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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.
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I NTRODUCTION: 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

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 existentialism 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 commonsensual location within a ‘bigger picture’—of one’s relevant relational field. 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]).

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.

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,’ 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


and a different theology and church practice.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{9} Moltmann also points out that monotheism has been the cause of equally important ecclesiological implications


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

---

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.’ 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.


or through hermeneutical experience and formation. 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. 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.


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.  

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

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. 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.’ 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. Around an inner circle of


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—

The ‘empirical turn’ in practical theology unseats,

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}


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. 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

\[\text{der Evangelischen Kirche in Hessen und Nassau} \text{ (Frankfurt: EPV, 1993).}\]

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
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{25} Besides giving religion the powerful, social function of ritualistically integrating a group or society, Durkheim points out that religious encounter strengthens and empowers.\textsuperscript{26} He sees this facilitated by

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{24} Milbank, \textit{Theology and Social Theory}.
\textsuperscript{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 \textit{stronger}: He
\end{flushleft}
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.


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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{31} and Marxist theory sees religion as


\textsuperscript{31} Peter L. Berger, \textit{The Social Reality of Religion} (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973); Thomas Luckmann, \textit{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

______________


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.  

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.’

---


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.’\textsuperscript{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

\begin{quote}
Ephraim Fischoff et al. (Berkeley, Cal., and London: Univ. of California Press, 1978), 1204ff.
\end{quote}

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. 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

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


(Percy),\textsuperscript{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 ‘ineradically evaluative’ nature of all theoretical accounts of power.\textsuperscript{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


‘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.’" 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. 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. 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


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

definition. 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, 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.

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. As Foucauldian—and relating—theorisations emphasise, the rules, 


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. 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

efficacy of power (including the deployment of myths) from a place of moral agnosticism.\textsuperscript{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 distinguishes 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,

for example, a sub-Saharan ‘politics of the belly’ (Bayart).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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


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


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. We have shown, ideologically compartmentalised theorisation of power facilitates messy and badly understood practical deployments and relevances of power in Christian/organisational situations. 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. 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. 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.


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\(^\text{58}\) conceals and obscures the very resources and operations by which power becomes established and operates.\(^\text{59}\) 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. 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

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

---


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—\textsuperscript{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

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.’ 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

---

between theory and practice. 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.’ 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.

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.
69 Foucault and Deleuze, ‘Intellectuals and Power,’ 208.
consider right within their field.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{73}


\textsuperscript{71} Foucault, ‘Powers and Strategies,’ 145.


\textsuperscript{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. 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. 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


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.’

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. 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-)Foucauldian understanding is to be achieved through a contemporary-strategical revisiting/


77 O’Farrell, Michel Foucault, 50ff.
transformation of Foucault’s progressive insights and theory developments, beginning with his theorisation of power in the 1970s. 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.

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. Foucault’s historico-analytical theorisations always include

---

78 Nealon, *Foucault beyond 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


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. 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. 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. 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.
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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;’\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{86} See the literature review at the end of this chapter.


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

---


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


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


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.  

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’).  

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.  

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


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. 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. 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. 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.


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.\textsuperscript{105} As Clegg, Foucault and Deleuze make clear (see above), either approach of beginning systematic-

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;\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{108}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
or, for that matter, Schleiermacher’s theology and ethics, 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.’ When, in this thesis, such words are used, the primary reference specifically denotes accounts of Pentecostal and charismatic-Christian experiences and

---


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).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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


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.  


(3) *Foucault and Pentecostal experience/practice*

Global Pentecostalism features a ‘great diversity’ of theological, practical, organisational and cultural expressions. 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
successful adaption to modernity.\footnote{Harvey Cox, \textit{Fire from Heaven: the Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-First Century} (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1995), 81.} 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.’\footnote{Foucault, \textit{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,’ \textit{Method and Theory in the Study of Religion} 23, no. 3–4 (2011): 283ff.} 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.\footnote{Land, \textit{Pentecostal Spirituality}, 1, 2 and passim; Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1, 5 and passim; Foucault, \textit{The Use of Pleasure: Volume 2 of The History of Sexuality}, tr. Robert Hurley (New York: Vintage, 1990), 5 and passim.} 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
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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{119} Such an exploration of emergent
construction is pursued, in particular in chapter 6, through a study of
Bartleman’s ministry accounts.\textsuperscript{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


\textsuperscript{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 Foucault.’ 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


banking crisis of 2008, can also be conceptualised in terms of Foucault’s historical readings of liberalism and neo-liberalism. 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. Subsequent to a ‘final-Foucault’ focus, important earlier power-analytical differentiations—and thus resources—can be overlooked.


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


shifts to the third, ethical/aesthetical concern.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{generalised} analytical frame, rather than annotating relevant Foucauldian texts, insights and interpretations.


\textsuperscript{130} Bernauer, \textit{Foucault’s Force of Flight}, 178ff.; Bernauer and Mahon, ‘Michel Foucault’s Ethical Imagination;’ Fuggle, \textit{Foucault/Paul}.

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. 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. 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.

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. 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

this thesis developed.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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, \textit{as an effect}, which emerges from the interconnection of different, disparate, practical-theological and historical

\begin{enumerate}
\item DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 3ff.
\item ‘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, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 238. Ibid., 10ff. and 232ff.; Jason Wallin, ‘Animal/Becoming-Animal,’ in \textit{Demystifying Deleuze: an Introductory Assemblage of Crucial Concepts}, ed. Rob Shields and Mickey Vallee (Ottawa: Red Quill Books, 2012), 17ff.; Adkins, \textit{DG’s A Thousand Plateaus}, 141ff.; Holland, \textit{DG’s A Thousand Plateaus}, 102ff.
\end{enumerate}
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.
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

141 Brown, Undoing the Demos, 17ff.
other side, sees Foucault ‘offering the apology’ of Chicago-school neo-
liberalism. 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. Recent theological contributions engage
with Foucault’s and Agamben’s theorisations of neo-liberalism and
‘biopolitics.’ 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
and the Left,’ in Foucault and Neoliberalism, ed. Daniel Zamora and
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 Governementalität (Berlin and Hamburg: Argument, 1997);
Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, ed., Foucault and
Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of
Rationality: an Introduction,’ in The Foucault Effect: Studies in
Governmentality, ed. Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Millner

144 Dotan Leshem, The Origins of Neoliberalism: Modeling the Economy from
Jesus to Foucault (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,\textsuperscript{145} chapter 3.6 limits its textual base to the content of Foucault’s lecture series.\textsuperscript{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.

\textit{(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

\textit{the West} (Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 131ff.

145 Käsemann, ‘Ministry and Community.’

146 Foucault, \textit{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.’

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; however, even across the


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{149} Albert Piette, \textit{La Religion de près: l’activité religieuse en train de se faire}, (Paris: Métailié, 1999).

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


single argument and rationale. After Foucault’s death, Deleuze offers an ‘accurate’ translation of Foucault into his own metaphysical concern. 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,’ 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. ‘Desire’ is thus the distributed-


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.’ 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, 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.’

In particular, earlier interpretations of DG see ‘desiring-production’ as an essential connecting link between the two volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* On the other hand, many of the more recent


interpretations emphasise Deleuze’s long-running concern with Spinozan-
metaphysical continuity which conversely links *A Thousand Plateaus* with
*Difference and Repetition*. 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,’ 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. 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
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.

John Law and John Hassard (Oxford and Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1999),
1ff.; Latour, ‘Powers of Association;’ Callon and Latour, ‘Unscrewing the
Big Leviathan.’
reading Foucault through Deleuze reinforces a unification of Foucault’sotherwise multifarious power theory through both ‘biopower’ (cf.
Deleuze’s ‘control societies’) and Foucault’s eventual ethical concern.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{A
Thousand Plateaus}.\textsuperscript{165} Despite a growing interest in Deleuze, the
researcher is not aware of any substantial theological use of DG’s ‘rhizome’
to date.\textsuperscript{166} A subversive-analytical (post-structuralist) ‘justification’ of such

\begin{flushleft}


\textsuperscript{166} Ward identifies the difference between modern and post-modern culture in
\end{flushleft}
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

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.

rhizomic organisation: swarms, ‘wasp and orchid,’ fungal mycelia, creativity, the neural structure of the brain etc., 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.

169 Several of these are mentioned explicitly in DG’s ‘Rhizome’ chapter: DG, Thousand Plateaus, 6ff.
170 DG, Thousand Plateaus, 7ff.
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,’ \textsuperscript{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. \textsuperscript{172}

Testing out the analytical capacities—and general suitability—of

\textsuperscript{171} Law, ‘Actor Network Theory,’ 141 and passim.

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.’ 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.’ 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.

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.


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.’ Thereby, ‘lines of articulation or segmentarity, strata and territories’ must never be seen to exclude ‘lines of flight, movements of deterritorialization and destratification.’ 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. 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.


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 assignifying 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.\(^{182}\)


\(^{181}\) 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, 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

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.
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. 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. 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.’

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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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’ theological interpretation/critique of the ‘domination’ power of Pentecostal


leadership (John Wimber). According to Percy—then—‘charismatic’ evangelical leaders conflate an ideologically (theologically and relationally) regulated divine power with leadership domination. 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.’ 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


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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


\textsuperscript{196} Cf. Latour, \textit{Reassembling the Social}, 227ff. and 52.
culturally productive innovation. 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. Drogers also gives ‘play’ methodological priority in the pursuit of thick ethnographic description, thereby replicating poststructuralist epistemological sensitivities. 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.’ By way—mainly—of an implicit dogmatic assumption, Sykes reaffirms a paramount

197 Droogers, Play and Power.

198 Vondey, Beyond Pentecostalism.


200 On the side of political theory and sociology, Sykes engages in particular with Lukes’ neo-Marxian ‘three-dimensional’ theorisation: Lukes, Power.
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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. 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. Kearsley attends to—and, in some respects, misconstrues—Foucault’s theorisations of

201 Sykes, Power and Christian Theology.

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.\(^\text{205}\) 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.\(^\text{206}\) 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.

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.

Foucault’s work into power relations and modern identity formation.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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


\textsuperscript{212} Marshall, \textit{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 Deleuze–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.

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.


\(^{218}\) 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.  

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

220 Piette, Religion de près.
situation,’ ‘beyond imperialistic monocultures’ and ‘beyond nature.’

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.

221 Welker, God the Spirit, 108, 124, 134, 147 and 158.

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. 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’

against tyrannical oppression. 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. 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. Bernauer understands


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.’

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.

Fuggle deepens such a

365ff.


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.’

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’


‘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.*

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. 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. 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


and resonates DG’s work on *Capitalism and Schizophrenia.*

Whereas previous theological engagements with Foucault and other post-structuralists were often framed in terms of ‘postmodern’ philosophy and culture, 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.

---


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.\textsuperscript{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’).\textsuperscript{238} Hart and Simpson refer to Deleuze in terms of an absolutising metaphysics of

\begin{flushright}

\end{flushright}
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. 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. 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.


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. 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. 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 Hinlucky, 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

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.

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. 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.’ 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.’

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.’


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 Godself 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,


256 Justaert, Theology after Deleuze, 35f.

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

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, particularly 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.*

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) 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-
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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 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.’\textsuperscript{3} He considers Weber, alongside Foucault, pointing to the modern-
disciplinary challenge and the relevance of resistance to organisational
legitimacy;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{6} These are just a selection of the relevant theorists

\textsuperscript{3} Clegg, Frameworks of Power, 84, 209 and passim. Ibid., 211ff.; Dahl,
‘Concept of Power;’ Dahl, ‘Power.’

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{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.’

\textsuperscript{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
that Clegg’s framework engages as it aims to supersede Lukes’ modern-obsolete ‘three-dimensional power.’ 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, 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

understanding of power relations that are less reinforced, further distributed, frequently evolving, fluid, shifting and vague. Clegg’s ‘relations of meaning and membership’\textsuperscript{[10]} are fixed and reified through ‘obligatory’ nodal or passage points.\textsuperscript{[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.\textsuperscript{[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.\textsuperscript{[13]}

In order to be successful, according to Foucault, an “‘analytics” of power’ must leave behind a Hobbesian, purely negative concern with

\textsuperscript{[10]} Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 219, 226 and passim.

\textsuperscript{[11]} On ‘nodal points’ and ‘obligatory passage points:’ Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 185, 204f., 207 and passim, emph. DQ.


\textsuperscript{[13]} Preliminarily, on pluralistic-charismatic relations: cf. Welker, \textit{God the Spirit}. 
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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.’

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.

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

---


15 Clegg, *Frameworks of Power*, 182 (fig. 7.1) and 152. Ibid., 1f., 21f., 36ff., 38, 150 and 182ff.
founding myths amongst its resources.  

(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.’ From such a starting point, researching the historical conditions of the formation of human agency and ethics is only a small step away. Foucault’s main writings concerning power show how the working together of power, discourse and practices facilitate human identity formation. Whilst

16 Clegg, Frameworks of Power, 30ff., 34ff. and 34 (fig. 2.1); Laclau and Mouffè, Hegemony and Socialist Strategy; Bauman, Legislator and Interpreters; cf. Latour, Reassembling the Social, 41.


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 lense 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—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. 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-

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

‘episodic circuit’—epistemic formations and overarching power strategies become facilitated by disciplinary (and other) power techniques in the circuit of ‘system integration.’¹²³ 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

---


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.

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


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.\(^\text{32}\) 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.\(^\text{33}\)

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).

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. 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. 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
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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 explicitly allows for spirits and gods, as constructed actor-network agencies. Thus, Latour


offers an insightful—albeit curiously non-corporeal—ANT attempt at religious speech; 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. 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. 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


38  Latour, Rejoicing; Latour, ‘Thou Shall Not Freeze-Frame.’
39  Piette, Religion de près.
its conception of the real world. 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. Following Benton’s rationale, Clegg opts for a thorough ‘moral relativism’ within a ‘realistic epistemology;’ and then chooses to place—at the centre of his framework—Laclau and


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.\textsuperscript{44} Clegg’s theory, therefore, is a tool for \textit{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.\textsuperscript{45} This makes Foucault’s examination of the modern sexuality dispositive (established upon the confession of illicit ‘pleasure’)\textsuperscript{46} the link that joins a Foucauldian power analytics and a material-semiotic metaphysics.\textsuperscript{47} On the other hand, ANT—and not DG—implies power-

\textsuperscript{44} Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 178ff., 185 and 203ff.; Laclau and Mouffe, \textit{Hegemony and Socialist Strategy}; Callon, ‘Sociology of Translation.’

\textsuperscript{45} DG, \textit{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, \textit{DG’s A Thousand Plateaus}.

\textsuperscript{46} Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Anti-Oedipus}: Scott Lash, \textit{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


\(^{50}\) 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. 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’ 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.


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.

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. 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.’ Clegg’s book traces a major discontinuity of Foucault’s—and Foucault-influenced—power analytics, as well as the previous mainline of modern power theory including, amongst others, Western-Marxist theorisations (Lukes) and Giddon’s ‘structuration.’ 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.

Clegg’s discussion of sociological theorisations culminates in a


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.’

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.

---


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{64} Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 198ff.


Foucault’s exposition of neo-liberalism and of ‘homo economicus’ as a contemporarily predominant ethics helps identify why, in practical terms, some leading twentieth-century theologies appear to have exceeded their ‘sell by date.’ His sexuality dispositive 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 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.

67 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics*.


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
than a request for otherworldly intervention.’ Bialecki, ‘Does God Exist,’ 40.
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

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

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, 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.’ 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.’ ‘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.

Clegg offers ‘a rich theory’ which dares to integrate many disparate theory perspectives and insights into a single complex relation. 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. 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

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.’
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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


10 Callon, ‘Sociology of Translation.’
circuit/system integration). Consider how e.g. Barth conceived his theology before and after the Great War;\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{12} and how Barth’s theology eventually facilitating a vocal resistance against the Nazi-Christian takeover of Protestantism in Germany.\textsuperscript{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)\textsuperscript{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

\footnotesize
\begin{verbatim}
12 Pfleiderer, Karl Barths praktische Theologie, pt. 1, 27ff.
\end{verbatim}
(facilitative power).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{16} Reversing the perspective, Clegg—here discussing Foucault’s contribution to organisation theory—is able to alternatively formulate that:

\[
\text{[...]} \text{power becomes conceived as a set of techniques, disciplinary practices, as well as the more or less stable or shifting networks of alliances that such disciplinary practices make possible through their elective affinities between wholly contingent forms of identity, extended over a shifting terrain of practice and discursively constituted interests.}\textsuperscript{17}
\]

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{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, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 18. Ibid., 23f; Lockwood, ‘Social Integration and System Integration.’
\item \textsuperscript{16} Clegg, \textit{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, \textit{Discipline and Punish}.
\item \textsuperscript{17} Clegg, ‘Weber and Foucault,’ 157.
\end{itemize}
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.\footnote{\textit{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, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 237. Ibid., 233.}} 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.\footnote{Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 223ff.} Clegg introduces \textit{Frameworks of Power} as an overdue academic response to the fact that Lukes’ \textit{Power} fails to fruitfully engage with newer—Foucauldian and poststructuralist—challenges.\footnote{Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 1f.} 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 \ldots
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 \textit{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, \textit{Frameworks of Power}; 41ff. and 86; Dahl, ‘Concept of Power.’
\(^{23}\) Clegg, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{24} Laclau and Mouffe, \textit{Hegemony and Socialist Strategy}, 133; ibid., 93ff.; Clegg, \textit{Frameworks of Power}, 178ff. and 204f.

\textsuperscript{25} Clegg, \textit{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

---


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).  

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 ‘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


\(^{33}\) 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.\textsuperscript{34}

Clegg theorises the systemic impact of facilitative-disciplinary power within dispositional and episodic power relations by introducing four theory modules.

\textit{(1) Passage points (Callon)}

Central to Clegg’s power concept is the discursive fixing of ‘meaning and membership’ in the relations of dispositional power;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{36}

Clegg’s understanding is firmly rooted within Foucauldian power analysis.

\textsuperscript{34} Clegg, \textit{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 \textit{Power: a Reader}, ed. Mark Haugaard (Manchester and New York: Manchester Univ. Press, 2002), 70.


\textsuperscript{36} Clegg, \textit{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 ‘spokespersons’ 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

---


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{40}

\textsuperscript{39} Callon, ‘Sociology of Translation.’

(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-
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.\textsuperscript{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

context.  

(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. 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 ‘biologically 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


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/disenfranchisement
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

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. The repeated rejection of ‘false doctrine,’ in each article, implies a formal schism: 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.


49 ‘We reject the false doctrine, as though the Church [...]’ Cochrane, *Church’s Confession*, 239ff.

50 Helmreich, *German Churches*, 162ff.
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*. 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. 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. The young pastors and theologians proposed a ‘translation’ of the Lutheran memory of a historical *status confessionis*, hoping to render


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—


\(^{56}\) ‘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); 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.

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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{58} In addition to Busch’s and Bethge’s biographies: John D. Godsey, ‘Barth and Bonhoeffer: the Basic Difference,’ \textit{Quarterly Review} 7, no. 1 (1987): 9ff.
continue studying, teaching and writing theology ‘as if nothing had
happened.’ 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.’ 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. 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:

(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.’ 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. 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.

(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.

betrayals and controversies" 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

______________


is a practical and not a theoretical question.’\textsuperscript{68} Is there not a need for Lutherans to theologically challenge Barth and Barmen?\textsuperscript{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,’\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{68} Callon, ‘Sociology of Translation,’ 219.


\textsuperscript{70} Althaus, ‘Bedenken zur Theologischen Erklärung,’ 200.
‘destroyed’ churches, which were largely drawn from the Prussian Union.\textsuperscript{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’ (\textit{Kirchliches Einigungswerk}) which paved the way for the post-war, cross-denominational creation of the Evangelical Church in Germany (\textit{EKD}).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{73} Putting all the differences, as regards


\textsuperscript{72} Jörg Thierfelder, \textit{Das Kirchliche Einigungswerk des württembergischen Landesbischofs Theophil Wurm} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975); Helmreich, \textit{German Churches}, 333ff. and 418.

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. 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.’

‘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. 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). 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


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.\footnote{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,
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.

It also mattered that the great majority of Protestant clergy and regular worshippers were of a conservative, anti-liberal political persuasion. 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.

(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. Efforts at incorporating the still ‘intact’ regional churches of Württemberg, Bavaria and Hanover, by directing administrative and coercive measures

84 Helmreich, *German Churches*, 157ff.
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. 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


\(^{90}\) 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. 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. 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


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
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 and 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—including: 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{99}


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 background suffered as well.
persuasion, was abhorrent on a completely different scale!\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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


\textsuperscript{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 Protestantism. 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’ 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.
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 3 NORMATIVE-THEOLOGICAL AGENCY: BARTH AND BARMEN
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).\footnote{Pfleiderer, \textit{Karl Barths praktische Theologie}.} 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

\footnote{Pfleiderer, \textit{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.
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


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

Bauman’s distinction of ‘legislators’ and ‘interpreters’ within Clegg’s review of previous theorisations of power, 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. 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.

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.


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 [...].

Since the capacity of categorical relations forming ever new relations (thus
‘multiplicities’) of meaning beyond control, 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. One must thus pursue an understanding which begins by ‘refusing to carve nature at the joints.’

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

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.  

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.

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.\(^\text{16}\) In addition, Foucault observes that the modern-territorial state and absolute monarchy fashioned themselves in legal terms.\(^\text{17}\) 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.\(^\text{18}\)

This occurred precisely because of the one-time relative proximities

\(^\text{16}\) Clegg, *Frameworks of Power*, 23f.

\(^\text{17}\) ‘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.

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.
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plays a certain role. 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. 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

‘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

\[\ldots\] secular order through divine grace. Order was to be constructed in the world through secularizing and generalizing God, ‘the first author of *speech*’ \[\ldots\], into a rational method capable of reconstituting the ‘body politic’ through ‘*pacts*’ and ‘*covenants*’ premised on the divine act of *fiat*.²⁶

---


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. A modern example of ‘political myth’ is Barth’s claim that he had completely broken with ‘liberal

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


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.’ 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. 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


31 Bauman, *Legislators and Interpreters*, 4f.
cause,’ of individualised agents inter-engaging through mechanistical-causal relations. 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, i.e. he advocates the avoidance of framing and limiting one’s research beforehand within the (allegedly) wider context and only illusionary ‘bigger picture.’ 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.

32 Clegg, *Frameworks of Power*, 26 and 34.
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 [...].

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.’

‘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-


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.
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

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. 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 Unbedingheit] 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,


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{44} Krockow, \textit{Entscheidung}.

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, 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. 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


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,

49 Graf, ‘Antihistorische Revolution,’ 389, tr. DQ.

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

\[\text{\ldots}\]
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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 (anologia 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

---


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.’ Heidegger’s ‘decisionism’ (Krockow) also became relevant for Bultmann’s ‘existentialist’ interpretation of the New Testament witness. 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


and the overthrowing of the Weimar-Republic democratic-constitutional
order.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{61} Both, Elert and Althaus can thus be subsumed under
the ‘anti-historistic’ and normative-theological turn within academic

\textsuperscript{59} Pfleiderer, \textit{Karl Barths praktische Theologie}, 90ff.; Schneider-Flume,
\textit{Politische Theologie Emanuel Hirschs}; Stayer, \textit{Martin Luther}, 96ff.; Feige,
\textit{Varieties of Protestantism}, 84ff. and 291ff.; Robert P. Ericksen, \textit{Theologians
under Hitler: Gerhard Kittel, Paul Althaus and Emanuel Hirsch}, (New
Lutherrenaissance in Deutschland von 1900 bis 1960,’ in \textit{Lutherrenaissance
Past and Present} (Göttingen and Bristol: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2015),
35ff.

\textsuperscript{60} Gregory A. Walter, ‘Karl Holl (1866–1926),’ in \textit{Twentieth-Century Lutheran
Theologians}, ed. Mark C. Mattes (Göttingen and Bristol, Conn.:
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2013), 56ff.; Stayer, \textit{Martin Luther}, 18ff.; Assel,
‘Lutherrenaissance,’ 24ff.

\textsuperscript{61} Leading the way was Elert’s essay from 1924: Werner Elert, \textit{Die Lehre des
Varieties of Protestantism in Nazi Germany}, 84ff. and 89ff. and 251ff.; Karl
Beyschlag, \textit{Erlanger Theologie}, 143ff.
theology, which aimed to support the reflective creation of a self-assertive counter-modern Christian understanding. 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. 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


God and Christ. Like for Hirsch, Karl Barth and Dialectical Theology provided the foil for the unfolding of Althaus’s theology. 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. Critically engaging within that generation’s anti-historicist redeployment of divine transcendence and theological (‘theological’) top-down normativity, Althaus was required to make a ‘legislator’s’ 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. By way of both mimetic and normative isomorphic

64 Stayer, Martin Luther, 90.


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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Being and Time}, on the basis of their shared concern with ‘authentic’ language.\textsuperscript{70}

In the second half of the twentieth century, Barth’s theological dogmatics asserted itself as the most influential academic-theological proposition of the era.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{72}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{69} DiMaggio and Powell, ‘Iron Cage Revisited.’
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{72} Daniel W. Hardy, ‘T. F. Torrance,’ in \textit{Modern Theologians}, ed. Ford, 163ff.;
\end{flushright}
either more or less forceful moves of disengagement, others contended with what theology emerged from Dialectical Theology and Barth. Within a new and bolder Roman-Catholic academic theology, Balthasar, Schillebeeckx and Kün engaged with Barth in depth; whereas Rahner developed his transcendental-theological position from an independent engagement with Heidegger, Kant and the Thomistic theological tradition.

Within the German-Protestant post-war discourse, academic theologians, as an alternative to Barth, opted for Bultmann’s existentialism as their point of departure for others. Daniel W. Hardy, ‘Karl Barth,’ in *Modern Theologians*, ed. Ford, 39.


of departure. 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. 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-decisionistic 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. Moltmann also creates a bridge to critical and contextual theologies; the goal of which is political

76 See above. Rohls, Protestantische Theologie, 561ff.


78 Rohls, Protestantische Theologie, 666f.
‘liberation.’ 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. 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


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’). 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. 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
drn (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. 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.  

(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. 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.  

(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.


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.\footnote{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.} Barth ‘preserved (or won back) theology’s autonomy’ using ‘the schemata of Idealism.’\footnote{Balthasar, \textit{Theology of Karl Barth}, 240.} Bonhoeffer’s understanding (two decades earlier) was even more precise: ‘Barth makes use of the philosophical language of neo-Kantianism.’\footnote{Dietrich Bonhoeffer, ‘Die Geschichte der systematischen Theologie des 20. Jahrhunderts,’ in \textit{Seminare—Vorlegungen—Predigten: 1924 bis 1941: Erster Ergänzungsband}, ed. Eberhard Bethge (Munich: Kaiser, 1972), 221, tr. DQ.} 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
accountability. 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.

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. When—in the summer of 1914—


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. Cohen’s normative objectivism helped Barth to envisage a way in which ‘thinking that begins with God’ 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. 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

_____________________


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

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.’

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. 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, *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.’

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. McCormack proposes a material shift from Barth’s predominantly eschatological/apocalyptic concern, in the early Weimar years, to a Christological focus, from 1924 onwards. 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, 19ff., 20ff. and 327ff.
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.\(^\text{109}\) 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 \textit{must completely avoid} building upon—or even engaging with—philosophical justification or argumentative support.\(^\text{110}\) 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


\(^{110}\) 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. 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.

111 Lohmann, Karl Barth, 361ff.

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.’

This, in turn—claims Gogarten—removed any understanding of history and of political-responsibility, contingency and content.

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. 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. 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. 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


same generation, amongst whom were: Gehlen, Carl Schmitt and Ernst Jünger, in addition to some openly fascist theorists. 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

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. 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.

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.’

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.  

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 [...].

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.  

Wagner thereby finds the

121 Rendtorff, ‘Ethischer Sinn der Dogmatik,’ 123, tr. DQ.


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.

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. 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

realistic,” 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). 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.

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).\footnote{129} Although Jesus
Christ, through the direct, biblical witness and the indirect witness of his
church, is alone ‘the Word of God’\footnote{130} and ‘the one light of life,’\footnote{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.\footnote{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 \textit{CD},
4/3—allows for variation and diversity within the Christian-theological
\footnote{129 Karl Barth, \textit{Church Dogmatics}, vol. 4, \textit{The Doctrine of Reconciliation}, pt. 3,
half 1, ed. G. W. Bromiley and T. F. Torrance, tr. G. W. Bromiley
Barth, \textit{CD}, 4/3/1, 96ff.}
\footnote{130 Barth, \textit{CD}, 4/3/1, 95ff.; cf. Barth, \textit{CD}, 1/1, 88ff.}
\footnote{131 Barth, \textit{CD}, 4/3/1, 91.}
\footnote{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, \textit{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.’

(4) *Inverted practical-transcendental theory (Pfleiderer)*

Korsch also takes account of the changing—meanwhile widely accepted—understanding of the beginnings of the Weimar-era ‘theological’ 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. 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 redeployls 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.


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


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.  

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.  

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.’ 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 view 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.


140 Pfleiderer, Karl Barths praktische Theologie, 9; Pfleiderer, ‘Das prophetische Amt’ 117; tr. DQ (also hereafter).
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. 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.

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


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{146} Under the impression of a (seemingly) complete historical collapse of the pre-war project of critical progress and enlightenment, young intellectuals of

\textsuperscript{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.’

\textsuperscript{145} Pfleiderer, Karl Barth’s praktische Theologie, 442.

\textsuperscript{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 ‘transcendently’ 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.\footnote{Pfleiderer, \textit{Karl Barths praktische Theologie}, 139.}

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-
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.  

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. 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.

149 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie*, 141f.
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.  

(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. 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. An examination of developments in Barth’s soteriology is not intended.

151 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans*, 505.

152 Pfleiderer, *Karl Barths praktische Theologie*, 266.


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.’

In the reinterpretation of Romans 1:16f.—i.e. of the core of the Protestant theological tradition—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.’

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.


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.’

Here, (alongside religious experience and ‘history’) all other relations of truth (both ‘religious’ and ‘secular’), and ‘ideology,’ in particular, become subsumed under the theological-salvific category of ‘the law.’

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.

Barth emphasises the priority of God’s ‘No’ which encompasses an even more emphatic divine affirmation of what is merely created. Barth’s

158 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans*, 35.

159 Barth, *Epistle to the Romans*, 52.


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 ‘historicist’ 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

\(^{164}\) Barth, *Epistle to the Romans*, 38. Cf. Barth, ‘Christian’s Place in Society.’  
In 1938, Barth theologically reconsidered the Christian engagement with the wider political order, 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.

3.4 A Foucauldian rescripting of Barth’s practical theology

Building upon research into the neo-Kantian contribution towards


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.’

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).

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 radikalisieter Handlungsbeiff;’ 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, Foucault’s previous knowledge ‘archaeology’ explores how contingent ‘historical *a priori*s’ both facilitate and limit conditions of discursive truth formations. In an interview, conducted in 1977, Foucault identifies ‘épistémè’ as a specific, less heterogeneous—and thus less general—case of a ‘*dispositif*.’ 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, [...].

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.


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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{176} Cf. above, section 3.2.
deployments of power: ‘God is in heaven, and thou art on earth.’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{178} Pentecostal-charismatic Spirit baptism and experiential

\textsuperscript{177}Barth, \textit{Epistle to the Romans}, 10; Ecclesiastes 5:2 (KJV).

empowerment, in chapter 5, will be studied through a formal reading of the
dimensions of Foucault’s sexuality dispositive (more below).\footnote{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’\footnote{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).\footnote{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).

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{179} Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1, 92ff. and 103ff.
\item \footnote{181} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}.
\end{itemize}
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, 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. With an ongoing publication of new Foucauldian sources (lectures, interviews and minor contributions), beginning in the 1990s, today’s understanding of Foucault is quite different to that of twenty or thirty years ago. More recent engagement often focuses on the ‘final Foucault.’

182 Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, 139ff.


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.  

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.  

Subsequently, conceptual developments, variations and differentiations in Foucault’s mid-career analytics of power can be missed. 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.


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’

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.  

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. 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.


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. 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

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.\textsuperscript{193} On the basis of this common statement, two Caucasian member churches were suspended at the 1984 World Assembly in Budapest.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{196} Efforts by the elected leadership of the


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. 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.’ According to the


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 neoliberal economic order is projected as a form of ‘empire which subverts God’s sovereignty over life and acts contrary to God’s just rule.’\(^\text{199}\) 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

---

\(^{199}\) 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.

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.

‘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.  

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-  


202 Quote from Formula of Concord, 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.  

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


203 This is what Tran, following Hardt and Negri’s reading of Foucault on neoliberalism 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.*
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.  

Neo-liberal capitalism instead ‘erodes the cultural substratum within society, and also the state’s role in regulating and distributing economic benefits.’ 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.
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.\textsuperscript{208} The lectures series attracted a great deal of interest when the English translation was published at the time of the 2008 financial crash.\textsuperscript{209} Whilst some see Foucault as offering ‘the apology of neoliberalism,’\textsuperscript{210} others use Foucault’s far-sighted analyses to clarify the contemporary erosion of Western-democratic political culture.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
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, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 313.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
209 Gane, ‘Foucault’s History of Neoliberalism.’
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
Foucault’s ‘genealogy of economy and government’ through an exploration of its Christian-theological contribution.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{212} Agamben, \textit{Kingdom and Glory}.
\textsuperscript{213} Leshem, \textit{Origins of Neoliberalism}.
\end{flushleft}
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). 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*, lectures 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*.  

338
Chicago school of economics had been established upon the theorisation of human capital.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’),\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{216} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 215ff.


\textsuperscript{218} Foucault, \textit{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. 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. Instead, Freiburg-school ordo-liberalism and Gesellschaftspolitik ensure the free operation of market mechanisms within

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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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 ‘\textit{homo oeconomicus};’ marriage/a family household are understood in terms of a company or production unit

\textsuperscript{222} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 240ff.; ibid., lectures 4–8, 75ff.
\textsuperscript{223} Foucault, \textit{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 oeconomicus* 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 oeconomicus* was established as being completely inaccessible to the state. The state must leave *homo oeconomicus* 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 oeconomicus* now becomes the correlate of a governmentality which will act on the

environment and systematically modify its variables.\textsuperscript{225}

\textit{(2) Homo \textit{o}economicus 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{227} A neo-liberal penal reform would reconstruct and reduce the criminal to the ethical concern of \textit{homo \textit{o}economicus} with self-interested calculation. At the same time,

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{225} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 270f.
\textsuperscript{227} Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1, 110 and 40. Ibid. 36ff..
\end{flushright}
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 *hominès 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 economicus* 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 economicus* 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 economicus.* [...] *Homo economicus* 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 economicus* and the market should not be
interfered with, nor can they be known.233 On 4 April, Foucault explored

the difference between the bonds: of ‘free association’—the foundation of civil society; and those of self-interested economic calculation.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{234} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 291ff.

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.\(^{237}\)]


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.

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{241} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 282 and 283. Ibid., 281ff.
\textsuperscript{242} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 283.
\textsuperscript{243} Foucault, \textit{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
\textit{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{246}

\textsuperscript{246} Foucault, \textit{Birth of Biopolitics}, 295, 296, 292 and passim. Ibid., 291ff.; Adam
Ferguson, \textit{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.\footnote{With Hobbes and Locke, however, ‘civil society’ is described as involving a legal-political relationship and order. 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*). 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. ‘Society’ is thus a ‘spontaneous synthesis;’ i.e. differing greatly from Hobbes’ concept, it comes into existence without explicit political organisation, or legal 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. Ferguson, *History of Civil Society*. In Smith’s *Wealth of Nations*, Ferguson’s ‘society’ correlates to ‘nation.’ Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics*, 299 and 300. Cf. ‘bond of society:’ Ferguson, *History of Civil Society*, 46.}
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.’

[...] 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.

The self-interested ‘economic bond’ and disinterested social bond are also different in scope. Traders have always engaged in relationships which

________________


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.”’

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.’

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.

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


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 \textit{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 economicus. 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.\footnote{Foucault, Birth of Biopolitics, 250.}

The personally embodied spiritual account of homo spiritualis would not
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,

*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. 

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


and socio-cultural force relations which are often beyond their localised grasp and control.\textsuperscript{259} Is it possible to conceive of a \textit{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?’\textsuperscript{260} On such a foundation, \textit{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,’ \textit{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?\textsuperscript{261}

\begin{flushright}
260 Welker, ‘Creation as the Heavens and the Earth.’
\end{flushright}
(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,’ 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. 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, whilst, at the same time, also developing local-yet-global expressions. Also in the


263 Martin, *Tongues of Fire*; Cox, *Fire from Heaven*.

264 Cox, *Fire from Heaven*.

1990s, a new academic-Pentecostal theology emerged;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{homo \aeconomicus}, 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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{266} Hollenweger, \textit{Pentecostalism}.
  \item \textsuperscript{267} Philip Jenkins, \textit{The Next Christendom: the Coming of Global Christianity} (Oxford and New York: OUP, 2002).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
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

It is thus not the argument of this research that Pentecostal/charismatic Christianities are likely to resist neo-liberalism/post-neoliberal, 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.

____________________
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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.\(^5\)


\(^{4}\) ‘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]).

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)

---


---

relies upon Foucault’s exposition of disciplinary normalisation in

*Discipline and Punish.*

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*.

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

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. 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.

(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


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
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.
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.’

Many of Käsemann’s dualised categories are drawn from the Lutheran dogmatic tradition. 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,’ together, deploy the morally evaluative categories of the heresiological and polemical writings of Irenaeus and of Luther. This, however, comes at a cost: 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.


stance and self-understanding of the historically successful party; the historical and theological (mis)representation of the Christian ‘heretical other’ remains beyond methodical control.}

(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), 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.’ Already on the fringes of


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; 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; and following his release in the summer of 1945, Niemöller


27 ‘Ein Trinitatis-Gespräch.’
reaffirmed this hope in his written conversations. 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. 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


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

---

policy—wherever possible—gave political preference to the return of Christian politics, administration and order to the Weimar situation.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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


authority to be able to speak to the nation and to the occupying forces.\footnote{Spotts, \textit{Churches and Politics}, 89ff. and 119ff.; Martin Greschat, \textit{Die evangelische Christenheit und die deutsche Geschichte nach 1945: Weichenstellungen in der Nachkriegszeit} (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002); Gerhard Besier, Jörg Thierfelder and Ralf Tyra, ed., \textit{Kirche nach der Kapitulation}, vol. 1, \textit{Die Allianz zwischen Genf, Stuttgart und Bethel} (Stuttgart, Berlin and Cologne: Kohlhammer, 1989); Beckmann, \textit{Kirchliches Jahrbuch} 72–75. Martin Greschat, ed., \textit{Im Zeichen der Schuld: 40 Jahre Stuttgarter Schuldabekenntnis: eine Dokumentation} (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl., 1985); Martin Niemöller, \textit{Reden 1945–1954} (Darmstadt: Stimme-Verl., 1958), 10ff.; Gerhard Besier and Gerhard Sauter, \textit{Wie Christen ihre Schuld bekennen: die Stuttgarter Erklärung 1945} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1985); Armin Boyens, ‘Das Stuttgarter Schuldabekenntnis vom 19. Oktober 1945: Entstehung und Bedeutung,’ \textit{Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte} 19, no. 4 (1971): 374ff.} 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
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, legislative 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

________________________
Spirit within a worshipping congregation of attending believers.  

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 and ‘correct’ administration of the sacraments (‘in qua evangelium pure docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta’). 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 [...].

Article 14 forbids the public preaching or administration of the sacraments by those without a regular calling and ordination (‘nisi rite vocatus’).

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*.

‘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.

*Bekenntnisschriften der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, 58, tr. from the Latin version DQ.
Here, the notion of doctrinal ‘purity’ serves as an alternative ‘myth’ 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.’

(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


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. 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.’ The vagueness of a traditional Protestant pneumatology, which all too often begins—and ends—with John 3:8, is a result of this impasse.

(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.’ 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.

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.’ 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.’ As his research into power relations progressed, 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,


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, 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.


\(^{56}\) 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.

\[\ldots\]\ 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.

combinatory individuality.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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)

\textsuperscript{60} Foucault, \textit{Discipline and Punish}, 192.

\textsuperscript{61} Foucault sees the modern ‘soul’ evoked alongside and through disciplinary power/knowledge: Foucault, \textit{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, \textit{Reassembling the Social}, 212.

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
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 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. 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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{embodied}

\textsuperscript{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, 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

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—and 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.’

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 \textit{distinctively} different field of study, in the second part of this research, owes to the power-analytical interest with exploring the possibility of analysing \textit{all kinds of} power relations relevant to Christian ministry, within a single non-normative, descriptive-analytical approach.

\(^{69}\) Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1.

\(^{70}\) DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 3ff.
PART II

GOD AS RELATIONS OF POWER ACCORDING TO PENTECOSTAL-CHARISMATIC EXPERIENCE
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.
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 detail3 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. 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*. 422
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 æconomicus 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-engaged 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. The Foucauldian analytical

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.’ 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.

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. Furthermore, Cox identifies


8 Robeck and Yong, ‘Global Pentecostalism;’ Anderson, Introduction to Pentecostalism.

‘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.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{13}


\textsuperscript{12} Hollenweger, ‘Pentecostals and Charismatic Movement;’ Land, \textit{Pentecostal Spirituality}, 14f.
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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.

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, LBGQT and related emancipatory/minority political concerns continue to refer to Foucault’s

18 Foucault, History of Sexuality, vol. 1, 105f.
theorisations of embodied subjectivation. 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. 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


adds ‘power’ (practices) to ‘discourse;’ and, eventually, adds subjectification (‘technologies of the self’) to power and discourse.  

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.  

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. 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)


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

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. A sufficiently close

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. 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.

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?’

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.


from which it should be possible to locate the formation of discursive practices.\textsuperscript{34} Whilst ‘power produces knowledge,’ discourse and knowledge contribute to the facilitation of power.\textsuperscript{35} Furthermore, ‘domains of knowledge,’ with their ‘new objects, new concepts, and new techniques’ also give rise to new human subjectivity.\textsuperscript{36} Power—in all its forms—according to Foucault, is physical and its focus is the human body.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{34} Foucault, \textit{Psychiatric Power}, 13.
\textsuperscript{35} Foucault, \textit{Discipline and Punish}, 27.
\textsuperscript{36} Foucault, ‘Truth and Juridical Forms,’ 2.
\textsuperscript{37} Foucault, \textit{Psychiatric Power}, 14.
\textsuperscript{38} Cf. Foucault, \textit{Discipline and Punish}.
\end{flushleft}
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?’


\(^{42}\) Mills, *Michel Foucault*, 3.

\(^{43}\) Carrette, *Foucault and Religion*, 142.
dynamic. 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. Across different chapters of this research, Foucault’s work on power has been selectively mined for a range of relevant concepts and analytical ‘tools’. 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. 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


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: Raffnsoe, Gudmand-Høyer and Thaning, *Michel Foucault;* Mills, *Michel Foucault.*


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


\(^{49}\) Ruoff, *Foucault-Lexikon*, 150.

\(^{50}\) Foucault, *History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, 94.
to their organisation.'

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.’ 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.’

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; [...].

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.


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.’\textsuperscript{55} Power relations are ‘both intentional and nonsubjective.’\textsuperscript{56}

\section*{5.3 A Foucauldian power analysis of embodied-spiritual experiences}

\subsection*{(1) Sexuality dispositive}

In the first volume of \textit{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.’\textsuperscript{57} The central proposition of this chapter is that \textit{Pentecostal-embodied experiences of religious power, presence and breakthrough}—that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{55} Foucault, \textit{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.
\item \textsuperscript{56} Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1, 94.
\item \textsuperscript{57} Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1, 103.
\end{itemize}
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.\textsuperscript{58} ‘Sexuality,’ writes Foucault—almost, by way of definition—is:

\[\ldots\] a historical construct [\textit{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Foucault/Paul}, 100 and 166.

\textsuperscript{59} Fuggle, \textit{Foucault/Paul}, 105f.; Foucault, \textit{Histoire de la sexualité}, vol. 1, 139.
emerges as ‘a great surface network,’ operating—in particular—through such relatively stable, heterogeneous ensembles ‘from below,’ and ‘exercised from innumerable points, in the interplay of nonegalitarian and mobile relations,’ 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.’ 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


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.


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’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. 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.’ 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 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).\(^\text{70}\) 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.\(^\text{71}\) This includes different ethnic and gendered

---


\(^{71}\) As one considers later Azusa Street accounts and testimonies, further theological differentiation 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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’—\textsuperscript{74} of global Pentecostalisms, would appear to be inappropriate and unhelpful.\textsuperscript{75} One must not feed American

---


\textsuperscript{72} Robeck, Azusa Street Mission, 67ff., 91, 99ff., 173, 214ff., 299ff. and 315ff.

\textsuperscript{73} Robeck, ‘Origins of Modern Pentecostalism;’ Hollenweger, Pentecostalism, 18ff.; Land, Pentecostal Spirituality; Macchia, Baptized in the Spirit; Smith, Thinking in Tongues.

\textsuperscript{74} Hollenweger, Pentecostalism, 18ff.

\textsuperscript{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. 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.
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

---


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.  

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. 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. 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{self-attributes} her anterior crisis experience as the outcome of an emotional


\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Reassembling the Social}, 47; ibid., 46ff. Cf. James: ‘God is real since he produces real effects.’ James, \textit{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.’ 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.

‘Sanctification’ also, as an embodied-emotional experience of a filling by divine ‘power’ (Crawford identified hers as ‘fire’ rather than a ‘flood’) 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,’ 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.

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.’


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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{92} Crawford, ‘Light of Life,’ 97.

\textsuperscript{93} Luhrmann’s exceptional ethnography misses to account of the interweaving of external events and observations: Luhrmann, \textit{When God Talks Back}.

\textsuperscript{94} Crawford, ‘Witness to the Power.’

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.

---
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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.’

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.

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. 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. 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.

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!’

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.’ 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.’)\footnote{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.

\textit{(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.’\footnote{106} It would appear that previous spiritual and breakthrough experiences have the

\begin{flushright}
105 Foucault, ‘Jeu de Foucault,’ 299.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
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.’
\end{flushright}
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’\textsuperscript{107}—in the 1936 booklet, she claims that this was confirmed by a Chinese-born man—\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{107} Crawford, ‘Witness to the Power.’
\textsuperscript{108} Crawford, ‘Light of Life,’ 99.
power to witness to lost souls that they might find Jesus.’ 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.

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{111} Cf. Deleuze, \textit{Difference and Repetition}.

\textsuperscript{112} Crawford, ‘Witness to the Power.’

\textsuperscript{113} [William J. Seymour], ‘The Apostolic Faith Movement,’ \textit{The Apostolic Faith} (Los Angeles) 1, no. 1 (September 1906): 2; Robeck, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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,’\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{114} Crawford, ‘Testimony and Praise To God;’ Crawford, ‘Cheering Testimony.’

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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. It also follows the conversion—sanctification—Azusa Street Spirit baptism paradigm. However, there is significant

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 Durham, ‘Chicago Evangelist’s Pentecost.’

(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.’

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’).

Durham also mentions an encounter with a preacher, H. L. Blake from Minnesota, 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{124} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 60.

\textsuperscript{125} Durham, ‘Chicago Evangelist’s Pentecost.’

\textsuperscript{126} Bartleman, \textit{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


131 Durham, ‘Chicago Evangelist’s Pentecost.’
comparable to Crawford’s self-practice of consecration.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{133} Durham’s reductive ‘stripping’

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 ‘imperceptibilist.’ ‘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, \textit{Deleuzism}, 93, orig. emph. DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 275ff; Patton, \textit{Deleuze and the Political}, 78ff.; Philip Goodchild, \textit{Deleuze and Guattari: an Introduction to the Politics of Desire} (London and Thousand Oaks, Cal.: Sage, 1996), 169ff.; Colebrook, \textit{Understanding Deleuze}, 155f.; Holland, \textit{DG’s A Thousand Plateaus}, 104ff.; Adkins, \textit{DG’s A Thousand Plateaus}, 141ff. On the feminist reception and discussion of the

\end{flushleft}
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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textbf{(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

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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.’ 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.  

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

__________
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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.’

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 [...].

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
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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.\(^\text{142}\)

Durham’s fellow Holiness evangelist Crawford also experienced a notable increase of conversions and Spirit baptisms during meetings after her Azusa Street breakthrough.\(^\text{143}\) How some of this became possible: how, e.g., Pentecostal seekers following Azusa Street found it easier to reach

\(^{\text{142}}\) Consider the practical—and power-analytical—challenge of facilitating the Hobbesian ‘Leviathan:’ Foucault, *Discipline and Punish;* Callon and Latour, ‘Unscrewing the Big Leviathan.’

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.\textsuperscript{144} This introduced a first doctrinal split to the emerging ‘classical’-Pentecostal movement.

\textit{(3) Jenny Moore}

Moore was a member of the first group who met at the Bonnie Brae Street cottage and who, on 9\textsuperscript{th} 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.\textsuperscript{145}

Moore’s testimony takes us right into the first Pentecostal breakthrough which took place around the ministry of William Seymour, the then
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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.\(^\text{146}\)

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.\textsuperscript{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 9\textsuperscript{th} 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, 

\textsuperscript{147} Acquisition of a Pentecostal mindset: Luhrmann, \textit{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.  

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
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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. This is to be explored further in chapter 6, in terms of facilitating the development of Pentecostal-rhizomic relations of power/presence.

(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. 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. 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.


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 9\textsuperscript{th} 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.\cite{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

\footnote{154 Moore, ‘Music from Heaven.’}
valid existence alongside the performatively acknowledged divine agency, as well as within the imagined-invisible realm.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{155} On imagining and performing God: Luhrmann, \textit{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.’ 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
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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.  

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. ‘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
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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’ 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. 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. 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. The following evaluation aims to deploy a more explicit


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;\textsuperscript{163} the holistic approach taken as a result of the deep roots within the Wesleyan-Holiness tradition;\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{163} Land, \textit{Pentecostal Spirituality}.

\textsuperscript{164} Hollenweger, \textit{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

perception and facilitating miraculous healing.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{167} Some of the basic mechanics of prayerful hands-off

---

\textsuperscript{166} Synan, \textit{Holiness-Pentecostal Tradition}.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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

---

\(^{168}\) 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. 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.’ 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. 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.


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.’ 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.
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.
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.

---

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


Whilst, according to Foucault, ‘scientia sexualis’—based upon ‘confession’—is at the centre of the creation of modern control over (human) life, \textsuperscript{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, \textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{180} Foucault, \textit{History of Sexuality}, vol. 1, 135ff.

\textsuperscript{181} Foucault, \textit{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) \textit{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, \textit{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, \textit{Deleuze}, 57f.; Gilles Deleuze, ‘Immanence: a Life,’ in \textit{Pure Immanence: Essays on a Life}, tr. Anne Boyman (New York: Zone Books, 2005), 25ff.; Gilles Deleuze and Claire Parnet, \textit{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. 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 ‘outside 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

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,


\(^{185}\) 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. 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.
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 RHIZOMATIC 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 Deleuze-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 reviverist, 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.  

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 charismatics-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.² 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


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’)

---


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.
connecting a Foucauldian understanding of embodied empowerment (chapter 5) with DG’s understanding of ontic-sociological innovation and construction (chapter 6). 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*.

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

---


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.\textsuperscript{14} The researcher is not aware of an explicitly theological use of the concept.\textsuperscript{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?’\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{14} Ward, ‘Postmodern Theology.’
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Rethinking Philosophy and Theology}, 191; Deleuze, ‘To Have Done with Judgement.’
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}
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.’ (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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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-)

\textsuperscript{18} DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 7ff.

\textsuperscript{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.
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.\footnote{21} Holy-Spirit presence as a
Pentecostal-charismatic power relation—its capacities, its characteristics,
its nature, its management and its reach—\footnote{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—\textit{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

\footnote{21} ANT ‘translation:’ Callon, ‘Sociology of Translation,’ 223f.; Latour,
Plateaus}, 12f. and 92f. ‘Deterritorialization:’ ibid., 9ff. and passim.

\footnote{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, 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).

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
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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, 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), 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:

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. Drawing on St. Victor and von Hildebrand, Mühlen’s


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.

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. 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’ 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. 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.

32 Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen*, 76 and passim.
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

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.’

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. 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.’ To Mühlen, the biblical language of corporate-ecclesial unity ‘in Christ,’ has thereby, not just


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-


pneumatological and soteriological categorical decisions.\textsuperscript{41} Allegedly, a pre-modern agrarian 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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{43} The rationale of dialogistic, familial, covenantal and transcendental-analogical relationality of ‘I—thou’ and ‘we’ is supplemented by a number of totalising-


\textsuperscript{42} Mühlen, ‘Soziale Geisterfahrung,’ 259f.

\textsuperscript{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, 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’).

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


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. 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.’ 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.\textsuperscript{48} This also reaffirms the relationship of the eternal, inner-Trinitarian, ‘I––thou’ and ‘We,’ thereby conceptually reintroducing the very dialogistic-sociographic understanding of personality formation within (incurred-)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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{48} Mühlen, \textit{Kirche wächst von innen}, 260, 263 and 266. Ibid., 250ff.; Vondey, \textit{Heribert Mühlen}, 1ff.

\textsuperscript{49} Mühlen, \textit{Kirche wächst von innen}, 268ff.
understanding.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{51}

\textit{(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.\textsuperscript{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,

\textsuperscript{50} Mühlen, \textit{Kirche wächst von innen}, 270, tr. DQ, orig. emph.

\textsuperscript{51} Barber, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{52} Land, \textit{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. 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,’ and encompassing a normalised ‘corporate-individual spirituality’ and practice of worship. 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.


regulation of a certain ‘Pentecostal’-religious performance. 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.’

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. Others aim instead at a Pentecostal contribution to the ecumenical and academic-theological discourse. Vondey proposes that, as a movement


of the Spirit, Pentecostals may introduce imaginative ‘play’ to the more highly formalised theology and practice of the wider church.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textit{(3) Peircean method (Yong)}

Yong correlates the persons of the triune God with his ‘hermeneutical

\textsuperscript{59} Vondey, \textit{Beyond Pentecostalism}.

trialectic,’ i.e. ‘the continuous interplay of Spirit, Word, and Community.’

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

theological-epistemic situation. 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. 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—alongside Peirce’s hopeful-academic pursuit of true and comprehensive knowledge through a Pentecostal Spirit eschatology—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’


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. 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.
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


68 Davies, ‘Read the Bible,’ 221 and 225. Cf. Smith pointing out that by ‘hermeneutical courage’ experiences and events become identified with prophetic 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.\footnote{‘Hybrids’ as embarrassment: Latour, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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—\textsuperscript{73} the distributed-spiritual journey and

\textsuperscript{71} On ‘weave:’ DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 8.
\textsuperscript{72} DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 7 and 11.
\textsuperscript{73} DG’s principle of ‘decalcomania:’ DG, \textit{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-

experiential journey and ministry understanding can be reconstructed. 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

---

‘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.

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. 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. 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,
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,‘ 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.

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

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


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.’ 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

---


metaphysical-philosophical exploration into that of a power-analytical perspective and tool which is suitable for our purposes. 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’ 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.’ 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.’ 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.’ 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,

practical and other non-linguistic elements. 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 [...].

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. Therefore, with the increase of


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, 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.’ ‘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. DG clarify this

---


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.’ 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.

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. 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


engagement, would not even exist.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{105}

\textit{(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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushright}
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, \textit{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, \textit{Rejoicing}; Latour, ‘Thou Shall Not Freeze Frame.’
106 Quote: DG, \textit{Mille Plateaux}, 16, tr. DQ.
\end{flushright}
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.  

(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.  

The best contemporary reference to use as an example is mind mapping.  

---


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.’

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.’ 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

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.’ 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

intimacy and love in God’s dealing with him.\textsuperscript{116} Bartleman relates this to having been a sensitive, often misunderstood child, struggling with ill health and his father’s harshness.\textsuperscript{117} Intelligence, a vivid imagination and introversion, predispositioned Bartleman for intense inner experiences of God, later on in life.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{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, \textit{From Plough}, 17f.
\textsuperscript{117} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 5ff.; Bartleman, \textit{My Story}, 8f.
\textsuperscript{118} Luhrmann suggests that natural or acquired capacities of imagination and absorption (‘flow’) relate to embodied-Pentecostal capabilities of experiencing God as real: Luhrmann, \textit{When God Talks Back}, 189ff.
\textsuperscript{119} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 22, 24, 27 and 80.
\textsuperscript{120} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 22 and 35; Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 48.
\end{flushleft}
God.  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; 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. 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:

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, 70ff., 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.  

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.’

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. 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

Ninth street [sic!], [...] but never entered, flashed into my mind.'\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{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,’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{131} Similarly, Bartleman’s urge to give public witness of his experience appears to anticipate his later ministry and message as an evangelist-

\textsuperscript{128} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 21.  
\textsuperscript{129} Bartleman, \textit{My Story}, 10.  
\textsuperscript{130} Luhrmann, \textit{When God Talks Back}, 137.  
\textsuperscript{131} On the temporal relations of Pentecostal-prophetic experience and understanding: Bialecki, \textit{Diagram for Fire}, 3f.
preacher. 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.’ 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? 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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{135} Bartleman, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{136} It would take the form of finance, goods, or practical help.\textsuperscript{137} Provision and people’s help would also arrive either without explicit prayer or with prophetic anticipation instead.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{140} Over time, Bartleman became more daring in identifying his concrete needs, and would prophetically know exactly what

\begin{footnotes}
\item[136] Change in Bartleman’s pocket covers for a tram-fare ‘to the cent:’ Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 38.
\item[137] A coat, Bartleman’s size, and the car-fare for the journey home: Bartleman, \textit{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.
\item[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, \textit{From Plough}, 75f.
\item[139] Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 46, 47, 48 and pass.
\item[140] Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 50. Cf. ibid., 69 and 106 (together with ibid., 104).
\end{footnotes}
financial amounts to pray for.\textsuperscript{141} The link between prayer and a subsequent external divine response appeared to become shorter, more reliable and precise.\textsuperscript{142} Prophetic clarity and provision after prayer seemed to become more a matter of course, and levels of provision (sums of money) increased.\textsuperscript{143} Pentecostal learning occurs as an effect of ongoing repetitions and variation of the paradigm,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{141} Receiving twenty dollars after praying for two: Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 86.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{From Plough}, 45.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{From Plough}, 130.

\textsuperscript{144} Deleuze, \textit{Difference and Repetition}.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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.
\end{flushleft}
faith the same as when we were in the mission work.\textsuperscript{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, \textit{from a private/hidden place}, and its connection with produce, finance or some kind of practical help \textit{from the outside}. Bartleman’s taking into account of divine provision does not imply that he dismissed more down-to-earth—alternative—reasoning.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{148} Alternatively, his lack of encountering provision by grace, or even falling short in terms of prophetic precision, would lead him towards introspection.\textsuperscript{149} Bartleman would account for—


\textsuperscript{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, \textit{From Plough}, 36.

\textsuperscript{148}At times, non-believers would come to Bartleman’s help in their place. Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 47, 74 and 81.

\textsuperscript{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. 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. 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.

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 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.
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.’\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
157 Bartleman, \textit{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.
\end{flushleft}
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

---


160 Bartleman, *From Plough*, 70f.

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


163 Cf. Smith, Thinking in Tongues, 22f.
tends to take on a specific feeling within their emotional and mental lives. In addition, ‘sideways’ rhizomic-libidinal—as well as ‘virally’ coded—exchanges occur between prophetic bodies and their respective environments. 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.’ 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.

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 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.’ Subsequently, Bartleman would develop a prophetic capacity to perceive the time and place at which to move on. 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 height 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.\textsuperscript{172} In this sense, even non-Christians can be understood to have ‘prophesied’ involuntarily.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{From Plough to Pulpit} and \textit{How Pentecost came to Los Angeles}, and focuses instead on presenting a prophetic-and-biblical interpretation of his life, and

\textsuperscript{172} Bartleman, \textit{My Story}, 14.

of situations/events which continue to unfold.\textsuperscript{174}

\textit{(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 \textit{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;’\textsuperscript{175} and how the creation of such new connections, can change rhizomic capabilities and characteristics.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{174} Classical ANT ethnographies show how accounts of ready-made scientific facts systematically disguise their very construction in laboratories and through peer-review: Latour, \textit{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, \textit{Religion de près}, 55ff.

\textsuperscript{175} DG, \textit{Thousand Plateaus}, 9.

\textsuperscript{176} DG, \textit{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.\footnote{Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 37.}

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.\footnote{‘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, \textit{From Plough}, 37f.} 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
matters also started to fall into place, once again. 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.

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.

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.  

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.

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:

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-optimize.

\[\text{The experience of divine absence in Alabama in 1899, on his way} \]

\[\text{had the Holiness Association refused to receive me? I was sick with temptation to doubt God. But I got the victory and determined to trust Him recklessly, though I perish. I determined I would try for rooms no further, but would wait for God to speak to me. And just then He spoke. He was waiting on me for this.’ Bartleman, From Plough, 107.} \]

\[\text{185 ‘Leaving ‘Frisco I started back, stopping at San Jose to see if the Lord wanted us there. But the more I prayed the blacker it got. The door was closed. I had no witness. That was not the place for us. I returned to Santa Cruz [...].’ Bartleman, From Plough, 127f. In a similar way, through experiential learning, unexpected challenges and difficulties can become indicative of the Spirit being up to some significant breakthrough: ibid., 83.} \]

\[\text{186 Consider also observations above, concerning the relations both of prayer–provision and of the prophetic.} \]
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
his church and officials withdraw practical support from his family and ministry. 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;’ 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.

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 Undoubtedly, 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. 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.

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.’ 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.

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. For Bartleman as a Pentecostal believer, it made all the difference 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 (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.


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.
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).

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. 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 of

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
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 reexpression 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.  

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.  

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. Practical difficulties/challenges, such as lack of finance and food, problems surrounding transport, bodily injury, ill health or imminent danger may hinder or stop Bartleman’s ministry, and Bartleman’s being caught up in secular employment is also a hindrance. A preacher might also be insufficiently supported (‘starved’) by a disinterested congregation. Within the ministry, Bartleman recognises other issues concerning morals and Morales: workers ethical standards being too low to sustain a Wesleyan-Holiness ministry, being rebellious, ambitious, jealous, resentful, pursuing a financial gain; 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.
616
twisted and double standards;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{218} Congregations might also fail to provide space for prayer, try to stop more dramatic embodied manifestations\textsuperscript{219} or be ‘averse to innovations.’\textsuperscript{220} Modern-organisational forms might also create obstacles/disruptions to the free operation of Spirit power: e.g. secular authorities hindering Christian outreach;\textsuperscript{221} church bodies wishing to put ‘their [...] stamp’ on candidates;\textsuperscript{222} senior church leaders making unwise appointments that would stop a divine move in its track.\textsuperscript{223} In addition, pastors in charge might impose limiting top-down

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{216} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 121f.; cf. ibid., 111.
  \item \textsuperscript{217} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 74, 76 and 79f.
  \item \textsuperscript{218} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 25, 28f. and 107. Decision to be financially secure and respectable could have prevented Bartleman from pursuing his evangelistic calling: ibid., 27.
  \item \textsuperscript{220} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 28 and 73f.
  \item \textsuperscript{221} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 43, 54, 62, 64 and 108.
  \item \textsuperscript{222} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 67. Cf. Foucault on examination as discipline.
  \item \textsuperscript{223} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 33f. and 122; Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 9.
\end{itemize}
control, or be religiously ‘fanatical,’ manipulative and overbearing. Problems could also be caused by a ‘professional’—instead of ‘spiritual’—approach to the ministry; by team disunity, fighting factions, and even competition between ministries. 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.

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. 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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textit{(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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{230} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 82ff.

\textsuperscript{231} Bartleman, \textit{From Plough}, 21, 26, 75 and 78f.
manifest nature—to Bartleman’s plans and basic human needs.\textsuperscript{232} By engaging with such difficulties—foremost in the place of private intercession—Bartleman engages both a symbolic \textit{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)

\textsuperscript{232}Bartleman, \textit{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.’ 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. 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. Bartleman’s rhizomic fight was to resist Pastor White’s manipulations and control in defence of his inner-embodied independence, divine connection and judgement. 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. 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. 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.

The encounter with Pastor White, the next morning, went well. Bartleman could leave feeling ‘nothing but love toward them.’ 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

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. His health, again, grew worse. Eventually, he had to leave pastoral work, 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, but also as a result of not coming to terms with what had become of them, 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{249}

Compare the quote from DG at the outset of this section.\textsuperscript{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.’

\textit{(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, 

\textquote[From Plough, 125]{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, \textit{From Plough}, 125.

\textquote[My Story, 16]{‘I allowed myself to be swallowed up with sorrow, “the spirit of heaviness.”’} Bartleman, \textit{My Story}, 16.

\textquote[My Story, 19]{249 Bartleman, \textit{My Story}, 19.}

\textquote[Thousand Plateaus, 9]{250 DG, \textit{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.\textsuperscript{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;’\textsuperscript{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;’\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{251} Cf. Justaert, \textit{Theology after Deleuze}, 130.
\textsuperscript{252} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 48.
\textsuperscript{253} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 19.
people into the work. A significantly greater challenge occurred when ‘all the religious sore-heads and crooks and cranks came, seeking a place in the work.’ As a first step, it was necessary for group members to identify this; 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.

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.’

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’ and pulling people towards humility, consecration, revival and love. 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. 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.
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.’

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.
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.


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. 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. 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, 


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.\textsuperscript{272} Thereby, the distributed confrontation, resistance and overcoming of—often, modern-organisational and related embodied—

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. 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

---

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 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.\textsuperscript{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’\textsuperscript{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.’\textsuperscript{276} (2) Bartleman soon felt called to reach out

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{275} Latour, Reassembling the Social, 207ff.

\textsuperscript{276} Bartleman, From Plough, 20.
to the marginalised and the poor; (3) and to pray for their salvation. 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. 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. 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. 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.\textsuperscript{281} (10) By his witness and example, Bartleman successfully challenged some of his peers to consider their call to the ministry.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{283} From a perspective of a Pentecostal theological ethics, Bartleman is able to reformulate this ministry expectation and power

\begin{quote}
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, \textit{From Plough}, 28. Cf. ibid., 23f. and 26.


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, \textit{From Plough}, 25.
\end{quote}
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. Other than Piette’s
concept of a broad-church Catholic God, that arises across distributed
traces of many kinds, 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.  

(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

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 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.

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.

his overly self-disciplined pastoral mannerism and ministry practice.  

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’).  

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.’  

---

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.  

(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.  ‘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).


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.
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. 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. ‘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.

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. 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.


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. 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. 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. 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
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. 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, 

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. 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.’ 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.

Bartleman engaged, again, with the Fergusons’ Peniel missions. At


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. 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. 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, a parallel 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 exploitation 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.’ 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. ... 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 despair’d of my life at times. The sorrows of my Lord had gripped me. I was in the Garden with Him.’ Ibid., 32.

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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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, \textit{My Story}, 26.
\end{flushleft}
greater things were yet to come. 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. The liminality, 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.


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.’

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. It is by an essentialist differentiation, for analytical purposes, 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. 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. 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. 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. 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.

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.

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 terrific 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.


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, 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. Bartleman was captured by its beauty and unearthly presence/ power; 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.

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.’

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. 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.’ 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


\(^{351}\) Bartleman, *How Pentecost*, 60.

\(^{352}\) Durham, ‘Chicago Evangelist’s Pentecost.’
divine presence; that the Spirit acted with an impact upon individual seekers or upon the meeting as a whole; 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;’ 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 correlates 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

---


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;\textsuperscript{356} no depending upon a human leader, no ‘ecclesiastical hierarchism and abuse,’ but rather spontaneity and ‘the Spirit’ being in control;\textsuperscript{357} no defending of the work of oneself, but prayer, a concern ‘not to grieve the Spirit’ and reliance upon God;\textsuperscript{358} no empty talk, no mere-social engagements, but an aim to firstly engage with God;\textsuperscript{359} no ‘counterfeiting’ of Spirit by ‘crooks and cranks,’ but ‘the real thing.’\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{361} Notably—at least in the early phase—it was

\textsuperscript{356} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 58.
\textsuperscript{357} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 58f.
\textsuperscript{358} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 55.
\textsuperscript{359} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 59.
\textsuperscript{360} Bartleman, \textit{How Pentecost}, 45 and 49.
\textsuperscript{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. [...]

673
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.’ 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.

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.\(^\text{368}\) Pentecostal innovation was facilitated and there were unexpected contributions,\(^\text{369}\) 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.\(^\text{370}\) Over time and up to a certain point, God’s presence became ‘clearer and stronger,’ more powerful and

\[\text{was immediately reproved by the Spirit. We were on "holy ground." This atmosphere was unbearable to the carnal spirit." Id., 55. ‘When He spoke we all obeyed. It seemed a fearful thing to hinder or grieve the Spirit. The whole place was steeped in prayer. God was in His holy temple. It was for man to keep silent.’ Bartleman, How Pentecost, 60.}\]

\(^\text{368}\) Bartleman, How Pentecost, 58ff.

\(^\text{369}\) 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.

\(^\text{370}\) Bartleman, How Pentecost, 56.
‘more and more wonderful.’

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.

(l) 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
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

‘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. 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.’

Local and itinerant pioneers in attendance form ‘knots of arborescence in rhizomes.’

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.’

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.’ A mere-arborescent ‘retracing’ would, instead, induce a narrowing down and

375 Bartleman, How Pentecost, 48.
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.

conversion process as being ‘biblical.’ Bartleman clearly enjoyed—and did well in—his biblical and theological studies at evening college. Within the limitations of an undergraduate, Wesleyan-Holiness horizon, he was reasonably well read; always making the most of access to a library. 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.

All doctrinal traditions, writes Bartleman, ‘hold some good.’ 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


382 The Wesleyan-Methodist president’s books ‘were a great feast to my soul.’ Bartleman, *From Plough*, 85.


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—一起 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

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

390 Bartleman, How Pentecost, 6, 16f., 21, 26, 27, 34, 36, 65, 68, 85, 88, 112 and 154; cf. ibid., 161ff.


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 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. In a similar manner, Bartleman’s autobiographic writings, moral, theological or prophetic evaluations often conclude with a biblical reference. 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.


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.
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. 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.

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.’

---

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.
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. 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. 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.

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.

_____________________


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.’ The traceability of certain ministry-related relations introduces durability and strength to rhizomic-spiritual relations. ‘[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.


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
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-
thological reflection; and thereby introduces transformation and
novation to the deeper levels of a personal experience, reflective identity,
odied ethical household and courses of action. Within the context of
ostalism (when it is at its best), Spirit baptism facilitates both
distributed courageous engagement and adaption, together with distributed
esistances and confrontations, within the power situations Pentecostal
ioneers encounter. The structural comparability of Spirit baptism with the
oucauldian 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
leuzo-Guattarian-experimental ontology was required to facilitate an
alytical understanding of the invisible relations and realms of a divine
which relates to Pentecostal and charismatic experience and praxis. With
ference to the life/ministry accounts of a peripatetic revivalist, prophetic
ecessor, and self-acclaimed pioneer and contributor of the Azusa Street
ouring, DG’s six rhizomatic principles were used to facilitate an
alysis of the development and growth of a Pentecostal/charismatic
istry, 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  DG, Thousand Plateaus, 14 and 25.
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