, can Bartleman identify many aspects of his conversion process—including the need to give witness of his salvation—as being 'biblical' from a Methodist-theological understanding.[127] This in turn, reinforces the concept of divine agency and leading behind the experience. As Bartleman processed the 'impression,' another prophetic impulse—this time quasi-visual—imposed itself. 'A Gospel Mission I had often seen on

---

125 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 19.

126 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 21.

127 Cf. Matthew 10:32 par. and Romans 10:10.

Ninth street [sic!], [...] but never entered, flashed into my mind.'[128]  He

immediately went.  Bartleman's previously internal deliverance, peace and

joy found an subsequent, external-reflection in the communal jubilation of

the congregation whose meeting he interrupted.  'It broke up the service

and everybody in the house.  A scene of glory filled the place.'[129]


Bartleman's conversion narrative incorporates aspects of linear

development: Bartleman's pre-given intelligent inquisitiveness,

introversion and capability of being carried along by 'flow,'[130] is now

channelled into a Pentecostal capacity of perceiving prophetic impulses and

following an inner-spiritual guidance.  Even more interestingly, vital

sequences, decisions and processes—rather than *following* cognisant

understanding—become clear with regards to their discursive meaning and

relevance *only after* their being prophetically received and acted upon.[131]

Similarly, Bartleman's urge to give public witness of his experience

appears to anticipate his later ministry and message as an evangelist-

---

128 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 21.

129 Bartleman, *My Story,* 10.

130 Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 137.

131 On the temporal relations of Pentecostal-prophetic experience and
    understanding: Bialecki, *Diagram for Fire,* 3f.

preacher.[132] The temporally ordered sequence of Bartleman responding to an inner-prophetic urge, leading to Bartleman experiencing personal-embodied breakthrough, followed by subsequent, external and communally public spiritual breakthrough in a worshipping congregation, would eventually turn out to be a power formation of central importance to Bartleman's ministry and self-understanding as a carrier of the Spirit; though, over time, new elements become added and a Pentecostal deepening and widening occurs. Bartleman's ministry rhizome thus clearly *begins* to grow 'from the middle.'[133] Did knowledge seep into Bartleman's spiritual journey in a non-conscious manner—sideways—from a multitude of places—in the way that viral-rhizomic transfer introduces alien genetic material?[134] Bartleman's narrative leads towards a more seductive consideration of his conversion experience already being located within the rhizomic 'middle' of the still to be realised power dispositive and practice of his later Spirit experience, ministry and journey. Each event of (apparently) reversed temporal-causal relations, over and against a

132 'It was suggested to my mind immediately that I must tell some one about it. I felt that would clinch the matter between my soul and God. It was again the voice of the Spirit speaking. I was saved to tell it. With the witness of my own acceptance came a desire to witness to others about it.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 20.

133 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 23 and 25.

134 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 10.

conventional economy of discursive understanding, reaffirms the experiential sense and cognitive idea of divine action, agency and guidance.

### 6.5.2  Distributed and heterogeneous connections: Pentecostal tubers

Amongst the many elementary, but fairly reliable, dispositive relations of Pentecostal power which, together, determine Bartleman's Pentecostal ministry/journey, only a few shall be examined in the following section.  These are: the construction of Bartleman's faith—provision; a few variations of the emergent prophetic; the gathering and subsequent possibilities of divine absence, as well as obstacles to Bartleman's revivalist ministry; and eventually, the emergent development of Bartleman's revivalist ministry dispositive into a prophetic-intercessory capacity of 'bringing' the Spirit breakthrough.

*(1)  Faith—provision*

The faith—provision relation is an essential element of a narrative-arc sequence of elements which repeats itself in many variations across

Bartleman's accounts (more below).  Bartleman was raised in impoverished circumstances.  When called to the ministry, he consciously embraces hardship and a life in which 'seeking God's Kingdom first' correlates with the biblical promise of divine provision.  The faith—provision relation was first established here, in a sequence whereby the foundation of Bartleman's emerging ministry was simultaneously laid.  Accepting to be sponsored as a Baptist candidate would have compromised his calling to slum ministry, Bartleman reasons.  A student at that time, and struggling to make ends meet, Bartleman found himself to be hugely encouraged by the following experience:

> On two occasions the second hand book man offered me exactly the price I had asked the Lord to give me for some books, without my having suggested any price to him.[135]

This, in turn, encouraged Bartleman and reaffirmed his sense that he was in—and continued to move in—God's will and favour.  The set of subsequent—later, internal—external dispositive relations are, thus, not confined to a straight-forward relation (blessing asked for—received); but rhizomatic development and learning may come from many sides.

Faith—provision in the case of Bartleman was overall modest, often

---

135 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 24.

arrived late in the day and did not stop Bartleman—all too often—burning

the candle at both ends.  Provision often appeared to come in response to

Bartleman's precise prayer requests.[136]  It would take the form of finance,

goods, or practical help.[137]  Provision and people's help would also arrive

either without explicit prayer or with prophetic anticipation instead.[138]

Obviously, Bartleman received divine provision from real people (e.g. the

book vendor), although as a matter of principle, the request for support is

always directed towards God and never towards human instruments of

grace.[139]  Bartleman would take, for example, the divine provision of his

travel fare as confirmation that his relocation plans were according to the

Spirit's leading.[140]  Over time, Bartleman became more daring in

identifying his concrete needs, and would prophetically know exactly what

---

136 Change in Bartleman's pocket covers for a tram-fare 'to the cent:' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 38.

137 A coat, Bartleman's size, *and* the car-fare for the journey home: Bartleman, *From Plough,* 67; suit: ibid., 72; hitching a lift: ibid., 45.; praying for a sleigh: ibid., 81; money for camp meeting: ibid., 100; firewood: ibid., 101.

138 'We were expecting a box of goods by freight from my wife's parents in N. Y. state.  The Lord revealed to me the very day it arrived.  I had received no notice, but I went to the station for it.  Sure enough it had just arrived.  It had been weeks on the way.  This greatly strengthened my faith.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 75f.

139 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 46, 47, 48 and pass.

140 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 50.  Cf. ibid., 69 and 106 (together with ibid., 104).

financial amounts to pray for.[141]  The link between prayer and a subsequent-external divine response appeared to become shorter, more reliable and precise.[142]  Prophetic clarity and provision after prayer seemed to become more a matter of course, and levels of provision (sums of money) increased.[143]  Pentecostal learning occurs as an effect of ongoing repetitions and variation of the paradigm,[144] but also through reflection on scripture (e.g. Matthew 6:33), and through the consideration of both one's own and other people's experiences.[145]  In its most basic, most generalised, form, Bartleman would account for four elements which constitute the prayer—provision dispositive.

> We frequently got out of money altogether.  Then we would pray and the
> Lord would make some one give to us.  We were trusting God, living by

---

141 Receiving twenty dollars after praying for two: Bartleman, *From Plough,* 86.

142 'I asked the Lord to send a wagon along.  In less than three minutes a man drove by, and gave me a ride clear into Ozark.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 45.

143 'I prayed the Lord for $10.00 extra, and He sent it to us, in the mail.  This I needed for our fares back to Santa Cruz, where we felt led to go.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 130.

144 Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition.*

145 Preaching for an offering as a travelling evangelist, Bartleman only received 5 cents.  Soon after, B. observed his more senior preaching partner place concern for the offering ahead of prophetic guidance, after which he fell ill. Both reinforced Bartleman's understanding of the biblical standard. Bartleman, *From Plough,* 51ff.  Prophetic listening lacking precision: ibid., 112.  In charge of a mission in Sacramento, Bartleman found free-will offerings increased when they relinquished collections during meetings: ibid., 114.

faith the same as when we were in the mission work.[146]

In a few occasions, reference to prayer is omitted as an element of this sequence.  It is essential to note the relation of an embodied investment of faith/prayer, *from a private/hidden place,* and its connection with produce, finance or some kind of practical help *from the outside.*  Bartleman's taking into account of divine provision does not imply that he dismissed more down-to-earth—alternative—reasoning.[147]  The link of dispositive elements is stabilised by biblical reflection.  Across—and in each of—the distributed-and-disparate elements of the dispositive and its repetitions, as framed by biblical code, divine activity/power may be seen and experienced: a God who is at work and in charge.  Finding his ministry and family unsupported could lead Bartleman to speculate whether other Christians were failing God.[148]  Alternatively, his lack of encountering provision by grace, or even falling short in terms of prophetic precision, would lead him towards introspection.[149]  Bartleman would account for—

---

146 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 78.  Cf. Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 10f.

147 Bartleman repeatedly found practical support: a meal and places to sleep, on the road to the Moody's school in Chicago.  Alongside acknowledging God's grace, Bartleman also accounts, that people '[...] could see I was no ordinary tramp.  I was a young student, trying to reach the Bible Inst.  This they seemed to appreciate.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 36.

148 At times, non-believers would come to Bartleman's help in their place.  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 47, 74 and 81.

149 Not being able to cover his rent and pursuing the wrong person for support

and be encouraged by—the provision, healing, help and grace which he/his family experienced.  Bartleman would also account for hardship; however, his experiences of going hungry, being unwell, becoming injured or being treated badly (e.g. by a surgeon) would not make him doubt divine provision.[150]  The exception is notable: when Bartleman—in view of his health collapsing—failed to continue in full-time ministry, his spiritual confidence as well as his faith—provision—even through suitable paid employment—also dried up.[151]  In Los Angeles—after prayer—Bartleman found fellow travellers who were prepared to provide him with all the resources he needed for printing/posting literature, renting a cottage and even a church hall.[152]

Prayer—provision connects a prior, privately hidden, basic need and prayerful plea—with an externally social, manifest and subsequent provision.  This 'asymmetric' and 'asignifying' link[153] facilitates embodied faith—invested in the first location—to (apparently) flow across and be

---

brings Bartleman to the conclusion, 'I was evidently not trusting God.  I was anxious.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 112.

150 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 72f.

151 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 125.

152 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 30, 33, 34, 40, 41, 43, 51, 67, 83 and 105.

153 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9ff.

received in the subsequent, external or socially distributed place, from where it returns—transformed and 'translated,' as an impact of Pentecostal-embodied recognition and encouragement—to the initial location. Furthermore, by way of Christian witness and teaching, the embodied encouragement and biblical-Pentecostal understanding can be rendered into a socially shared, further flowing, holistic reality consisting of a discursive truth relation and the embodied flow of encouragement and wonder.

*(2)  Relations of the prophetic*

Through an exploration of Bartleman's conversion and prayer—provision dispositive, we have already come across prophetic understanding, knowledge and foreknowledge.  These may be received and perceived in many shapes and forms, even within a single charismatic/ Pentecostal embodiment; however, like prayer—provision, they share in a heterogeneous, distributed previous—subsequent and internal—external/ manifest structural relation; albeit different in nature.  When on mission with Moody's Gospel Wagon through Illinois, one of the horses went lame and—according to a local horse dealer—would need to be written off.

> But I prayed, and the Lord showed me to pull his shoe off.  I did so and
> in a day or two he was all right.  He had been shod wrong.  A nail was

making him lame.[154]

Unexpected, improbable, questionable insight—here, also defying professional expertise—forms an 'asignifying' and 'aparallel' bond with a subsequent, manifest and material finding ('A nail was making him lame.').[155]

Often, to follow a prophetic lead requires a Pentecostal to take a certain risk.  After a successful evangelistic campaign in Ellijay, Georgia, Bartleman's partner 'old Uncle Tillman' wanted to part ways.

> We went to the station together, but when the agent asked me where I wanted my ticket for, I answered at once, Nelson.  God spoke the word to me at that moment.  I had to go with him.[156]

In Nelson, the partners facilitated a breakthrough in which, Bartleman conveys, almost all 200 inhabitants were converted.  Here, subsequent ministry success proves Bartleman's involuntary-prophetic action as being from God.  One remembers that with regards to Bartleman's conversion, the following of his inner guidance (a voice, an understanding and an embodied urge) is confirmed as prophetic by the blessing released at the

154 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 40.

155 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 40.

156 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 52f.

mission—and by Bartleman's journey, in its parts and as a whole, confirming Wesleyan-doctrinal standards.  Different from prayer—provision, the coded previous—external connection in this case is more indirect.

On a few occasions, distributed and independent prophetic guidance does not find an external affirmation, but rather finds its resolution in the other.  In the summer of 1897, Bartleman made his way into Chicago, following a trail of grace.  He hoped to find support with a mission leader whom he hardly knew.  Since Bartleman arrived unannounced, he was hesitant and anxious, but, to his amazement, he 'was received with open arms as from the Lord.'[157]  Pastor McFadden and his workers had prayed for a replacement as McFadden had fallen ill and needed rest.  The mission met Bartleman's precise needs, offering him a short-time placement, as he became the precise match in response to their prayers.  Whilst the general structure of prophetic understanding is a prior, problematic, disputable, insight which connects with a later, external, evident relation, from a closer

---

157 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 38.  Comparable: ibid., 45.  Then a travelling evangelist, Bartleman was taken in by a Baptist pastor in Georgia who felt spiritually prompted, 'Something tells me to take this young man in.'  They shared a connection with the Philadelphia Temple.  Bartleman received a highly welcome hot meal; the pastor had his faith strengthened for a blessing.

perspective, a more complex picture unfolds.

In a variation of the theme of externally 'objective' confirmation, prophetic perception can find affirming confirmation by way of another, independent prophetic insight. Prophetic guidance towards engagement with Anna Ladd also exemplifies a common journey of assembling distributed considerations and perceptions into a single prophetic insight and proposition.

> Married at twenty-eight, in the will of God, with a threefold witness direct from the skies some weeks before, at the same moment to myself, my wife (now), in different parts of the city of Pittsburg, and a friend five miles away, as to the mind of God favoring this union, I settled down for a little time.[158]

At an earlier stage, Bartleman had discovered that he cared for Anna when she—by mistake—rejected a proposal he had not made. Bartleman found that Anna's written note would not burn up. 'This I thought might indicate a chance yet, though I had been rejected.' Note, that Bartleman does/did not consider his hope/thought, connecting with the external-material incident, at the time, to be prophetic! When he and Miss Ladd were on a ministry trip, together, to a neighbouring community, Bartleman's prophetic portion consisted of a series of embodied impulses (disparate in nature)

---

158 Bartleman, *My Story,* 13.

which by engaging with one another—in Bartleman's experience/ understanding—amounted to a prophetic urge which required his action, with the implication that it was clearly a prophetic interpretation of a divine purpose/plan. Waiting in an associate pastor's study, (1) Bartleman happened to see a box labelled 'wedding plate' which (2) immediately struck him 'as very peculiar and significant:' an external-visual stimulus connecting with a strong/clear embodied witness. (3) Bartleman responds by prayerfully considering the possibility that God is urging him to propose to Anna which—again—appears (4) to be immediately confirmed by a thought and (5) by a sense of urgency: 'Immediately I felt a strong witness that I should.' (6) Bartleman checks the time: it is 4 o'clock; (7) he 'felt a strong impression to return to the Mission, [8] and did so at once.' It is at this point of prophetic accumulation, that—arguably—a purpose and understanding could be considered to have been revealed (albeit still disputable and unconfirmed). The prophetic relation was further ascertained by a socially distributed prophetic witness: (9) Bartleman later found out that Anna, in a different location but at the same time, 'felt a strong impression that she should return at once to the Mission.' (10) Furthermore, Anna's motherly friend, Miss Austin—also at 4 pm—was impressed to pray for Anna and Frank. In isolation, the (alleged) spiritual guidance of Bartleman, Anna and Miss Austin would be considered

problematic, contestable and inconclusive.  It is the combination of a

distributed Pentecostal witness however, that creates the sense of prophetic

clarity and purpose: the relation locks each of the contributions into a

compelling relation of Pentecostal power-and-truth.[159]  (11) By way of

discourse, all involved—as well as the mission leader—came to share in

the conviction that the union was God's will and plan; with the

circumnavigation ('outflanking') of moral standards, house rules and

alternative human plans only adding narrative plausibility and spice to the

perception of divine scheming.[160]  (12) With hindsight, a preacher's action,

who had visited a few months beforehand and had held the two by the

hand, blessing them, also becomes recognisable as prophetic.[161]

Prophetic perception takes many modes and forms.  The distributed

elements and traces of an assembled/emergent prophetic insight: may be

internal or external; may be audible, visual, emotional; may manifest as an

embodied urge; may be noetic: either in a real-material or virtual sense; and

in most cases, they are already composite and heterogeneous in nature.

Although exceptional occasions of immediate, self-imposing clarity do

---

159 Bartleman, *My Story,* 13.  Furthermore, there is implicit reference to a
    principle in scripture: Deuteronomy 19:15 and 2 Corinthians 13:1.

160 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 70f.

161 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 66.

occur, in many cases, prophetic perception—in itself—tends to be vague, imprecise, unclear—or at least controversial—with regards to prophetic relevance, let alone meaning. In most cases, there is too great a structural semblance: between a (potentially) spiritual urge, and one's own embodied wishes; and between a (potentially) revelatory vision, audition or thought, and a mere brain wave. Prophetic insight and discerning understanding, then, tends to be based upon strategies of perceiving, recognising, playfully exploring and scrutinising (possible) meaningful connections between disparate and (temporally, spatially and socially) distributed prophetic traces and occurrences. At this level, there often remains—if not a degree of vagueness and dispute—a potential controversy and risk attached to making a (perceived) prophetic understanding public, or to act upon it.[162] Announcements tend to be confirmed in their prophetic nature through subsequent events, that usually have an external and more verifiable form (although here, too, 'hermeneutical courage' may be required).[163] Prophetic perception cannot be humanly controlled. However, a prayerful attention and openness to one's surroundings, body and mind can be learned. Luhrmann's 'prayer experts' inform her that the divine presence and voice

---

162 On 'uncertainties' and 'controversy' being reflective of actor-network construction: Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 21ff.

163 Cf. Smith, *Thinking in Tongues,* 22f.

tends to take on a specific feeling within their emotional and mental lives.[164] Moving through a time-place of liminal vulnerability, danger and proximity to the divine, experiencing more exceptional, 'supranatural' input/guidance seems to become increasingly more likely.[165] In addition, 'sideways' rhizomic-libidinal—as well as 'virally' coded—exchanges occur between prophetic bodies and their respective environments.[166] The most basic prophetic connection is that of a *previous* insight/declaration which becomes correlated to a *subsequent*-manifest event. Towards the culmination of the Los Angeles Pentecost—after years of prophetic-intercessory learning—Bartleman would often see 'visions [that] would appear before me like pictures, thrown upon the canvas of the mind.'[167] By that time, an embodied clarity had developed in Bartleman, giving him insight as to when—and in which direction—he was to pray; and to what effect.[168]

---

164 Jane practiced 'writing letters to God:' In the process, 'God takes over. [...] How can she tell it is God? "The tone is different."' Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 55. Also: ibid., 53ff., 134ff. and 274ff.

165 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 6ff., 25, 32f. and 47ff.

166 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 10f.

167 Bartleman, *My Story,* 30.

168 'The Spirit generally kept me in such close touch with the battle that I knew beforehand when some new development would take place, and prophesied of it. It always came to pass.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 30.

However, neither are such degrees of clarity and assurance common in earlier stages of Pentecostal learning, nor is it essential for the recognition of prophetic revelation. One's heart's wishes, mere consideration[169] or any freak announcement, may be considered prophetic, *if* clear-enough subsequent confirmation can be identified of an external, real nature. 'I had written north some months before this that I would reach Philadelphia by April. This prophecy came exactly true.'[170] Subsequently, Bartleman would develop a prophetic capacity to perceive the time and place at which to move on.[171] A previously received prophetic understanding can offer orientation where subsequent events move quickly. However, it may only be during the event—with hindsight—that previous

---

169 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 40.

170 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 50.

171 In Erie County, Bartleman 'became convinced we would only stay to the end of the year;' soon after, he 'began to feel that I would have to go west soon.' *Bartleman, From Plough,* 80 and 82. Cf. ibid., 101 and 120. At the hight of the Azusa Street revival, this prophetic capacity got transformed and significantly enlarged: 'My heart travels worldwide today for souls, especially in prayer. Jerusalem and Palestine have been promised me ever since I realized my call to preach, if I keep faithful, I must reach them, I feel, if only to pray. The world-wide call to evangelism is heavy upon me.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 13. For an external-subsequent relation, Azusa Street had begun sending missionaries abroad; also, Bartleman would later see many places: Frank Bartleman, *Around the World by Faith: with Six Weeks in the Holy Land,* 2nd edn (Los Angeles: self-pub., [1925]); Bartleman, *Two Years Mission Work in Europe: Just Before the World War 1912–1914,* 2nd edn (Los Angeles: self-pub., [1924]); both repub. in Bartleman, *Witness to Pentecost.*

prophecy is recognised.[172]  In this sense, even non-Christians can be understood to have 'prophesied' involuntarily.[173]

Pentecostal discourse often sidelines the details and processes of complex assembling of prophetic power/truth relations from largely fleeting, unclear, vague and contestable perceptions and considerations. Instead, it focuses on the possibility—or acclaimed proposition—that God may have spoken—and what the message/meaning might be.  A case in point is Bartleman's *My Story,* published in 1909, where (differing from his autobiographical travel and ministry account from the mid-1920s) he aims to present himself as a herald of the 'latter rain' revival and to share his prophetic message.  Accordingly, Bartleman misses out a great deal of the embodied-technical detail of prophetic reception, which is given in *From Plough to Pulpit* and *How Pentecost came to Los Angeles,* and focuses instead on presenting a prophetic-and-biblical interpretation of his life, and

---

172 Bartleman, *My Story,* 14.

173 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 6; Bartleman, *My Story,* 10.  Cf. Pastor Conwell's declaration on occasion of Bartleman's baptism that Bartleman understands as prophetic: ibid., 10.

of situations/events which continue to unfold.[174]


*(3)  Divine absence*


It has been observed that, across Bartleman's journey accounts, it is through an inner sense of guidance, presence and purpose, confirmed by external evidence—in particular by ministry success—that (according to Bartleman) divine favour proves itself to be with him as God's carrier of revival.  By extension of Bartleman's faith—provision and prophetic-Pentecostal relation, an embodied sense of *divine absence* is introduced to Bartleman's Pentecostal rhizome.  Tracing its variations and development across Bartleman's journey, provides a striking example of how rhizomic tubers 'explode into a line of flight' to form new innovative connections which 'always tie back to one another;'[175] and how the creation of such new connections, can change rhizomic capabilities and characteristics.[176]

---

174 Classical ANT ethnographies show how accounts of ready-made scientific facts systematically disguise their very construction in laboratories and through peer-review: Latour, *Science in Action*.  In the same manner, classical dogmatic-theological accounts can presuppose relations of the divine whilst ignoring the fact that any Christian reality of God relies on its ongoing construction through ordinary religious action and discourse surrounding Christian proclamation and worship: Piette, *Religion de près,* 55ff.

175 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9.

176 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

Bartleman first experienced an embodied sense of divine absence (of a different kind) in summer of 1897 when, on the way to the Bible Institute (see above), Bartleman decided to earn some money and dress presentably before walking into Chicago. As Bartleman left the outskirts of the city, God's grace appeared to leave him—at first externally: Bartleman could not find a job, and instead of having-favour with people (as he had done for weeks before), he now received abuse.

> Finally utterly exhausted, and almost in despair, I began to rebel. I declared I would not go a step farther. But with that to my complete surprise I felt better. A conviction began to steal over me that possibly I was on the wrong track after all.[177]

Somewhat counter-intuitively, Bartleman's 'rebellion' and declaration did not further harm or weaken his remaining divine connection, but (in this order:) brought about a spiritual-emotional release, and an unexpected inner peace which introduced a process of increasing (inner) clarity of understanding.[178] His decision to not walk straight into Chicago had 'possibly' been a mistake. As Bartleman began retracing his steps, finding his way into Chicago after all, he began to recover—at first—the sense of grace, clarity of understanding and joy. Eventually, practical-external

---

177 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 37.

178 'I then and there decided I would risk it anyway. Then the light came. I knew at once that this was the cause of my trouble. I was out of the will of God. My heart became light. My body seemed to lose largely its tiredness. My mind suddenly cleared.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 37f.

matters also started to fall into place, once again.[179]  The emergent

prophetic recognition that he had been wrong; that, in fact, his trust in God

had failed at the very end of a long journey, when he decided he needed to

look presentable, is reaffirmed reflectively with reference to the evangelical

truth that it is by faith that we become acceptable.[180]

Two years later, Bartleman experienced comparable difficulties, but

this time, to a much greater embodied depth.  In Alabama, on his way south

to Texas, Bartleman, for the first time as a travelling evangelist, found

people—even pastors—failing to support him.  He had to rent a room and,

much worse, experienced that the familiar sense of divine presence had

completely left him.

> But when I knelt to pray there was no God.  He had simply been plotted
> out.  I think I sweat cold sweat.  This was a new experience.  I could not
> imagine what was the matter.  Every moment the situation seemed to
> become more terrible.  The heavens were brass.[181]

Since his conversion, Bartleman had not known such a sense of a divine

void.  This brought him to a place of existential desperation where he even

contemplated suicide, understanding this to be an attack of 'the devil.'

---

179 Bartleman did not get lost, was fed and given the train fare.

180 'I was not willing to come "just as I am."'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 37.  Cf.
  e.g. Matthew 11:28.

181 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 58; cf. Deuteronomy 28:23.

My brain seemed to reel.  If I had only had some premonition, or clue to the difficulty, it would not have been so terrible.  I literally writhed in the agony of my soul.  I had reached the limit.  A 'horror of great darkness' had fallen suddenly on me.  Then the devil got busy.  I had foolishly carried a revolver in my grip, for dogs.  He now tempted me to shoot myself.  [...]  Finally I threw myself into bed, dazed, without hope, dreading nothing more than the breaking of another day without God.  I desired oblivion.  Death seemed less terrible than life.[182]

When Bartleman considered retracing his steps the next morning, he recovered—at first—a mere glimmer of hope.  This directed him, one step at a time, to recover God's manifest grace.  Only on reflection, did Bartleman understand that he had followed his own ambition and not the will of God, as he sought to make his way to Texas.[183]

In another variation, Bartleman found doors to be unexpectedly closed against him, during his return to Denver in the winter of 1902.  Late at night, nobody would take him in.  Less dramatic than before, diabolic temptation came in the form of a proposition to take the early morning train home.  Bartleman's inner unrest and sense of abandonment also appeared less pronounced.  The resolution came through clear prophetic guidance:[184]

---

182 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 58

183 'I had no intimation of what was wrong, and this made it harder for me.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 58

184 'Satan suggested that I sit up in the railroad station that night and take the first train home again.  [...]  I became almost rebellious.  It seemed the Lord Himself had forsaken me.  I did not understand or know what to do.  Why

Bartleman was to stay at the Pentecostal Union mission to become reconciled with Alma White's ministry which he had left after a power clash only six months previously. The sequential relation clearly became condensed into a Pentecostal power dispositive which—a year later—could be translated into yet another method/channel of prophetic discernment, akin to a virtually pain-free prophetic litmus test.[185] As with the feeding networks of slime mould and ant pheromone trails, experimental-Pentecostal power relations seem to become consolidated, reinforced and shortened, where successful, with repetitions and over time; whilst connections which appear expendable, problematic or of little value, are pruned back or abandoned.[186] Rhizomes self-optimise.

The experience of divine absence in Alabama in 1899, on his way

had the Holiness Association refused to receive me? I was sick with temptation to doubt God. But I got the victory and determined to trust Him recklessly, though I perish. I determined I would try for rooms no further, but would wait for God to speak to me. And just then He spoke. He was waiting on me for this.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 107.

185 'Leaving 'Frisco I started back, stopping at San Jose to see if the Lord wanted us there. But the more I prayed the blacker it got. The door was closed. I had no witness. That was not the place for us. I returned to Santa Cruz [...].' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 127f. In a similar way, through experiential learning, unexpected challenges and difficulties can become indicative of the Spirit being up to some significant breakthrough: ibid*.,* 83.

186 Consider also observations above, concerning the relations both of prayer–provision and of the prophetic.

south, became significant for Bartleman's concept and embodied sense of a dark power. It introduced him to an embodied sense of abandonment and angst which, together with self-destructive, suicidal, urges, Bartleman understood to be 'the devil.' From the start of his Christian journey, Bartleman had experienced confrontation and hardship. It was only from this point onwards however that (according to Bartleman's accounts) 'the devil' became relevant as a consideration and agency which could be perceived to be an embodied presence. As a Pentecostal power relation, 'the devil' became incorporated into Bartleman's intercessory-revivalist perception and ministry practice when, as a Wesleyan-Methodist pastor in Erie County (1900–01), he experienced a visitation 'from the dark side'[187] (which, in turn, prepared him for the Jesus visitation which he experienced in Pasadena, together with his prayer partner Boehmer).

As a newly-wed, at his pastoral placement (1900–01), Bartleman engaged in an intercessory 'battle' to spiritually save one of his rural congregations, which he found to be entrenched in a legal fight over the use of the chapel building. As he refrained from taking sides, Bartleman found

---

187 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 77f. Cf. in Pasadena, soon after Bartleman's re-commissioning experience over Esther's grave: 'The devil fought hard. [...] At times while preaching a hot blast from the "pit" seemed to strike me. More than once I almost fainted, and had to rally my strength before I could proceed.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 9.

his church and officials withdraw practical support from his family and ministry.[188] Bartleman met with the lay preacher on the other side of the legal battle and set time aside, every day, to intercede for his unrepentant charge. According to Bartleman, this 'soon stirred the devil mightily;'[189] this corresponding to a further withdrawal of practical support for his family and a reflectively reinforced will to reject God's offer of repentance and grace. In a number of ways, one would expect that taking the confrontation right into the centre of contention amidst his congregation, would have an impact on Bartleman's already fragile body. Even prior to a showdown with his fighting charge and their leader, Bartleman accounts of two nocturnal visitations:

> Two nights in succession the devil attacked me very real. I had just gone to bed on both occasions. I was not sleepy, but was praying. The first night suddenly he seemed to enter the room, and advance toward my bed. I had not been thinking of him at all. It was a sudden, unexpected visitation. The room was dark. I could see no form, but his presence seemed as real as my own. He approached to destroy me. I cried out for Jesus to help me. With that he fled. The very next night he came again. This time he seemed almost to reach my bed. Again it was the name of Jesus that put him to flight. He came no more.[190]

---

188 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 74ff.

189 'I began to call mightily on God to convict the whole bunch, and save them, and made it a custom to go to the church where the fight had been and pray at least two hours every day. This soon stirred the devil mightily.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 75. Consider the double 'mightily,' attributed to Bartleman's embodied prayer-battle *and* the subsequently accumulation of dark power.

190 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 77f.

Bartleman emphasises that, in the place of intercession, the original visitation was 'sudden, unexpected.' He was able to locate 'the devil' as a quasi-embodied, quasi-human form moving across the room towards him; and could also immediately perceive—or know—its destructive purpose and will. In this last point, Bartleman's diabolic visitation draws upon his embodied experience of off-track angst in Alabama. With these named features, 'the devil' 'seemed' (three times!) to be 'very real.' Pentecostal revelation/knowledge have their unique ways of combining affirmation with uncertainty.

Visitations—especially from the 'dark side'—are likely to be judged as being delusional and dangerous; if not signs of mental disturbance.[191] As with prophetic foreknowledge in general, the possibility of their viability and 'truth' derives from their distributed-external and narrative-temporal (prior—subsequent) relations. With hindsight, it could be argued that Bartleman's diabolic visitations anticipate—and clearly prepared him for— a series of open power clashes which began soon afterwards. At first, Concord chapel (which was the main congregation in his charge) rejected

---

191 Undoubtably, prayer-battle with demonic forces is dangerous and may correlate with mental disorder: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 260ff. and 298f.

God's offer of repentance and revival.[192]  After this, his church trustees staged a final confrontation.  Bartleman reidentified 'the devil' as being operative in their spokesman.  Bartleman knew this from an understanding of the man's actions, as well as an embodied sensation ('a nervous chill') reminiscent of his previous embodied encounters of the dark power.[193]  With hindsight, Bartleman could—in addition—account for the outcome of the church trust's hardened stance for the Concord church and its local community, as well as for the trustee's fate of dying 'a horrible death, with his boots on.'[194]  For a final power confrontation, it was Cottage Hill, the second congregation in Bartleman's charge, with its local community, that experienced revival.  There are many less compelling references to 'the devil,' which mainly relate to obstacles or efforts to stop the revival breakthrough which Bartleman carried and brought.[195]

---

192 Bartleman preaching repentance did not result in breakthrough.  'For a full half hour I lay like a dead man.  I could not move.  The atmosphere was awful with conviction.  I could hear groans all over the house.  But the people dared not move.  The fear of God was on them.  [...]  But my backslidden members would not yield to the Spirit.  They hardened their necks and hearts still more.  [...]  They would not repent.'  Bartleman, *From Plough*, 79.

193 'One of my trustees now called on me and insisted strenuously that I help fight the other faction to a finish.  When he left I had a nervous chill.  I had just gotten out of bed from a severe sickness.  The devil possessed the man.' Bartleman, *From Plough*, 81.

194 Bartleman, *From Plough*, 79.

195 'The devil was in' Bartleman's horse, when he was to deliver an important sermon, but Bartleman did not loose his temper.  'The devil wanted' that the

Rhizomatic-eruptive 'lines of flight' (DG) travel in different directions.  Rhizomic growth never is unidirectional or 'systematic.'  In Pasadena, together with Boehmer (his prayer partner) Bartleman experienced a Jesus visitation.[196]  For Bartleman as a Pentecostal believer, it made all the difference[197] but, conceptually—and as an acquired religious-embodied capacity—experiencing a visitation either by a demonic or a divine power, perceived, in both cases, as a quasi-embodied personal presence, is not a major step.  However, in sharing this experience with another person (his prayer partner Boehmer), Bartleman introduces a qualitative change: he connects two individually embodied spiritual 'weaves,' one with the other[198]  (and this will be explored further below).

There is yet another rhizomic eruption from those dark visitations at night.  From the repeated experience of 'the devil' brought to flee as he

---

fighting congregation would not repent.  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 83.  'The devil wanted' to quench revival by having an unsuitable minister appointed to Bartleman's Cottage Hill congregation: ibid., 83; cf. ibid., 121.  Much more low-key: 'the devil made a fine mess of it,' when Anna, by mistake, rejected Bartleman in the place of another suitor: ibid., 70.

196 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19f.; Bartleman, *My Story,* 31.  Cf. in a place of congregational worship: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 38.

197 'For days I seemed to walk in heaven, in that marvellous Presence [sic!].  It strengthened me greatly in my calling to intercession, and in assurance of the outpouring.'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 31.

198 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8.

'cried out for Jesus' to help, Bartleman attained a generalised, practical-and-theological understanding.

> I got a new conception of the power of the name of Jesus. And also of the power of the devil, and of my own helplessness in his presence, if unaided by the Lord.[199]

Bartleman recognises a hierarchy of power: although 'the devil' may easily overwhelm his human capacities of self-preservation 'if unaided by the Lord,' an even greater authority is invested in 'the name of Jesus' that will make 'the devil' take flight. By way of a first 'deterritorialisation,' Bartleman's dark encounter is translated into a biblical-teaching concept; by way of a *subsequent* deterritorialisation, this teaching could be further reterritorialised through the practice of prophetic intercession (prayer warfare) or an incarnational practical-theological strategy.[200] Whilst possibilities of doctrinal learning remain generally unexplored, it is clear that Bartleman's spiritual battles, from this time onwards, became more severe.

*Power-analytical evaluation*

Pentecostal-charismatic ministry dispositives are not merely

---

199 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 78.

200 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9ff.

embodied (chapter 5). They are rhizomic, distributed and heterogeneous in that they interconnect elements which are previous with others that are subsequent; of which some are internally embodied, personal, subjective or arguable, whilst others are materially external and verifiable, objective, evident, socially distributed or communal. Thereby, it is the extraordinary elements of a subsequent, manifest and external 'confirmation' which seal distributed contributions into the structurally stable connection of a Pentecostal-charismatic tuber. Although Pentecostals aim to further stabilise, qualify and normalise experiential relations through referencing biblical code (or common-sensual relations of meaning), Pentecostal connections are essentially of an 'asignifying' nature. Connections are created, develop, are reproduced and strengthened, by 'aparallel evolution,' on the basis of the intensity of flow through certain deterritorialised-heterogeneous connections, once they are formed.[201] Whilst the nature of Pentecostal-rhizomic tubers can appear to be unexpected—astonishing even—explaining their creation/evolution should, in principle, be no more difficult than resolving the asymmetric symbiosis of the orchid and its wasp. The distinctive ways of such distributed-heterogeneous connections relate to the different ministries, Spirit powers and 'gifts' (χαρίσματα).

201 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9ff.

*Some* Pentecostal dispositive relations (such as faith—provision) display a closely knit stability.  Even with many repetitions, only minor developments and functional alterations appear to occur.  Dynamics mainly occur by way of routinising, normalising, and the shortening of channels/ connections.  Across variations, occasions of intensification—as well as of 'flattening'—may be observed.  Other forms of Pentecostal power/ charisma—such as prophetic foreknowing—are more flexible in nature, with regards to a greater variety of elements and relations.  The distributed and highly heterogeneous nature the elements of prophetic knowing, as well as the creativity in which they are playfully, intuitively assembled, were observed—even prior to subsequent 'confirmation.'  Dynamics of rhizomic development and growth include an increase in the number of channels and possibilities of (embodied-)prophetic perception, within the very nature of their revelatory connections.  Changes and developments are more commonly introduced to relatively stable relations (dispositives?) of the prophetic.[202]  Pentecostal discourse displays tendencies to neglect the material-embodied and technical side of prophetic perception and, instead, to focus on the processing of the contents of (potential) revelatory truth.  Even more significant changes were traced in the development and growth

---

202 '[...] the tracing should always be put back on the map.'  DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 13.

of Bartleman's experience of divine absence as a Pentecostal power relation. Encounters and visitations of a dark-personified power emerged as a result of moving beyond the bounds of divine grace, guidance and purpose. Rhizomic offshoots and deterritorialisations are manifold and different in nature. In Bartleman's case, they include: the capacity to experiencing divine visitations; a new tool of prophetic discernment; and new embodied capacities of intercessory/incarnational warfare; potentially also a theological understanding of the prophetic, of power and of powers encountered on a Pentecostal journey. Each of these offshoots, are (once again) capable of connecting with other—already existing, or newly forming—Pentecostal connective 'tubers.'

With regards to the power relations of any of these Pentecostal connections, it is necessary to consider: what, and how far distributed, are its heterogeneous elements (temporally, spatially and socially/culturally); of what kind are its links, and how reliably can they be established; what kind of causality (if any at all) might be attributed; of what kind, and how significant, is the impact of an element or tuber link? According to Bartleman, seeing God at work may lead to significant encouragement and embodied empowerment; minor prophetic obedience can lead to a major breakthrough of revival; 'the devil' appearing on the scene heralds the great

613

danger of destructive power, which, in turn, enhances the perception of the power that resides with 'the name of Jesus.' Encounters/confrontations of the divine, with resisting/obstructive powers, would appear to play an important role in terms of rhizomic growth and innovation; and this shall now be further explored.

### 6.5.3 Asignifying rupture: Pentecostal displacement breakthrough, experimentation

On 'asignifying rupture,' DG write, 'A rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines.'[203] In this section, the impact of problems, challenges and resistances upon rhizomic developments shall be explored. That these are relevant in the context of Pentecostal breakthrough/empowerment, has already been ascertained in chapter 5. In this vein, Bartleman continues the notion of preparation for a salvific purpose—or ministry—which requires a vicarious suffering for the good of others, i.e. their revival breakthrough.[204]

---

203 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9.

204 '[...] the capacity of rexpression to produce the new depends on whether individuals seek to encounter difference, to enter the crack of immanence. Only if this is done is there the chance of making the difference that runs throughout reality into a weapon against what has presently settled in. [...] the political demand for change is inseparable from the ethical demand to

We must be broken, ground to a pulp, in order for the realization of God's highest preparation for us.  Some must be sacrificed for others' good.  Some are but born for this.  It is the penalty for our broken state.  But in the 'restoration of all things,' all things will be restored.  Our sacrifice will yield its increase then.[205]

The following two sections trace and clarify how this is outworked within and across (some) evolutions of Bartleman's ministry dispositive.

*Obstacles, resistances, attacks*

Bartleman experiences obstacles, resistances and attacks against the work and power of God, that his (embodied) ministry bring; and they come from many directions.  Only very occasionally does Bartleman attribute them to 'the devil.'  People, local environments and towns may turn out to be hostile to the gospel, or simply violent/dangerous places.[206]  A poor state

---

respond to suffering, to dissatisfaction with the present, to the pain of what is given.'  Barber, *Deleuze,* 71.  Cf. ibid., 64f., 65ff. and 91ff.; Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition,* 85ff.; Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: the Time-Image,* tr. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (London: Athlone, 1989), 82f. and 85; Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 176ff., 185ff. and 199ff.

205 Bartleman, *My Story,* 19.  Cf. 2 Corinthians 1:6; 4:12.15

206 'The saloon keepers here were very wicked.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 61.  Cf. ibid., 21.  Abusive and violent behaviour rendering community or locality unsafe: ibid., 55.  People, communities and locations may be 'generally hard in spirit,' 'very ignorant and wicked' (referring to common alcohol consumption, prostitution, violence etc.), 'tough' (Roman-Catholic working-class resistance to evangelistic ministry): ibid., 25, 32f., 52, 70 and 104f.

of the local church may thereby play a role.[207] Practical difficulties/

challenges, such as lack of finance and food, problems surrounding

transport,[208] bodily injury, ill health[209] or imminent danger may hinder or

stop Bartleman's ministry;[210] and Bartleman's being caught up in secular

employment is also a hinderance.[211] A preacher might also be insufficiently

supported ('starved') by a disinterested congregation.[212] Within the

ministry, Bartleman recognises other issues concerning morals and

morales: workers ethical standards being too low to sustain a Wesleyan-

Holiness ministry,[213] being rebellious,[214] ambitious, jealous, resentful,

pursuing a financial gain;[215] preachers being morally inconsistent, having

---

207 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 56, 74f. and 79.

208 Lame horses, broken coach, no feed: Bartleman, *From Plough,* 40, 44 and 77.

209 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 59f. and 62.

210 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 77 and 131.

211 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 26f. and 31; Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 13.

212 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 34, 74 and 77; cf. ibid., 101. Prayer partner covering for Bartleman's rent: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 41.

213 Being flirtatious, smoking, chewing tobacco: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 34f. and 55f.

214 Disrupting revivalist ministry by undermining Bartleman as leader in charge: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 34f.

215 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 53, 57f. and 76.

twisted and double standards;[216] and a compromising of the gospel by

pastors in order to please a congregation or through having low

expectations of what God can do.[217] In addition, Christians might lack

spiritual focus or be held back from engaging with people on the fringes by

'pride' and 'worldly' middle-class standards.[218] Congregations might also

fail to provide space for prayer, try to stop more dramatic embodied

manifestations[219] or be 'averse to innovations.'[220] Modern-organisational

forms might also create obstacles/disruptions to the free operation of Spirit

power: e.g. secular authorities hindering Christian outreach;[221] church

bodies wishing to put 'their [...] stamp' on candidates;[222] senior church

leaders making unwise appointments that would stop a divine move in its

track.[223] In addition, pastors in charge might impose limiting top-down

---

216 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 121f.; cf. ibid., 111.

217 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 74, 76 and 79f.

218 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 25, 28f. and 107. Decision to be financially
secure and respectable could have prevented Bartleman from pursuing his
evangelistic calling: ibid., 27.

219 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 24f.; cf. Bartleman, *From Plough,* 65.

220 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 28 and 73f.

221 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 43, 54, 62, 64 and 108.

222 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 67. Cf. Foucault on examination as discipline.

223 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 33f. and 122; Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 9.

control,[224] or be religiously 'fanatical,' manipulative and overbearing.[225]

Problems could also be caused by a 'professional'—instead of 'spiritual'—

approach to the ministry;[226] by team disunity, fighting factions, and even

competition between ministries.[227] In general, from Bartleman's

perspective, a corporate or institutional rationale would be one of a 'hard'

and unconcerned nature in the face of human vulnerability and suffering.[228]

The characteristic of Bartleman's ministry engagements—first as a

Holiness evangelist, later as a pastor, mission leader, prophetic intercessor,

and eventually, as a facilitating contributor to revival on a larger, historical,

scale—are peculiar combinations of being successful and yet having to

concede, during the encounters and confrontations that occur with each—

and every—area and dimension of power and resistance, both of an

internally embodied and external nature. The results is 'asignifying'

rhizomic displacements and offshoots, 'lines of flight,' in at least three

---

224 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 79f.

225 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 89 and 90ff.

226 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 34.

227 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 59, 74f., 78f., 81; cf. ibid., 32 and 69. At the
height of revival, having a 'sectarian' or 'party spirit' could amount to as
little as having a concern for one's congregational boundaries,
recognisability and identity: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 21, 26f., 34 and 68.

228 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 113 and 123.

dimensions which affect Bartleman's Pentecostal ministry. Across

Bartleman's narratives, struggles, illness and challenges prepare and

intensify Bartleman's anointing and subsequent revival breakthrough. It

will be seen that this remains to be true as obstacles to Bartleman's ministry

grow beyond measure and seem to completely destroy his work and even

the man himself.

*(1) Breakthrough in another place*

In Erie County, in 1900 and 1901, most of Bartleman's investments

of revivalist prayer and concern was for taking of his Concord main

congregation into repentance over their legal battle (and into revival). At a

series of 'special services,' Bartleman was able to deliver a sincere call to

repentance and God's power had a manifestly embodied impact upon all

attending; and yet, God's grace and revival was rejected.[229] Instead,

Bartleman was able to usher in revival at his second, Cottage Hill

---

229 'After a few moments of silence, in which one could almost hear a pin drop,
the power of God came upon me so strong that I fell to the floor helpless.
For a full half hour I lay like a dead man. I could not move. The atmosphere
was awful with conviction. I could hear groans all over the house. But the
people dared not move. The fear of God was on them. It seemed like
Judgement Day. Finally I found myself able to arise, and I preached with a
mighty anointing, a solemn message of warning. But my backslidden
members would not yield to the Spirit. They hardened their necks and hearts
still more.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 78f.

congregation, just days before his pastoral appointment was terminated.  At

the Wesleyan-Methodist annual conference, Bartleman's residual struggle

against his trustees was to ensure an arrangement for his pastoral

succession that would help the Cottage Hill church continue in the revival

that had just begun.[230]  The revival for which Bartleman had laboured for

his main congregation, which was of no avail, erupted and found its way in

the other, less resistant, place.


*(2)  Moving on in Bartleman's ministry sequence*


   'Sinners' but also Christians in rebellion against God's standards and

will, would be 'located,' 'dug out,' 'condemned' or 'judged' by God

through Bartleman's preaching or life witness.  They would either come to

repent and enter revival, or harden their resistance to a conscious

rejection.[231]  Only on occasion, Bartleman would attribute the closing ranks

of people and communities, the self-organisation and hardening of their

opposition, to 'the devil' being 'stirred [...] mightily.'  Such processes

would often be further aligned with challenges—of a heterogeneous and

---

230 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 82ff.

231 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 21, 26, 75 and 78f.

manifest nature—to Bartleman's plans and basic human needs.[232]  By

engaging with such difficulties—foremost in the place of private

intercession—Bartleman engages both a symbolic *and* embodied-

experiential dimension, which—in an instant of asignifying connection and

asymmetric evolution—'perceives' the social and material dimensions of

contention, resistance and challenge, including even their appropriate

understanding.  The Spirit empowerment which Bartleman accessed and

accumulated in such a way, would be transmitted, at the point of social

contact (e.g. preaching at a meeting) to those people and reality dimensions

that were prepared to engage with, receive, be filled and transformed by it.

A spiritual victory however would never be complete.


There is a sequence which repeats itself across Bartleman's ministry

journey, beginning with Bartleman's conversion in 1893.  It can be

formalised as follows:  Again and again, Bartleman believes that God

wants him to go to the next place, do the next thing—and is obedient and

moves; as difficulties arise (often practical challenges and health issues)

---

232 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 75.  Bartleman, on the way to a service where he
   believed a divine message was to be delivered, found his journey delayed as
   his horse played up and got into difficulties.  Bartleman construes this as 'the
   devil must have sensed,' and sought to stop him by operating 'in' the horse.
   That, in the situation, he did not become agitated and angry, Bartleman
   attributes to divine help: 'God kept me sweet, else I would have lost my
   anointing.'  Arriving on time, Bartleman preached; the congregation had a
   revival-breakthrough.  Ibid., 83.

including resistance to his ministry, Bartleman stands his ground and—to a point—perseveres; God sustains Bartleman (and his family) and gives grace, which encourages Bartleman; some things are achieved for God and through God's power; trouble however, increases until it eventually becomes clear to Bartleman that he must move on; Bartleman affirms that this is according to God's leading. This narrative structure or sequence describes rhizomic-eruptive displacements and 'lines of flight' along the tracks of Bartleman's journey, as Bartleman's ministry and spiritual experiences repeat themselves, develop and grow.[233]

*(3) Development and growth in Pentecostal power relations*

*(a) Bartleman's ministry dispositive*

Embedded in this overarching ministry narrative, is a more short-term dispositive relation of Pentecostal-revivalist breakthrough. It was on the basis of disruptions, obstructions and repetitive new beginnings that rhizomic variations, developments and new additions were introduced to this core ministry dispositive. Eventually, Bartleman's ministry and Spirit gift of prophetic intercessor and bringer of revival breakthrough could be acquired and developed; and from this point onwards, Bartleman's

---

233 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9.

contribution towards events in Pasadena and Los Angeles—from his perspective—culminate in the Azusa Street revival.

To understand how this became possible, a change in the nature and intensity of resistances, challenges and obstacles to Bartleman's ministry must be considered, marked by Bartleman's transition from working on his own as an itinerant evangelist (up to 1899) to getting married and overseeing local missions or churches (from 1900 on). With a wife and infant to look after, in practical and in emotional terms, it would be more challenging to face a squeeze on resources, and harder to simply move on from major obstacles. Rubbing shoulders with locals over longer periods of time implied a more holistic engagement and deeper-embodied struggles. As a resident minister, Bartleman would be particularly exposed to people's social expectations and would need their goodwill. It is of equal importance that Bartleman's Pentecostal breakthrough in 1899, at a Pittsburgh rescue mission, introduced Bartleman to a deeper dimension of prophetic-intercessory struggle, including occasional encounters with dark powers (above, 6.5.2). An important transition in Bartleman's ministry during this time became possible—from bringing revival (mainly) as a Holiness evangelist to doing so as a prophetic intercessor—when, in early 1900, due to a deterioration of his health, Bartleman had to take time out

from full-time ministry and preaching (more below).

Bartleman's journey towards becoming a Pentecostal trailblazer of the southern-Californian revival of 1906 began with him hitting a wall confronting powerful obstacles to revival which were not of anti-Christian, secular or reserved church origins, but came from Holiness-movement radicals themselves. Some fine rhizomic developments can be observed here which make a more detailed exploration worthwhile.

*(b) Denver Pentecostal Union (1902)*

When in 1902, Bartleman's family joined the 'Pentecostal Union,' Bartleman relates the discovery that, under Alma White's leadership, a 'hard and tyrannical,' indeed 'fanatical' spirit had taken hold of the Denver mission home. By way of a distributed prophetic revelation, Bartleman had the embodied sense that '[t]here was something unnatural and strained about the atmosphere of the place,' and Anna, from the beginning, 'felt [...] as though the flesh was being literally torn from her bones.'[234] Bartleman soon understood the problem to be a combination of the leader's religious zeal and an effort at manipulating the workers; thereby falling short of the

---

234 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 89 and 90f. Consider, the same power-relation invested and perceived, alternatively, in a Christian leader's will, actions, character and effects on people; but then also: in a building, space and organisational context.

love of Christ.[235]  Encountering, for the first time, an obstacle to revival

which originated with radical Holiness people, rhizomic escape required of

Bartleman that he develop a more refined and mature theological and

practical outlook, with regards to being spiritual, God's Spirit and

revival.[236]  Bartleman's rhizomic fight was to resist Pastor White's

manipulations and control in defence of his inner-embodied independence,

divine connection and judgement.[237]  In addition, he prayed for the

leadership and deliverance of his fellow workers and family.  After a

deterioration of the situation, Bartleman decided that they had to leave.  A

final showdown and power clash left the couple and baby exposed to the

elements—and Bartleman traumatised.[238]  Bartleman recovered and as an

intercessor, supported revival breakthrough at tent meetings of the Greeley

Holiness Band (more below).

---

235 'She seemed determined to break the spirit of the workers completely,
   bringing them under her own dominating will.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,*
   90.

236 'It cured me effectually of ever worshipping a religious zeal or creed, in
   place of Christ.  "He that loveth not, knoweth not God.  For God is love."'
   Bartleman, *From Plough,* 89.

237 This included breaking mission rules by withholding a small amount of
   money to feed the baby.  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 92.

238 Bartleman perceived '[...] something like a rubber blanket seemed to settle
   down around me.  [...] a kind of stupor that seemed to render me semi-
   conscious for a time.'  His Pentecostal interpretation: this was 'God's
   protecting mercy.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 97.

In terms of rhizomic restoration and innovative growth, the following events are remarkable:  When Bartleman eventually returned to Denver, he experienced a prophetic guidance through 'divine absence' and an inner voice (cf. above) which made him spend another night at the Whites' mission home.  On his way there, Bartleman had to face up to—and prayerfully wrestle down—his embodied demons: 'pride' and self-protective reasoning 'tried to rise up;' even a desire to remain ethically upright and clear would become a problem.[239]  Bartleman had to learn to prayerfully put aside such forms of embodied self-preservation and cognitive control in order to remain in—or rather, to re-enter—a place of Pentecostal-divine presence and grace.

> Certainly if there was any self left in me in the matter that killed it.  If I had not fully forgiven them I had to now.  And my coming would prove that to them.  Possibly this was why I had to go there that night.  If I wanted the continued favor and guidance of God I had to obey Him.[240]

The encounter with Pastor White, the next morning, went well.  Bartleman could leave feeling 'nothing but love toward them.'[241]  Whilst the challenge had been imminent, Bartleman's relation with Alma White and his ability to play a constructive role within Christian circles in Denver was not the only

---

239 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 107.

240 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 108.

241 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 108.

issue at hand.  Also at stake was a power takeover in Bartleman: the arborescent crystallisation and destruction—over time—of his rhizomic-Pentecostal capacities of engaging with others (and with life) from a place of divine power and presence, especially if the struggle was with people and Christianities from the stock of Alma White.  Bartleman would continue to move with the current of divine presence/grace which was now further deepened and intensified due to rhizomic disruption and realignment.  Furthermore—as the outcome/fruit of Bartleman's embodied struggle and breakthrough—new capacities were added to his Pentecostal power dispositive: coming to a place of—and demonstrating—'forgiveness;' taking divine 'peace' to a place of contention; and coming to feel, in the Spirit, 'nothing but love' towards people who had seriously wronged him.  Further down the line, the embodied perception that divine love was powerfully present, was the hallmark of revival at the Azusa Street mission according to Bartleman's assessment.[242]

*(c)  Ministry shutdown (1903–04)*

The disunity and in-house fighting amongst Holiness revivalists which hindered opportunities for Pentecostal renewal, not only made Bartleman's pursuit of Christian renewal appear even more forlorn but his

---

242 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 54f.

theological understanding, prophetic discernment and practical strategies of

finding partners in ministry and relating to others in the church, had to

adapt and mature (see below, 6.5.5).  Bartleman experienced—and saw—

further defeat in the inner-Christian (inner-Pentecostal) struggles with

sectarian Holiness radicals.[243]  His health, again, grew worse.[244]  Eventually,

he had to leave pastoral work,[245] and would not even find suitable secular

employment by which to support his wife and infant girls.  Eventually, this

led to the near-complete breakdown of his ministry and spiritual assurance.

'Beaten and rejected by the ecclesiastical powers,' worn down by ever-

increasing, solidifying 'unbelief' in the church,[246] but also as a result of not

coming to terms with what had become of them,[247] Bartleman became

---

243 At Sacramento, Bartleman had major difficulties with mission workers who
    turned out to be followers of 'Burning Bush' sectarianism.  Bartleman, *From
    Plough,* 117ff. and 120ff.  The Metropolitan Church Association (Burning
    Bush), at the time, took over and split Holiness missions across the country.
    'The Burning Bush were making a great effort to destroy all other missions,
    and substitute their own organization in their place, in stead of seeking to
    build up the body of Christ in general.  If one called attention to their
    inconsistency and fanaticism they would immediately raise the cry of
    persecution and threaten with the judgments of God.'  Ibid., 120; cf. ibid.,
    111; Kostlevy, *Holy Jumpers.*

244 At the very least, Bartleman struggled from regular severe headache (altitude
    sickness in Colorado), and the return of malaria: Bartleman, *From Plough,*
    108f., 110, 115f. and 119.

245 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 124.

246 Bartleman, *My Story,* 17.

247 'It seemed wrong to have to suffer so from hard work when I had given my
    life unreservedly and unselfishly in His service.  I had turned down every

depressed.[248]

> We must be broken, ground to a pulp, in order for the realization of God's highest preparation for us.  Some must be sacrificed for others' good.  [...]  It is the penalty for our broken state.  But in the 'restoration of all things,' all things will be restored.  Our sacrifice will yield its increase then.[249]

Compare the quote from DG at the outset of this section.[250]  It was at the lowest point of his life, over his four-year-old daughter's open grave, that Bartleman experienced a prophetic recommissioning which, in his different Pentecostal capacities, made him a trailblazer for the revival which became known as the 'Los Angeles Pentecost.'

*(d)  Azusa Street revival (1906)*

To understand the Azusa Street revival in terms of power relations, one must—as Bartleman does—take a step back from an individual spokesperson's (Bartleman's) assemblage, experience and performance of Pentecostal power.  This does not mean however, that one transitions to a totalising or socially 'collective' perspective, since heterogeneous,

---

opportunity for my own ease and gain in life, and yet here I was, sick and penniless, eking out a bare existence for my family, at the price of blood.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 125.

248 'I allowed myself to be swallowed up with sorrow, "the spirit of heaviness."' Bartleman, *My Story,* 16.

249 Bartleman, *My Story,* 19.

250 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9.

distributed-individual Pentecostal contributions and perceptions continue to be essential for the facilitation of divine presence/power in places such as the Azusa Street mission.[251] There are certain power effects which Bartleman accounts for as characteristic, with regards to spiritual processes and occurrences at the mission: a sense that God's presence/Spirit showed up at a meeting; that a divine 'tide arose in victory;'[252] that the Spirit would work in, through and across individual contributions, so that an emergent order, rationale and purpose would appear/be recognised, 'unguided by human hands;'[253] that God seemed to be 'in control' of what was going on. To take hold of these kinds of power effects, socially distributed processes and resonances must be perceived and understood, as they inter-engage with embodied action/perception, four of which shall be examined here.

If connections 'in the Spirit' are established and strengthened by way of asignifying rupture, the different concerns that obstruct/resist the moving of the Spirit—and how they can be overcome—need to be considered. External opposition, e.g. by a hostile press—according to Bartleman—did not cause a major problem but was, in fact, used by God, even to draw

---

251 Cf. Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 130.

252 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 48.

253 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19.

people into the work.[254]  A significantly greater challenge occurred when

'all the religious sore-heads and crooks and cranks came, seeking a place in

the work.'[255]  As a first step, it was necessary for group members to identify

this;[256] secondly, they had to learn that efforts to address such issues head-

on would affirm 'fear' amongst attending worshippers—a new obstacle

threatening to cut across rhizomic connections and stop the move of the

Spirit.

> We found early in the 'Azusa' work that when we attempted to steady
> the Ark the Lord stopped working.  We dared not call the attention of the
> people too much to the working of the [d]evil.  Fear would follow.  We
> would only pray.  Then God gave victory.[257]

In such a way, embodied understanding, prayer and faith were invested into

self-establishing, socially charismatic (distributed and embodied), rhizomic

deposits and channels.  In these, divine presence, intensity, understanding,

power and grace could freely gather, vibrate and flow.


As a second obstacle, Bartleman identifies pastoral and modern-

---

254 'The newspapers began to ridicule and abuse the meetings, thus giving us
much free advertising.  This brought the crowds.  [...]  Outside persecution
never hurt the work.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 49.

255 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 49.

256 'Discernment was not perfect, and the enemy got some advantage, which
brought reproach to the work, but the saints soon learned to "take the
precious from the vile."'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 48.

257 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 49.

professional pride and a self-assertive sense of entitlement which presumes

the right to control and take centre stage. 'Presumptuous men would

sometimes come among us. Especially preachers who would try to spread

themselves, in self-opinionation.'[258] Under the deep power of anointing

experienced at the mission, a bleeding/draining away of embodied-spiritual

energy occurred, flowing into the ever-deepening channels and productive

processes of a Pentecostal 'machine'[259] and pulling people towards

humility, consecration, revival and love.[260] In some cases, preachers would

find themselves practically incapable of delivering a coherent contribution.

According to Bartleman's account, the 'hands off' approach of intercessor-

pioneers focusing on God in prayer from within the congregation and

letting the Spirit do the work, was essential in overwhelming challengers in

such a manner.[261] Again, channels of anointing presence would be

---

258 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 60. Cf. ibid., 58. Bartleman accounts of a single
case of simple-minded badgering an audience with empty talk at a spiritually
significant moment: 'He rattled like an empty wagon for a half hour, saying
nothing. Then I got up. But up he jumped again, and went at it.' Ibid., 42.

259 Cf. DG's 'desiring-production' as 'machine:' DG, *Anti-Oedipus.*

260 'Pride and self-assertion, self-importance and self-esteem, could not survive
there. The religious ego preached its own funeral sermon quickly.'
Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58. Also challenging were 'the winds of
criticism, jealousy, unbelief, etc.:' ibid., 45. Cook records that he failed 'to
straighten the people out in their doctrine' over Seymour's calm: Cook,
'Azusa Street Meeting.'

261 'Their minds would wander, their brains reel. Things would turn black
before their eyes. They could not go on. [...] No one cut them off. We
simply prayed. The Holy Spirit did the rest.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 60.

deepened/strengthened.

Thirdly, an immediate social connection, as well as an harmonious flowing together in prayer and worship, were rendered improbable through matters such as: denominationally doctrinal disagreements, inwardly oriented Christian identities and organisation, social stratification, a racist moral order and demarcated ethnic-cultural group identities.  According to Bartleman, this challenge was mitigated through two elements of a charismatic-revivalist ethical orientation, which manifested itself at Azusa Street, to facilitate both an alternative social connection and a flowing together 'in God's Spirit' (see also 6.5.5 and 6.5.6, below).  Bartleman duly emphasises sincere humility as an absolute prerequisite for entering one's 'Pentecost;' when considering the challenge that preachers regularly faced at Seymour's mission, for example (see above).  The need for humility was even 'materially'/practically reinforced by the sub-standard state of the building:  'The rafters were low, the tall must come down.  By the time they got to "Azusa" they were humbled, ready for the blessing.'[262] Bartleman further emphasises that Pentecostal seekers at the mission

---

262 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 59.  According to Justaert, the embodied precondition of participating in the liberating, communitarian and ever-evolving 'becoming-Christ' requires one 'giving up your subjectivity' and slipping 'through all categories,' i.e. 'becoming-minoritarian:' Justaert, 'Liberation Theology,' 157ff.

prayerfully focused on divine presence to such a degree that they, almost entirely, avoided engaging with one another in any conventional way, if unmitigated by the Spirit.[263] It is on such an ethical foundation that a Pentecostal unity in the pursuit of divine-proximity and 'love' could be achieved. Bartleman repeatedly calls for the rejection of 'sectarian prejudice, party spirit, etc., on all sides;'[264] and he emphasises that, at Azusa Street, 'The "color line" was washed away in the blood.'[265] What was unexpected—from a culture under white-European, high-modern hegemony—was a mixed group of worshippers under African-American pastoral leadership. The creation of a counterculture—that of a shy encounter with God's sanctity, a mutual submission and non-racist social unity, in the overwhelming presence of God's holiness and love—was facilitated by the 'asignifying' eruption of a humble and prayerful focus on engaging with God. As such, it was further shaped, by efforts to evade the embodied-and-symbolic power regimes of one's common (hierarchically organised, socially stratified and racist) culture, as much as it was by the

---

263 'We wanted God. When we first reached the meeting we avoided as much as possible human contact and greeting. We wanted to meet God first. We got our head under some bench in the corner in prayer, and met men only in the Spirit, knowing them "after the flesh" no more.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 59. Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:16.

264 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 21; cf. ibid., 34, 40, 68 and 89.

265 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 54.

search for a spiritual and biblical resolution.[266]

Finally, at a historico-cultural level, the San Francisco earthquake
(18 April 1906) shook the confidence of the Progressive Era.  The fact
that—the same day as the earthquake—a local newspaper reported the
'Weird Babel of Tongues' among a gathering of '[c]olored people and a
sprinkling of whites' at Azusa Street,[267] 'drew the crowds.'[268]  It seemed
natural to interpret the temporal coinciding of the earthquake and the
revival as a divine call to repentance.[269]  Bartleman—already fasting—
spent time writing and distributing a tract which aimed to prove from
scripture that God was the cause of earthquakes, and therefore required our

---

266 Justaert conceives a Deleuzian liberating-political 'church assemblage' as 'a
   non-hierarchical, temporary encounter of minorities, human and non-human,
   that function together in their resistance against the captivation of desire and
   the consequential forms of oppression and exploitation endemic to capitalist
   society.'  Justaert, *Theology after Deleuze,* 130  Although the Pentecostal
   display of counter-hierarchical, cross-denominational and counter-racist
   unity and love at Azusa Street only lasted for a short season, it was possible
   for this to become the rhizomic nucleus e.g. for a future Pentecostal-
   ecumenical vision: Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism,* 17ff.

267 Los Angeles Daily Times, 'Weird Babel of Tongues: New Sect of Fanatics is
   Breaking Loose, Wild Scene Last Night on Azusa Street, Gurgle of Wordless
   Talk by a Sister' (18-4-1906), repub. in *Wild and Weird,* ed. Martin, 25ff.

268 Bartleman , *How Pentecost,* 54.

269 '[...] both Heaven and hell seemed to have come to town.  Men were at the
   breaking point.  Conviction was mightily on the people.  They would fly to
   pieces even on the street, almost without provocation.'  Bartleman, *How
   Pentecost,* 53.

response.[270]  He found 'the earthquake had opened many hearts' for repentance and Spirit baptism and, as such, contributed significantly to making Azusa Street more than a merely congregational revival.[271]  A shaking of power relations, at a historical/cultural level, relates to power effects of a Pentecostal break-in which continues to impact and facilitate alternative late-modern power economies.

*Evaluation*

Progress in Bartleman's core ministry dispositive, including the introduction of Pentecostal innovation and effects of qualitative change, are created, strengthened, and evolve upon the basis of (series of) experimental rhizomic eruptions.  At times, these occur in unexpected ways and places.  In resistant and challenging situations, rhizomic eruptions facilitate the overcoming of some obstacles and the evasion of others, thereby making possible the creative fusion of innovative—whilst yet distinctive and intense—tuber connections between that which is disparate and distributed (what is prior, personal and internally embodied; and what is subsequent,

---

270 Bartleman, *My Story,* 36ff. and 48ff.; Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 50ff.

271 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 50.  'In the early "Azusa" days both Heaven and hell seemed to have come to town.  Men were at the breaking point.  Conviction was mightily on the people.  They would fly to pieces even on the street, almost without provocation.'  Ibid., 53.

external, material or verifiable).  This remains to be the case when

prophetic-intercessory ministries are translated into socially dispersed and

more epic dimensions.

Pentecostal relations—the power of 'God in the Spirit'—should thus

not be reduced to the (treelike-unified) power rationale of an individual

person's Pentecostal ministry.  Pentecostal worshippers refer to divine

presence, anointing and power not just in relation to empowered preachers,

miracle-working prophets or intercessors:  Divine power/agency is also

identified in Pentecostal/charismatic gatherings, times and places; on the

basis of a working-together of Pentecostal/charismatic stakeholders in

prayerful pursuit of Spirit presence, sanctity, unity, humility and love.  In

terms of power effects in, through, with and across such distributed

contributions, divine Spirit may be seen (and understood) to act, arise and

take control.[272]  Thereby, the distributed confrontation, resistance and

overcoming of—often, modern-organisational and related embodied—

---

272 Deleuze's immanent ('univocal'), 'atheist' and non-representational
     exploration of Nietzsche's enunciation of the 'death of God' considers that it
     is only after dropping the generalised-theistic notion of an absolute and
     transcendent God, that a consistently immanent, richer, distributed and,
     again, unlimited possibility of divine creativity, multiple presence and power
     emerges:  Gilles Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy,* tr. Hugh Tomlinson
     (London and New York: Continuum, 1986), 152ff.; Deleuze, *Difference and
     Repetition;* Shults, *Iconoclastic Theology;* Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as
     Revolt,* 48ff.

power regimes is shown to be absolutely indispensable.  What and how rhizomic growth/innovation in Pentecostal capacities is facilitated by asignifying rupture shall now be examined.

### 6.5.4  Multiplicity: evolving Pentecostal capacities and effects

According to DG's 'principle of multiplicity,' increasing a rhizome's external connections enlarges and modifies its possibility and—subsequently—its nature.[273]  Bartleman's experience of divine absence (above) demonstrates how rhizomic development and growth facilitates the embodied experience of dark visitation and, furthermore, makes possible new spiritual possibilities/capacities of prophetic practice, doctrinal understanding and incarnational/intercessory strategy and technique. Taking this one step further, it is not hard to imagine how subsequent rhizomic-experimental growth, amongst and across these dimensions—as well as across already established embodied-Pentecostal power capacities—could create further capacities of Pentecostal practice: one of an innovative, even more complex, fluid and intense nature.  This kind of effect, whereby rhizomic enlargement facilitates emergent-spiritual power

---

273 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 8; Adkins, *DG's A Thousand Plateaus,* 25f.

638

capacities and relations, shall be further explored in the assemblage of Bartleman's core ministry dispositive, first as Holiness preacher and then as he develops a prophetic-intercessory role by which to usher in revival.

## (1)  Revival preacher

Within in the overarching ministry sequence (see above), a second, more short-term pattern/dispositive relation of Pentecostal-ministry breakthrough is embedded.  Its characteristic interlinking of previous *and* subsequent, internally embodied *and* communal-public elements, may be traced as far back as Bartleman's account of his conversion in 1893 (6.5.1). Commonly, this core sequence begins (1) with Bartleman immersing himself—in an embodied-holistic way—into a contentious field or spiritual struggle, and often prayerfully responding to a spiritual prompting, guidance or need.  (2) In the place of prayer, Bartleman experiences a personal Spirit encounter.  (3) This correlates with a public, socially distributed spiritual breakthrough at a revival meeting (cf. above). Although this occurs according to its own intrinsic terms (aparallel evolution), Bartleman either perceives, or recognises, a relation with his prior—or simultaneously—embodied encounter.  Often, he describes material-and-meaningful points of reference—or resonance—between the

two.[274]  (4) Further down the line, external evidence of moral, economic or social transformation in people affected by this revival (or in a relevant congregation's wider community) may be recounted.

During the time of Bartleman's ministry formation at the Philadelphia Baptist Temple and Conwell's evening college, elements were added which would intensify certain connections and develop this sequence, connecting personally embodied struggle and breakthrough encounter, with subsequent, communally and publicly manifest, Spirit-events.  Through its repetitions and further development, the sequence became the ministry dispositive of a revival evangelist/preacher.  Thereby, relevant 'plug-ins'[275] were as follows:  (1) At his conversion, Bartleman responded to a call to give public witness; the subsequent blessing which this brought to the worshipping congregation affirmed his understanding that he 'was saved to tell it.'[276]  (2) Bartleman soon felt called to reach out

---

274 Bartleman's conversion account invokes God's light and glory in the context of his personal conversion-breakthrough, as well as, at the nearby Gospel Mission meeting which he disrupts in order to give his testimony.  'It broke up the service and everybody in the house.  A scene of glory filled the place.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 10.

275 Latour, *Reassembling the Social,* 207ff.

276 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 20.

to the marginalised and the poor; (3) and to pray for their salvation.[277] (4) Bartleman's call to the ministry was recognised by pastors, teachers and more senior church members. (5) His 'naturally independent' personality and fear of dependence upon paternal authorities channelled Bartleman towards embodied faith—provision, independent biblical learning and choosing a line of ministry that lacked social status.[278] (6) Bartleman immerses himself intensely in biblical studies which often include dimensions of prayerful self-application, thus rendering Bartleman's theological learning to be embodied and holistic.[279] (7) Bartleman longed for 'a deeper consecration' and Pentecostal empowerment. (8) Alongside his intense biblical learning, he also experiences a growing embodied-spiritual urge to immediately preach the biblical understanding that he receives.[280] (9) Hardship and being bullied at work for his Christianity,

---

277 'A great burden had come upon me for the lost.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 23.

278 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 22f.

279 'Conscious realization has been my aim.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 11. '"Seek first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." I believed this.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 24. 'The Psalms of David were made very real to me during this winter. I seemed to pass through the soul experience of David largely, and to come out with him. Dr. Stearn's Lectures on Prophecy [sic!] were also a great help to me at this time.' Ibid., 28.

280 'My heart became hungry for a deeper consecration, and a greater anointing from God for the service to which He had called me. I had much real soul-travail in those days and was in the glow of my "first love."' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 25. 'I had also preached to many an imaginary congregation

further deepened and accelerated Bartleman's embodied-spiritual

processes.[281]  (10) By his witness and example, Bartleman successfully

challenged some of his peers to consider *their* call to the ministry.[282]  (11)

When engaging with people in the slums of Philadelphia, and at his first

series of meetings, Bartleman, very reliably, experienced—and learned to

expect—conversions and revival breakthrough, whenever he preached.


Many repetitions of the pattern routinised and strengthened this as a

power dispositive.[283]  From a perspective of a Pentecostal theological

ethics, Bartleman is able to reformulate this ministry expectation and power

---

there.  The Gospel was a fire in my bones that roared all the day.  I felt "woe is me if I preach not."  My soul was expanding in the truth.  The Spirit of revelation was working mightily within me.'  Ibid., 26.  'I was consumed by love of the Word,' respectively, 'literally consumed by love for the Lord and His work and passed through a real death to all my natural desires.'  Ibid., 28.

281 'But I grew in grace during those days, and deepened rapidly in God.  I was being separated unto Him, for His service.  He told me He had "chosen me in the furnace of affliction," and it has proven so.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 28.  Cf. ibid., 23f. and 26.

282 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 23; cf. ibid., 76 and Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 10.

283 '[...] I saw many a poor derelict saved during this ministry.  [...]  I was accustomed to seeing definite results, and expected fruit for my labor in every meeting.  When such was not in evidence it caused great searching of heart.'  When Bartleman was insecure concerning his first invitation as a speaker, it is evidence of ministry success: revival-breakthrough and a 'good congregation' built, confirmed to him he had not been presumptuous.  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 25.

relation as consisting of the following elements: stepping out in faith; 'a desperate passion for souls;' a theological 'conception of a great savior who could reach them;' and reaching out for the (embodied-)Pentecostal power/ 'anointing' which would facilitate all that was required.  Furthermore, Bartleman frames his pursuit of 'power' and 'revival' by way of doxological-embodied consecration and focus.[284]  Other than Piette's concept of a broad-church Catholic God, that arises across distributed traces of many kinds,[285] the Pentecostal divine arising through Bartleman's anointed ministry appears to be more powerful, since amongst the distributed elements of this ministry, one finds: more deeply embodied despair/passion; more externally manifest effects/observations; and finally, a greater intensity/strength, as well as extravagance, amongst the essential—prior-and-subsequent, internal-and-manifest—asymmetric dispositive correlations that occur between relevant elements of both kinds.

---

284 'I felt there was little time to lose.  From the first I had a desperate passion for souls, and the conception of a great Savior, who could reach them.  My vision was very large.  I was full of zeal.  I was reaching out after the power of God to effect this, and realized many precious and powerful anointings of the Holy Ghost, for service.  [...]  My eyes were on Him, my desire toward Him, the Holy Ghost, Jesus enthroned.'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 11.

285 Piette, *Religion de près.*

*(2)  Prophetic intercession*

At this early point of ministry formation, alongside faith—provision and prophetic capacities, Pentecostal intercession is also introduced into Bartleman's ministry dispositive.  Alongside his biblical studies, Bartleman prayed for several hours every day.  He experienced '[a] great burden' and 'labored unceasingly for souls.'  Bartleman prayed for young people in his congregation and—together with two of his friends—'became greatly burdened for the life of our church.'  As with Bartleman's evangelism, prayer—occasionally, at least—had to connect with subsequent-and-external evidence of success.  In the case of the Philadelphia Grace Baptist Temple, the prayer investment of the young intercessors appears to have been answered by the subsequent invitation of a well-known preacher and the raising of the church's spiritual life.[286]

*(a)  Assemblage (1899–1900)*

In the case of Bartleman's own Pentecostal breakthrough, it was 'asignifying rupture'—malaria and other health issues which required Bartleman to take a break from preaching and full-time ministry at the

---

286 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 23 and 28.  Cf. Bartleman's prayer partnership with Boehmer in Pasadena: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19f., 30 and 33.

644

Pittsburgh Hope Mission (1899–1900)—which introduced a significant

transformation to Bartleman's revival-preacher ministry and power

dispositive. It is noteworthy that Bartleman's later prophetic-intercessory

dispositive capacity of either perceiving or introducing revival

breakthrough[287] was preconfigured, on a single occasion, more than a year

earlier, when Bartleman, at a series of evangelistic meetings in a Georgian

town, experienced a prophetic vision at the very moment of revival

breakthrough:

> The power of God came on me mightily one day while preaching. I saw
> a ball of fire falling from heaven. It was about the size of a cannon ball,
> and burst right within me. I do not know what the people saw but
> conviction seized them in a terrible way. In some way God had revealed
> Himself to them. They started to run for the altar. There were about 100
> people in the audience. [...] No invitation had been given. But God had
> spoken.[288]

Bartleman's embodied-Pentecostal breakthrough at the Pittsburgh mission,

in September 1899, significantly altered the focus and nature of his

ministry. Ministering at the altar, whilst engaged in a challenging prayer

battle for another seeker, Bartleman himself experiences a deeply intense

Pentecostal out-of-body/out-of-time encounter which, he confers, freed up

---

287 The question of causality remains contentious even from within a
   Pentecostal practice and understanding as Pentecostal dispositive activation
   can—in Clegg's terms—rarely, if ever, be limited to 'agency circuit'
   relations.

288 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 51.

his overly self-disciplined pastoral mannerism and ministry practice.[289]

From this point onwards, Bartleman would experience deeper and more profound embodied-Pentecostal encounters—and do so on a fairly regular, reliable basis. Evangelism and preaching, as his main ministry outlet, had to be closed down, at least for a season. Only then could this newly erupted rhizomic possibility, of entering into a more intensely embodied place of Pentecostal power/presence, form an interlocking connection with Bartleman's already existing prophetic-and-intercessory capacities. Three months later, Bartleman returned to Hope Mission without a leadership role since his deteriorated physical condition forbade public ministry. He concentrated on intercession in his private space (the 'Prophet's Chamber').[290] Especially during services which aimed at edifying Christian volunteers, Bartleman describes 'such a weight of glory one had to gasp for breath, and cry out under it' and '[a] wonderful spirit of love and unity.'[291]

---

289 'I began to get faith for him and finally began to declare "It shall be done." I repeated this a number of times, my voice each time rising higher, as faith touched God. Finally I struck through. God came. I was caught out of myself. When I came to my surroundings I was at the other side of the hall, shouting at the top of my voice, and jumping up and down. How I ever got there I do not know. After that I was much freer in the Spirit. The workers rejoiced much at my added freedom. They had been praying for it.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 65.

290 'This was a gateway of heaven to me. I met God in prayer here many times wonderfully, especially when praying for the meetings.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 70.

291 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 69. Here for the first time, Bartleman identifies an

Here for the first time, Bartleman identifies an external, quasi-spatial heavy anointing—which Pentecostals facilitate together by way of a shared spiritual attitude (unity, love)—with his personal—divine encounter in his private space, enveloped as it was by the prayers of other workers at the mission; and this only one of many Pentecostal contributions.[292]

### (b) Stoneboro Wesleyan-Methodist Camp (1900)

In a subsequent step, such dimensions of embodied displacement and quasi-material prophecy were reintroduced to Bartleman's central ministry dispositive of revivalist power/ministry.  A few examples shall be examined to indicate the characteristics of this re-formed Pentecostal power paradigm and its possibilities of further variation and development.  At the 1900 Wesleyan Camp Meeting at Stoneboro, Bartleman challenged fellow believers and church leaders to raise their expectations for a more significant move of God.[293]  'The tide rose,' and Bartleman was found to be interceding.  He experienced the build-up of an embodied-intercessory

external, quasi-spatial heavy anointing which Pentecostals facilitate together by way of a shared spiritual attitude (unity, love).

292 But cf. Bartleman, *From Plough,* 25 and 32; cf. also Bartleman's description of spiritual-developments towards/at Azusa Street: Bartleman, *How Pentecost.*

293 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 76.  Cf. ibid., 23, and Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 10.

'burden' ahead of Spirit breakthrough in one of the meetings. 'I came into the tent and sat down, but soon lost all control of my body under the power.' At the very point of communal breakthrough, Bartleman experienced the climax to his embodied journey.

> The burden was very great. I could not move. The meeting began. Suddenly the power of God began to go through me like great waves of electricity. It seemed as though I would be electrocuted under the mighty shocks. I gasped for breath like a dying man. The Evangelist never got a chance to preach. He attempted it two or three times, but finally gave it up. The preachers all piled up at the altar, on the right side, in the place of the penitents, and the power of God literally swept the place.[294]

Overwhelmed by his experience, Bartleman 'was unconscious to what was going on' around him. As he regained conscious access to his senses, Bartleman experienced a quasi-visual intensification. 'I came back to my surroundings slowly. There was a halo all over the tent.' Over time, this perception faded.[295] It was by way of conversation after the service that Bartleman learned how his 'electric shock' experience had correlated with revival at the altar, and how 'it went through the tent in waves,' as other seasoned Pentecostals would relate.[296]

---

294 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 76f.

295 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 77. Intensified perception of one's external reality: Luhrmann, *When God Talks Back,* 152f.

296 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 77.

*(c)  Concord Wesleyan-Methodist Church (1900–01)*

When, around the same time, Bartleman prepared for a revival service with his Concord congregation (Erie County), he perceived entering a divine realm.

> While praying in my room one evening, just before going to preach, suddenly the very atmosphere of the room changed.  [...]  It was like heaven, a change of worlds.  The whole atmosphere became supernatural.  I started for the church panting for breath under the weight of the presence of God.

When arriving at the church, Bartleman found himself to be immobilised and unable to speak, yet perceiving his congregation's 'bitter' opposition.

> After a few moments of silence, in which one could almost hear a pin drop, the power of God came upon me so strong that I fell to the floor helpless.  For a full half hour I lay like a dead man.  I could not move.  The atmosphere was awful with conviction.  I could hear groans all over the house.  But the people dared not move.  The fear of God was on them.  It seemed like Judgement Day.[297]

When, eventually, Bartleman stood up and preached, he gave 'a solemn message of warning.'  As has been pointed out above, this time, Bartleman's message was unsuccessful.  'They hardened their necks and hearts still more.  [...]  They would not repent.'[298]

---

297 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 78 and 78f.

298 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 79.

*(d)  Greeley Holiness Tent (1902)*

Whilst in intercession, at a tent-meeting in Greeley, Colorado (1902), Bartleman, again, experienced an intercessory burden.[299]  Sensing that a breakthrough of revival was at hand, Bartleman encouraged the preacher, Hattie Livingstone, to take the risk and carry on, albeit that a storm ('almost a cyclone') approached.[300]  'The Lord got busy,' as the people remained and with conditions worsening, were soon trapped in the tent.

> A spiritual cyclone suddenly struck the Tent [sic!].  We had only to keep out of the way of the Spirit.  Several hardened sinners, who had been standing in the way of the meeting, suddenly went down.  The power of God seemed to go around the tent in circles.  It mowed the sinners off their seats as it went.  They lay like sheaves of wheat on a threshing floor.  And all without human intervention.  God did it.  Some of the hardest of them were gloriously saved.[301]

On this occasion, Bartleman observed that, instead of his embodied Spirit experience, it were the dangers and processes of nature that aligned with what unfolded inside the tent.[302]  Bartleman's double language reference to

---

299 'One night I was greatly burdened during the service.  I lay behind the organ through the meeting, groaning in prayer in the straw.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 99.

300 'It blew almost a cyclone.  [...]  A great conviction was on the people.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 99.

301 Bartleman, *From Plough,* 99.

302 Not too long before, Bartleman had discovered vestiges of biblical wisdom in the spectacle of nature whilst climbing Pikes Peak.

'cyclone' prophetically recognises a symbolic correspondence.[303]   Beneath

this unifying recognition was a perception of a non-hierarchical order—

thus divine orchestration—with the observation of social cascades

('sinners' falling like 'sheaves') simultaneously implying, in the case of all

involved, a personally intense spiritual-embodied process.


    With Bartleman's Pentecostal breakthrough at the Pittsburgh mission,

new, intercessory-and-prophetic, capacities were introduced to Bartleman's

ministry dispositive through a series of its repetition and variation, in ever

new localities and situations.  With the deepening and intensification of

embodied experience—the embodied-prophetic grasp of a subsequent,

external, manifest and socially distributed relation of reality could also be

intensified and enhanced—as could, in equal measure—the intuitive grasp

of its biblical-prophetic coding/interpretation.


*(3)  Contributor to a 'latter rain' Pentecost*


    When Bartleman's family arrived in Pasadena and Los Angeles

(Christmas 1904), worn down by suffering, grinding poverty, the resistance

---

303 Cf. the correspondence of embodied 'floods of light' with '[a] scene of glory'
    at the mission on the occasion of Bartleman's conversion: Bartleman, *My
    Story,* 10.

of unbelief and confrontations with church leaders, Bartleman—struggling with his fate and with God—had reached a low point. Giving in to depression, it was over his first child's grave that Bartleman experienced a consecration and recommissioning as an intercessor/revivalist.[304] Very quickly, Bartleman recovered whatever Pentecostal practice and anointing he had lost through previous defeats in battle and through depression. In one sense, different aspects of Bartleman's public ministry were reactivated and restored: Bartleman was asked to preach at revival meetings; he prayed and received prophecy; he admonished others to pursue God and pray; and he distributed literature in churches, saloons and in the streets. Bartleman, again, experienced embodied encounters whilst praying or preaching, which would be followed by revival breakthrough.[305] Also, new lines of ministry were added: Bartleman began networking between revivalists and churches, wrote articles for the religious press and his own tract literature with a biblical-prophetic message, calling for a response to the unfolding Spirit revival. Some things however, differed to previous times.

Four effects of the overall process of apparent destruction of

---

304 'My own awakening, or reawakening to his plan, was brought about through the loss of my little girl.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 21.

305 Repeatedly, 'a hot blast from the "pit" seemed to strike' Bartleman when he preached at Peniel Pasadena. Soon after, God's presence, peace and glory entered the place; many repented. Bartleman, *My Story,* 9.

Bartleman's previous ministry rhizome, its subsequent eruption and new growth can be identified (below, [a] to [d]). Together, they make it possible for the revivalist dynamics that were apparent in Los Angeles, between 1905 and 1907, to develop deeper and faster, reach further, and be of a different quality than anything which Bartleman had previously experienced.

## (a) Epic spiritual eruption

Bartleman was himself aware that pursuing God and revivalist ministry was a way of avoiding grief and the hammering pain which accompanied his loss.[306] Given the 'epic' disruption/destruction of Bartleman's Pentecostal rhizome and its preparation through unbearable grief/pain,[307] there was even greater sincerity and depth to Bartleman's prayerful pursuit of God and revival. Bartleman's pain of loss was especially channelled into a sense of intercessory burden and urgency in the call to repentance and preparation for God.[308]

---

306 'Little Esther's death had broken my heart and I felt I could only live while in God's service.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 11f. In summer 1908, Bartleman's grieving process was clearly ongoing: Bartleman, *My Story,* 14ff.

307 'We must be broken, ground to a pulp, in order for the realization of God's highest preparation for us.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 19.

308 'I longed to know Him in a more real way and to see the work of God go forth in power. A great burden and cry came in my heart for a mighty

*(b) Distributed, multidimensional engagement*

At the time that revival broke through in Pasadena, Bartleman reassembled a number of—each quite disparate—power nodes pertaining to his new revivalist ministry: exhortation of Christians through the spoken and written word; re-engaging in preparatory intercession but at a previously unknown intensity; prophecy, as before; and a renewed '"gift of faith" for revival.' Bartleman recounts these as divine 'blessings' and 'spirits' that he received *together*.[309] Although disparate in nature—each from different places, with a distinctive previous—subsequent, personal— manifest/collective power economy, and a different technicality and focus—together, they were directed towards facilitating and strengthening an emergent move of God. Exhortation and intercession, in different ways,

---

revival. [...] This could only be brought about by the realization of a deeper need in my own heart for God, and a real soul travail for the work of God.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 12. On a different level, the Azusa Street Pentecost would probably not have hit the news and would not have had the same sharp impact and would not have reached the same level of fame, had not the Progressive Era's (and people's) confidence been shaken by the San Francisco earthquake which occurred within days of revival-meetings beginning at the mission.

309 'The Lord blessed me with a further spirit of exhortation to revival among the churches, giving me articles to write for the Holiness press along the same lines also. [...] One night I awoke from my sleep shouting the praise of God. He was getting hold of me more and more. I was now going day and night, exhorting to faith in God for mighty things. The spirit of revival consumed me. The spirit of prophecy came upon me strongly, also. I seemed to receive a definite "gift of faith" for revival. We were evidently in the beginning of wonderful things to come, and I prophesied continually of a mighty outpouring.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 14.

identifies and mobilises (potential) resources for revival; prophecy and faith take hold of divine moves and overarching strategies which intercession, preaching and writing—in turn—can process. By way of interconnecting they thus mutually inform, intensify and strengthen one another.

*(c) Partnerships and recognising others*

Bartleman now found and recognised other revivalists around him; and they were not within a single ministry, but distributed across places and churches. Together with a group of young people (the 'Peniel boys') Bartleman prayed for revival breakthrough, firstly at another Pasadena mission, then across town, and across Los Angeles and the wider region. Like Bartleman, members of this group also engaged with spiritual processes in different churches that were entering a move of God.[310] From their midst, Boehmer became Bartleman's partner in prayer and ministry.[311] Together, the two experienced a Jesus visitation which, in its intensity, drove out doubt and fear. It affirmed—both by the 'reality' and power of

---

310 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 10, 12 and 14. Due to their prayer investment into revival at a Pasadena Methodist-Episcopal church, even before his ministry engagement, Bartleman 'found a wonderful work of the Spirit going on.' Ibid., 12. Later they would join Bartleman Bartleman in supporting spiritual processes at Smale's church in Los Angeles. Ibid., 19, 34.

311 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 17f. and 19f.

God—that their prayers mattered and that indeed a major revival breakthrough was imminent.[312]  Towards the climax of Bartleman's intercessory journey, Elizabeth 'Mother' Wheaton, a well-known prison evangelist, also joined Bartleman in L. A. to help him carry the growing intercessory 'burden.'[313]  Bartleman saw the connection with the 1904–05 Welsh revival as being crucial for the unfolding divine move on the American West Coast.  Connections were established through literature, through Bartleman's exchange of letters with Evan Roberts, and through Smale's appointment—on his return from Wales—to Los Angeles' First Baptist Church.  Along with Smale, Bartleman regarded the Welsh revival as providing more than the paradigm for what was to be pursued in Los Angeles in order to see a divine move and order.  Bartleman also valued the direct personal link and connection in prayer/spiritual concern, across which Spirit power seemed to travel between places at great distance.[314]  Bartleman engaged, again, with the Fergusons' Peniel missions.  At

312 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 17f., 30f. and pass.  Jesus visitation: ibid., 19ff.; Bartleman, *My Story,* 31.  Erie County diabolic visitations contributed to preparation: see above.  Boehmer covered rent for Bartleman's cottage: Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 31.

313 'I prayed for help, and the dear Lord showed me He was sending Mother Wheaton, the prison evangelist.  [...]  Three days later she arrived.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 32f.; cf. Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 40f.

314 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 18, 24, 33 and 35.  'I feel their prayers had much to do with our final victory in California.'  Ibid., 35.

different phases of the spiritual process, Bartleman would acknowledge the importance and senior leadership: at first, of Smale's ministry; then, at the height of revival, of Seymour (and his team); and eventually, of Durham.[315] Of equal importance were the many people, of different ethnic backgrounds/nationalities from many places and churches, initially, across the town, but soon drawn from across California, across the States and across different parts of the world, who—once revival was underway—came to meetings, at Azusa Street and other Pentecostal hotspots, as Pentecostal seekers and spiritual contributors.[316] It is their disparate and distributed backgrounds, together with the distribution of locations/communities receiving Pentecostal ministry teams and missionaries that emanated from Azusa Street, that determined the growing temporal, regional and socio-cultural impact of the 'Los Angeles Pentecost.'

The concept of prayer meetings that would 'run themselves,' without pastoral guidance, was equally established upon social distribution:

---

315 'God found His Moses, in the person of Brother Smale, to lead us to the Jordan crossing. But He chose Brother Seymour, for our Joshua, to lead us over.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 47. On Durham: ibid., 445ff. Historically discerning academic accounts point out that, factual gaps and errors aside, Bartleman over-emphasises not just his own, but Caucasian leadership impact, whilst his judgement of Seymour's ministry is inappropriately harsh: Nelson, 'For Such [...]' 89ff.; cf. Synan and Fox, *William J. Seymour;* Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission.*

316 Bartleman, *My Story,* 12.

worshippers focusing on God and participating in a Spirit-orchestrated

'harmony,' each according to their distributed-spiritual contribution.[317]

Deriving from the Welsh revival, according to Bartleman—although

African-American practices of leadership and prayer would, in fact, have

formed a significantly more powerful paradigm and source—Spirit-guided

distributed practices/processes became characteristic of the events of 1906

at Seymour's mission. Through their distributed and heterogeneous

cooperation with one another, Pentecostals strengthen and inform one

another within their shared revivalist concern.[318] There is no reason as to

why asignifying, aparallel connections should not be established in such a

way that they cross over individually contained embodiments. The

intensity, sincerity and depth of, for example, Bartleman's embodied

(memory of) pain can inform the emergent, inter-individual and

suprapersonal weave of spiritual events, power flows and possibilities that

are thus facilitated.

---

317 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19 and 23; cf. 1 Corinthians 12:26ff.

318 Consider Justaert's Deleuzean radical ecclesiological vision: 'A church
assemblage is a non-hierarchical, temporary encounter of minorities, human
and non-human, that function together in their resistance against the
captivation of desire and the consequential forms of oppression and
explotation endemic to capitalist society. From the margins, a liberating
church creates an immanent plane of resistance that can question and
challenge established institutions and logics.' Justaert, *Theology after
Deleuze,* 130.

*(d)  Rhizomic growth and power effects*

The creation of a complex rhizomic weave of power nodes, and deepening of channels of flow can be easily traced along Bartleman's temporal-narrative sequence: At his funeral recommissioning, Bartleman prayerfully sublates the grieving process into the pursuit of 'eternal issues.'[319]  Within a week, he preached at Peniel Mission, experienced 'a hot blast from the "pit"' (cf. above, 6.5.2, on Bartleman's dark visitation) and ushered in revival.  When there was a risk that this congregational revival could be aborted prematurely, Bartleman decided to fast and pray.  From then on, he would, step by step, further extend and intensify his prayer life.  At Peniel, a group of radical revivalists (a young woman and the 'Peniel boys') were 'dug out.'  Bartleman would often re-encounter them whenever revival reached another threshold.  ...[320]  Bartleman distributed tracts; heard of the Welsh revival; encountered 'Mother' Wheaton's ministry for the first time ('She was on fire for God.'); and longed to re-engage in the ministry.  Immediately, Bartleman recovered

---

319 'Beside that little coffin, with heart bleeding, I pledged my life anew for God's service.  In the presence of death how real eternal issues become.  I promised the rest of my life should be spent wholly for Him.  [...]  I then begged Him to open a door of service quickly, that I might not find more time for sorrow.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 9.  'By this time the spirit of intercession had so possessed me that I prayed almost day and night.  I fasted much also, until my wife almost despaired of my life at times.  The sorrows of my Lord had gripped me.  I was in the Garden with Him.'  Ibid., 32.

320 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 9ff.

faith for God's provision, a longing for a deeper personal consecration; and was drawn into intercession for a greater divine visitation of the people. As Bartleman brought revival to another church in Pasadena, his revivalist intercession also picked up pace. Often with—and alongside the 'Peniel boys'—Bartleman prayed for a congregational breakthrough. 'We then began to pray for an outpouring of the Spirit for Los Angeles and the whole of southern California.' Following his prophetic discernment, Bartleman began to intercede on behalf of pastors and ministries in other places, that they would not miss the emergent move of God.[321] He also read up on the Welsh revival:

> The Spirit, through the little book, set me on fire. I visited and prayed with three preachers and a number of workers before I returned home, at noon.[322]

Bartleman thus began encouraging others, through literature distribution, preaching and article writing, to enter the rhizomic-revivalist stream of Spirit consecration and expectation of a greater breakthrough. Communicating his understanding of the Spirit move in Wales, as well as distributed prophetic insights which were received and shared at prayer meetings, Bartleman thus shaped the expectation and understanding, within

---

321 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 12. Ibid., 11ff.

322 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 13.

the revivalist-intercessory milieu to which he belonged, of the kind of

spiritual move to anticipate and for which to prepare, with regards to its

characteristic elementary relations and its overall power strategy. ...[323]

There is a significant amount of rhizomatic-repetitive stitching backwards,

forwards and sideways even in Bartleman's published accounts. It is by

way of repetition and variation that a reflective understanding becomes

established. Efforts to reproduce this however, serve to undermine a sense

of spiritual intensification and acceleration in Pentecostal-revivalist

processes and journeys.[324]


Encouraged by revivalists coming out of the woodwork and rhizomic

---

[323] By June 1905, Bartleman (with Smale) watched out for meetings that, as in Wales, would 'run themselves;' Smale had prophesied the return of charismatic gifts; and Los Angeles was identified as the 'a veritable Jerusalem [...] for a mighty move of God to begin.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19.

[324] With Emilia Fogelklou's theorisation of 'form and radiance,' Carlsson Redell explores the possibility of a post-representational spirituality of Christian transgression: 'Matter, form itself, is no longer infused by a shining divine concrete stability, nor defined and distantly viewed by a transcendent subject. On the contrary, it is characterized by change and vibrancy, she says.' The contemporary spiritual challenge would be, '[...] to flee submission as obedience in order to dive into form as liberated from its former formality. Nothing past can dictate the conduct of the individual, she states. Inherited forms cannot dictate, nor exercise power over the present, since presence in the present is a presence of transgression. To be present in the world in this manner is to be in, and part of, living form—radiant form. [...] The presence in the here and now, as a transgressive presence of the infinitely new is, then, dependent on the repetition of forms.' Carlsson Redell, *Mysticism as Revolt,* 150.

connections creating a sense of a Spirit move picking up momentum,

Bartleman's prayer life intensified.  Eventually, Bartleman found himself to

be in a continuous flow of prophetic prayer; discovering that he was

praising, 'groaning' and interceding 'in the Spirit,' even whilst asleep and

waking up in the night.[325]  The intercessory 'burden' would, at times,

become unbearably intense; and Bartleman describes 'groaning' and crying

out in response to Spirit-induced contractions in the prayerful process of

giving birth to revival.[326]  A Jesus visitation topped off one of these intense

nights of prayer and gave affirmation to Bartleman and Boehmer as to:

what had been achieved; who they were as intercessors to God; and that

---

325 'At night I would roll and groan in my sleep, and wife declared I was
      pleading for souls even then.  The mighty divine compassion, travail, agony
      for souls had gripped me, and I could not shake it off.  The child must be
      brought forth.'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 26.  'I was carrying this burden [of
      prayer] now in ever increasing volume, night and day.  The ministry was
      intense.  It was "the fellowship of His sufferings," a "travail" of soul, with
      "groanings that could not be uttered."'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 17.  'The
      spirit of prayer came more and more heavily upon us.  In Pasadena, before
      moving to Los Angeles, I would lie on my bed in the daytime and roll and
      groan under the burden.  At night I could scarcely sleep for the spirit of
      prayer.  I fasted much, not caring for food while burdened.  At one time I was
      in soul travail for nearly twenty-four hours without intermission.  It nearly
      used me up.  Prayer literally consumed me.  I would groan all night in my
      sleep.  Prayer [...] was God breathed.  It came upon us, and overwhelmed us.'
      Ibid., 35.  Cf. ibid., 14, 18, 24f., 28. and passim.

326 'We prayed for a spirit of revival for Pasadena until the burden became well
      nigh unbearable.  I cried out like a woman in birth-pangs.  The Spirit was
      interceding through us.  Finally the burden left us.'  Bartleman, *How
      Pentecost,* 19; cf. ibid., 20, 24, 26 and 35.  'Day and night the Spirit was
      heavy upon me for this, until it seemed that I must die.  My precious wife
      remarked to a friend that I would die [...].'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 26.

greater things were yet to come.[327]  In the place of embodied liminality,

intensified encounter and ongoing prayer—and after years of Pentecostal

learning—Bartleman's prophetic-intercessory clarity and capacity appeared

to be highly enhanced, to the place of—it seemed—a reliable near

automatism.[328]  The liminality,[329] intensification and swiftness in delivery, at

the time, also impacted Bartleman's preaching and exhortation.

> Sometimes the travail of soul would become so great I could not live at
> home.  God had taken away, almost, the spirit of preaching, except when
> I would prophesy of the coming work.  I was practically shut up in my
> closet fifteen months.  When the pressure would get too great I would go
> out, driven of the Spirit, and something always came to pass.  Things
> would be stirred for God mightily.  Then I would go back to prayer
> again.  My message at such a time was generally an exhortation to
> prayer.  Like the prophets of old I would sally forth, hurl myself upon the
> people like a whirlwind, then hide away again.  Few people understood
> me, most feared me, but God knew what He was about.[330]

---

327 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19ff.; cf. Bartleman, *My Story,* 31.

328 'The Spirit made intercession "according to the will of God."  Whole
congregations were surprisingly revived.  The Spirit would fall upon them
most unexpectedly, and on many individuals, at the same hour I prayed for
them.  They were generally puzzled to understand the meaning of it all.
They saw no connection in the matter.  But God was working.  It was my
ministry.  The Spirit generally kept me in such close touch with the battle
that I knew beforehand when some new development would take place, and
prophesied of it.  It always came to pass.  [...]  Ofttimes I seemed to be given
the map of war.  I seemed to sit at a great keyboard and press buttons of
faith, while the electric currents of God's potency would sensibly leap forth
in all directions through the universe.'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 30.

329 Being unguarded, vulnerable and exposed, in a multi-faceted, inner and
external, way—whilst engaging with, and flowing in, an embodied sense of
purposeful presence, proximity, empowerment and grace.

330 Bartleman, *My Story,* 32.

At the same time, there were clear patterns, phases, distinctive densities

and qualities in the 'flow of the Spirit.'[331]

By way of a transfer from Bartleman's prophetic-and-prayerful

journey, a 'liminalisation,' as it were, and acceleration occurred—in the

extreme—of Bartleman's writing, printing and distribution of tract

literature, as the earthquake struck and events at Azusa Street got under

way.  Following prophetic guidance, Bartleman had just begun a ten-day

fast.  During the following days, Bartleman experienced an extreme

acceleration of prayer, action and events.  Throughout the process,

Bartleman sensed the weight of urgency and divine presence, precise

prophetic guidance and preservation in danger—but also people's rebellion

and resistance—even on his body.[332]  It is by an essentialist differentiation,

for analytical purposes,[333] that within Bartleman's revivalist ministry

different topics or types have been differentiated: proclamation,

networking, literature production and distribution, prophecy and prayer.

Heading towards the breakthrough of April 1906, as such categorically

331 E.g., Bartleman accounts of 'a blessed weeping burden for a number of days during which my heart became very tender.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 40.

332 Bartleman, *My Story,* 41ff. and 50ff.

333 '[O]versignifying breaks separating structures or cutting across a single structure:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9.

differentiated ministry forms engage with one another ever more closely, they become increasingly dissolved and stirred together like 'schlieren' (inhomogeneities and regions of different density within a single flowing movement) in a place of embodied liminality and liquid acceleration.

Previously, all of Bartleman's ministry engagements—revivalist preaching, tract distribution and prophetic intercession—had had a local spatial-temporal focus and scope.[334] However, with regards to Bartleman's prophetic and intercessory capacities, there was a change. As intercession prayer deepened, swiftened and intensified—and as, step by step, prophetic audacity and clarity were added—its focus and reach also increased. Bartleman, and others around him, began by praying for revival at a specific Peniel mission and Methodist-Episcopal congregation. They went on to claim 'Pasadena for Jesus;' then, a 'Pentecost' for Los Angeles; California; the States; and other parts of the world.[335] Bartleman, in his spirit, would (at times) connect with places which he had previously visited, bringing—he was assured—an unexpected revival even in localities where he had previously failed.[336] He would develop a perception of

---

334 As regards their impact and distribution, article writing and literature distribution are somewhat different in kind.

335 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19; Bartleman, *My Story,* 24ff.

336 Bartleman, *My Story,* 30.

embodied connection with 'the spiritual conditions of the four quarters of the earth' from which his intercessory burden derived.[337]  At the height of the Azusa Street revival, Bartleman's prophetic admonitions also appeared to take on a global scope/reach; if they did not stretch to the end of the age, one could conceive—with hindsight—that they extended (at the very least) beyond the Great War.[338]

In one sense, the recovery of Bartleman's disrupted and destroyed prophetic-intercessory capacities—the reactivation of old associations and the addition of new connections with the subsequent power effects of intensification, acceleration, sharpening and spatial-temporal widening— only serve to facilitate additional performances of Bartleman's prophetic-intercessory dispositive relation as explored above in section 6.5.2:

> Sometimes I would lie awake all night travelling in prayer all over the States, where I had gone before, and the Spirit would kindle fires of promise everywhere.  I would prevail with God.  This has been later realized.[339]

---

337 'Sometimes the conflict in the heavenlies would be terrific in its shock.  I seemed in my spirit to draw a knowledge of the spiritual conditions from the four quarters of the earth.  This brought a terriffic strain, naturally, on my whole physical and mental being.  And yet this soul travail is one of the very sweetest experiences man can realize.'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 31.

338 Bartleman, *My Story,* 35f.

339 Bartleman, *My Story,* 30.

There are, again, repetitions/variations of the distinctive prophetic-intercessory, asignifying-aparallel, connections between previous, private and embodied revelatory perceptions or prayer investments, on the one side; and external, socially distributed and verifiable, but subsequent, realities, on the other side. However, this now took place *on an epic scale.* Whereas previously, it had often been possible to immediately verify the external-and-subsequent confirmation of what appeared to be a powerful prayer or prophetic premonition, the significantly greater geographical/historical distribution of the elements of the dispositive made verification, in general, more difficult.

*(4) Meetings which 'run themselves'*

As the focal point of revival moved to Azusa Street in April 1906, Bartleman took a back seat. For the first time, he was not a key player but rather one of many visitors who immersed himself into whatever divine presence and blessing was on offer. This not only related to Seymour's group picking up the baton, and Bartleman's exhaustion and sense that his preparatory work had come to fruition;[340] it also corresponded to a change

340 'I threw myself full length in a last agony of prayer, my strength all gone, to reach this, and it came. My work was done. That particular burden left me then. It remained largely now for others to carry it on.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 33.

in the characteristics and nature of worship and thus the power economy, as Bartleman attended meetings with Seymour's group at a cottage in Bonnie Brae Street and at the Azusa Street mission.

*(a) Sideways transfer of spiritual gifts*

With this change of perspective in Bartleman's accounts, there is the possibility of examining sideways redeployments of Pentecostal power manifestations and capacities. With regards to his preparatory journey, and also that of Seymour's group, Bartleman points out that many Pentecostal seekers were surprised by what appeared to be a sudden, unexpected, move of God. However, any Pentecostal blessing must be carefully assembled and thoroughly tested before it can be passed on and received by others at a significantly lower personal cost.[341] Something of a similar nature occurred when Bartleman was at the Azusa Street mission and received the 'gift of song' or 'heavenly chorus.'[342] It was Moore, who first received this

---

341 'The present Pentecostal manifestation did not break out in a moment, like a huge prairie fire, and set the world on fire. In fact no work of God ever appears that way. There is a necessary time for preparation. The finished article is not realized at the beginning. Men may wonder where it came from, not being conscious of the preparation, but there is always such. Every movement of the Spirit of God must also run the gauntlet of the devil's forces.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 45. Cf. the difference of construction and deployment of scientific facts: Latour, *Science in Action.*

342 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56.

spiritual gift at her breakthrough at Bonnie Brae Street,[343] and it was she

who also introduced it to Azusa Street.  From Bartleman's perspective

however, it came without preparation, unexpected, straight out of heaven.[344]

Bartleman was captured by its beauty and unearthly presence/ power;[345] and

discerned the impression that it had upon he gathering in general:

> The effect was wonderful on the people.  It brought a heavenly
> atmosphere, as though the angels themselves were present and joining
> us.  And possibly they were.[346]

Bartleman recounts his experience: '[...] a great hunger entered my soul to

receive it.  I felt it would exactly express my pent up feelings.'  This

identifies the distinctively personal and different function of the 'gift,' in

Bartleman, by comparison with its purpose in Moore.  In the event,

Bartleman observed himself as having involuntarily joined the others in

this kind of song.  He points out that, at the time, revivalists 'feared to try

to reproduce it, as with the "tongues" also.'[347]

---

343 Moore, 'Music from Heaven;' see above, chapter 5.

344 'It was a gift from God of high order, and appeared among us soon after the
   "Azusa" work began.  No one had preached it.  The Lord had sovereignly
   bestowed it [...].'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56.

345 'It was a spontaneous manifestation and rapture no earthly tongue can
   describe.  In the beginning this manifestation was wonderfully pure and
   powerful.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56.

346 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56.

347 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56.

With every Pentecostal-charismatic contributor already existing as a rhizomic weave of pre-established Pentecostal symbolic-embodied capacities/powers in her/his own right, many variations of performance, across a socially distributed field of spiritual contributions, facilitate a flowing-together in worship within a single rhizomic presence/power of God's Spirit.  Thereby, full sets of new possibilities are introduced to the rhizomic multiplicity that constitutes Pentecostal worship during the hot phase of revival.

*(b)  The Pentecostal multiplicity*

Already at Smale's church, meetings had begun to open up to more liquid and organic processes of self-organisation.[348]  Bartleman completely fails to account for the preparation of Seymour's group, and to acknowledge the African-American 'black oral root' tradition of worship in which 'everybody is a potential contributor to the liturgy.'[349]  However, Bartleman appreciated that the core group surrounding Seymour—both individually and corporately—with undivided attention, pursued prayer, sanctification, and the promised drawing close of the Pentecost Spirit.

---

348 'Souls are being saved all over the house, while the meeting sweeps on unguided by human hands.  The tide is rising rapidly, and we are anticipating wonderful things.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19.

349 Hollenweger, *Pentecostalism,* 23.

Bartleman noted Seymour's unpretentious humility, spiritual discipline and obvious 'anointing.' As a pastoral leader, Seymour was at liberty to let each service run as a self-organising processual flow in which worshippers, both individually and as a group, pursued God, and where God's Spirit was given permission to take control. During the 'hot phase' of the revival at least, Seymour would not exercise leadership in the form of ministerial oversight.

There are emergent-spiritual possibilities, capacities and effects which contributors may observe, in relation to collective-Pentecostal worship/prayer, during the hot phase of a revival, which are best described in terms of DG's multiplicity principle of inter-engaging 'weaves.' Amongst these are: Bartleman's account of Pentecostal recognition of meaningful process/order across 'spontaneous' contributions at meetings that were not—in a conventional sense—pastorally planned and overseen;[350] a perception that 'the Spirit would fall upon the congregation,'[351] be it as 'fire' or 'like rain;'[352] that, at a meeting, 'the tide of blessing would rise and fall' as Pentecostal pioneers sought to usher in

---

350 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19 and 23.

351 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 60.

352 Durham, 'Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'

divine presence;[353] that the Spirit acted with an impact upon individual seekers or upon the meeting as a whole;[354] that problematic contributors would be silenced in response to divine power, rather than human engagement, and be drawn into preconfigured paths of sanctification/ empowerment; that power/anointing would be present in the shape of holiness, conviction, unity or humility, or else envelop believers as 'a sea of pure divine love;'[355] that God was present, alive and real.

At the foundation of the Pentecostal multiplicity or rhizomic 'weave,' is a socially distributed, prayerful focus on Spirit presence, consecration, power, love.  It has been pointed out (6.5.3) that the specific godly qualities of anointing/presence at Azusa Street (conviction, consecration, holiness, humility, power, love) are best explained as spiritual correlatives to the conquering of cultural resistances/challenges in distributed-embodied power encounters.  Bartleman ascribes a number of negative descriptors to exceptional occurrences at Azusa Street: no pride, no empty self-assertion, no fear, no giving of special honour to the rich and

---

353 Argue, 'Memories,' 6.  Cf. Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 48.

354 'Suddenly the Spirit would fall upon the congregation.  God himself would give the altar call.  Men would fall all over the house, like the slain in battle, or rush for the altar enmasse [sic!], to seek God.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 60.

355 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 55.

educated, but rather humility, love and honouring God in whatever insignificant vessel the Spirit chose;[356] no depending upon a human leader, no 'ecclesiastical hierarchism and abuse,' but rather spontaneity and 'the Spirit' being in control;[357] no defending of the work of oneself, but prayer, a concern 'not to grieve the Spirit' and reliance upon God;[358] no empty talk, no mere-social engagements, but an aim to firstly engage with God;[359] no 'counterfeiting' of Spirit by 'crooks and cranks,' but 'the real thing.'[360] What Pentecostal pioneers have chosen in prolonged personal preparation, in and across many struggles and breakthrough experiences, is of the very same nature as that which impregnated the spiritual atmosphere of power/ presence in the multifariously interwoven relations of time, place, community and the process of revival.  At Azusa Street, there was yet a form of leadership which Bartleman describes (with reference to 2 Samuel 6) as a 'priestly' group effort of carrying 'the Ark' of divine presence together on one's shoulders.[361]  Notably—at least in the early phase—it was

---

356 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58.

357 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58f.

358 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 55.

359 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 59.

360 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 45 and 49.

361 'The "Ark of God" moved off slowly, but surely, at "Azusa."  It was carried "on the shoulders" of His own appointed priests in the beginning.  [...]  The priests were "alive to God," through much preparation and prayer.  [...]

not possible to 'steady the Ark of the Lord' by way of pastoral intervention. 'We could only pray.  Then God gave victory.  There was a presence of God with us, through prayer, we could rely on.'[362]  Bartleman saw Pastor Seymour modelling humble-servant leadership, which together with a prayerful focus, distinguished the Azusa Street ministry as that of carrying God's presence.

Furthermore, Bartleman develops *a charismatic ethics* in which this prayerful-priestly focus upon God's power/presence corresponds with a charismatic self-restraint that recognises the spiritual contribution of others. There was a distributed art of Pentecostal leadership which—both individually and socially distributed—aimed to detect the Spirit's choice was, at a given time, as to who had been apportioned the anointing for the next contribution.

> No one knew what might be coming, what God would do.  All was spontaneous, ordered by the Spirit.  We wanted to hear from God, through whoever he might speak.[363]

Explicitly, this could be 'the poor and ignorant;' i.e. revivalists had to overcome the self-assured, 'selfish, human element.'  Bartleman's

---

Gradually the tide arose in victory.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 48.

362 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 49.

363 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58.

exposition resonates with Pauline exhortation on charismatic praxis.

> We wanted to meet God first. We got our head under some bench in the
> corner in prayer, and met men only in the Spirit, knowing them 'after the
> flesh' no more. [...] We were shut up to God in prayer in the meetings,
> our minds on Him. All obeyed God, in meekness and humility. In honor
> we 'preferred one another.' The Lord was liable to burst through any
> one. [...] Some one would finally get up anointed for the message. All
> seemed to recognize this and gave way. It might be a child, a woman, or
> a man. It might be from the back seat, or from the front. It made no
> difference.[364]

Bartleman thus claims a shared revivalist focus and self-discipline in the
place of conventional (modern-)ethical standards of an appropriate attitude
and behaviour.

As a result, a number of developments, capacities, innovations and
characteristics became possible, as secondary effects of Pentecostal self-
organisation: distributed-charismatic contributions under an emergent-
alternative order which were, 'controlled by the Spirit, from the throne;'[365]
a perception that God stopped working when conventional pastoral
management and fear swept in;[366] and that divine presence, empowered by
prayer, deal with whoever moved in a way other than 'in the Spirit.'[367]

---

364 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 59; cf. 2 Corinthians 5:16 and Romans 12:3.

365 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 59.

366 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 49.

367 'The Spirit wrought very deeply. An unquiet spirit, or a thoughtless talker,

Spirit orchestration could occur on the side of prophetic meaning.

Bartleman's accounts also detail different phases of a meeting as it would

progress: spontaneous contributions of testimony, praise and worship; quiet

waiting for the Spirit to fall upon someone who would then give a message;

the Spirit falling upon the congregation as a whole, with everyone rushing

to the altar or many simultaneously falling to the ground; and an intense

silence in God's presence.[368]  Pentecostal innovation was facilitated and

there were unexpected contributions,[369] or new capacities such as

glossolalia or 'new song,' in its variations and each with its different

possibilities and effects.  New song, for example, would introduce a

celestial presence and new possibilities to worship and prayer, or minister

to people at a deeper-emotional level.[370]  Over time and up to a certain

point, God's presence became 'clearer and stronger,' more powerful and

---

was immediately reproved by the Spirit.  We were on "holy ground."  This atmosphere was unbearable to the carnal spirit.'  Id., 55.  'When He spoke we all obeyed.  It seemed a fearful thing to hinder or grieve the Spirit.  The whole place was steeped in prayer.  God was in His holy temple.  It was for man to keep silent.'  Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 60.

368 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 58ff.

369 The Spirit fell on a minister, suddenly.  'He sprang from his chair, began to praise God in a loud voice in "tongues," and ran all over the place, hugging all the brethren he could get hold of.  He was filled with divine love.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 61.

370 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 56.

'more and more wonderful.'[371]

### 6.5.5 Pentecostal rhizome as power relation

It is now possible to return to the four areas of analytical concern proposed at the outset of this chapter, in order to clarify Pentecostal-rhizomic power.

*(1) Pentecostal ministry*

Pentecostal power relations become established through the spiritual-preparatory journeys, struggles, relocations and redeployments of Pentecostal pioneers; through their engagement with—and at times creation of—revivalist milieus, gatherings and groups of seekers who realise, pluralise and externalise the possibilities of embodied power that pioneer revivalists carry and bring through their ministry engagements. With growth ever 'from the middle,' dimensions of meaningful discourse are just as important as those of the embodied anointing which they experience and facilitate. In fact, all basic Pentecostal connection and development occurs

---

371 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 54 and 58.

by way of growth 'from the middle' and on the basis of 'asignifying rupture' and 'aparallel evolution.' Through such means, dispositive connections are explored, established and fortified between: that which is personally embodied, prior and problematic; with that which is external, distributed and evident; and that which becomes recognised as biblical, meaningful and relevant. With regards to prophetic foreknowledge and Pentecostal intercession, it has been demonstrated that conventional temporal-causal relations may thereby be seen to be reversed.

That certain connections remain improbable, mysterious and unexplained, only serves to underline the perception that it is not human leaders, but God, who is active and in control. The intensity of embodied experience is a relevant dimension of Pentecostal spirituality and power; it is, however, these relevant correlations of a hidden—evident, prior—subsequent (and similar) nature, which mark out Pentecostal experiences and ministry practices as being relevant and powerful. In fact, mature prophetic intercessors (such as Bartleman) learn to perceive embodied reflections and resonances of external relations (both present and future) with which they engage and which include: challenges, resistances and power clashes; others resisting or sharing in their intercessory burden; spiritual breakthrough; and emergent realities of the 'Kingdom come.' In

certain cases, by way of 'asymmetrical evolution,' a correspondence develops between the intensity of a certain type of embodied experience (a 'burden') and its externally relational reality.  In the cases in which, within Pentecostal process or ministry, these kinds of correspondences are largely amiss, one must consider the possibilities of Pentecostal deception and delusion.  Alongside repetitions and variations, discursive practice contributes to the embodied-libidinal 'intensification' of relevant asymmetrical connections.  It also reinforces certain (types of) connections in regards to biblical understanding and doctrinal discourse.

Repeated Pentecostal rhizomic disruptions, re-engagements and retranslations— and thereby an increase in Pentecostal experience—may eventually lead to an increase in embodied-spiritual expertise, maturity and understanding; and thus to a greater reliability and fluidity of Pentecostal assessment and action.  In Bartleman's case, an 'epic' disruption/ destruction brought about a reconfiguration of his ministry eventually.  This facilitated innovation and led to an intensification: a deepening, acceleration and greater fluidity, of Bartleman's Pentecostal-embodied engagement.  Alongside a social distribution and subsequent gathering of Pentecostal pioneers, it also facilitated an increase of the both temporal and geographical impact/reach of Bartleman's prophetic and intercessory

capacity.[372]

*(2)  God's Spirit in Pentecostal worship*

The most exciting effects of Spirit power occur in the context of

socially distributed, non-hierarchical, forms of charismatic-Pentecostal

worship/prayer.  They are established on the basis of the multiplicity and

Pentecostal weave that is created by prayerful cooperation within

extensively managed groups of (mature) Pentecostal worshippers.  A

widening and deepening of the base of Pentecostal capacities/contributions

occurs in both, individual embodiments and on the basis of social

distribution of revivalist expertise: the consolidation of a dense complexity

of multiplicity relations, through charismatic interweaving, facilitates ever

more sophisticated/astonishing features and engagements of God's Spirit as

a living presence.  Emergent power effects are created in, between and

across their distributed spiritual contributions, which include: the embodied

sense of flowing intensities of divine power/presence (e.g. 'the tide of

blessing' rising and falling); spontaneous, unexpected occurrences and

effects (which would either impact individuals or be of a distributed

372 Impact and reach is amongst the descriptors of ANT power-analysis: Law,
       'Notes on the Theory.'

nature); and relations of emergent self-organisation, order and meaningful purpose.  Together, these are at the heart of those exceptional Pentecostal/ charismatic perceptions/understandings whereby God-the-Spirit is moving, alive, 'in charge' and 'at work.'  Whilst not every flow and every move of Spirit presence needs to be understood and assessed, it is essential that— every now and then—relations to scripture and to an embodied-theological understanding of different kinds emerge, as part of the overall picture.

### 6.5.6  Putting tracings on the map: Pentecostal leadership and truth

From Law's list of power-analytical concerns, two are yet to be addressed:  'How is it that managers manage?' and, related to this:  What role does 'calculation' play?[373]  The first refers to the establishment, recognition, role and interconnecting of Pentecostal pioneers; the second to the manner of their grass-roots theological and biblical reflections.

*(1)  Pentecostal pioneers*

Pioneer leaders such as Bartleman are the 'spokespeople' (ANT) and

---

373 Law, 'Notes on the Theory,' 390.

'managers' of spiritual power in the context of Pentecostal performance and revival.  Preaching and ministry engagement with congregations is just one of the relevant dimensions of their Pentecostal 'management.'  Bartleman would consider drawing upon resources and bringing revival through prayers of intercession and prophetic guidance to be of greater relevance; therefore, one should not underestimate the importance of the points of contact relating to Bartleman's embodied perception, a communally external breakthrough, or a transformation facilitated by Bartleman's embodied revival power.

According to Bartleman, on the way to—and at—Azusa Street, the 'management' of Spirit power and organisation took place through a distributed, socially rhizomic leadership.  Without giving them priority with regards to their Pentecostal contribution, Bartleman acknowledges the leadership of local pastors and their ministry teams (the Fergusons, Roberts, Smale and Seymour).  According to the Azusa Street *Apostolic Faith* (amongst other sources) it is clear that Bartleman underestimates Seymour's doctrinal and verbal-pastoral engagements in the management of spiritual processes and power.[374]  Nevertheless, Bartleman is correct to point out that it was a 'priestly' community, which carried the presence of a

---

374 Robeck, *Azusa Street Mission,* 87ff. and 129ff.

living divine 'on the shoulders.'[375]  Local and itinerant pioneers in

attendance form 'knots of arborescence in rhizomes.'[376]  As long as a Spirit

revival develops, deepens and grows, ministries and their pioneer leaders

continue to engage with a spiritual reality as an externally evolving

relation.  'It is tracings that must be put on the map, not the opposite.'[377]

What is important is the maintenance of an economy of accumulation

and release of embodied Spirit power ('anointing') through ongoing

reperformances of a sequence which—at least in Bartleman's case—

includes (literally) 'nomadic' relocations and the holistic confrontation of

obstacles, resistances and hardship.  Where rhizomic eruptions and

redeployments occur, Pentecostal-ministry dispositives remain powerful

and fresh.  Using ANT terminology, a cost must be paid for a fresh

engagement of an established dispositive relation in a new and different

situation:  Both God's Spirit *and* the situation must be treated as resistant

'mediators,' rather than formalised and standardised 'intermediaries.'[378]  A

mere-arborescent 'retracing' would, instead, induce a narrowing down and

---

375 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 48.

376 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 20.

377 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 21.

378 Latour, *Reassembling the Social.*

petering out: a 'routinisation' of Pentecostal power.

In the engaging of Spirit power, it becomes easier to maintain a certain state of Pentecostal maturity and expert fluidity, once they have been achieved through many redeployments and variations (see above). Self-organising processes of charismatic-Pentecostal prayer/worship, in which socially distributed contributions facilitate a sense of divine presence/power, and of 'God in control,' require a milieu of well-prepared Pentecostal pioneers who understand certain Pauline standards of charismatic focus, social engagement and self-discipline.  In order to create flows of spiritual blessing within and across a socially distributed weave— to render active and alive, a God-in-the-Spirit—Pentecostal-charismatic worshippers, both individually and corporately, are required to discipline and direct their embodied and performed spiritual flows in a threefold manner: maintaining a prayerful orientation towards engaging (exclusively) with the divine; evading conventional manners of social engagement that are contrary to this focus (pride, hierarchical reasoning and planning, shallow conversation ...); and a preparedness to promote spiritual contributions wherever they emerge.  In addition, the following abilities are also required: the recognition of timely charismatic contributions; the facilitation of an understanding (some understanding) of what is happening,

'in the Spirit,' within the group (prophetic perception); and practical-pastoral wisdom.

*(2)  Pentecostal theological discourse*

Finally, the kind of biblical and theological-discursive practices which support/accompany such flows of Spirit power, within and across charismatic weaves/multiplicities, shall be observed.  The following examines the ways in which Bartleman engages with theological doctrine and creates biblical/theological understanding and learning.

*(a)  Deploying theological doctrine*

One remembers that Bartleman's conversion process (6.5.1) follows—in some exceptional detail—a well-known Wesleyan biblical-dogmatic paradigm.[379]  Thereby, it is the peculiar reversal of temporal-causal relations, rather than Bartleman's claim to prophetic intervention, which puts the doctrinal 'tracing' 'back on the map:'[380] a reversal which—only later—would enable Bartleman to theologically appreciate his

---

379 Emphasis of a 'must' and 'now' of conversion; sense that one's life is 'empty;' call to give it all up 'for peace with God;' need for public confession to 'hold God in that way,' cf. Romans 10:9f. and Matthew 10:32: Bartleman, *From Plough,* 19f. and 21.

380 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 13.

conversion process as being 'biblical.' Bartleman clearly enjoyed—and did

well in—his biblical and theological studies at evening college.[381] Within

the limitations of an undergraduate, Wesleyan-Holiness horizon, he was

reasonably well read; always making the most of access to a library.[382] A

Methodist-theological approach commonly encourages embodied-

experiential (rhizomic) experimentation and learning in relation to biblical

doctrine/discourse. Bartleman's theological discernment has a prophetic

and Christological edge:

> My eyes were on Him, my desire toward Him, the Holy Ghost, Jesus
> enthroned. [...] The mind of the Spirit for us at the time should be our
> quest.[383]

All doctrinal traditions, writes Bartleman, 'hold some good.'[384] However,

the affective focus and encompassing frame must neither be upon

embodied experience nor upon doctrinal truth, but upon taking hold of God

in an embodied here and now.


     When the Azusa Street movement fragmented—in part along

---

381 'I studied hard and wasted no time in trifling. In fact I married my books
     [...].' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 24; cf. ibid., 22 and 26.

382 The Wesleyan-Methodist president's books 'were a great feast to my soul.'
     Bartleman, *From Plough,* 85.

383 Bartleman, *My Story,* 11f.

384 Bartleman, *My Story,* 11.

doctrinal and ethnic lines—Bartleman sided with Durham and a 'finished-work' soteriology.[385] (In the mid-1920s, Bartleman would deploy doctrinal reasoning in his contribution to the Christological 'oneness' controversy.)[386] Bartleman notably dissociated himself when Durham—under attack—began to retaliate.[387] Embodied connectivity takes precedence over dogmatic truth.[388]

*(b) Non-sectarian revivalism*

It was over power clashes with 'Pillar of Fire' and 'Burning Bush' radicals, that Bartleman's uncompromising pursuit of revival/holiness—together with a common-Christian insistence on doctrinal particularity—became subordinated to a non-sectarian ecclesiology, in which Christian unity is found in drawing closer to Jesus and to 'love.'[389] Such a

---

385 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 145f.; Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit,* 134ff.

386 Frank Bartleman, *The Deity of Christ: what Think Ye of Christ? Is He God or Man?* (Los Angeles: F. Bartleman, [1926]), www.ccel.org; Jacobsen, *Thinking in the Spirit,* 194ff.

387 'I left the platform finally, not willing to stand for a spirit of retaliation. I felt I must keep clear of carnal strife and controversy.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 150. Cf. also: 'We had terrible battles with fleshly confessors and deceivers also. But God gave victory. The Spirit was much grieved by contentious spirits.' Ibid., 69.

388 Cf. at Eighth Street/Maple Avenue: 'We had terrible battles with fleshly confessors and deceivers also. But God gave victory. The Spirit was much grieved by contentious spirits.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 69.

389 'It cured me effectually of ever worshipping a religious zeal or creed, in

theological outlook guided—and guarded—Bartleman's assessment of

events in Los Angeles.  In this 'second Pentecost,' it was necessary for

humility, unity, love; a quasi-ecumenical, accommodating, non-sectarian,

non-partisan approach to the ministry—one which was free from self-

concern—to accompany the concern for deep prayer, repentance,

consecration and zeal.[390]  From such a basis, it was not possible to

recognise the identity of any distinctive group or ministry;[391] and, at a local

level, meetings were able to 'run themselves,' 'in the divine order.'[392]

---

place of Christ [...].'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 89.  'Multitudes are shut up in ecclesiastical systems, within sectarian boundaries, while God's great, free pasture lies out before them, only limited by the encircling Word of God. "There shall be one flock, and one Shepherd."—(See Ps. 23.)  Traditional theology, partial truth and revelation, soon becomes law.  The conscience is utterly bound, like Chinese foot-binding, shut up against further progress.' Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 82.  Cf. Bartleman, *My Story,* 11f.

390 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 6, 16f., 21, 26, 27, 34, 36, 65, 68, 85, 88, 112 and 154; cf. ibid., 161ff.

391 A case of 'oversignifying breaks separating structures or cutting across a single structure:' DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 9.  Also, cf. Foucault's work on παρρησία (courageous enunciation) and 'care of the self:' Foucault, *Courage of Truth;* Bernauer, 'Foucault's Philosophy of Religion;' Alexandre Macmillan, 'Michel Foucault's Techniques of the Self and the Christian Politics of Obedience,' *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 4 (2011): 3ff. According to Fuggle, Foucault and, more radically, Paul formulate 'responsibility without authority [...] without assuming the rhetoric of power:' Fuggle, *Foucault/Paul,* 161; cf. ibid., 195.

392 Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 19 and 87.  Ibid., 19, 23, 68, 87, 115f. and 140.

*(c) Forging theological argument from scripture*

Bartleman was well versed in the Bible[393] and uses scripture in two different ways.  He was able to deploy biblical references alongside theological authorities forging a normative-theological argument, within the naive-biblicist method of his Christian context.  Some examples of this use are to be found in Bartleman's earthquake tract from April 1906 or Bartleman's defence of a classical-Christological position in the 'oneness' controversy.[394]  In a similar manner, Bartleman's autobiographic writings, moral, theological or prophetic evaluations often conclude with a biblical reference.[395]  In each case, normative-biblical affirmation calls for a distributed, shared-ethical decision and action; thus, rhizomic-embodied 'deterritorialisation.'

393 'My pastor examined me for the [preaching] licence and declared I had passed the best test in the Bible of any candidate he had ever examined.  [...] The Bible was my text book.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 26.  'Frequently I would sit at my Bible from morning until evening, [...].' Ibid., 28.

394 Bartleman, *My Story,* 48ff.; cf. Bartleman, *How Pentecost,* 52f.  Bartleman, *Deity of Christ.*

395 Bartleman asserts his decision to not pursue an economically secure career as correct by referencing Matthew 6:33: '"Seek first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."  I believed this.' Bartleman, *From Plough,* 24.  Bartleman's assessment of the Denver Pentecostal Union that 'had drifted into a hard, fanatical spirit,' ends with reference to 1 John 4:8, 'He that loveth not, knoweth not God.  For God is love.' Ibid., 89.

*(d)  Creating rhizomic understanding from scripture*

Bartleman also deploys scripture 'from the middle' of dispositive relations.  This occurs in connection with prophetic learning.  Here, biblical reference often remains implicit.  With reference to his student days, Bartleman writes: 'I grew in grace during those days, and deepened rapidly in God.'  Bartleman aligns his embodied journey with the paradigm of young Samuel and Jesus (according to 1 Samuel 2:26 and Luke 2:52).  In the same context, Isaiah 48:10 is referenced, which is—simultaneously—marked out as a prophetic audition.[396]  Eventually, Bartleman points out that a lecture on prophecy and reading the Book of Psalms, at the time, offered an interpretative structure from within his embodied-spiritual journey and emergent self-understanding.[397]

In addition to investing his own embodied journey into biblical-symbolic relations, Bartleman engages with relations of biblical meaning.  Both take the form of rhizomic learning and growth 'in the middle' and 'from the middle.'[398]  Once a rhizomic field of meaning becomes

---

396 'He told me He had "chosen me in the furnace of affliction."'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 28.

397 'The Psalms of David were made very real to me during this winter.  I seemed to pass through the soul experience of David largely, and to come out with him.'  Bartleman, *From Plough,* 28.

398 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 21, 23 and 25.

690

established—by way of correlating biblical reference—further biblical relations of meaning may be invoked, added and interconnected. In this manner, a basis for the assessment and guidance of embodied-and-distributed decision-making and growth can be created.[399] Whatever relation is perceived to give meaningful prophetic-biblical orientation to Pentecostal eruption and growth, could be deemed to be feasible. Since the growth of biblical(-prophetic) meaning occurs 'from the middle,' it is not given priority over embodied process, or vice versa.

The growing horizons of Bartleman's ministry rhizome correlate with a development of biblical-prophetic relations: prior to the family reaching Pasadena, biblical reference related to Bartleman's personal experience/ministry; it then referenced the gathering of Pentecostal pioneers towards a final Pentecost; and eventually, from within the Los Angeles revival, Bartleman prophesied into the biblical relations of the global effects of this end-of-the-age 'Pentecost.' All of this can be traced in Bartleman's *My Story: the Latter Rain.* On the outset of this early autobiographic account, which was written in the spring 1908, Bartleman

---

399 Another collage around Bartleman's first outreach to the slums of Philadelphia, creates a field of meaning by correlating reference to Hebrews 11:8, Matthew 8:20/Luke 9:58, 2 Timothy 2:12 and 3; in a second step, Bartleman introduces meaning from Jeremiah 17:5 and Matthew 6:33: Bartleman, *From Plough,* 23f.

aims to prove/clarify—with reference to scripture—how his life journey, from humble beginnings, is reflective of a prophetic calling that culminated in the then still unfolding revival in Los Angeles.[400] From the paradigm of his life, and corresponding biblical construction which marks it as being divinely ordained and prophetic, Bartleman comes to a generalised conclusion, which he further fortifies with reference to scripture, theological authorities and observations at Azusa Street: that it is the unlikely, lowly, downtrodden and despised who are chosen by God for exceptional purposes in this final move of God.

> Many, like myself, for years have been being prepared for present developments by God, through enlargement of vision of possibilities, the mind of God and personal desire for realization. 'A body didst Thou prepare for Me,' again, as for every fresh revelation, manifestation of the Spirit of God, in the line of development to the final consummation of 'the sons of God.' These are the 'bruised ones,' of necessity, that in time He comes to set at liberty. They are misunderstood, abused, resisted, persecuted, by those who think they thus even do God service.[401]

Such a field of paradigmatic biblical meaning could inspire Bartleman's readers to arise in God beyond the point of having been 'misunderstood, abused' and 'bruised.' Rhizomic expansion and growth is ever ongoing.

---

400 Biblical reference includes: Jeremiah 1:5 and 45:5, John 1:46, Isaiah 33:23 and 1 Corinthians 1:29. On the expectation of a 'latter rain' revival: Joel 2:23, Hosea 6:3, James 5:7 etc. Bartleman, *My Story,* 7f.

401 Bartleman, *My Story,* 12. Hebrews 10:5, cf. Psalm 40:6; John 1:12 and 1 John 3:7; Isaiah 55:15, 66:2 and Luke 4:18; cf. Isaiah 42:3 and Matthew 12:20.

From within the relations of the Azusa Street breakthrough,
Bartleman eventually receives prophetic insight as to that which is yet to
unfold, regarding the final horizon of this age. After the unfurling of this
global Pentecost, a final judgement was to occur, beginning with the church
before reaching the unprepared nations across the globe. Using a mix of
biblical references, Bartleman paints an apocalyptic-prophetic narrative
which—in March 1908—would appear to allude to global events such as
the Great War 1914–18, and beyond.[402]

Pentecostal-pioneer leaders, and a certain number of their
theological/biblical formations, form 'arborescent' structures which—in a
range of ways—must be reintroduced within processes of rhizomic
development/growth, if their aim is to participate in a subsequent-emergent
divine move. As a reliable embodied—external, prior—subsequent power

---

402 'Judgement, also, is beginning at the house of God. (1 Peter 4:17). It must
be sifted, shaken (Heb. 12:25–29). "A noise shall come even to the end of
the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations, He will plead
with all flesh," Jer. 25: 31 [sic!]. Is not this being realized today? [...] "A
sound of battle" is also in the land. "Destruction cometh." The nations are
arming to the teeth in greed and horrid purpose of murder. They both hate
and fear one another. [...] Capital and labor must both take the "mark of the
Beast," Brain and muscle, forehead and hand. Only the Kingdom of Christ,
in righteousness shall stand. The times of the Gentile nations are nearly full,
Israel is fast returning to Palestine. The showers are also returning, the
"latter rain," physically, to bring forth the abundance of the promise. Jesus
must return soon. Events hasten Him.' Bartleman, *My Story,* 35f. Cf. also:
Jeremiah 50:22 ('[a] sound of battle'); Ezekiel 7:25 and 1 Thessalonians 5:3
('[d]estruction cometh'); Revelation 13:16f. ('mark of the Beast') ...

relation, Bartleman's ministry dispositive forms a traceable structure which, through repeated displacements/re-enactments, was reinvested in changing locations and situations; and thus within evolving and ever-extending rhizomic relations of—and in—God's Spirit.  In the pursuit of a Spirit revival, established Pentecostal leaders re-engage with one another and with divine Spirit *as an external reality.*

Bartleman understands how to forge a conventional-theological argument from a range of traditional and biblical resources, in view of evoking decisions at the rhizomic grass-roots level.  A more creative and 'prophetic' deployment of scripture mirrors the developments and growth in Bartleman's spiritual ministry and outlook.  Through confrontations with sectarian-Holiness radicals, Bartleman embraced a Pauline-theological ethics of charismatic contribution, self-restraint and love.  Scripture deployed 'from the middle' of an evolving field of biblical meaning and relevance provides orientation and opens up discursive possibilities in relation to further-rhizomic development/expansion in the living weave that is Pentecostal power.

The key to facilitating living weaves from free flows of embodied presence and sensation—according to DG—consists in refraining from

crystallising and solidifying free associative flows of embodied presence, sensation and will, into rigid, totalitarian, noetic structures.  Arborescent structure is however, always present with Pentecostal ministry dispositives. Pentecostal pioneers, including Bartleman, engage with—and may reproduce—conventional-ecclesiastical order, formal-biblical teaching and theological normativity; Pentecostal rhizomes 'intersect roots and sometimes merge with them.'[403]  The traceability of certain ministry-related relations introduces durability and strength to rhizomic-spiritual relations.[404]  '[T]he tracing should always be put back on the map' however, if one seeks to avoid 'routinisation' and the weakening of the processes of Pentecostal innovation and growth.[405]

---

403 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 13.  A contemporary concern would be around the 'franchising' of evangelical programs and ministry concepts.

404 Cf. Law, 'Notes on the Theory,' 390.

405 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 13.

## CONCLUSION

This thesis explores whether it is possible to understand the many fields of power navigated by Christian leadership, within a single theory approach. It has been pointed out that such a conceptually united analysis would need clarify the relationships between: organisation and politics, the religious and the secular, and theology and spirituality; as well as understanding the creation of empowered agency and also the divine. With regards to the latter, it would not be sufficient to account for divinity solely within the terms of theological dogmatics, since such normative accounts remain in tension with the concept of a distributed-living presence and power which moves, both in and across, networks of charismatic experiences, engagements and performances.

Chapter 1 establishes the overall comparability of a range of non-normative, descriptive-analytical lenses and language games, namely: Clegg's politico-organisational theory, Foucault's concerns with discourse, embodiment and agency formation, and an ANT-ontological perspective.

As the researcher's understanding has evolved, it has become clear that, within a heterogeneous objective and distributed theory approach, DG's experiential-ontological play—rather than ANT—should be given preference. DG's conceptualisation of rhizomic creativity, in particular, facilitates a more immediate translation of a Foucauldian understanding of religious-experiential power and empowerment. Chapter 2 demonstrates that Clegg's three-circuits theory frame offers all the tools and capacities required to model the full complexity of *political* relations and processes— in the widest possible sense—including the interplay between: organisation and structural conditions; episodic and strategic action; disciplinary, material and technological power conditions; the demise and new creation of political players; and changes to the political field. If analysis begins from the depth of the third, 'facilitative,' circuit, Clegg's power-analytical framework is able to facilitate the conceptual management of—even politically volatile and fast-moving—historical processes and their surrounding conditions. In a case study of the Protestant Struggle in Nazi Germany, Clegg's theory is shown to have the capacity to resolve common difficulties in political and organisational theory. A three-circuits analysis is able to clarify complex inter-engagements within political structure, reasoning and action, including: the use and abuse of regulative formation for political gains; the impact of state power and regulation over and

against developments in a Christian context; and the power of religion within 'secular' politics. In the case of the Confessing struggle, religious power took on the forms of: a politically unexpected intensity of mobilisation at grass-roots level; and theological-identity formation. Using Clegg's framework, theology, religion and 'God' cease to be particular problems and become *just another* political relation, field and play. To express this with greater analytical precision: it is possible for religious forms of power to become factors within the circuit of system integration of a secular-political game; and vice versa, political interference may introduce environmental-disciplinary hazards and selective pressures to the fields of religious competition or Christian politics.

However, Clegg's theory is *not* 'the' power theory behind this thesis. Foucault's work on power is 'central' to this research, whilst ANT should be employed as an 'encompassing' power concept, due to its restraint and balance—both conceptually and methodologically—as well as its material-ontological perspective. Chapters 3–6 share a concern with alternative forms of agency creation, ethics, embodiment and empowerment. These chapters explore a wider range of Foucauldian theory tools, power analyses and concerns that are—in different ways and respects—relevant to ministry and order in mainline-historical churches, global-Pentecostal movements

and milieus. The task of introducing the Pentecostal/charismatic divine, in its own right, as a gathering of distributed-and-heterogeneous capacities and relations of power, which inter-engage with Pentecostal-embodied experiences and practices, makes it necessary to move from a Foucauldian interest with embodied empowerment to a Deleuzo-Guattarian rhizome-ontological perspective and concern with creative play and innovation.

According to a reading in chapter 3, Barth's 'Word-of-God' dialectics utilises a counter-modern theory design, which Pfleiderer identifies as an inverted-transcendental ethics. Prevalent amongst Weimar scholars and political activists of Barth's generation, the aim of this theory-type is to overwhelm and coerce its recipients into becoming part of an intellectual vanguard, by completely embracing—through immediate acts of self-construction—the totalising preconditions of a radically modern God relation, self-understanding and world approach. Precisely because this theory design also facilitated the formation of twentieth-century totalitarian-political ideologies, a Barthian-theological approach also has the capacity to empower theological and political resistance over and against totalitarian-and-ideological forms of state power and political discourse. For the very same reason, it also fails to speak truth to the pervasive and unchecked power of the globalised-market rationale and the

699

neo-liberal 'no-alternative' politics of recent years.  Foucault's historico-systematic analyses of modern-liberal governmentalities are redeployed in an exploration of the structure and impasses of the neo-liberal rationale and politics of the (previous) Chicago school.  Chapter 4 applies some of Clegg's observations, as well as Foucault's exploration of modern professionalism and discipline, so as to clarify other relevant dimensions of pastoral empowerment within historical-and-mainline forms of power and order within Christian ministry.  This further clarifies the systematic impasses which hinder the practical-theological accountability of pastoral engagement (within the rationale of a mainline, top-down normative, ecclesiology and Christian order) whilst also defining some of the common difficulties involved in pastorally facilitating charismatic empowerment and order amongst worshipping members of a congregation.

At the end of chapters 3 and 4, practical-theological questions are asked:  Could a different form of spiritual empowerment—in theory and/or in the future—facilitate an effective and meaningful resistance and challenge to neo-liberal *homo œconomicus*; as well as posing a meaningful challenge to a post-neo-liberal '*homo illiberalis*?'  Taking the conditions of modern forms of pastoral and professional empowerment into consideration, what would a charismatic, mutually empowering ethics look

like, were it to be at all conceivable?

The exploration of Pentecostal-experiential relations of power, according to the Azusa Street revival of 1906, in the second part of the thesis (chapters 5f.), demonstrates the possibility of appropriately modelling a very different manner of Christian empowerment, agency creation and power relation using Foucauldian-analytical tools.  In addition, chapters 5 and 6 also respond to the concluding practical-theological questions of chapters 3 and 4.  It is not the claim of this thesis however, that Pentecostal Christianities possess the cure—or are the cure—to the identified structural impasses.  Nevertheless, a different power economy and ethical structure implies different capacities of political and ethical deployment and engagement.  Chapter 5 redeploys Foucault's six analytical dimensions—which, together, construct 'sexuality' as a modern power dispositive—for a theorisation and analysis of Pentecostal/charismatic Spirit baptism, religious experience and practice.  Using accounts relating to this revival, it can be seen that compelling and overwhelming spiritual experiences—ones which cannot be easily and fully contained—have a capacity to make innovation—in the fields of theological and pastoral discourse—both possible and necessary.  Spirit baptism individualises and empowers.  It facilitates embodied confidence and transformation, morally

renewed identity, ministry capacities, calling, and contextualised-theological reflection; and thereby introduces transformation and innovation to the deeper levels of a personal experience, reflective identity, embodied ethical household and courses of action.  Within the context of Pentecostalism (when it is at its best), Spirit baptism facilitates both distributed courageous engagement and adaption, *together with* distributed resistances and confrontations, within the power situations Pentecostal pioneers encounter.  The structural comparability of Spirit baptism with the Foucauldian bodies and power relations of insanity, criminality and sexual deviation, point to the Pentecostal/charismatic capacity of facilitating a different form of counter-modern embodied creativity and resistance.

A transfer of rationale from a Foucauldian-embodied ethics to a Deleuzo-Guattarian-experimental ontology was required to facilitate an analytical understanding of the invisible relations and realms of a divine which relates to Pentecostal and charismatic experience and praxis.  With reference to the life/ministry accounts of a peripatetic revivalist, prophetic intercessor, and self-acclaimed pioneer and contributor of the Azusa Street outpouring, DG's six rhizomatic principles were used to facilitate an analysis of the development and growth of a Pentecostal/charismatic ministry, spiritual-experiential journey and understanding; making possible

the exploration of emergent power relations, including those connecting the

dimensions of divine presence, power and action. The transition from an

ethical to an ontological-analytical perspective, also made possible the

consideration of a different type of Pentecostal power dispositive. The

heterogeneous relations which identify Pentecostal/charismatic-perceptive

capacities and ministry practices as being Spirit empowered and Spirit

facilitated, combine elements which are temporally, spatially and socially

further distributed. Within the relations of a single emergent Pentecostal-

charismatic power dispositive: that which is previous gets connected with

that which is subsequent; and that which is internally embodied, personal,

subjective or arguable, gets connected with that which is materially

external, objective, socially distributed, communal or verifiable. Thereby,

counter-intuitive reversals of the ordinary-temporal—seemingly causal—

order, which remain difficult to explain, reassert the sense of a living divine

at work: a prophetic intercessor for example, would experience a public

breakthrough of revival *prior* to the event. Once reinforced, through many

series of variations, repetitions and relations of biblical understanding, to a

degree of embodied predictability, a Pentecostal dispositive relation may

mature to the point of sustaining a charismatic ministry gift, a calling, a

presence and work 'in the power of the Spirit.' It is through many

displacements, disruptions, new beginnings and growth; through the

recovery and intensification of that which is previous and the creation of new rhizomic connections; and through the creation of rhizomic-multiplicity weaves of increased reach, density and intensity of connections—in particular, through the appropriate inter-engagement with other pioneer revivalists and their acquired Pentecostal capacities and Spirit endowments—that the nature and character of the Pentecostal rhizome changes; and this is the distributed-Pentecostal divine. At some point, the Spirit may begin to move within, through and across—and may even take control of—the interweaving of a distributed-charismatic contribution and perception.

One must not fail to observe that a counter-modern Pentecostal-Spirit empowerment comes with a double—or at least, a two-step—ethical orientation. The *homo spiritualis* called for in chapter 3 to (potentially) counter a neo-liberal ethics of calculating self-interest, is fleshed out in chapter 5 and the earlier parts of chapter 6, as a Spirit-baptised, empowered, morally renewed, confidently self-affirmed agency. The quintessential form of this Pentecostal agency would courageously pursue their God, embodied ministry and calling. They would also take many distributed forms of embodied-spiritual transformation and empowerment to others and their communities. A significant personal cost would often be

paid as they—from a place of liminal vulnerability and trust in God—

engage with, adapt to and resist the many power situations which they

encounter.  They would be guided by a different ethical orientation which

facilitates a shared, charismatic, pursuit of God's presence and power.

Chapter 4 identified the notion that one is unlikely to achieve charismatic

order from a place of embodied empowerment and self-affirmed strength.

Nevertheless, many of the identified Pauline-ethical propositions remain

relevant, including the need to pursue an understanding of charisma which

honours and facilitates the witness contribution of others, so that Christ is

magnified from a place of mutual submission and love.  Bartleman's

accounts, according to chapter 6, add further ethnographic insight.  The

spiritual journeys of Pentecostal pioneers, for example, are likely to include

repeated-embodied rupture, dislocation, pain, new beginnings and

recoveries, as a means of preparation—each independently, in a distributed

whilst coordinated manner—for their different contributions towards an

arising move of God.[1]  The common—distributed—ethical orientation

within a relevant core group of Pentecostal pioneers, gathered in a place of

worship, will combine a single-minded focus on God—and a longing for

divine presence and holiness—with a socially distributed attention to the

---

1    'We must be broken, ground to a pulp, in order for the realization of God's
     highest preparation for us.'  Bartleman, *My Story,* 19.

contribution and action of whoever the Spirit wishes to empower, at a certain time, alongside with a shared disregard for alternative forms of order, status and empowerment.

Combining Bartleman's narrative with DG's analytics of rhizomic creativity prompts some open questions regarding a rhizomic-charismatic engagement of conventional forms of theology, ecclesiology and church order.  These are considered at the end of chapter 6.  In the thesis introduction, the following questions are asked:  If one was to pursue a Pentecostal-revivalist concern, how could one engage with a conventional normative-theological tradition?  Is an exclusively charismatic-Christian order and communal 'flowing in the Spirit' conceivable; respectively, is it possible to avoid Weber's 'routinisation of charisma?'  A Deleuzo-Guattarian response points out that integrating 'tracings' and arborescence into a rhizomic-relational field introduces stability and structure.  At the same time, it is wise to prevent arborescent domination taking over and arresting rhizomic development; even destroying connections that have already been established.  It is advisory to: 'Plug the tracings back into the map, connect the roots or trees back up with a rhizome.'  In such a ways, one may continue to 'playfully' engage with an 'arborescent'-theological principle or doctrinal tradition, without allowing it to rule people's faith

and spiritual relations. Whilst 'routinisation of charisma' will always occur, an alternative development and possibility also remain an option: that the Spirit pushes towards a subsequent revival, displacement, or re-liquidisation; or that offshoots of new life occur from a sclerotic old. An 'exclusively' charismatic-Pentecostal ordering and flow may not exist, however, watching and preparing—for another Christian new beginning, eruption or explosion of spiritual-rhizomic creativity and life may still be valid—especially in more politically volatile days. The divine, its Pentecostal presence, power and perception, will never be found 'above,' in a place of absolute control, but always 'proceeding from the middle.'[2]

---

2 DG, *Thousand Plateaus,* 14 and 25.

blank page

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adkins, Brent.  *Deleuze and Guattari's* A Thousand Plateaus: *a Critical Introduction and Guide.*  Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2015.

Adkins, Brent, and Paul R. Hinlicky.  *Rethinking Philosophy and Theology with Deleuze: a New Cartography.*  London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Agamben, Giorgio.  *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*.  Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen.  Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1998.

——.  *The Kingdom and the Glory: for a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government (*Homo Sacer 2,2*).*  Translated by Lorenzo Chiesa, with Matteo Mandarini.  Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2011.

——.  'What Is an Apparatus?'  In *What is an Apparatus?: and Other Essays*, translated by David Kishik and Stefan Pedatella, 1–24.  Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2009.

Alexander, Estrelda Y.  *Black Fire: One Hundred Years of African American Pentecostalism.*  Downers Grove, Ill.: 2011.

——.  *Limited Liberty: the Legacy of Four Pentecostal Woman Pioneers.*  Cleveland, Oh.: Pilgrim, 2008.

——.  *The Women of Azusa Street.*  Cleveland, Oh.: Pilgrim, 2005.

Alles, Gregory.  'The Study of Religions: the Last 50 Years.'  In *The Routledge Companion to Study of Religion*, edited by John Hinnells, 2nd edn, 39–55.  London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Alliez, Éric.  *The Signature of the World: or, What Is Deleuze and Guttari's*

*Philosophy*.  Translated by Eliot Ross Albert and Alberto Toscano. London and New York: Continuum, 2004.

Althaus, Paul.  'Bedenken zur "Theologischen Erklärung" der Barmer Bekenntnissynode.'  In *Die Erlanger Theologie,* by Karlmann Beyschlag, 258–265.  Erlangen: Martin-Luther-Verlag, 1993.

——. *Die christliche Wahrheit: Lehrbuch der Dogmatik*.  7th edn. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1966.

——. *Luther's Haltung im Bauernkrieg*.  Tübingen: WB, 1952.

Althaus-Reid, Marcella.  'Class, Sex and the Theologian: Reflections on the Liberationist Movement in Latin America.'  In *Another Possible World*, edited by Marcella Althaus-Reid, Ivan Petrella and Luis Carlos Susin, 23–38.  London: SCM, 2007.

——. 'Do not Stop the Flow of My Blood: a Critical Christology of Hope among Latin American Women.'  In *From Feminist Theology to Indecent Theology*, 44–59.

——. *From Feminist Theology to Indecent Theology: Readings on Poverty, Sexual Identity and God*.  London: SCM, 2004.

——. 'On Wearing Skirts without Underwear: Poor Women Contesting Christ,'  In *From Feminist Theology to Indecent Theology*, 83–94.

——. *The Queer God*.  London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Althaus-Reid, Marcella, and Lisa Isherwood.  'Thinking Theology and Queer Theory.'  *Feminist Theology* 15, no. 3 (2007): 302–314.

Ammerman, Nancy T.  'North American Protestant Fundamentalism.'  In *Fundamentalisms Observed*, edited by Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby, 1–65.  Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1991.

Andermatt Conley, Verena.  'Becoming-Woman Now.'  In *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*, edited by Ian Buchanan and Claire Colebrook, 18–37. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2000.

Anderson, Allan [Heaton].  'The Dubious Legacy of Charles Parham: Racism and Cultural Insensitivities among Pentecostals.'  *Pneuma* 27, no. 1 (2005): 51–64.

—. *An Introduction to Pentecostalism: Global Charismatic Christianity.* 2nd edn. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

—. *Moya: the Holy Spirit in an African Context.* Pretoria: Univ. of South Africa Press, 1991.

—. *Spirit-Filled World: Religious Dis/Continuity in African Pentecostalism.* London and Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018.

—. *Spreading Fires: the Missionary Nature of Early Pentecostalism.* London: SCM, 2007.

Anthony, P. D. *The Ideology of Work*. London: Tavistock, 1977.

Anzinger, Herbert. *Glaube und kommunikative Praxis: eine Studie zur 'vordialektischen' Theologie Karl Barths.* Munich: Kaiser, 1991.

[Apostolic Faith Mission.] *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles), 13 issues (1906–1908). ifphc.org, last accessed 31-10-2017.

Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas. *Faith in the City: a Call for Action by Church and Nation, the Report of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Commission on Urban Priority Areas.* London: Church House Publishing, 1985.

Archbishops' Council. *Mission-Shaped Church: Church Planting and Fresh Expressions of Church in a Changing Context.* London: Church House Publishing, 2004.

Archer, Kenneth J. *A Pentecostal Hermeneutic: Spirit, Scripture and Community.* Cleveland, Tenn.: CPT, 2009.

Argue, Zelma. 'Memories of Fifty Years Ago.' In *The Pentecostal Evangel* (Springfield, Mo.) 2814 (22-4-1956): 6–7 and 29–30. ifphc.org, last accessed 2-5-2017.

Arnett, William M. 'Existentialism in the Thought of Bultmann and Tillich.' *Asbury Journal* 20, no. 2 (1966): 28–39.

Asad, Talal. 'The Concept of Cultural Translation in British Social Anthropology.' In *Genealogies of Religion*, 171–199.

———. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam.* London and Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1993.

Assel, Heinrich. 'Die Lutherrenaissance in Deutschland von 1900 bis 1960.' In *Lutherrenaissance Past and Present*, 23–53. Göttingen and Bristol: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2015.

Augustine. *Confessions.* Edited and translated by Carolyn J.-B. Hammond. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 2014 and 2016.

Aune, Michael B. 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles: Conclusion— Might We Be "Liberals" after All?' *Dialog* 46, no. 2 (2007): 153–165.

———. 'Discarding the Barthian Spectales, Part 1: Recent Scholarship on the History of Early Twentieth Century German Protestant Theology.' *Dialog* 43, no. 3 (2004): 223–232.

———. 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 2: Rereading Theological Directions, 1900–1914.' *Dialog* 44, no. 1 (2005): 56–68.

———. 'Discarding the Barthian Spectacles, Part 3: Rewriting the History of Protestant Theology in the 1920s.' *Dialog* 45, no. 4 (2006): 389–405.

Avis, Paul. *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: an Introduction.* London: SPCK, 2000.

Badiou, Alain. *Saint Paul: the Foundation of Universalism*. Translated by Ray Brassier. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2003.

Bahrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. Decisions and Nondecisions: an Analytical Framework.' *The American Political Science Review* 57, no. 3 (1963): 632–642.

———. 'Two Faces of Power.' In *Power: a Reader,* edited by Mark Haugaard, 28–37. Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002.

Bailey, F. G. *Morality and Expedience: the Folklore of Academic Politics.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1977.

Balke, Friedrich. 'Episteme.' In *Foucault-Handbuch,* edited by Kammler,

246–249.

Ballor, Jordan J. 'The Aryan Clause, the Confessing Church, and the Ecumenical Movement: Barth and Bonhoeffer on Natural Theology, 1933–1935.' *Scottish Journal of Theology* 59, no. 3 (2006): 263–280.

Balthasar, Hans Urs von. *The Theology of Karl Barth.* Translated by John Drury. New York and Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Barber, Daniel Colucciello. *Deleuze and the Naming of God: Post-Secularism and the Future of Immanence*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2014.

Barratt, T. B. *The Work of T. B. Barratt.* Edited by Donald W. Dayton. New York and London: Garland, 1985.

Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, eds. *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government*. London: UCL Press, 1996.

Barth, Heinrich. 'Gotteserkenntnis.' In *Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie,* pt. 1, *Karl Barth, Heinrich Barth, Emil Brunner,* edited by Jürgen Moltmann, 221–255. Munich: Kaiser, 1962.

Barth, Karl. 'An die deutschen Theologen in der Kriegsgefangenschaft: 1945,' In *Offene Briefe 1945–1968*, edited by Diether Koch, Gesamtausgabe, 5/15, 47–58. Zurich: TVZ, 1984.

——. *Briefe 1961–1968.* Edited by Jürgen Fangmeier and Hinrich Stoevesandt. Gesamtausgabe, 5/6. 2nd edn. Zurich: TVZ, 1979.

——. 'The Christian's Place in Society.' In *The Word of God and the Word of Man,* translated by Douglas Horton, 272–327. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928.

——. *Church and State.* Translated by G. Ronald Howe. Macon, Georg.: Smyth and Helwys, 1991.

——. *Church Dogmatics.* Vol. 1, *The Doctrine of God,* pt. 1, edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, translated by G. W. Bromiley. 2nd edn. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1975.

——. *Church Dogmatics.* Vol. 2, *The Doctrine of God,* pt. 1, edited by G.

W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, translated by G. W. Bromiley et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957.

—. *Church Dogmatics.* Vol. 3, *The Doctrine of Creation,* pt. 2, edited by W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, translated by Harold Knight et al. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1960.

—. *Church Dogmatics.* Vol. 4, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation,* pt. 1, edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.

—. *Church Dogmatics.* Vol. 4, *The Doctrine of Reconciliation,* pt. 3, half 1, edited by G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, translated by G. W. Bromiley. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1961.

—. *The Epistle to the Romans.* Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. Oxford and New York: OUP, 1968.

—. 'The Humanity of God.' Translated by John Newton Thomas. In *The Humanity of God,* 37–67. Louisville, Ken.: Westminster John Knox, 1960.

—. 'Interview von Alfred Blatter: 1968.' In *Gespräche 1964–1968,* edited by Eberhard Busch, Gesamtausgabe, 4/28, 543–551. Zurich: TVZ, 1996.

—. 'Liberal Theology—an Interview.' In *Final Testimonies,* edited by Eberhard Busch, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, 33–40. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

—. 'No! Answer to Emil Brunner.' In *Karl Barth: Theologian of Freedom,* edited by Clifford Green, 151–264. London and San Francisco: Collins, 1989.

—. *Der Römerbrief (Erste Fassung) 1919.* Edited by Hermann Schmidt. Gesamtausgabe, 2/16. Zurich: TVZ, 1985.

—. *Der Römerbrief (Zweite Fassung) 1922.* Edited by Cornelis van der Kooi and Katja Tolstaja. Gesamtausgabe, 2/47. Zurich: TVZ, 2010.

—. *Theologische Existenz heute!* Munich: Kaiser, 1933.

Barth, Karl, and Adolf von Harnack. 'Ein Briefwechsel zwischen K. Barth

und A. von Harnack.' In *Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie,* vol. 1, *Karl Barth, Heinrich Barth, Emil Brunner,* edited by Jürgen Moltmann, 323–347. Munich: Kaiser, 1977.

Barth, Karl, and Eduard Thurneysen. *Karl Barth—Eduard Thurneysen Briefwechsel.* Vol. 1, *1913–1921.* Edited by Eduard Thurneysen. Gesamtausgabe, 5/3. Zurich: EZV, 1973.

———. *Revolutionary Theology in the Making: Barth–Thurneysen Correspondence, 1914–1925.* Translated by James D. Smart. London: Epworth, 1964.

Bartleman, Frank. *Around the World by Faith: with Six Weeks in the Holy Land.* 2nd edn. Los Angeles: self-published, [1925]. Republished (facsimile) in *Witness to Pentecost,* by Bartleman.

———. *The Deity of Christ: what Think Ye of Christ? Is He God or Man?* Los Angeles: F. Bartleman, [1926]. www.ccel.org, last accessed 14-4-2017.

———. *From Plough to Pulpit: from Maine to California.* Los Angeles: self-published, 1924. Republished (facsimile) in *Witness to Pentecost,* by Bartleman.

———. *How Pentecost Came to Los Angeles: As It Was in the Beginning.* 2nd edn. Los Angeles: self-published, 1925. Republished (facsimile) in *Witness to Pentecost,* by Bartleman.

———. *My Story: 'The Latter Rain.'* Columbia, S. C.: John M. Pike, 1909. www.ccel.org, last accessed 9-4-2017.

———. *Two Years Mission Work in Europe: Just Before the World War 1912–1914.* 2nd edn. Los Angeles: self-published, [1924]. Republished (facsimile) in *Witness to Pentecost,* by Bartleman.

———. *Witness to Pentecost: the Life of Frank Bartleman.* Edited by Donald W. Dayton. New York and London: Garland, 1985.

Bauckham, Richard. 'Jürgen Moltmann.' In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 147–162.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Legislators and Interpreters: on Modernity, Post-modernity and Intellectuals.* Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity,

1987.

Baum, Gregory. *The Church for Others: Protestant Theology in Communist East Germany.* Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1996.

Bayart, Jean-François. *The State in Africa: the Politics of the Belly.* Translated by Mary Harper, Christopher Harrison and Elizabeth Harrison. 2nd edn. Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2009.

Bayart, Jean-François, Achille Mbembe and Comi Toulabor. *Le politique par le bas en Afrique noire.* New edn. Paris: Karthala, 2008.

Becker, Gary S. 'Crime and Punishment: an Economic Approach.' *Journal of Political Economy* 76, no. 2 (1968): 169–217.

——. *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior.* Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1976.

——. 'Irrational Behavior and Economic Theory.' *Journal of Political Economy* 70, no. 1 (1962): 1–13.

——. 'Nobel Lecture: the Economic Way of Looking at Behavior.' *Journal of Political Economy* 101, no. 3 (1993): 385–409.

Becker, Gary S., François Ewald and Bernard Harcourt. '"Becker on Ewald on Foucault on Becker:" American Neoliberalism and Michel Foucault's 1979 *Birth of Biopolitics* Lectures; a Conversation with Gary Becker, François Ewald, and Bernard Harcourt.' *Institute for Law and Economics Working Paper,* 2nd ser., 614, and *Public Law and Legal Theory Working Paper,* 401 (2012). www.snrn.com, posted 5-9-2012, last revised 1-10-2013, last accessed 22-5-2018.

Becker, Jürgen. *Paul: Apostle of the Gentiles.* Translated by O. C. Dean, Jr. Westminster, Kent.: John Knox, 1993.

Becker, Matthew. 'Werner Elert (1885–1954).' In *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians*, edited by Mark C. Mattes, Refo500 Academic Studies, 10, 93–135. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013.

Beckford, James A. 'The Restoration of "Power" to the Sociology of Religion.' *Sociological Analysis* 44, no. 1 (1983): 11–32.

Beckmann, Joachim, ed. *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die Evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, 60–71: 1933–1944.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1948.

——. *Kirchliches Jahrbuch für die evangelische Kirche in Deutschland, 72–75: 1945–1948.* Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1950.

Behrent, Michael C. 'Liberalism without Humanism: Michel Foucault and the Free-Market Creed, 1976–1979.' In *Foucault and Neoliberalism*, edited by Zamora, 24–62.

Beintker, Michael. *Die Dialektik der 'dialektischen Theologie' Karl Barths: Studien zur Entwicklung der Barthschen Theologie und zur Vorgeschichte der 'Kirchlichen Dogmatik.'* Munich: Kaiser, 1987.

Benton, T. '"Objective" Interests and the Sociology of Power.' *Sociology* 15, no. 2 (1981): 161–184.

Berger, Klaus. *Theologiegeschichte des Urchristentums: Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Tübingen and Basel: Francke, 1994.

Berger, Peter L. *The Social Reality of Religion*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.

Bernauer, James W. 'Confession.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 75–79. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

——. *Michel Foucault's Force of Flight: toward an Ethics for Thought*. Atlantic Highlands, N. J.; London: Humanities Press, 1990.

——. 'Michel Foucault's Philosophy of Religion: an Introduction to the Non-Fascist Life.' In *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience*, edited by James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette, 77–97. Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004.

——. 'The Prisons of Man: an Introduction to Foucault's Negative Theology.' *International Philosophical Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1987): 365–380.

Bernauer, James, and Jeremy Carrette. 'The Enduring Problem: Foucault, Theology and Culture.' In *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience*, edited by James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette,

1–16. Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004.

——, eds. *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience*. Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004.

Bernauer, James W., and Michael Mahon. 'Michel Foucault's Ethical Imagination.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 149–175. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005.

Bernauer, James, and David Rasmussen, eds. *The Final Foucault*. Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT, 1987.

Besier, Gerhard. 'Auf dem Weg zur Bildung einer Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands: die erste Nachkriegstagung des Lutherrates im August 1945.' In *Der Kompromiß von Treysa: die Entstehung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD) 1945: eine Dokumentation,* edited by Gerhard Besier, Hartmut Ludwig and Jörg Thierfelder, with Michael Losch, Christoph Mehl, Hans-Georg Ulrichs, 21–31. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1995.

——. *Der SED-Staat und die Kirche: der Weg in die Anpassung.* Munich: Bertelsmann, 1993.

Besier, Gerhard, and Gerhard Sauter. *Wie Christen ihre Schuld bekennen: die Stuttgarter Erklärung 1945.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985.

Besier, Gerhard, Hartmut Ludwig, Jörg Thierfelder and Ralf Tyra, eds. *Der Kompromiß von Treysa: die Entstehung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD) 1945: eine Dokumentation.* Edited with Michael Losch, Christoph Mehl and Hans-Georg Ulrichs. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1995.

——. *Kirche nach der Kapitulation.* Vol. 1, *Die Allianz zwischen Genf, Stuttgart und Bethel.* Stuttgart and Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1989.

——. *Kirche nach der Kapitulation.* Vol. 2, A*uf dem Weg nach Treysa.* Stuttgart and Berlin: Kohlhammer, 1990.

Bethge, Eberhard. *Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Theologian—Christian—Man of His Times: a Biography.* Edited by Victoria J. Barnett. Rev. edn. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.

Beyschlag, Karlmann.  *Die Erlanger Theologie*.  Erlangen: Martin-Luther-Verlag, 1993.

Bialecki, Jon.  *A Diagram for Fire: Miracles and Variation in an American Charismatic Movement*.  Oakland, Calif.: Univ. of California Press, 2017.

——. 'Does God Exist in Methodological Atheism?: on Tanya Lurhmann's [sic!] *When God Talks Back* and Bruno Latour.' *Anthropology of Consciousness* 25, no. 1 (2014): 32–52.

Bially, Gerhard, Kieker, Carola, and Passon, Klaus-Dieter, eds.  *Ich will dich segnen ...: Einblicke in den charismatischen Aufbruch der letzten Jahrzehnte*.  Düsseldorf: Charisma; Asslar: Projektion-J; and Ravensburg: D-und-D; 1999.

Bittlinger, Arnold.  *Gifts and Ministries*.  Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1973.

Blake, H. L.  '"Everywhere Preaching the Word".' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 1.  ifphc.org, last accessed 27-4-2017.

Blaschke, Olaf.  *Die Kirchen und der Nationalsozialismus*.  Stuttgart: Reclam, 2014.

Blok, Anders, and Torben Elgaard Jensen.  *Bruno Latour: Hybrid Thoughts in a Hybrid World*.  London and New York: Routledge, 2011.

Bloomquist, Karen L., with an advisory group.  'Engaging Economic Globalization as a Communion: a Working Paper of the Lutheran World Federation (2001).'  In *Communion, Responsibility, Accountability: Responding as a Lutheran Communion to Neoliberal Globalization,* edited by Karen L. Bloomquist, on behalf of LWF Department Theology and Study, 21–50.  Geneva: LWF, 2004.

Boff, Leonardo.  *Church, Charisma and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church*.  Translated by John W. Diercksmeier.  New York: Crossroad, 1985.

——. *Trinity and Society*.  Translated by Paul Burns.  Tunbridge Wells: Burns and Oates, 1988.

Bogard, William. 'Sense and Segmentarity: Some Markers of a Deleuzian-Guattarian Sociology.' *Sociological Theory* 16, no. 1 (1998): 52–74.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. 'Die Geschichte der systematischen Theologie des 20. Jahrhunderts.' In *Seminare—Vorlesungen—Predigten: 1924 bis 1941: erster Ergänzungsband,* edited by Eberhard Bethge, with Otto Dudzus, Gesammelte Schriften, 5, 181–227. Munich: Kaiser, 1972.

——. *No Rusty Swords: Letters, Lectures and Notes 1928–1936.* Edited by Edwin H. Robertson. Translated by Edwin H. Robertson and John Bowden. London and San Francisco: Collins, 1965.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 'Legitimation and Structured Interests in Weber's Sociology of Religion.' Translated by Chris Turner. In *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity,* edited by Scott Lash and Sam Whimster, 119–136. London and Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1987.

——. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, New York and Melbourne: CUP, 1977.

Bowler, Kate. *Blessed: a History of the American Prosperity Gospel.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2013.

Boyens, Armin. 'Die Kirchenpolitik der amerikanischen Besatzungsmacht in Deutschland von 1944 bis 1946.' In *Kirchen in der Nachkriegszeit: vier zeitgeschichtliche Beiträge,* by Armin Boyens et al., 7–57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1979.

——. 'Das Stuttgarter Schuldbekenntnis vom 19. Oktober 1945: Entstehung und Bedeutung.' *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 19, no. 4 (1971): 374–397.

Braaten, Carl E., and Robert W. Jenson, eds. *A Map of Twentieth-Century Theology: Readings from Barth to Radical Pluralism.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Brakelmann, Günter. *Evangelische Kirche im Entscheidungsjahr 1933/1934: der Weg nach Barmen: ein Arbeitsbuch.* Berlin and Münster: Lit, 2010.

Brandt, Sigrid. *Religiöses Handeln in moderner Welt: Talcott Parsons' Religionssoziologie im Rahmen seiner allgemeinen Handlungs- und*

*Systemtheorie.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1993.

Brankaer, Johanna. *Die Gnosis: Texte und Kommentar.* Wiesbaden: Marixverlag, 2010.

Bretherton, Luke. 'Pentecostalism and Political Witness: Framing Pentecostal Responses to Capitalism and Democracy.' www.academica.edu, last accessed 10-7-2017.

Brown, Wendy. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution.* New York: Zone Books, 2015.

Brunotte, Heinz. 'Der kirchenpolitische Kurs der Deutschen Evangelischen Kirchenkanzlei: von 1937 bis 1945.' In *Zur Geschichte des Kirchenkampfes: gesammelte Aufsätze,* ed. Kurt Dietrich Schmidt, 1–54. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965.

——. 'Die theologische Erklärung von Barmen 1934 und ihr Verhältnis zum lutherischen Bekenntnis.' In *Bekenntnis und Kirchenverfassung: Aufsätze zur kirchlichen Zeitgeschichte,* 149–175. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977.

Bublitz, Hannelore. 'Macht.' In *Foucault-Handbuch*, edited by Kammler, 273–277.

Buchanan, Ian. *Deleuzism: a Metacommentary.* Durham, N. C.: Duke Univ. Press; Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2000.

Busch, Eberhard. *Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts.* Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM, 1976.

Bussolini, Jeffrey. 'What is a Dispositive?' *Foucault Studies* 10 (2010): 85–107.

Bußmann, Walter. 'Politische Ideologie zwischen Monarchie und Weimarer Republik: ein Beitrag zur Ideengeschichte der Weimarer Republik.' *Historische Zeitschrift* 190, no. 1 (1960): 55–77.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity.* London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

[Buzan, Tony]. 'Tony Buzan: Inventor of Mind Mapping.' www.tonybuzan.com, last accessed 28-2-2017.

721

Caborn, Joannah. 'On the Methodology of Dispositive Analysis.' *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 1, no. 1 (2015): 112–123.

Calás, Martha B. 'Deconstructing Charismatic Leadership: Re-reading Weber from the Darker Side.' *Leadership Quarterly* 4, no. 3 and 4 (1993): 305–328.

Callon, Michel. 'Some Elements of a Sociology of Translation: Domestication of the Scallops and the Fishermen of St Brieuc Bay.' In *Power, Action and Belief: a New Sociology of Knowledge?* edited by John Law, 196–233. London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

Callon, Michel, and Bruno Latour. 'Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Marco-structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them to Do So.' In *Advances in Social Theory and Methodology: towards an Integration of Micro- and Macro-sociologies,* edited by K. Knorr-Cetina and A. V. Cicourel, 277–303. London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981.

Campenhausen, Hans von. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries.* Translated by J. A. Baker. London: A. and C. Black, 1969.

Candea, Matei, ed. *The Social after Gabriel Tarde: Debates and Assessments.* London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Caputo, John D. 'On not Knowing Who We Are: Madness, Hermeneutics and the Night of Truth in Foucault.' In *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience,* edited by James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette, 117–140. Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004.

Carr, Stephen. 'Foucault amongst the Theologians.' *Sophia* 40, no. 2 (2001): 31–45.

Carrette, Jeremy [R.]. 'Beyond Theology and Sexuality: Foucault, the Self and the Que(e)rying of Monotheistic Truth.' In *Michel Foucault and Theology: the Politics of Religious Experience*, edited by James Bernauer and Jeremy Carrette, 217–232. Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2004.

——. *Foucault and Religion: Spiritual Corporality and Politicial Spirituality.* London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

——. 'Foucault, Strategic Knowledge and the Study of Religion: a Response to McCutcheon, Fitzgerald, King, and Alles.' *Culture and Religion* 2, no. 1 (2001): 127–140.

——. 'Post-Structuralism and the Study of Religion.' In *The Routledge Companion to the Study of Religion*, edited by John R. Hinnells, 2nd edn, 274–290. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

——. 'Prologue to a Confession of the Flesh.' In *Religion and Culture,* by Michel Foucault, 1–47. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

——. 'Rupture and Transformation: Foucault's Concept of Spirituality Reconsidered.' *Foucault Studies* 15 (2013): 52–71.

Carter, Guy Christopher. 'Confession at Bethel, August 1933—Enduring Witness: the Formation, Revision and Significance of the First Full Theological Confession of the Evangelical Church Struggle in Nazi Germany.' Doct. diss., Marquette Univ., Milwaukee, Wisc., 1987.

Cassierer, Ernst. 'Hermann Cohen, 1842–1918.' *Social Research* 10, no. 2 (1943): 219–232.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Imitating Paul: a Discourse of Power.* Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

Chabal, Patrick. *Power in Africa: an Essay in Political Interpretation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1992.

Cho Kyu-Hyung. 'The Move to Independence from Anglican Leadership: an Examination of the Relationship between Alexander Alfred Boddy and the Early Leaders of the British Pentecostal Denominations (1907–1930).' Doct. thesis, Birmingham, 2009.

Chopp, Rebecca S., and Ethna Regan. 'Latin American Liberation Theology.' In *The Modern Theologians: an Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918,* edited by David F. Ford, with Rachel Muers, 3rd edn, 469–484. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005.

Christenson, Larry, ed. *Welcome Holy Spirit: a Study of Charismatic Renewal in the Church*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1987.

Church of England. 'The Thirty Nine Articles of Religion.' In *The Book of Common Prayer: the Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662,* edited by Brian Cummings, 647–685. Oxford and New York: OUP, 2011.

Clayton, Allen L. 'The Significance of William H. Durham for Pentecostal Historiography.' *Pneuma* 1, no. 1 (1979): 27–42.

Clegg, Stewart R. *Frameworks of Power.* London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1989.

——. 'Weber and Foucault: Social Theory for the Study of Organizations.' *Organization* 1, no. 1 (1994): 149–178.

Clements, Keith. 'Barmen and the Ecumenical Movement.' *The Ecumenical Review,* 61, no. 1 (2009): 6–16.

Cochrane, Arthur C. *The Church's Confession under Hitler.* 2nd edn. Pittsburgh, Penn.: Pickwick, 1976.

——, ed. *Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century: Edited with Historical Introductions.* Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

Cohen, Hermann. *System der Philosophie.* Vol. 2, *Ethik des reinen Willens.* Berlin: Cassirer, 1904.

Colebrook, Claire. 'Introduction Part 1.' In *Deleuze and Gender*, edited by Claire Colebrook and Jami Weinstein, 1–19. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2008.

——. *Understanding Deleuze.* Crows Nest, N. S. W.: Allen and Unwin, 2002.

Colman, Felicity J. 'Rhizome.' In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr, rev. edn, 232–235. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010.

Conlee, J. R. 'The Lord Is Speaking in the Earth Today.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 12 (January 1908): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 27-4-2017.

Conley, Verena. 'Minoritarian.' In *The Deleuze Dictionary,* edited by Adrian Parr, rev. edn, 166–168. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press,

2010.

Cook, Glenn A.  'The Azusa Street Meeting: Some Highlights of this Outpouring.'  In *True Believers,* edited by Martin, 51–56.

——.  'Receiving the Holy Ghost.'  *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 3 (November 1906): 2.  ifphc.org, last accessed 3-5-2017.

Cotton, Emma.  'The Inside Story of the Azusa Street Outpouring.'  *Saved and Sanctified,* edited by Martin, 39–46.

Cox, Harvey.  *Fire from Heaven: the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century.*  Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1995.

——.  *Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective.*  New edn.  Princeton, N. J., and Woodstock, Oxon: Princeton Univ. Press, 2013.

Crawford, Florence.  'A Cheering Testimony.'  *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 11 (January 1908): 4.  ifphc.org, last accessed 18-8-2017.

——.  'The Light of Life Brought Triumph.'  In *Saved and Sanctified,* edited by Martin, 95–99.

——.  'Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.'  *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 12 (January 1908): 1.  ifphc.org, last accessed 18-8-2017.

[Crawford, Florence].  'Testimony and Praise To God.'  *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 9 (September 1907): 4.  ifphc.org, last accessed 18-8-2017.

——.  'A Witness to the Power of God.'  *The Apostolic Faith* (Portland, Or.) 21 (1912): 3.  ifphc.org, last accessed 18-8-2017.

Cummings, Brian, ed.  *The Book of Common Prayer: the Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662.*  Oxford and New York: OUP, 2011.

Custer, Olivia.  'Sex.'  In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 449–455.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Dahl, Robert A. 'The Concept of Power.'  *System Research and Behavioral*

*Science* 2, no. 3 (1957): 201–215.

—. 'Power.' In *Power: a Reader,* edited by Mark Haugaard, 8–25. Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002.

Datta, Ronjon Paul. 'Plane of Consistency.' In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 137–140. Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

Davidson, Arnold I. 'Ethics as Aesthetics: Foucault, the History of Ethics, and Ancient Thought.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault,* edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 123–148. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005.

—. 'Introduction.' In *Society Must Be Defended*, by Foucault, xvii.

Davie, Grace. *The Sociology of Religion: a Critical Agenda.* 2nd edn. London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 2013.

Davies, Andrew. 'What Does It Mean to Read the Bible as a Pentecostal?' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 18, no. 2 (2009): 216–229.

Dean, Mitchell. 'Foucault, Ewald, Neoliberalism, and the Left.' In *Foucault and Neoliberalism*, edited by Daniel Zamora and Michael C. Behrent, 85–113. Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016.

Dean, Tim. 'Foucault and Sex.' In *After Foucault,* edited by Downing, 141–154.

Deleuze, Gilles. 'Breaking Things Open, Breaking Words Open.' In *Negotiations, 1972–1990,* translated by Martin Joughin, 83–93. New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1997.

—. *Cinema 2: the Time-Image.* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. London: Athlone, 1989.

—. *Difference and Repetition.* Translated by Paul Patton. London and New York: Continuum, 2004.

—. *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*. Translated by Martin Joughin. New York: Zone Books, 1990.

—. *Foucault*. Edited and translated by Seán Hand. Minneapolis, Minn.:

Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1988.

——. 'Immanence: a Life.' In *Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life*. Translated by Anne Boyman, 25–33. New York: Zone Books, 2005.

——. 'Michel Foucault's Main Concepts.' In *Between Deleuze and Foucault*, edited by Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith, 59–71. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016.

——. *Nietzsche and Philosophy*. Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. London and New York: Continuum, 1986.

——. 'Postscript on Control Societies.' In *Negotiations, 1972–1990*, translated by Martin Joughin, 177–182. New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press, 1997.

——. 'To Have Done with Judgment.' In *Essays Critical and Clinical,* translated by Daniel W. Smith and Michael A. Greco, 126–135. London and New York: Verso, 1998.

——. 'What is a Dispositif?' In *Michel Foucault Philosopher: Essays translated from the French and German,* edited and translated by Timothy J. Armstrong, 159–168. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *L'Anti-Œdipe: Capitalisme et schizophrénie, 1*. New edn. Paris: Minuit, 1973.

——. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Robert Hurley, Mark Seem, and Helen R. Lane. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1983.

——. *Mille Plateaux: Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2*. Paris: Minuit, 1980.

——. 'On Capitalism and Desire.' In *Desert Islands and Other Texts: 1953–1974,* edited by David Lapoujade, translated by Michael Taormina, 162–173. Los Angeles and New York: Semiotext[e], 2004.

——. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis and London: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1987.

——. 'What is a *dispositif*?' In *Michel Foucault Philosopher: Essays*

*translated from the French and German*, edited and translated by Timothy J. Armstrong, 159–168. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

——. *What Is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1994.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Claire Parnet. *Dialogues II.* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Rev. edn. New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press, 2007.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology.* Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Corr. edn. Baltimore and London: J. Hopkins Univ. Press, 1997.

*Die Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche: Herausgegeben im Gedenkjahr der Augsburgischen Konfession 1930.* 11th edn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992.

DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 'The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.' *American Sociological Review* 48, no. 2 (1983): 147–160.

Dingel, Irene, ed. *Der Adiaphoristische Streit (1548–1560).* With Jan Martin Lies and Hans-Otto Schneider. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2012.

Dorrien, Gary J. *The Remaking of Evangelical Theology.* Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Know, 1998.

Downing, Lisa. 'Introduction.' In *After Foucault*, edited by Downing, 1–13.

——, ed. *After Foucault: Culture, Theory, and Criticism in the Twenty-First Century.* Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2018.

Dreyfus, Hubert L., and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* 2nd edn. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983.

Droogers, André. 'Essentialist and Normative Approaches.' In *Studying Global Pentecostalism: Theories and Methods,* edited by Allan Anderson, Michael Bergunder, André Droogers and Cornelis van der

Laan, 30–50.  Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: Univ. of California Press, 2010.

⸺.  'Methodological Ludism: beyond Religionism and Reductionism.'  In *Play and Power in Religion,* 311–338.

⸺.  *Play and Power in Religion: Collected Essays.*  Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter, 2012.

⸺.  'The Third Bank of the River: Play, Methodological Ludism and the Definition of Religion.'  In *Play and Power in Religion,* 339–364.

Dunn, James D.G.  *The Theology of Paul the Apostle.*  Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1998.

Durham, W[illiam] H.  'A Chicago Evangelist's Pentecost.'  *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 6 (March 1907): 4.  ifphc.org, last accessed 19-8-2017.

Durkheim, Émile.  *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.*  Translated by Joseph Ward Swain.  2nd edn.  London and Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1976.

Ebeling, Gerhard.  *Dogmatik des christlichen Glaubens.*  3 vols.  Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.

⸺.  *Luther: Einführung in sein Denken*.  5th edn.  Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Ehrman, Bart D.  *Lost Christianities: the Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew.*  Oxford and New York: OUP, 2003.

EKD, Rat und Kirchenkanzlei, ed.  *Eisenach 1948: Verhandlungen der verfassungsgebenden Kirchenversammlung der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland vom 9.–13. Juli 1948.*  Berlin: Wichern, 1951.

Elden, Stuart.  *Foucault: the Birth of Power.*  Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2017.

⸺.  *Foucault's Last Decade*.  Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016.

Elert, Werner.  *Die Lehre des Luthertums im Abriss*.  2nd edn.  Munich:

Beck'sche, 1926.

Epstein, Catherine.  *Model Nazi: Arthur Greiser and the Occupation of Western Poland.*  Oxford and New York: OUP, 2010.

Ericksen, Robert P.  *Theologians under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch.*  New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 1985.

Evangelischen Kirche in Hessen und Nassau, ed.  *Person und Institution: Volkskirche auf dem Weg in die Zukunft; Arbeitsergebnisse und Empfehlungen der Perspektivkommission der Evangelischen Kirche in Hessen und Nassau.*  Frankfurt: EPV, 1993.

Evans, Richard J.  *The Third Reich at War: how the Nazis Led Germany from Conquest to Disaster.*  London and New York: Penguin, 2009.

——. *The Third Reich in Power, 1933–1939.*  London and New York: Penguin, 2006.

G. R. Evans, G. R., and Martin Percy, eds.  *Managing the Church?: Order and Organization in a Secular Age.*  Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Faupel, David William.  *The Everlasting Gospel: the Significance of Eschatology in the Development of Pentecostal Thought.*  Sheffield: Sheffield Acad. Press, 1996.

Feder, Ellen K.  'Power/Knowledge,'  In *Michel Foucault*, edited by Taylor, 55–68.

Feige, Franz G. M.  *The Varieties of Protestantism in Nazi Germany: Five Theopolitical Positions.*  Lewiston, N. Y., and Lampeter, Wales: Edwin Mellen, 1990.

Ferguson, Adam.  *An Essay on the History of Civil Society.*  Edited by Fania Oz-Salzberger.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1995.

Fillion, Réal.  'Moving Beyond Biopower: Hardt and Negri's Post-Foucauldian Speculative Philosophy of History.'  *History and Theory* 44**,** no. 4 (2005): 47–72.

Fischer, André.  *Zwischen Zeugnis und Zeitgeist: die politische Theologie*

*von Paul Althaus in der Weimarer Republik.*  Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2012.

Fischer, Hermann.  *Protestantische Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002.

Fisher, Simon.  *Revelatory Positivism?: Barth's Earliest Theology and the Marburg School.*  Oxford and New York: OUP, 1988.

Fitzgerald, Timothy.  'Problematising Discourses on Religion.'  *Culture and Religion* 2, no. 1 (2001): 103–111.

Floyd, Wayne Whison.  'Dietrich Bonhoeffer.'  In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 43–61.

Flynn, Thomas R.  'Foucault on Experiences and the Historical *a priori*: with Husserl in the Rearview Mirror of History.'  *Continental Philosophy Review* 49, no. 1 (2016): 55–65.

——.  'Foucault's Mapping of History.'  In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 29–48.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2006.

David F. Ford.  'Introduction to Modern Christian Theology.'  In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 1–15.

Ford, David F., ed.  *The Modern Theologians: an Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918.*  With Rachel Muers.  3rd edn.  Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005.

Foucault, Michel.  *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974–1975.*  Edited by Valerio Marchetti and Antonella Salomoni.  Translated by Graham Burchell.  New York: Picador, 2003.

——.  *Archaeology of Knowledge.*  Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

——.  *Les aveux de la chair: histoire de la sexualité,* vol. 4.  Edited by Frédéric Gros.  Paris: Gallimard, 2018.

——.  *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–79.* Edited by Michel Senellart.  Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

——. 'Carceri e manicomi nel congegno del potere ("Prisons et asiles dans le méchanisme du pouvoir").' In *Dits et écrits: 1954–1988, vol. 2, 1970–1975,* edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, with Jacques Lagrange, no. 136, 521–525. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

——. *The Care of the Self: Volume 3 of The History of Sexuality.* Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon, 1986.

——. 'The Confession of the Flesh.' In *Power/Knowledge*, 194–228.

——. *The Courage of the Truth (The Government of Self and Others II): Lectures at the Collège de France, 1983–1984.* Edited by Frédéric Gros. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

——. *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison.* Translated by Alan Sheridan. 2nd edn. New York: Vintage, 1995.

——. 'Foucault.' In *Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology*, edited by James D. Faubion, translated by Robert Hurley et al., 459–464. New York: New Press, 1998.

——. *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1981–82*. Edited by Frédéric Gros. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

——. *Histoire de la sexualité.* Vol. 1, *La volonté de savoir.* Paris: Gallimard, 1976.

——. *History of Madness*. Edited by Jean Khalfa. Translated by Jonathan Murphy and Jean Khalfa. London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

——. 'The History of Sexuality.' In *Power/Knowledge*, 183–193.

——. *The History of Sexuality.* Vol. 1, *An Introduction.* Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon, 1978.

——. 'Interview with Michel Foucault.' In *Power*, 239–297.

——. 'Le jeu de Michel Foucault.' In *Dits et écrits 1954–1988,* vol. 3, *1976-1979,* edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, with Jacques Lagrange, no. 206, 298–329. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

———. *Language, Counter-memory, Practice: Selected Essays*.  Edited by Donald F. Bouchard.  Translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon.  Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977.

———. *Mental Illness and Psychology*.  Translated by Alan Sheridan.  Berkeley, Cal., and London: Univ. of California Press, 1987.

———. 'On the Genealogy of Ethics: an Overview of Work in Progress.'  In *The Foucault Reader*, edited by Paul Rabinow, 340–372.  New York: Pantheon, 1984.

———. 'Powers and Strategies.'  In *Power/Knowledge*, 134–145.

———. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault, 1954–1984,* vol. 3.  Edited by James D. Faubion.  Translated by Robert Hurley et al.  London and New York: Penguin, 2001.

———. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977.*  Edited by Colin Gordon. Translated by Colin Gordon et al.  New York and Toronto: Random House, 1980.

———. 'A Preface to Transgression.'  In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by Donald F. Bouchard, translated by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon, 29–52.  Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1977.

———. *Psychiatric Power: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1973–74.*  Edited by Jacques Lagrange.  Translated by Graham Burchell.  Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

———. 'Les rapports de pouvoir passent à l'intérieur des corps.'  In *Dits et écrits 1954–1988,* vol. 3, *1976–1979,* edited by Daniel Defert and François Ewald, with Jacques Lagrange, no. 197, 228–236.  Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

———. *Religion and Culture*.  Edited by Jeremy R. Carrette.  London and New York: Routledge, 1999.

———. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1977–78.*  Edited by Michel Senellart.  Translated by Graham Burchell.  Basingstoke, Hants, and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

———. *'Society Must Be Defended:' Lectures at the Collège de France,*

*1975–76.* Edited by Mauro Bertani and Alessandro Fontana. Translated by David Macey. London and New York: Penguin, 2004.

——. 'The Subject and Power.' In *Michel Foucault: beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics,* by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, 2nd edn, 208–226. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1983.

——. *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison.* Paris: Gallimard, 1975.

——. 'Truth and Juridical Forms.' In *Power,* 1–89.

——. 'Truth and Power.' In *Power/Knowledge,* 109–133.

——. *The Use of Pleasure: Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality.* Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Vintage, 1990.

Foucault, Michel, and Maurice Blanchot. *Foucault—Blanchot: Maurice Blanchot: the Thought from Outside, by Michel Foucault, Translated by Brian Massumi, Michel Foucault as I Imagine Him, by Maurice Blanchot, Translated by Jeffrey Mehlman.* New York: Zone Books, 1990.

Foucault, Michel, and Gilles Deleuze. 'Intellectuals and power.' In *Language, Counter-memory, Practice,* by Foucault, 205–217.

Fox, Judith. 'New Religious Movements.' In *The Routledge Companion to the Study of Religion*, edited by John R. Hinnells, 2nd edn, 339–353. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Fuggle, Sophie. *Foucault/Paul: Subjects of Power.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man.* New York and London: Free Press, 2006.

Furseth, Inger, and Pål Repstad. *An Introduction to the Sociology of Religion: Classical and Contemporary Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge, 2016.

Fyfe, Gordon, and John Law, eds. *Picturing Power: Visual Depiction and Social Relations.* London and New York: Routledge, 1988.

Gallie, W. B. 'Essentially Contested Concepts.' *Procedings of the*

*Aristotelian Society,* new series, 56 (1955–56): 167–198.

Gallus, Petr. *Der Mensch zwischen Himmel und Erde: der Glaubensbegriff bei Paul Tillich und Karl Barth.* Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007.

Gane, Nicholas. 'Foucault's History of Neoliberalism.' In *After Foucault,* edited by Downing, 46–60.

Geertz, Clifford. 'Religion as a Cultural System.' In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 87-125. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

——. 'Thick Description: toward an Interpretative Theory of Culture.' In *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*, 3–30. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis.* London and Basingstoke, Hants: Macmillan, 1979.

——. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 1984.

Gillett, Robert. 'Foucault's Genealogy.' In *After Foucault*, edited by Downing, 17–30.

Godsey, John D. 'Barth and Bonhoeffer: the Basic Difference.' *Quarterly Review* 7, no. 1 (1987): 9–27.

Goering, D. Timothy. *Friedrich Gogarten (1887–1967): Religionsrebell im Jahrhundert der Weltkriege.* Berlin and Boston, Mass.: de Gruyter, 2017.

Gogarten, Friedrich. *Gericht oder Skepsis: eine Streitschrift gegen Karl Barth.* Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1937.

Goodchild, Philip. *Deleuze and Guattari: an Introduction to the Politics of Desire.* London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1996.

Gordon, Colin. 'Governmental Rationality: an Introduction.' In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Millner, 1–51. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.

Gorringe, Timothy. *Karl Barth: Against Hegemony.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 1999.

Graf, Friedrich Wilhelm. 'Die "antihistorische Revolution" in der protestantischen Theologie der zwanziger Jahre.' In *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre: Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Wolfhart Pannenberg*, edited by Jan Rohls and Guther Wenz, 377–405. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988.

——. 'Die Freiheit der Entsprechung zu Gott: Bemerkungen zum theozentrischen Ansatz der Anthropologie.' In *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* by Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, edited by Trutz Rendtorff, 76–118. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975.

Grau, Friedrich. 'Der neutestamentliche Begriff Charisma, seine Geschichte und seine Theologie.' Doct. diss., Tübingen Univ., 1947.

Greco, Monica, and Martin Savransky. 'Foucault's Subjectivities.' In *After Foucault*, edited by Downing, 31–45.

Green, Garrett. 'The Sociology of Dogmatics: Niklas Luhmann's Challenge to Theology.' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50, no. 1 (182): 19–34.

Grenz, Stanley J., and Roger E. Olson. *Twentieth-Century Theology: God and the World in a Transitional Age.* Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992.

Greschat, Martin. *Die evangelische Christenheit und die deutsche Geschichte nach 1945: Weichenstellungen in der Nachkriegszeit.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002.

Greschat, Martin ed. *Im Zeichen der Schuld: 40 Jahre Stuttgarter Schuldbekenntnis: eine Dokumentation.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985.

Gutting, Gary. 'Ethics.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 136–142. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

——. 'Foucault and the History of Madness.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Focuault*, edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 49–73.

Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005.

⸻. *Foucault: a Very Short Introduction.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2005.

⸻. 'Michel Foucault: a User's Manual.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 1–28. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2006.

Gros, Frédéric. 'Deleuze's *Foucault:* a Metaphysical Fiction.' In *Between Deleuze and Foucault*, edited by Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith, 128–136. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

Grosz, Elizabeth. 'A Thousand Tiny Sexes: Feminism and Rhizomatics.' *Topoi* 12, no. 2 (1993): 167–179.

Gürtler, Paul. *Nationalsozialismus und evangelische Kirchen im Warthegau: Trennung von Staat und Kirche im nationalsozialistischen Weltanschauungsstaat.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1958.

Haase, Hans-Wilfried. 'Theological Remarks on the Accra Confession.' *HTS Theological Studies* 65, no. 1 (2009): 3 pages. www.hts.org.za, last accessed 17-6-2017.

Hackett, Rosalind I. J. 'Anthropology of Religion.' In *The Routledge Companion to the Study of Religion*, edited by John R. Hinnells, 2nd edn, 165–185. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Haight, Roger D. *Christian Community in History.* 3 vols. London and New York: Bloomsbury T and T Clark, 2014.

Han, Béatrice. 'The Analytic of Finitude and the History of Subjectivity.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 176–209. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005.

⸻. *Foucault's Critical Project: between the Transcendental and the Historical.* Translated by Edward Pile. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2002.

Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman. *Organizational Ecology.* Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

——. 'The Population Ecology of Organizations.' *American Journal of Sociology,* 82, no. 5 (1977): 929–964.

——. 'Structural Inertia and Organizational Change.' *American Sociological Review* 49, no. 2 (1984): 149–164.

Hansen, Guillermo. 'Confessing the Triune God in a Globalized Era.' *The Ecumenical Review,* 61, no. 1 (2009): 32–48.

——. 'Neoliberal Globalization: a *Status Confessionis*?' In *Communion, Responsibility, Accountability: Responding as a Lutheran Communion to Neoliberal Globalization,* edited by Karen L. Bloomquist, on behalf of The Lutheran World Federation Department for Theology and Study, 163–178. Geneva: LWF, 2004.

Happold, F. C. *Mysticism: a Study and an Anthology.* Rev. edn. Harmondsworth, Mddx.: Penguin, 1970.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Assembly.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2017.

——. *Empire.* Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 2000.

Hardy, Daniel W. 'Karl Barth.' In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 21–42.

——. 'T. F. Torrance.' In Ford, *The Modern Theologians*, 163–177.

Harman, Graham. *Prince of Networks: Bruno Latour and Metaphysics.* Melbourne: Re.Press, 2009.

——. *Tool-Being: Heidegger and the Metaphysics of Objects.* Chicago and La Salle, Ill.: Open Court, 2002.

Hart, David Bentley. *The Beauty of the Infinite: the Aesthetics of Christian Truth.* Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

Harris, Harriet A. *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals*. Oxford and New York: OUP, 1998.

Hauerwas, Stanley. 'The Christian Difference, or Surviving Postmodernism,' In *The Blackwell Companion to Postmodern Theology*, edited by Graham Ward, 144–161. Malden, Mass., and Oxford:

Blackwell, 2001.

Haugaard, Mark. *Structures, Restructuration and Social Power.* Aldershot, Hants, and Brookfield, Verm.: Avebury, 1992.

——. *The Constitution of Power: a Theoretical Analysis of Power: Knowledge and Structure.* Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 1997.

Haugaard, Mark, ed. *Power: a Reader.* Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002.

Hauschild, Wolf-Dieter. *Die Kirchenversammlung von Treysa 1945.* Hanover: Lutherhaus, 1985.

——. 'Was ist "lutherisch"?: zum Selbstverständnis der Lutheraner des sog. Lutherrats (1936–1948).' *Kerygma und Dogma* 53, no. 2 (2007): 124–144.

Havis, Devonya N. 'Discipline.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon,* edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 110–118. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Helmreich, Ernst Christian. *The German Churches under Hitler: Background, Struggle, and Epilogue.* Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1979.

Hendinger, Ulrich. *Der Freiheitsbegriff in der Kirchlichen Dogmatik Karl Barths.* Zurich and Stuttgart: Zwingli Verlag, 1962.

Henriksson, Lennart. 'Many Good Words—Little Action?: the World Alliance of Reformed Churches and the "South Africa Question," 1960–1990.' In *Reformed Churches in South Africa and the Struggle for Justice: Remembering 1960–1990,* edited by Mary-Anne Plaatjies-van Huffel and Robert Vosloo, 359–371. Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 2013.

Herbst, Jeffrey. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control.* Princeton, N. J., and Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press, 2014.

Herms, Eilert. 'Schleiermacher's *Christian Ethics.*' In *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher,* edited by Jacqueline Mariña, 209–228. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005.

Heyes, Cressida J. 'Subjectivity and Power.' In *Michel Foucault*, edited by Taylor, 159–172.

Hill. 'Get Into the Cornfield.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 2 (October 1906): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 3-5-2017.

Hindess, Barry. 'Rationality and the Characterization of Modern Society.' In *Max Weber, Rationality and Modernity,* edited by Scott Lash and Sam Whimster, 137–153. London and Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1987.

Hoffman, Marcelo. 'Disciplinary Power,' In *Michel Foucault*, edited by Taylor, 27–39.

———. *Foucault and Power: the Influence of Political Engagement on Theories of Power.* New York and London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan: with selected variants from the Latin edition of 1668.* Edited by Edwin Curley. Indianapolis and Cambridge, Mass.: Hackett, 1994.

Holland, Eugene W. *Deleuze and Guattari's* Anti-Oedipus: *Introduction to Schizoanalysis*. London and New York: Routledge, 1998.

———. *Deleuze and Guattari's* A Thousand Plateaus. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Hollenweger, Walter J. *Pentecostalism: Origins and Developments Worldwide.* Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.

———. 'Pentecostals and the Charismatic Movement.' In *The Study of Spirituality,* edited by Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright and Edward Yarnold, 549–553. Oxford and New York: OUP, 1986.

———. 'Gifts of the Spirit: Natural and Supernatural.' In *The New International Dictionary of Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements,* edited by Stanley M. Burgess, with Eduard M. van der Maas, rev. ed, 667–668. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2002.

Holmberg, Bengt. *Paul and Power: the Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles.* Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2004.

Hoy, David Couzens. 'Introduction,' In *Foucault: a Critical Reader,*

edited by David Couzens Hoy, 1–25.  Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1986.

Hroch, Petra.  'Intensity/Intensive.'  In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 95–98.  Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

Huffer, Lynne.  'Foucault and Queer Theory,'  In *After Foucault*, edited by Downing, 93–106.

——. *Mad for Foucault: Rethinking the Foundations of Queer Theory.* New York and Chichester, W. Suss.: Columbia Univ. Press, 2010.

Hume, David.  *A Treatise of Human Nature.*  Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch.  2nd edn.  Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.

——. *Enquiries concerning the Human Understanding and concerning the Principles of Morals.*  Edited by L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch. 3rd edn.  Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.

Jacobsen, Douglas.  *Thinking in the Spirit: Theologies of the Early Pentecostal Movement.*  Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 2003.

Jäger, Siegfried, and Florentine Maier.  'Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis.'  In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 2nd edn, 34–62. London and Los Angeles: Sage, 2009.

James, William.  *The Varieties of Religious Experience: a Study in Human Nature.*  Edited by Martin E. Marty.  London and New York: Penguin, 1985.

Jasper, Gotthard.  *Paul Althaus (1888–1966): Professor, Prediger und Patriot in seiner Zeit*.  Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013.

——. 'Die Zwei-Reiche-Lehre bei Paul Althaus: ein Schlüssel zu seiner politischen Ethik?'  *Luther* 85, no. 1 (2014): 41–55.

Jenkins, Eric. 'War Machine.' In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey

Vallee, 195–198. Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

Jenkins, Philip. *The Next Christendom: the Coming of Global Christianity.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2002.

Jenzen, Olu, and Sally R. Munt. 'Queer Theory, Sexuality and Religion.' In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Contemporary Religion and Sexuality*, edited by Stephen J. Hunt and Andrew K. T. Yip, 45–58. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 'Paul's Ecclesiology.' In *The Cambridge Companion to St Paul,* edited by James D. G. Dunn, 199–211. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2003.

Jones, Cheslyn, Geoffrey Wainwright and Edward Yarnold, eds. *The Study of Spirituality.* London: SPCK, 1986.

Josuttis, Manfred. *Die Einführung in das Leben: Pastoraltheologie zwischen Phänomenologie und Spiritualität.* 2nd edn. Gütersloh: Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2004.

Justaert, Kristien. 'Liberation Theology: Deleuze and Althaus-Reid.' *SubStance* 39, no. 1 (2010): 154–164.

——. *Theology after Deleuze.* London and New York: Continuum, 2012.

Kagame, Alexis. *La philosophie Bantu comparée.* Paris: Présence Africaine, 1976.

Kamitsuka, Margaret D. *Feminist Theology and the Challenge of Difference.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2007.

Kammler, Clemens, Rudolf Parr and Ulrich Johannes Schneider, eds. *Foucault-Handbuch: Leben—Werk—Wirkung.* Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 2008.

Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason.* Edited and translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: CUP, 1998.

Käsemann, Ernst. 'Amt und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament.' In *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen,* vol. 1. 2nd edn, 109–134. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1960.

——. 'Ministry and Community in the New Testament.' In *Essays on New Testament Themes,* translated by W. J. Montague, 63–94. London: SCM, 1964.

Kay, William K., and Anne E. Dyer, eds. *Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies: a Reader.* London: SCM, 2004.

Kearsley, Roy. *Church, Community and Power.* Farnham, Surr., and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2008.

Kehrer, Günter. *Einführung in die Religionssoziologie.* Darmstadt: WB, 1988.

Kelsey, David H. 'Paul Tillich.' In *The Modern Theologians: an Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, edited by David F. Ford, with Rachel Muers, 3rd edn, 62–75. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell: 2005.

Kennedy, Philip. *Twentieth-Century Theologians: a New Introduction to Modern Christian Thought.* London and New York: Tauris, 2010.

Khalip, Jacques. 'Foucault's Ethics.' In *After Foucault*, edited by Downing, 155–169.

Kilby, Karen. 'Karl Rahner,' In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 92–105.

Kirsch, Thomas G. *Spirits and Letter: Reading, Writing and Charisma in African Christianity.* New York and Oxford: Berghahn, 2008.

Knapp, Martin Wells. '*Impressions.*' 4th edn. Cincinnati, Oh.: Revivalist Publishing House, 1892.

Knibbe, Kim, and André Droogers. 'Methodological Ludism and the Academic Study of Religion.' *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 23, no. 3–4 (2011): 283–303.

Kögler, Hans-Herbert. *Michel Foucault.* 2nd edn. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004.

Kolf-van Melis, Claudia. 'Tod des Subjekts?: eine Auseinandersetzung mit Karl Rahner und Michel Foucault.' In *Tod des Subjekts?: Poststrukturalismus und christliches Denken*, edited by Michael Zichy

743

and Heinrich Schmidinger, 93–110. Innsbruck and Vienna: Tyrolia, 2005.

Konferenz der Evangelischen Kirchenleitungen in der DDR. 'Zehn Artikel über Freiheit und Dienst der Kirche, erarbeitet im Auftrag der Konferenz der Evangelischen Kirchenleitungen in der DDR und von dieser gemeinsam für alle Landeskirchen verabschiedet.' In *Kundgebungen: Worte, Erklärungen und Dokumente der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland.* Vol. 2, *1959–1969,* edited by Joachim E. Christoph, 112–118. Hanover: Verlag des Amtsblattes der EKD, 1994.

Kooi, Cornelis van der. *Anfängliche Theologie: der Denkweg des jungen Karl Barth (1909 bis 1927).* Munich: Kaiser, 1987.

Kooi, Jelle van der. *Das Betheler Bekenntnis: mit einer Einführung von Jelle van der Kooi und einem Brief Dietrich Bonhoeffers.* Bielefeld: von Bodelschwinghsche Anstalten, 1983.

Koopman, Nico. 'The Reception of the Barmen Declaration in South Africa.' *The Ecumenical Review* 61, no. 1 (2009): 60–71.

Korsch, Dietrich. 'Christologie und Autonomie: zur dogmatischen Kritik einer neuzeitlichen Deutung der Theologie Karl Barths.' In *Dialektische Theologie nach Karl Barth,* 146–177. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

——. 'Hermann Cohen und die protestantische Theologie seiner Zeit.' In *Dialektische Theologie nach Karl Barth*, 41–73. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.

Kostlevy, William. *Holy Jumpers: Evangelicals and Radicals in Progressive Era America.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2010.

Kögler, Hans-Herbert. *Michel Foucault.* 2nd edn. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2004.

Krockow, Christian Graf von. *Die Entscheidung: eine Untersuchung über Ernst Jünger, Carl Schmitt, Martin Heidegger.* Frankfurt and New York: Campus, 1990.

Krötke, Wolf. 'Dietrich Bonhoeffer als "Theologe der DDR:" ein kritischer Rückblick.' *Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik* 37, no. 1 (1993): 94–105.

Kruger, Erin. 'Rhizome/Arborescent.' In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts,* edited by Rob Shields and

Mickey Vallee, 153–156. Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* 4th edn. Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2012.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: towards a Radical Democratic Politics.* 2nd edn. London and New York: Verso, 2001.

Lake, John G. *The Complete Collection of His Life Teachings.* Edited by Roberts Liardon. New Kensington, Penn.: Whitaker House, 2005.

Lambert, Gregg. 'Notes from a Thought Experiment: What Is a Rhizome? (ca. 1976).' In *In Search of a New Image of Thought: Gilles Deleuze and Philosophical Expressionism*, 45–61. Minneapolis, Minn., and London: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Land, Steven Jack. *Pentecostal Spirituality: a Passion for the Kingdom.* Cleveland, Tenn.: CPT Press, 2010.

Langer, Hans-Otto. *Der Kirchenkampf in der Ära der Kirchenausschüsse (1935–1937).* Bielefeld: Bechauf, 1971.

Lash, Scott. *Sociology of Postmodernism.* London and New York: Routledge, 1990.

Latour, Bruno. 'Coming Out as a Philosopher.' *Social Studies of Science* 40, no. 4 (2010): 559–608.

——. 'Factures/Fractures: from the Concept of Network to the Concept of Attachment.' *RES* 36 (1999): 20–31.

——. *An Inquiry into Modes of Existence: an Anthropology of the Moderns.* Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard Univ. Press, 2013.

——. *Jubiler: ou les tourments de la parole religieuse.* Paris: La Découverte, 2013.

——. 'On Interobjectivity.' *Mind, Culture, and Activity* 3, no. 4 (1996): 228–245.

——. 'On Recalling ANT.' In *Actor Network Theory and After,* edited by

John Law and John Hassard, 15–25. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999.

——. 'On the Cult of the Factish Gods.' In *On the Modern Cult of the Factish Gods,* translated by Catherine Porter and Heather MacLean, 1–66. Durham, N. Car., and London: Duke Univ. Press, 2010.

——. 'The Powers of Association.' In *Power, Action and Belief: a New Sociology of Knowledge?,* edited by John Law, 264–280. London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

——. *Reassembling the Social: an Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2005.

——. *Rejoicing: or the Torments of Religious Speech.* Translated by Julie Rose. Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2013.

——. *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1987.

——. '"Thou Shall Not Freeze Frame," or How Not to Misunderstand the Science and Religion Debate.' In *On the Modern Cult of the Factish Gods*, translated by Catherine Porter and Heather MacLean, 99–123. Durham, N. Car., and London: Duke Univ. Press, 2010.

——. '"Thou Shalt not Take the Lord's Name in Vain:" Being a Sort of Sermon on the Hesitation of Religious Speech.' *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 39, no. 1 (2001): 215–234.

——. *We Have Never Been Modern.* Translated by Catherine Porter. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1993.

Law, John. 'Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics.' In *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory,* edited by Bryan S. Turner, 141–158. Chichester, W. Suss., and Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

——. 'After ANT: Complexity, Naming and Topology.' In *Actor Network Theory and After,* edited by John Law and John Hassard, 1–14. Oxford, and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999.

——. 'Notes on the Theory of the Actor-Network: Ordering, Strategy, and Heterogenity.' *System Practice* 5, no. 4 (1992): 379–393.

———. 'On Power and Its Tacticts: a View from the Sociology of Science,' *The Sociological Review* 34, no. 1 (1986): 1–38.

———. 'On the Methods of Long-Distance Control: Vessels, Navigation and the Portuguese Route to India.' In *Power, Action and Belief: a New Sociology of Knowledge?,* edited by John Law, 234–263. London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986.

———. *Organizing Modernity.* Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1994.

———. 'Power, Discretion and Strategy.' In *A Sociology of Monster: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination,* edited by John Law, 165–222. London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

———, ed. *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge?* London and Boston, Mass.: Routledge, 1987.

———, ed. *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination.* London and New York: Routledge, 1991.

Law, John, and John Hassard, eds. *Actor Network Theory and After.* Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999.

Leeuw, Gerardus van der. 'Macht und theoretisierte Macht.' In *Religionsethnologie,* edited by Carl August Schmitz, 51–64. Frankfurt: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft, 1964.

Legg, Stephen. 'Assemblage/Apparatus: Using Deleuze and Foucault.' *Area* 43, no. 2 (2011): 128–133.

Lemke, Thomas. '"The Birth of Bio-Politics": Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-Liberal Governmentality.' *Economy and Society* 30, no. 2 (2001): 190–207.

———. *Eine Kritik der politischen Vernunft: Foucaults Analyse der modernen Gouvernementalität.* Berlin and Hamburg: Argument, 1997.

Lemm, Vanessa, and Miguel Vatter, eds. *The Government of Life: Foucault, Biopolitics, and Neoliberalism.* New York: Fordham Univ. Press, 2014.

Leshem, Dotan. *The Origins of Neoliberalism: Modeling the Economy*

*from Jesus to Focuault.* New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 2016.

Link, Jürgen. 'Dispositiv.' In *Foucault-Handbuch,* edited by Kammler, 237–242.

——. 'Disziplinartechnologie/Normalität/Normalisierung,' In *Foucault-Handbuch,* edited by Kammler, 242–246.

Livesey, Graham. 'Assemblage.' In *The Deleuze Dictionary,* edited by Adrian Parr, rev. edn, 18–19. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010.

Livingston, James C. *Modern Christian Thought.* Vol. 1, *The Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century.* 2nd edn. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2006.

Livingston, James C., and Francis Schüssler Fiorenza, eds. *Modern Christian Thought.* Vol. 2, *The Twentieth Century.* With Sarah Coakley and James H. Evans Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government: an Essay Concerning the True Original, Extent and End of Civil Government.* Edited by Richard H. Cox. Wheeling, Ill.: Harlan Davidson, 1982.

Lockwood, David. 'Social Integration and System Integration.' In *Explorations in Social Change,* edited by Georg K. Zollschan and Walter Hirsch, 244–257. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.

Lohmann, Johann Friedrich. *Karl Barth und der Neukantianismus: die Rezeption des Neukantianismus im 'Römerbrief' und ihre Bedeutung für die weitere Ausarbeitung der Theologie Karl Barths.* Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1995.

Lohse, Bernhard. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine.* Translated by F. Ernest Stoeffler. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Lorraine, Tamsin. 'Lines of Flight.' In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr, rev. edn, 147–148. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010.

Los Angeles Daily Times. 'Weird Babel of Tongues: New Sect of Fanatics is Breaking Loose, Wild Scene Last Night on Azusa Street, Gurgle of Wordless Talk by a Sister' (18-4-1906). Republished in *Wild and Weird,* edited by Martin, 25–27.

Los Angeles Examiner. 'Negroes at Revival Talk in Strange Tongues' (11-6-1906). Republished in *Wild and Weird: Azusa Street and Early Pentecostals as Viewed by Los Angeles Newspapers,* edited by Larry Miller, 30–31. Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2012.

Luckmann, Thomas. *The Invisible Religion: the Problem of Religion in Modern Society.* New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Ludwig, Hartmut. '"Die Kirche gehört ja nicht uns ...:" Zur Bedeutung der Gemeinde im Wirken Martin Niemöllers.' *Die Zeichen der Zeit* 36, no. 1 (1982): 26–30.

——. 'Tagung der Bekennenden Kirche in Frankfurt/M.' In *Der Kompromiß von Treysa: die Entstehung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland (EKD) 1945: eine Dokumentation*, edited by Gerhard Besier, Hartmut Ludwig and Jörg Thierfelder, with Michael Losch, Christoph Mehl, Hans-Georg Ulrichs, 9–20. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag, 1995.

Luhmann, Niklas. *Ecological Communication.* Translated by John Bednarz, Jr. Cambridge: Polity; Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989.

Luhrmann, T. M. *When God Talks Back: Understanding the American Evangelical Relationship with God.* New York and Toronto: Vintage Random, 2012.

Lukes, Steven. *Power: a Radical View.* 2nd edn. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

[Lum, Clara]. 'The Old-Time Pentecost.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 1-5-2017.

——. 'The Pentecostal Baptism Restored: the Promised Latter Rain Now Being Poured Out on God's Humble People.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 2 (October 1906): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 27-4-2017.

——. 'Pentecost Has Come.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 1-5-2017.

——. 'Spreading the Full Gospel.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 3 (November 1906): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 27-4-2017.

Luther, Martin. 'On the Freedom of a Christian.' In *On the Freedom of a Christian: with Related Texts,* edited and translated by Tryntje Helfferich, 17–42. Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 2013.

——. 'Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings: Wittenberg, 1545.' In *Selections from his Writings*, edited by John Dillenberger, 3–12. New York: Anchor Books, 1962.

Lutherische Generalsynode, ed. *Bericht über die Tagung der Verfassungsgebenden Generalsynode vom 6. bis 8. Juli 1948 in Eisenach: mit Dokumentenanhang aus den Jahren 1933 bis 1948.* Hanover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1956.

Lynch, Richard A. 'Foucault's Theory of Power.' In Taylor, *Michel Foucault*, 13–26.

Macchia, Frank D. *Baptized in the Spirit: a Global Pentecostal Theology.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2006.

Macmillan, Alexandre. 'Michel Foucault's Techniques of the Self and the Christian Politics of Obedience.' *Theory, Culture and Society* 28, no. 3 (2011): 3–25.

Mahon, Michel. *Foucault's Nitzschean Genealogy: Truth, Power, and the Subject.* Albany, N. Y.: State Univ. of New York Press, 1992.

Mann, Michael. *The Sources of Social Power.* Vol. 1, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760.* Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1986.

Mariña, Jacqueline. *Transformation of the Self in the Thought of Friedrich Schleiermacher.* Oxford and New York: OUP, 2008.

——, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher.* Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2005.

Marquardt, Friedrich-Wilhelm. *Theologie und Sozialismus: das Beispiel Karl Barths.* 3rd edn. Munich: Kaiser, 1985.

Marsden, George M. *Fundamentalism and American Culture.* 2nd edn. Oxford and New York: OUP, 2006.

Marshall, Ruth. *Political Spiritualities: the Pentecostal Revolution in Nigeria.* Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2009.

Martin, David.  *On Secularization: towards a Revised General Theory.*  Aldershot, Hants, and Burlington, Verm.: Ashgate, 2005.

⸺.  *Pentecostalism: the World their Parish.*  Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2002.

⸺.  *Tongues of Fire: the Explosion of Protestantism in Latin America.*  Oxford and Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell, 1990.

Martin, Larry E., ed.  *The Chosen Vessels: Holy Ghost Revival on Azusa Street.*  Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2010.

⸺.  *Saved and Sanctified: Formerly Published as* The True Believers Part 2; *Holy Ghost Revival on Azusa Street.*  Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2005.

⸺.  *Sceptics and Scoffers: the Religious World Looks at Azusa Street: 1906–1907.*  Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2004.

⸺.  *The True Believers: Holy Ghost Revival on Azusa Street.*  Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 1998.

⸺.  *Wild and Weird: Azusa Street and Early Pentecostals as Viewed by Los Angeles Newspapers.*  Pensacola, Fl.: Christian Life Books, 2012.

Massumi, Brian.  *A User's Guide to* Capitalism and Schizophrenia: *Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari.*  Cambridge, Mass., and London: MIT, 1992.

Mattes, Mark C., ed.  *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians.*  Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013.

May, Todd.  *Gilles Deleuze: an Introduction*.  Cambridge and New York: CUP 2005.

⸺.  'Philosophy as a Spiritual Exercise in Foucault and Deleuze.'  *Angelaki* 5, no. 2 (2000): 223–229.

⸺.  *The Philosophy of Foucault.*  Chesham, Bucks.: Acumen, 2006.

Mbembe, Achille.  'African Modes of Self-writing.'  Translated by Steven Rendall.  *Public Culture* 14, no. 1 (2002): 239–273.

——. 'Necropolitics.' Transllated by Libby Meintjes. *Public Culture* 15, no. 1 (2003): 11–40.

——. *On the Postcolony.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: Univ. of California Press, 2001.

——. 'Pouvoir des morts et langage des vivants: les errances de la mémoire nationaliste au Cameroun.' In *Le politique par le bas en Afrique noire,* by Jean-François Bayart, Achille Mbembe and Comi Toulabor, new edn, 155–190. Paris: Karthala, 2008.

McCormack, Bruce L. *Karl Barth's Critically Realistic Dialectical Theology: Its Genesis and Development 1909–1936.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.

McGushin, Edward. 'Foucault's Theory and Practice of Subjectivity.' In *Michel Foucault*, edited by Taylor, 127–142.

——. 'Spirituality.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 472–476. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

McHoul, Alec, and Wendy Grace. *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject.* New York: New York Univ. Press, 1997.

McKay, Heather. 'She Said to Him, He Said to Her: Power Talk in the Bible or Foucault Listens at the Keyhole.' *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 28, no. 2 (1998): 45–51.

McLane, Patrick. 'Majoritarian/Minoritarian.' In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 111–112. Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

——. 'Multiplicity.' In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 121–123. Ottawa: Red Quill, 2012.

McSweeney, John. 'Foucault and Theology.' *Foucault Studies* 2 (2005): 117–144.

——. Review of 'Jonathan Tran, *Foucault and Theology* (London and New York: T and T Clark, 2011), ISBN: 978-0567033437.' *Foucault Studies* 14 (September 2012): 13–217.

McWhorter, Ladelle. 'Normalization.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 315–321. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Mehlmann, Sabine, and Stefanie Soine. 'Gender Studies/Feminismus.' In *Foucault-Handbuch,* edited by Kammler, 367–379.

Meier, Kurt. *Der Evangelische Kirchenkampf: Gesamtdarstellung in drei Bänden, vol. 3: Im Zeichen des zweiten Weltkrieges.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1984.

——. *Kreuz und Hakenkreuz: die evangelische Kirche im Dritten Reich.* Rev. ed. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2001.

Melzer, Karl-Heinrich. *Der Geistliche Vertrauensrat: Geistliche Leitung für die Deutsche Evangelische Kirche im Zweiten Weltkrieg?* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991.

Menacher, Mark D. 'Gerhard Ebeling (1912–2001).' In Mattes, *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians*, edited by Mattes, 307–334.

Meyer, Birgit. *Translating the Devil: Religion and Modernity Among the Ewe in Ghana.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 1999.

Meyer, John W., and Brian Rowan. 'Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony.' *American Journal of Sociology* 83, no. 2 (1977): 830–363.

Michael, Robert T., and Gary S. Becker. 'On the New Theory of Consumer Behavior.' *The Swedish Journal of Economics* 75, no. 4 (1973): 378–396.

Milbank, John. 'Paul against Biopolitics.' In *Paul's New Moment: Continental Philosophy and the Future of Christian Theology*, edited by John Milbank, Slavoj Žižek and Creston Davis, with Catherine Pickstock, 21–73. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos, 2010.

——. *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason.* 2nd edn. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2006.

Milbank, John, Slavoj Žižek and Creston Davis. *Paul's New Moment: Continental Philosophy and the Future of Christian Theology.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Brazos, 2010.

Miller, Glenn T.  *Piety and Profession: American Protestant Theological Education, 1870–1970.*  Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2007.

Miller, Kent D.  'Organizational Research as Practical Theology.' *Organizational Research Methods* 18, no. 2 (2015): 276–299.

Mills, Sara.  *Michel Foucault.*  London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Mintzberg, Henry.  *Power In and Around Organizations.*  Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1983.

Miscov, Jennifer Ann.  'Life on Wings: the Forgotten Life and Theology of Carrie Judd Montgomery (1858–1946).'  Doct. thesis, Birmingham, 2011.

Mitchell, Roger Haydon.  *Church, Gospel, and Empire: How the Politics of Sovereignty Impregnated the West.*  Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2011.

Mol, Annemarie.  'Ontological Politics: a Word and Some Questions.'  In *Actor Network Theory and After,* edited by John Law and John Hassard, 75–89.  Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999.

Moltmann, Jürgen.  *The Church in the Power of the Spirit: a Contribution to Messianic Ecclesiology.*  Translated by Margaret Kohl.  London: SCM, 1977.

——.  *Theology of Hope: on the Ground and the Implications of a Christian Eschatology.*  Translated by James W. Leitch.  London: SCM, 1967.

——.  *The Trinity and the Kingdom: the Doctrine of God.*  Translated by Margaret Kohl.  London: SCM, 1981.

Montgomery, Carrie Judd.  *The Life and Teaching of Carrie Judd Montgomery.*  Edited by Donald W. Dayton.  New York and London: Garland, 1985.

M[oore], J[enny].  'Music from Heaven.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 8.  (May 1907): 3.  ifphc.org, last accessed 20-8-2017.

Morar, Nicolae, and Marjorie Gracieuse.  'Against the Incompatibility Thesis: a Rather Different Reading of the Desire–Pleasure Problem.'  In *Between Deleuze and Foucault*, edited by Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail

and Daniel W. Smith, 232–246. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016.

Morgan, Robert. 'Ernst Troeltsch and the Dialectical Theology.' In *Ernst Troeltsch and the Future of Theology*, edited by John Powell Clayton, 33–80. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1976.

Morar, Nicolae, and Marjorie Gracieuse. 'Against the Incompatibility Thesis: a Rather Different Reading of the Desire—Pleasure Problem.' In *Between Deleuze and Foucault*, edited by Nocolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith, 232–246. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016.

Morton, Barry. '"The Devil Who Heals:" Fraud and Falsification in the Evangelical Career of John G Lake, Missionary to South Africa 1908–1913.' *African Historical Review* 44, no. 2 (2012): 98–118.

Mühlen, Heribert. *A Charismatic Theology: Initiation in the Spirit.* Translated by Edward Quinn and Thomas Linton. London: Burns and Oates; New York and Toronto: Paulist, 1978.

——. *Einübung in die christliche Grunderfahrung,* 2 pts. Mainz: Grünewald, 1976.

——. *Der Heilige Geist als Person: in der Trinität, bei der Inkarnation und im Gnadenbund: Ich—Du—Wir.* 5th edn. Münster: Aschendorff, 1988.

——. *Im-Wir-sein: Grundlegung der Wir-Wissenschaft: Beitrag zu einer wirgemäßen Lebens- und Weltordnung.* Edited by Wilhelm Maas Paderborn: Schöningh, 2008.

——. *Kirche wächst von innen: Weg zu einer glaubensgeschichtlich neuen Gestalt der Kirche: Neubestimmung des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Gesellschaft.* Paderborn: Bonifatius, 1996.

Münker, Stefan, and Alexander Roesler. *Poststrukturalismus*. Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler, 2000.

Murray, Paul D. 'Roman Catholic Theology after Vatican II.' In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 265–286.

Nail, Thomas. 'Biopower and Control.' In *Between Deleuze and Foucault,* edited by Nicolae Morar, Thomas Nail and Daniel W. Smith, 247–263.

Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2016.

Nardoni, Enrique. 'Charisma in the Early Church since Rudolph Sohm: an Ecumenical Challenge.' *Theological Studies,* 53, no. 4 (1992): 646–662.

Naudé, Piet. 'The Reception of Karl Barth in South Africa 1960–1990: Selected Perspectives.' In *Reformed Churches in South Africa and the Struggle for Justice: Remembering 1960–1990,* edited by Mary-Anne Plaatjies-van Huffel and Robert Vosloo, 186–199. Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 2013.

Nealon, Jeffrey T. *Foucault beyond Foucault: Power and Its Intensifications since 1984.* Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2008.

——. 'Historical a Priori.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 200–206. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Negri, Antonio. 'Gilles Deleuze: the How and When of Deleuze-Guattari.' In *Marx and Foucault: Essays Volume 1*, translated by Ed Emery, 166–182. Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2017.

——. 'How and when I Read Foucault.' In *Marx and Foucault: Essays Volume 1*, translated by Ed Emery, 155–165. Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2017

Nelson, Douglas J. 'For Such a Time as This: the Story of Bishop William J. Seymour and the Azusa Street Revival: a Search for Pentecostal/ Charismatic Roots.' Doct. diss., Birmingham, 1981.

Neubert, Erhart. *Eine protestantische Revolution.* Osnabrück: Edition Kontext, 1990.

——. *Geschichte der Opposition in der DDR 1949–1989.* Berlin: Links, 1997.

——. *Kirche und Opposition in der DDR.* Rapporte der Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung Vertretung in Polen, 19. Warsaw: Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung, 2010.

——. *Unsere Revolution: die Geschichte der Jahre 1989/90.* Munich and Zurich: Piper, 2008.

Nicholls, David.  *Deity and Domination: Images of God and the State in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.*  London and New York: Routledge, 1989.

Niemöller, Martin.  'Kirche?—Kirche! Ein Wort zur Stunde ernster Entscheidung.'  *Junge Kirche* 2 (1934): 139–143.

——.  *Reden 1945–1954.*  Darmstadt: Stimme-Verl., 1958.

——.  'Zur Gestaltung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland.'  In *Reden 1945–1954,* 56–62.  Darmstadt: Stimme-Verl., 1958.

O'Farrell, Clare.  *Michel Foucault.*  London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 2005.

Ogden, Steven G.  *The Church, Authority and Foucault: Imagining the Church as an Open Space of Freedom.*  London and New York: Routledge, 2017.

Oksala, Johanna.  'Freedom and Bodies.'  In *Michel Foucault*, edited by Taylor, 85–97.

Oliver, Simon.  'Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: from Participation to Late Modernity.'  In *The Radical Orthodoxy Reader,* edited by John Milbank and Simon Oliver, 3–27.  London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

Olivier, Lawrence.  'La question du pouvoir chez Foucault: espace, stratégie et dispositif.'  *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 21, no. 1 (1988): 83–98.

Orthner, Sherry B.  'Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties.'  *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26, no. 1 (1984): 126–166.

Ortwig, A. W.  'My First Visit to the Azuzu [sic!] Street Pentecostal Mission, Los Angeles, California.'  *The Weekly Evangel* (St. Louis, Miss.) 131 (18-3-1914): 4f. and 7.  ifphc.org, last accessed 1-5-2017.

Otto, Rudolf.  *The Idea of the Holy: an Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and Its Relation to the Rational.*  Translated by John W. Harvey.  2nd edn.  Oxford and New York: OUP, 1950.

Pannenberg, Wolfhart.  *Systematic Theology,* vol. 1.  Translated by

Geoffrey W. Bromiley.  Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991.

Parsons, Talcott.  'On the Political Concept of Power.'  In *Power: a Reader,* edited by Mark Haugaard, 70–112.  Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002.

Pasewark, Kyle A.  *A Theology of Power: Being beyond Domination.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1993.

Patton, Paul.  *Deleuze and the Political.*  London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

——.  'Foucault's Subject of Power.'  In *The Latter Foucault: Politics and Philosophy*, edited by Jeremy Moss, 64–77.  London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1998.

——.  'Mobile Concepts, Metaphor, and the Problem of Referentiality.'  In *Deleuzian Concepts: Philosophy, Colonization, Politics*, 19–40. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford Univ. Press, 2010.

Peirce, Charles S.  'The First Rule of Logic (1898).'  In *The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings,* vol. 2, edited by Nathan Houser et al., 42–56.  Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana Univ. Press, 1998.

Pelikan, Jaroslav.  *Credo: Historical and Theological Guide to Creeds and Confessions of Faith in the Christian Tradition.*  New Haven and London: Yale Univ. Press, 2003.

Percy, Martyn.  'Adventure and Atrophy in a Charismatic Movement: Returning to the "Toronto Blessing."'  *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 20, no. 1 (2005): 71–90.

——.  *The Future Shape of Anglicanism: Currents, Contours, Charts.* London and New York: Routledge, 2017.

——.  'The Morphology of Pilgrimage in the "Toronto Blessing".'  *Religion* 28, no. 3 (1998): 281–288.

——.  *Power and the Church: Ecclesiology in an Age of Transition.*  London and Washington: Cassell, 1998.

——.  '"Sweet Rapture:" Subliminal Eroticism in Contemporary Christian Worship.'  *Journal of Theology and Sexuality* 6 (1997): 70–105

⸺. *Words, Wonders and Power: Understanding Contemporary Christian Fundamentalism and Revivalism.* London: SPCK, 1996.

Pflaum, Michael. *Deleuze's Differenzdenken und die Idiomenkommunikation: eine neue Perspektive der Theologie.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998.

Pfleiderer, Georg. 'Das "prophetische Amt" der Theologie: Zur systematischen Rekonstruktion der Theologie Karl Barths und ihres Entwicklungsgangs.' *Zeitschrift für Dialektische Theologie* 17, no. 2 (2001): 112–138.

⸺. *Karl Barths praktische Theologie: zu Genese und Kontext eines paradigmatischen Entwurfs systematischer Theologie im 20. Jahrhundert.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Piette, Albert. *La Religion de près: l'activité religieuse en train de se faire.* Paris: Métailié, 1999.

⸺. *Le fait religieux: une théorie de la religion ordinaire.* Paris: Economica, 2003.

Pinnock, Sarah K., ed. *The Theology of Dorothee Soelle.* Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Plaatjies-van Huffel, Mary-Anne. 'The Belhar Confession: Born in the Struggle against Apartheid in Southern Africa.' *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 39, no. 1 (2013): 185–203.

Plonz, Sabine. *Die herrenlosen Gewalten: eine Relektüre Karl Barths in befreiungstheologischer Perspektive.* Mainz: Grünewald, 1995.

Poster, Mark. 'Foucault and the Problem of Self-Constitution.' In *Foucault and the Critique of Institutions*, edited by John Caputo and Mark Yount, 63–80. University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 1993.

Powell-Jones, Lindsay, and F. LeRon Shults, eds. *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion.* London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Protevi, John. 'Deleuze and Life.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Deleuze,* edited by Daniel W. Smith and Henry Somers-Hall, 239–264. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2012.

Quash, Ben. 'Hans Urs von Balthasar.' In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 106–123.

Raffnsøe, Sverre, Marius Gudmand-Høyer and Morten S. Thaning. *Michel Foucault: a Research Companion.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *Called to Communion: Understanding the Church Today.* San Francisco, Cal.: Ignatius Press, 1996.

Redell, Petra Carlsson. *Mysticism as Revolt: Foucault, Deleuze and Theology beyond Representation.* Aurora, Col.: Davies Group, 2014.

Rendtorff, Trutz. 'Der ethische Sinn der Dogmatik: Zur Reformierung des Verhältnisses von Dogmatik und Ethik bei Karl Barth.' In *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* by Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, edited by Trutz Rendtorff, 119–134. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975.

——, ed. *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths.* Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975.

——. 'Radikale Autonomie Gottes: Zum Verständnis der Theologie Karl Barths und ihrer Folgen.' In *Theorie des Christentums: Historisch-theologische Studien zu seiner neuzeitlichen Verfassung,* 161–181. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1972.

Revel, Judith. 'Power.' In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 377–385. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Riesebrodt, Martin, and Mary Ellen Konieczny. 'Sociology of Religion.' In *The Routledge Companion to the Study of Religion*, edited by John Hinnells, 2nd edn, 145–164. London and New York: Routledge, 2010.

Robbins, Lionel. *An Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science.* London: Macmillan, 1932.

Robeck, Cecil M. Jr. *The Azusa Street Mission and Revival: the Birth of the Global Pentecostal Movement.* Nashville, Tenn.: Nelson, 2006.

——. 'Bartleman, Frank.' In *The New International Dictionary of*

*Pentecostal and Charismatic Movements,* edited by Stanley M. Burgess, with Eduard M. van der Maas, 366. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2002.

——. 'The Origins of Modern Pentecostalism: Some Historiographical Issues.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism,* edited by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, and Amos Yong, 3–30. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

——. 'The Writings and Thought of Frank Bartleman.' In *Witness to Pentecost,* by Bartleman, vii–xxviii.

Robeck, Cecil M. Jr., and Amos Yong. 'Global Pentecostalism: an Introduction to an Introduction.' In *The Cambridge Companion to Pentecostalism*, edited by Cecil M. Robeck, Jr, and Amos Yong, 1–10. Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Robertson, Roland. 'Glocalization: Time-space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity.' In *Global Modernities,* edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson, 25–44. London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1995.

Robinson, Keith, ed. *Deleuze, Whitehead, Bergson: Rhizomatic Connections.* Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Roessler, Philip. *Ethnic Politics and State Power in Africa: the Logic of the Coup–Civil War Trap.* Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2016.

Roffe, Jonathan. 'Multiplicity.' In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr, rev. edn, 181–182. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010.

Rohls, Jan. *Protestantische Theologie der Neuzeit.* Vol. 2, *Das 20. Jahrhundert.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Roon, Ger van. *Widerstand im Dritten Reich: ein Überblick.* 6th edn. Munich: Beck, 1994.

Root, Andrew. 'Regulating the Empirical in Practical Theology: on Critical Realism, Divine Action, and the Place of the Ministerial.' *Journal of Youth and Theology* 15, no. 1 (2016): 3–22.

Rosa, [Adolph]. 'Bro. Rosa's Testimony.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los

Angeles) 1, no. 2 (October 1906): 1.  ifphc.org, last accessed 3-5-2017.

Rouse, Joseph.  'Power/Knowledge.'  In *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*, edited by Gary Gutting, 2nd edn, 95–122.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2003.

Ruhbach, Gerhard.  'Das Betheler Bekenntnis.'  In *Die lutherischen Kirchen und die Bekenntnissynode von Barmen: Referate des internationalen Symposiums auf der Reisensburg 1984,* edited by Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, 56–72.  Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1984.

Ruoff, Michael.  *Foucault-Lexikon: Entwicklungen—Kernbegriffe—Zusammenhänge.*  2nd edn.  Paderborn: Fink, 2009.

Sandeen, Ernest R.  *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Milleniarism, 1800–1930.*  Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1970.

Savoia, Paolo.  'Madness.'  In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 273–280.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

Schilbrack, Kevin.  'Religion, Models of, and Reality: Are We through with Geertz?'  *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 73, no. 2 (2005): 429–452.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich.  *The Christian Faith.*  3rd edn.  London and New York: Bloomsbury T. and T. Clark, 2016.

———.  *On Religion: Speeches to its Cultured Despisers.*  Edited by Richard Crouter.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1988.

———.  *Selections from Friedrich Schleiermacher's Christian Ethics*.  Edited and translated by James M. Brandt.  Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 2011.

Schmädeke, Jürgen, and Peter Steinbach, eds.  *Der Widerstand gegen den Nationalsozialismus: die deutsche Gesellschaft und der Widerstand gegen Hitler.*  3rd edn.  Munich and Zurich: Piper, 1994.

Schmidt, Aurel.  'Gilles Deleuze und Félix Guattari oder Der Anti-Ödipus und die molekulare Revolution.'  In *Französische Denker der Gegenwart: zwanzig Porträts,* by Jürg Altwegg and Aurel Schmidt,  62–

70.  Munich: Beck, 1987.

Schmidt, Jürgen.  *Martin Niemöller im Kirchenkampf.*  Hamburg: Leibniz, 1971.

Schneider, Thomas Martin.  *Gegen den Zeitgeist: der Weg der VELKD als lutherischer Bekenntniskirche.*  Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2008.

Schneider-Flume, Gunda.  *Die politische Theologie Emanuel Hirschs 1918–1933.*  Bern: H. Lang; Frankfurt: P. Lang, 1971.

Scholder, Klaus.  *The Churches and the Third Reich*.  2 vols.  Translated by John Bowden.  London: SCM, 1987–88.

——.  'Modern German History and Protestant Theology: Aspects and Questions.'  In *A Requiem for Hitler: and Other New Perspectives on the German Church Struggle*, 35–60.  London: SCM, 1989.

Schultz, Theodore W.  'The Emerging Economic Scene and Its Relation to High School Education.'  In *The High School in a New Era,* edited by Francis S. Chase and Harold A. Anderson, 97–109.  Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1958.

Schüßler, Werner.  *Paul Tillich*.  Munich: Beck, 1997.

——.  '"Gott über Gott:" Ein Zentralbegriff Paul Tillichs.'  In *Was uns unbedingt angeht*, 133–141.

——.  'Paul Tillich und Karl Barth: ihre erste Begegnung in den zwanziger Jahren.'  In Schüßler, *Was und unbedingt angeht*, 119–130.

——.  'Protestantisches Prinzip versus natürliche Theologie?: zu Paul Tillichs Problemen mit einer natürlichen Theologie.'  In *Was und unbedingt angeht,* 161–173.

——.  '"Was uns unbedingt angeht": Aspekte des religionsphilosophischen Denkens Paul Tillichs.'  In *Was uns unbedingt angeht*, 143–160.

——.  *"Was uns unbedingt angeht": Studien zur Theologie und Philosophie Paul Tillichs*.  2nd edn.  Münster: Lit, 2004.

Schwarz, Hans.  'Paul Althaus (1888–1966).'  In *Twentieth-Century*

*Lutheran Theologians*, edited by Mattes, 136–154.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Church Order in the New Testament.* Translated by Frank Clarke. London: SCM, 1961.

——. *Das Leben des Herrn in der Gemeinde und ihren Diensten.* Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1946.

Schwöbel, Christoph. 'Wolfhart Pannenberg.' In *Modern Theologians*, edited by Ford, 129–146.

Second Vatican Council. 'Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (*Lumen Gentium*).' In *Vatican 2: the Essential Texts,* edited by Norman Tanner, 100–188. New York: Image Random House: 2012.

[Seymour, William J.]. 'The Ordinances Taught by our Lord.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 10 (September 1907): 2. ifphc.org, last accessed 1-5-2017.

——. 'The Apostolic Faith Movement.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 2. ifphc.org, last accessed 25-4-2017.

Shapin, Steve, and Simon Schaffer. *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life.* New edn. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton Univ. Press, 2011.

Sheerattan-Bisnauth, Patricia. 'Confessing Faith Together in the Economy: the Accra Confession and Covenanting for Justice Movement.' *International Review of Mission* 97, no. 386–387 (2008): 233–244.

Shields, Rob. 'Line, Line of Flight.' In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 99–101. Ottawa: Red Quill, 2012.

Shults, F. LeRon. 'The Atheist Machine.' In *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion*, edited by Lindsay Powell-Jones and F. Leron Shults, 163–192. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.

——. *Iconoclastic Theology: Gilles Deleuze and the Secretion of Atheism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2014.

Siebenpfeiffer, Hania. 'Körper.' In *Foucault-Handbuch,* edited by Kammler, 266–272.

Simpson, Christopher Ben. *Deleuze and Theology.* London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2012.

——. 'Divine Life: Difference, Becoming, and the Trinity.' In *Deleuze and the Schizoanalysis of Religion,* edited by Lindsay Powell-Jones and F. LeRon Shults, 59–73. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Smit, D. J. 'A *Status Confessionis* in South Africa?' *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 47 (1984): 21–46.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Vol. 1. Edited by R. H. Campbell and A. S. Skinner, with W. B. Todd. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

Smith, Daniel W. 'Deleuze and the Question of Desire: towards an Immanent Theory of Ethics.' In *Deleuze and Ethics*, edited by Nathan Jun and Daniel W. Smith, 123–141. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2011.

——. *The Logic of Sense*. Edited by Constantin V. Boundas. Translated by Mark Lester, with Charles Stivale. London: Athlone, 1990.

——. *Nietzsche and Philosophy.* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson. London and New York: Continuum, 1986.

Smith, James K. A. *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: Mapping a Post-secular Theology.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, and Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2004.

——. *Thinking in Tongues: Pentecostal Contributions to Christian Philosophy.* Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010.

——. *Who's Afraid of Postmodernism?: taking Derrida, Lyotard, and Foucault to Church.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2006.

Smith-von Osten, Annemarie. *Von Treysa 1945 bis Eisenach 1948: zur Geschichte der Grundordnung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980.

Söhlmann, Fritz ed. *Treysa 1945: die Konferenz der evangelischen Kirchenführer 27.–31. August 1945; mit einem Bericht über die Synode der Bekennenden Kirche in Berlin-Spandau 29.–31. Juli 1945 und über die unmittelbar vorangegangenen Tagungen des Reichsbruderrates und*

*des Lutherischen Rates.*  Lüneburg: Heliand, 1946.

Sölle, Dorothee.  *Mutanfälle: Texte zum Umdenken.*  Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe, 1994.

Sontheimer, Kurt.  'Anti-democratic Thought in the Weimar Republic.'  In *The Road to Dictatorship: Germany 1918–1933*, translated by Lawrence Wilson, 39–56.  London: Wolff, 1964.

——.  *Antidemokratisches Denken in der Weimarer Republik: die politischen Ideen des deutschen Nationalismus zwischen 1918 und 1933.*  Munich: DTV, 1978.

Sparn, Walter.  '"Extra Internum": die christologische Revision der Prädestinationslehre in Karl Barths Erwählungslehre.'  In *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* by Falk Wagner, Walter Sparn, Friedrich Wilhelm Graf and Trutz Rendtorff, edited by Trutz Rendtorff, 44–75.  Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975.

Spieckermann, Ingrid.  *Gotteserkenntnis: Ein Beitrag zur Grundfrage der neuen Theologie Karl Barths.*  Munich: Kaiser, 1985.

Spotts, Frederic.  *The Churches and Politics in Germany.*  Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1973.

Sprinkle, Stephen V.  'A God at the Margins?: Marcella Althaus-Reid and the Marginality of LGBT People.'  *Journal of Religious Leadership* 8, no. 2 (2009): 57–83.

Stagoll, Cliff.  'Becoming.'  In *The Deleuze Dictionary*, edited by Adrian Parr, rev. ed., 25–27.  Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2010.

Stanley, Susie Cunningham.  *Feminist Pillar of Fire: the Life of Alma White.*  Cleveland, Oh.: Pilgrim Press, 1993.

Stasiewski, Bernhard.  'Die Kirchenpolitik der Nationalsozialisten im Warthegau 1939–1945.'  *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 7, no. 1 (1959): 46–74.

Stayer, James M.  *Martin Luther, German Saviour: German Evangelical Theological Factions and the Interpretation of Luther, 1917–1933.*  Montreal and Kingston, Ont.: McGill-Queen's Univ. Press, 2000.

Stephenson, Christopher A.  *Types of Pentecostal Theology: Method, System, Spirit.*  Oxford and New York: OUP, 2013.

Strohm, Christoph.  *Die Kirchen im Dritten Reich.*  2nd rev. edn.  Munich: Beck, 2017.

Sundermeier, Theo.  *The Individual and Community in African Traditional Religions.*  Hamburg: Lit, 1998.

Suurmond, Jean-Jacques.  *Word and Spirit at Play: towards a Charismatic Theology.*  Translated by John Bowden.  London: SCM, 1994.

Sykes, Stephen.  *Power and Christian Theology.*  London and New York: Continuum, 2006.

Synan, Vinson.  *The Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition: Charismatic Movements in the Twentieth Century.*  2nd edn.  Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997.

——, ed. *Spirit-Empowered Christianity in the Twenty-First Century.*  Lake Mary, Fl.: Charisma Strang, 2011.

Synan, Vinson, and Charles R. Fox, Jr.  *William J. Seymour: Pioneer of the Azusa Street Revival.*  Edited by Harold J. Chadwick.  Alachua, Fl.: Bridge-Logos, 2012.

Taylor, Charles.  *Modern Social Imaginaries.*  Durham, N. Car., and London: Duke Univ. Press, 2004.

Taylor, Dianna.  'Abnormal.'  In *The Cambridge Foucault Lexicon*, edited by Leonard Lawlor and John Nale, 3–9.  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2014.

——. 'Introduction: Power, Freedom and Subjectivity.'  In *Michel Foucault,* edited by Dianna Taylor, 1–9.

——, ed. *Michel Foucault: Key Concepts*.  London and New York: Routledge, 2014.

Taylor, Mark C.  *Erring: a Postmodern A/theology.*  Chicago and London: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1984.

Taylor, Mark Kline.  *Paul Tillich: Theologian of the Boundaries*.  London

and San Francisco: Collins, 1987.

Tempels, Placide. *Bantu Philosophy.* Translated by Colin King. Paris: Présence Africaine, 1959.

The Apostolic Faith Mission Winnipeg. 'Winnipeg, Can.' *The Apostolic Faith* (Los Angeles) 1, no. 12 (January 1908): 1. ifphc.org, last accessed 27/4/2017.

'The Confessioun of Faith Professit and Belevit be the Protestantes within the Realme of Scotland. Publisched be Thaim in Parliament. And be the Estatis thairof Ratifeit and Apprevit, as Hailsum and Sound Doctryne Groundit upon the Infallible Treuth of Goddis Worde.' In *Bekenntnisschriften und Kirchenordnungen der nach Gottes Wort reformierten Kirche,* edited by Wilhelm Niesel, with Wilhelm Boudriot et al., 2nd edn, 79–117. Zollikon-Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1938.

The Lutheran World Federation. 'History of the LWF Assemblies since 1947.' From the LWF Institutional Memory. 2014. www.lutheranworld.org, last accessed 15-6-2017.

——. *In Christ—a New Community: the Proceedings of the Sixth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, June 13–25, 1977.* Ed. Arne Sovik. Geneva: LWF, 1977.

——. 'Transforming Economic Globalization.' In *For the Healing of the World: Official Report: the Lutheran World Federation Tenth Assembly Winnipeg, Canada, 21–31 July 2003,* 60–62. Geneva: LWF, 2004.

Thierfelder, Jörg. *Das Kirchliche Einigungswerk des württembergischen Landesbischofs Theophil Wurm.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975.

——. 'Die Kirchenpolitik der vier Besatzungsmächte und die evangelische Kirche nach der Kapitulation 1945.' In *Evangelische Kirche nach dem Nationalsozialismus,* edited by Wolf Schieder, 5–21. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1992.

Thomas, John Christopher. 'Women, Pentecostals and the Bible.' *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 5 (1994): 41–56.

Thompson, Kevin. 'From the Historical *a priori* to the *dispositif*: Foucault,

the Phenomenological Legacy, and the Problem of Transcendental Genesis.' *Continental Philosophical Review* 49, no. 1 (2016): 41–54.

Torrance, Thomas F. *Karl Barth: an Introduction to his Early Theology, 1910–1931.* London: SCM, 1962.

Tillich, Paul. 'Existential Philosophy (1944).' In *Main Works/Hauptwerke,* vol. 1, *Philosophical Writings/Philosophische Schriften*, 353–380. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter; Frankfurt: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1989.

——. *On the Boundary: an Autobiographical Sketch.* Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2011.

——. 'What is Wrong with "Dialectic" Theology?' In *Theologian of the Boundaries*, edited by Mark Kline Taylor, 104–116. London and San Francisco: Collins, 1987.

Tracy, David. *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism.* New York: Crossroad, 1981.

Tran, Jonathan. *Foucault and Theology.* London and New York: T. and T. Clark, 2011.

'Ein Trinitatis-Gespräch 1941.' Evangelisches Zentralarchiv, Berlin.

Troeltsch, Ernst. *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches.* Vol. 1. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: Allen and Unwin; New York: Macmillan, 1931.

Ulrichs, Karl Friedrich. 'Käsemann, Ernst.' In *Biographisch-biliographisches Kirchenlexikon,* vol. 18, edited by Friedrich-Wilhelm Bautz and Traugott Bautz, 775–778. Herzberg: Bauz, 2001.

Utzinger, J. Michael. *Yet Saints Their Watch Are Keeping: Fundamentalists, Modernists, and the Development of Evangelical Ecclesiology, 1887–1937.* Macon, Georg.: Mercer Univ. Press, 2006.

Valdez, A. C., Sr. 'Fire on Azusa Street.' In *Saved and Sanctified,* edited by Martin, 47–55.

Ven, Johannes A. van der. 'Practical Theology: from Applied to Empirical Theology.' *Journal of Empirical Theology* 1, no. 1 (1988): 7–27

Vintges, Karen.  'Freedom and Spirituality.'  In *Michel Foucault*, edited by Taylor, 99–110.

Vondey, Wolfgang.  *Beyond Pentecostalism: the Crisis of Global Christianity and the Renewal of the Theological Agenda.*  Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2010.

——.  *Heribert Mühlen: His Theology and Praxis: a New Profile of the Church.*  Dallas: Univ. Press of America, 2004.

Wagner, Falk.  'Gehlens radikalisierter Handlungsbegriff: ein theologischer Beitrag zur interdisziplinären Forschung.'  *Zeitschrift für Evangelische Ethik* 17, no. 1 (1973): 213–229.

——.  'Politische Theorie des Nationalsozialismus als politische Theologie.'  In *Kritik der politischen Theologie,* by Manfred Baumotte, Hans-Walter Schütte, Falk Wagner and Horst Renz, 29–51.  Munich: Kaiser, 1973.

——.  'Theologische Gleichschaltung: Zur Christologie bei Karl Barth.'  In *Die Realisierung der Freiheit: Beiträge zur Kritik der Theologie Karl Barths,* edited by Trutz Rendtorff, 10–43.  Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1975.

Wakefield, Gavin.  *Alexander Boddy: Pentecostal Anglican Pioneer.*  London and Colorado Springs: Paternoster, 2007.

Wallin, Jason.  'Animal/Becoming-Animal.'  In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Inroductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 17–20.  Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

——.  'Immanence/Plane of Immanence.'  In *Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts*, edited by Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee, 87–90.  Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012.

Walter, Gregory A.  'Karl Holl (1866–1926).'  In *Twentieth-Century Lutheran Theologians*, edited by Mattes, 56–69.

Ward, Graham.  *Barth, Derrida and the Language of Theology.*  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 1995.

——.  *Cultural Transformation and Religious Practice.*  Cambridge and New York: CUP, 2004.

——. 'Kulturkritik im Dienste der Theologie.' In *Gottes und des Menschen Tod?: die Theologie vor der Herausforderung Michel Foucaults*, edited by Christian Bauer and Michael Hölzl, 129–141. Mainz: Grünewald, 2003.

——. 'Postmodern Theology.' In *The Modern Theologians: an Introduction to Christian Theology Since 1918*, edited by David F. Ford, with Rachel Muers, 3rd edn, 322–338. Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2005.

——, ed. *The Postmodern God: a Theological Reader.* Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1997.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society: an Outline of Interpretive Sociology.* 2 vols. Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: Univ. of California Press, 1978.

——. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology.* Edited and translated by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

——. *The Methodology of the Social Sciences.* Edited and translated by Edward A. Shils and Henry A. Finch. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Pr., 1949.

——. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations*. Edited by Talcott Parsons. Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Free Press, 1947.

——. 'The Three Types of Legitimate Rule.' Translated by Hans Gerth. In *Berkeley Publications in Society and Institutions* 4, no. 1 (1958): 1–11.

Weber, Max, Ernst Troeltsch, Georg Simmel and Ferdinand Toennies. 'Max Weber on Church, Sect and Mysticism.' *Sociological Analysis* 34, no. 2 (1973): 140–149.

Welch, Sharon D. *Communities of Resistance and Solidarity:a Feminist Theology of Liberation*. Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 1985.

Welker, Michael. 'Alfred North Whitehead's Basic Philosophical Problem: the Development of a Relativistic Cosmology.' Translated by Eric von der Luft and Frank Eberhardt. *Process Studies* 16, no. 1 (1987): 1–25.

——. 'Creation as the Heavens and the Earth.' In *Creation and Reality,* translated by John F. Hoffmeyer, 33–44. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress,

1999.

——. 'Das Reich Gottes.' *Evangelische Theologie* 52, no. 6 (1992): 497–512.

——. *God the Revealed: Christology.* Translated by Douglas W. Stott. Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2013.

——. *God the Spirit.* Translated by John F. Hoffmeyer. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1994.

Whitehead, A[lfred] N[orth]. *The Concept of Nature: Tarner Lectures Delivered in Trinity College, November 1919.* Cambridge: CUP, 1920.

——. *Process and Reality: an Essay in Cosmology: Gifford Lectures Delivered in the University of Edinburgh During the Session 1927–28.* Ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. Corr. edn. New York and London: Free Press, 1979.

——. *Science and the Modern World: Lowell Lectures, 1925.* New York: Free Press, 1967.

Winzeler, Peter. *Widerstehende Theologie: Karl Barth 1920–35.* Stuttgart: Alector, 1982.

Wischnath, Rolf. 'Bekennen in der Friedensfrage: Eine Erinnerung an die Reformierte Friedenserklärung 1982.' Paper presented October 2015 in Hanover and in Hildesheim. www.info-reformiert.de, last accessed 17-6-2017.

Wolf, Erik. 'Gutachten über die rechtmäßige Neuordnung der Leitung der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland.' In *Treysa 1945,* edited by Söhlmann, 181–195.

World Alliance of Reformed Churches. 'Covenanting for Justice: the Accra Confession.' *Reformed World* 55, no. 3 (2005): 185–190.

——. *Ottawa 1982: Proceedings of the 21st General Council of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (Presbyterian and Congregational).* Edited by Edmund Perret. Geneva: WARC, 1983.

Wrong, Dennis H. *Power: Its Forms, Bases, and Uses.* New edn. New Brunswick and London: Transaction, 1995.

Yoder, John Howard.  *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster.*  2nd edn. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1994.

Yong, Amos.  'On Divine Presence and Divine Agency: toward a Foundational Pneumatology.' *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies* 3, no. 2 (2000): 167–188.

—–. *The Spirit Poured Out on All Flesh: Pentecostalism and the Possibility of Global Theology.*  Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2005.

—–. *Spirit—Word—Community: Theological Hermeneutics in Trinitarian Perspective.*  Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2002.

Zahl, Simeon.  'Experience.'  In *The Oxford Handbook of Nineteenth-Century Christian Thought*, edited by Joel D. S. Rasmussen, Judith Wolfe and Johannes Zachhuber, 177–195.  Oxford and New York: OUP, 2017.

Zamora, Daniel.  'Foucault, the Excluded, and the Neoliberal Erosion of the State.'  In *Foucault and Neoliberalism*, edited by Zamora, 63–84.

Zamora, Daniel, and Michael C. Behrent, ed.  *Foucault and Neoliberalism*. Cambridge and Malden, Mass.: Polity, 2016.

blank page