

DEVELOPING A THEOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL
MODEL FOR CONFRONTING EVIL WITHIN
URBAN POWER STRUCTURES

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

James Richard Jackson

May 1995

ABSTRACT

DEVELOPING A THEOLOGICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL
MODEL FOR CONFRONTING EVIL WITHIN
URBAN POWER STRUCTURES

James Richard Jackson, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1995
Chairperson: Dr. John P. Dever

In this dissertation, a theological and sociological foundation for confronting evil within urban power structures was established. From this foundation, a model was developed for guiding churches in confronting evil within the power structures of their communities. Chapter 2 focused on the development of a theological understanding of the nature of evil within urban power structures derived from the writings of Walter Wink.

Chapter 3 examined urban power structures from a sociological perspective. This chapter aided in understanding how and where systemic evil resides within the major urban power structures of society (governments, economic and cultural institutions, and corporations) and within American capitalism as a whole.

Chapter 4 offered a practical eight-step method for discovering the individuals within particular power structures who hold the power. This helps in locating the pressure points of change. In addition, this chapter aided in understanding what it is about the nature and function

of urban power structures that often make them appear impervious to change. This section related urban power structures to conflict theory and, specifically, to the writings of C. Wright Mills and Ralf Dahrendorf.

Chapter 5 examined three community organizations that illustrate what is involved in struggles against urban power structures. The first example is drawn from Saul Alinsky's organizing of Rochester, New York's, African-American community. The second is concerned with the mobilization of Brooklyn, New York's, underclass. The third example, taken from the South Bronx, provides an excellent illustration of an attempt at community organizing which failed.

Chapter 6 focused on a case study of Kentucky Youth Advocates (KYA), a community organization which has met with a great deal of success in confronting systemic evil.

This particular case focused on KYA's attempts to bring Kentucky into compliance with the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP A).

Chapter 7 was dedicated to the development of a model for organizational confrontation of evil as found within urban power structures. This model was developed out of the theological and sociological research of chapters 2, 3, and 4, and the case studies of chapters 5 and 6.

To My Parents,
whose compassion is a model
for me

© Copyright by
James Richard Jackson
1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page		
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
Chapter		
	1. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.....	1
	BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSAL.....	5
	METHODOLOGY.....	10
	Chapter 2.....	10
	Chapter 3.....	13
	Chapter 4.....	14
	Chapter 5.....	15
	Chapter 6.....	17
	Chapter 7.....	18
	2. A THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: SYSTEMIC EVIL	
	IN THE THOUGHT OF WALTER WINK.....	19
	Background to Wink's Study of the Powers.....	20
	Walter Rauschenbusch.....	20
	Reinhold Niebuhr.....	23
	Jacques Ellul.....	26
	William Stringfellow.....	27
	Walter Wink's Concept of Systemic Evil.....	30

The Language of Power.....	32
Interpreting the Powers.....	35
Unmasking the Powers.....	54
Chapter	
The Domination System.....	64
The Nature of the Domination System.....	77
Unmasking the Domination System.....	83
Jesus' Third Way.....	90
A Brief Evaluation of Wink.....	94
3. A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: URBAN POWER STRUCTURES AS THE EMBODIMENT OF SYSTEMIC EVIL (I).....	98
The Critique of Domination: "God's Domination-Free Order".....	98
Servanthood.....	99
Economic Equality.....	101
Racial and Ethnic Inclusion.....	103
Equality for Women and Children.....	104
Healing and Exorcism.....	107
A Critique of Urban Power Structures.....	108
The Nature of Power.....	110
The Foundational American Power Structure: Capitalism.....	113
Urban Power Structures Within American Capitalism.....	123
American Capitalism and God's Domination- Free Order.....	168

4.	A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: URBAN POWER STRUCTURES AS THE EMBODIMENT OF SYSTEMIC EVIL (II).....	171
	The Distribution of Power Within Urban Power Structures.....	171
	Approaches to Determining the Distribution of Power.....	171
	A Method for Measuring Local Power.....	183
Chapter Page		
	The Intransigence of Power Structures: The Relevance of Conflict Theory.....	192
	Intellectual Roots of Conflict Theory.....	195
	Modern Conflict Theory.....	197
	Conclusion.....	209
5.	CONFRONTING EVIL WITHIN POWER STRUCTURES: COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN ACTION.....	211
	The Alinsky Model: FIGHT--The Organizing of Rochester's Black Community.....	212
	Background to the Action.....	214
	The Birth of FIGHT.....	216
	Action and Outcome.....	218
	General Analysis and Evaluation	226
	The Organization and the Powers.....	232
	The Brooklyn Challenge: The Mobilizing of Brooklyn's Underclass	
238		
	Background to the Struggle.....	239

	Initial Action.....	240
	Initial Reflection.....	240
	Follow-Up Action.....	244
	General Analysis and Evaluation.....	247
	The Organization and the Powers.....	250
	When Community Organizing Fails:	
	The Story of the South Bronx.....	252
	Background to the Action.....	252
	The Action.....	255
	The Collapse of the Organization.....	259
	General Analysis and Evaluation.....	260
Chapter		
Page		
	The Organization and the Powers.....	262
	Conclusion.....	265
6.	"ENGAGING THE POWERS": KENTUCKY'S NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE FEDERAL JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT.....	267
	Introduction.....	268
	A Description and History of Kentucky Youth Advocates.....	270
	An Overview of KYA's Engagement Strategies.....	274
	Administrative Advocacy.....	274
	Legislative monitoring or lobbying.....	281

Litigation and Other Legal Strategies.....	281
Public Education and Constituency Development.....	283
The Importance of Leveraging.....	284
A History of KYA's Involvement with the General Issue of Juvenile Detention.....	284
The Process of Choosing the Issue.....	285
The Results of the Analysis.....	287
KYA's Initial Attempts at Reform.....	289
KYA's Previous Attempts to Bring Kentucky into Compliance with the JJDPa.....	290
KYA's Latest Effort to Bring Kentucky into Compliance with the JJDPa.....	294
Barriers to Compliance with the Federal JJDPa.....	295
The Proposal.....	302
KYA and the Powers.....	306
Conclusion.....	311

Chapter
Page

7. THEOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY INTERSECTING: ENGAGING THE URBAN SYSTEMS OF SOCIETY.....	312
Introduction.....	312
The Model.....	314
Discerning the Angel of a Congregation.....	314
Transforming the Angel of	

a Congregation.....	323
Engaging the Powers: The Prophetic Task.....	339
Engaging the Powers: Non-Violent Direct Action.....	357
Strength for the Journey.....	361
Conclusion.....	366
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	369

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to recognize the special contributions of several individuals whose suggestions were of inestimable value during the preparation of this dissertation. Dr. Jerry L. Barnes was instrumental in the initial stages of this work, providing both encouragement and feedback as the topic took shape. Drs. John Dever and Glen Stassen provided numerous suggestions for the form and content of each chapter. Chapter 6 could never have been written without the support and encouragement of David Richart. He provided complete access to all relevant documents and tolerated numerous questions and requests for meetings. The author's parents, Harold and Frances Jackson, and his brother Ronald, proofread each chapter, often with a very short deadline, providing numerous suggestions concerning writing style and literary form which have been of inestimable value. Finally, the author's wife, Yvette, provided invaluable feedback in chapter 3, both as a Mexican-American woman who grew up in Houston's inner-city and as a professional social worker. In both roles, she has come to understand evil within urban power structures as few have had opportunity.

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Evangelical pastors are often daunted by the challenge of seeking to confront and transform unjust power structures within society. The Protestant heritage, with its emphasis on a personal faith and an individual ethic, has not helped evangelicals understand the nature and the dynamics of urban power structures and how to relate them to the gospel.¹ Mortimer Arias points out that despite Protestantism's encompassing view of history and God's sovereignty in human affairs, as well as John Wesley's example of compassion and social concern, evangelicals tend to see society as a conglomerate of individual units, and social evils as the consequence of individual sins and vices.² David Moberg contends that this evangelical individualism can be traced back to the 1920's and 1930's during the fundamentalist-liberal controversies, and as a reaction to the social gospel.³ Thus, the only response most evangelicals offer to systemic evil within urban power structures is personal conversion and personal virtues.⁴ Moberg says that the effect of American individualism has been thorough accommodation of the gospel to

¹Mortimer Arias, "Evangelization and Social Ethics--Some Reflections," Perkins Journal, 35 (Winter-Spring 1982), 37.

²Ibid., pp. 37-38.

³David O. Moberg, The Great Reversal, 2nd. rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Holman, 1977), pp. 30-31.

⁴Arias, "Evangelization and Social Ethics," p. 38.

American culture.⁵

Some attempts have been made to balance this cult of the individual. Moberg, for instance, tried to recover the biblical understanding of social sin and pointed to some relevant ways through which Christians can express social concerns as part of the gospel proclamation and witness.⁶ However, Arias maintains that those who have sought to redress the imbalance (Moberg included) have failed to "go beyond the accepted concepts of social service and personal philanthropy."⁷ All such attempts have done is to incorporate into a dominant understanding of the gospel certain social concerns, what are called "social implications" or "social duties." Such attempts have made no effort to incorporate an understanding of systemic evil within urban power structures as an integral part of the gospel.⁸ Arias argues that what is needed is an analysis of the macro-

⁵Moberg, The Great Reversal, n.p.

⁶Ibid., pp. 120ff., 172ff.

⁷Arias, "Evangelization and Social Ethics," p. 38.

⁸In fact, much of the literature on the subject shares a general uniformity. The authors begin by discussing Scriptures which point to God's demand for justice and equality. Having grounded their concern for justice in the Bible, the authors begin to grapple with the "serious" task of confronting corrupt power structures. These books close with a chapter or two calling on churches to work for justice. Sometimes this structure can be seen within sections of a book and sometimes within each chapter of a book. Examples of this can be found repeatedly throughout the literature. The Christian Call To Justice and Peace by Joseph Stoutzenberger (Winona: Saint Mary's, 1987); Agenda for Biblical People by Jim Wallis (New York: Harper & Row, 1972); The Preferential Option for the Poor, Encounter Series, ed. by Richard John Neuhaus (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988); Christian Faith and Public Policy by Arthur Simon (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987); You Can Make a Difference by Betty Bock (Birmingham, AL: Woman's Missionary Union, SBC, 1992); and

structures of society, including the military-industrial complexes, large corporations, and social and cultural structures; in short, he calls for an analysis of the power structures of society as "the contemporary version of the 'powers and principalities.'"⁹

Arias's statement points to the fact that little has been written which can be used as a resource toward a holistic understanding of the nature of urban power structures, the forms systemic evil takes within these structures, and methods, grounded in theory, which can be used to confront and redeem them.¹⁰ There is a serious need for an understanding of systemic evil grounded in a strong theoretical foundation based upon theology and sociology, and which then takes the theory and applies it to urban ministry. The purpose of this dissertation is to develop a theological and sociological model for confronting evil within urban power structures. Evil within urban power structures (systemic evil) will be examined from a number of different perspectives. Each of these perspectives will aid in the development of a model for confronting corrupt urban power structures. The work of Walter Wink, through his development of Paul's concept of the principalities and powers, will form the basis of a theological understanding of systemic evil (see chapter 2). Evil within urban power structures will then be examined from a

The Church that Cares by Kenneth Miller and Mary Wilson (Valley Forge: Judson, 1985) each, to varying degrees, shares this structure. Nothing is inherently wrong with following such a structure. My point is only that little attempt is made to develop a theology for transforming social structures, nor to analyze urban power structures from a sociological perspective, nor to develop a model for transforming urban power structures that flows out of a theological and sociological understanding of urban power structures.

⁹Arias, "Evangelization and Social Ethics," p. 38.

¹⁰The bibliography gives evidence of the wide variety of sources I am consulting in order to develop just such a resource.

sociological perspective in order to understand it more fully. A critique of American capitalism and the major urban power structures within capitalism (chapter 3) will be followed by a discussion of a method for determining where power is located within particular urban power structures (chapter 4). Using conflict theory, this chapter will end with a discussion of the difficulties involved in effecting change within urban power structures. An examination of three community organizations that have sought to effect change will form the basis of chapter 5. Chapter 6 will involve an ethnographic study of a contemporary community organization's attempt to bring about change in a corrupt urban power structure. Chapter 7 will be dedicated to the development of a model for organizational confrontation of evil within urban power structures. This model will be developed out of the research done in the preceding chapters.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSAL

My first introduction to systemic evil came in the fall of 1987 when I began working in Chicago's Cabrini-Green housing project.¹¹ Cabrini-Green was the first of

¹¹I interned at an African-American Lutheran Church. My supervisors were the pastors of the church--Dr. Charles Infelt and Rev. Maxine Washington, each of whom has several years of inner-city pastoral experience. My responsibilities included various pastoral duties including worship leadership, preaching, visitation, youth work, teaching Sunday School, etc. In addition, I worked as a chaplain of the Uptown Detoxification Center, an in-resident recovery program for alcohol-dependent adults, as chaplain of a Lutheran elementary school, and as a leader of a church reorganization committee charged with restructuring and revitalizing the entire organizational structure of Holy Family Church. The courses I took through the Seminary Consortium for Urban Pastoral Education were integrated with my field experience, practical and relevant in design, and taught by such recognized leaders in urban ministry as Dr. David

Chicago's big housing complexes.¹² It occupies a five-by-eight block area (seventy acres) on Chicago's Near North Side, housing 10,000-14,000 people in twenty-three high-rises and fifty-five row houses. Almost 70 percent of the residents are children; almost 80 percent are one-parent families. The average annual income per family in 1982 was \$4,000.¹³ Beyond these statistics lie a multitude of problems ranging from poverty and unemployment to gang violence and police corruption.¹⁴ The various labels attached to Cabrini-Green by the media include that of "war zone" and "hell on earth."¹⁵

As I became acquainted with the community and the people living there and the problems they faced, I began to realize that the traditional concepts of sin and evil upon which I had been raised were not large enough to encompass what I was finding there. Sin in Cabrini-Green seemed more ominous, more encompassing--filling every building and pervading the very air of the project with its stench. As I listened to the residents tell their stories and watched the young people deal with their issues, I was confronted with the puzzling feeling that there was something blocking these people from

Claerbaut, Dr. John McKnight, Dr. Carl Dundley, Dr. David Frenchak, and the late Dr. Bill Leslie. Some of the courses I took included "Transforming Urban Systems," "Functional Relationships Between Church and Community," "Public Issues in Pastoral Ministry," "Dynamics and Development of the Modern Industrial City," "Biblical Theology of the City," "Introduction to Urban Ministry," and "Conceptions of the City." I want to express deep gratitude to all of these mentors from whom I learned so much.

¹²William Mullen, "The Road to Hell," Chicago Tribune Magazine, 26 (March 31, 1985), 12.

¹³Harry Lehotsky, "Inner-City Ministry," (source lost), (March 1982), 9.

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Ibid.

building lives for themselves and developing as whole human beings. I realized that if this was true, it must, in some sense at least, be sin, but my world view had no sin category large enough to encompass all that I was witnessing. The concept I was looking for and would eventually discover was that of "systemic evil." One initial kairos moment for me occurred when I was reading an article by Harry Lehotsky. In this article, he had this to say about the problems in Cabrini-Green:

I am convinced . . . that the deeper problem lies outside Cabrini, in a society which allows and encourages the existence of Cabrini-Greens. The deeper problem lies among those political, financial, social and religious institutions which refuse to use their resources to facilitate change in the plight of Cabrini. (It is hard to pull yourself up by your bootstraps when both your arms are tied, so you can't even reach the bootstraps.) The deeper problem lies with those people who themselves benefit by supporting those negligent politicians and systems.¹⁶

Another "kairos" moment for me came as I was reading an article entitled, "How Will You Compete with Horses?" by John V. Shaver. In it, he quoted an American nun, Sister Mary Evelyn Jagen:

It does not matter that we may be personally innocent of acts we perceive as unjust. Our institutions do our sinning for us. We must therefore examine our consciousness more than our conscience about apathy in the face of human destruction.¹⁷

These two articles began the process of opening my mind and heart to the existence of systemic evil. Over the next few years, I read some of the limited material that was available that touched on systemic evil.¹⁸ A number of writers spoke of the

¹⁶Ibid., p. 13.

¹⁷John V. Shaver, "How Will You Compete with Horses?" Touchstone, 1, no. 3 (October 1983), 21.

¹⁸Some of these books include Urban Ministry by David Claerbaut (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983); Christian Mission and Social Justice by Samuel E. Escobar and John Driver (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1980); Evangelizing

scarcity of books on urban ministry that grew out of an understanding of the city and its structures.¹⁹ This troubled me a great deal, and I decided to work toward a dissertation topic connected with systemic evil within urban power structures that would make a contribution to the literature and be relevant and practical in design. I wasn't sure how to do this and expressed my quandary to my friend and mentor, Jerry L. Barnes of Acadia Divinity College. He suggested that I read all I could find by Walter Rauschenbusch and Reinhold Niebuhr to see if their writings could give me any guidance. Having already read some of Rauschenbusch, I went immediately to Niebuhr to see what additional information he had on systemic evil. As I studied, I was amazed at the similarities I found between him and Rauschenbusch, yet I could also see where Niebuhr had developed and deepened what Rauschenbusch had said. It was at this point that a

Neopagan North America: The Word that Frees by Alfred Krass (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1982); Living More with Less by Doris Longacre (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1980); Towards a Church of the Poor: The Work of an Ecumenical Group on the Church and the Poor, ed. by Julio DeSanata Ana (Geneva: Commission on the Churches' Participation in Development, World Council of Churches, 1979); Metro Ministry, ed. by David Frenchak and Sharrel Keyes (Elgin, IL: David C. Cook, 1979); Discipling the City: Theological Reflections on Urban Ministry, ed. by Roger Greenway (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979); Urban Church Breakthrough by Richard E. Moore and Duane L. Day (New York: Harper & Row, 1966); Hunger for Justice: The Politics of Food and Faith by Jack A. Nelson (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1980); Survival and Mission for the City Church by Gaylord B. Noyce (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975); Cry Justice: The Bible on Hunger and Poverty by Ron Sider (New York: Paulist, 1980); City of God--City of Satan by Robert Linthicum (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991); and Envisioning the New City: A Reader on Urban Ministry, ed. by Eleanor Scott Meyers (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992).

¹⁹Claerbaut, for instance, expresses this concern in the preface to his volume, Urban Ministry.

concrete idea for a topic began to form in my mind: to develop a holistic understanding of the nature of urban power structures, and methods, grounded in a strong theoretical base, that can be used to confront and redeem them.

Shortly thereafter, I talked with Glen Stassen and told him of the excitement I was experiencing as a theoretical foundation for an understanding of systemic evil grounded in theology was beginning to develop in my mind. He pointed me in the direction of Walter Wink and encouraged me to study his writings to see what they could contribute to my paradigm. The writings of Wink were a revelation. I saw where he built on the foundation laid by Rauschenbusch and Niebuhr, but I recognized, at the same time, that he took the study to a new level with his analysis of the concept of the principalities and powers. I saw in the writings of Walter Wink an invaluable resource that could provide a strong theological foundation for a study of evil within urban power structures.

At this point, I took my idea to my supervisor, John Dever. He challenged me not only to look to theology as a basis for understanding systemic evil, but also to investigate what sociology could contribute toward a theoretical understanding of power structures. As I began to analyze urban power structures from a sociological perspective, it became apparent that theology and sociology must go hand-in-hand in a holistic understanding of systemic evil as found within urban power structures. Theology provides a spiritual dimension to the analysis, while sociology grounds the analysis in the political, economic, and social context of a particular society. In fact, I discovered that sociology could help not only in understanding the nature of systemic evil, but also (through conflict theory) aid in understanding the intransigence of urban power structures.

I also decided to analyze attempts that have been made to confront corrupt urban power structures, and as well do a case study of a community organization which

seems to be dealing effectively with one aspect of systemic evil to illustrate the problem I was confronting. All of this led to chapter 7 as the heart of my paper--the development of a model for confronting evil within urban power structures.

METHODOLOGY

The dissertation will be organized into seven chapters as follows.

Chapter 2

In order to develop an effective model for confronting evil within urban power structures, it will be helpful to have a theological understanding of the nature of evil within urban power structures derived from the writings of Walter Wink. Wink is a key figure today in the ethical and theological study of systemic evil. His definitive work on the principalities and powers is an indispensable foundation for a study of evil.

Herman C. Waetjen has said of Wink:

No one else has produced such a far-reaching, comprehensive and incisive understanding of "the powers" as they are disclosed in biblical literature, and no one else has articulated their significance for today through such relevant interpretation.²⁰

Wink took the analysis of systemic evil to a new level with his theological analysis of the concept of the principalities and powers. Wink proposes that the spiritual powers be viewed "not as separate heavenly or ethereal entities but as the inner aspect of material or tangible manifestations of power."²¹ Thus, the principalities and powers are

²⁰Herman C. Waetjen, review of Engaging the Powers, by Walter Wink, The Christian Century, 110, no. 21 (July 14-21, 1993), 722.

²¹Walter Wink, Naming the Powers, vol. 1 of The

the "inner or spiritual essence, or gestalt, of an institution or state or system."²² It is important to understand that, for Wink, these "Powers" do not have a separate spiritual existence independent of their material counterparts. They must become embodied "in cellulose or in a culture or in a regime or a corporation or a megalomaniac."²³ Wink, thus, uses the term, "Powers," to refer to all manifestations of power, whether seen from the perspective of their physical or institutional concretion on the one hand, or their inner essence or spirituality on the other.²⁴

To grasp Wink's thought, it is also vital to understand his concept of the "Domination System." Wink uses the term "to indicate what happens when an entire network of Powers becomes integrated around idolatrous values."²⁵ Theologically, this can be spoken of as widespread systemic evil. One must be careful, however, not to equate corrupt power structures with the Domination System. The Domination System transcends any of its current embodiments.²⁶ No power structure is ever identical with the Domination System. Beyond each manifestation of corruptness stands the ancient System of Domination, the spirit of which is Satan.²⁷ This term will be fleshed out in chapter 2. A more thorough understanding of Wink's position will be pursued, too, by focusing on several men who helped lay the intellectual groundwork for Wink: Walter Rauschenbusch, Reinhold Niebuhr, Jacques Ellul, and William Stringfellow.

Powers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), p. 104.

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid., p. 105.

²⁴Ibid., p. 107.

²⁵Walter Wink, Engaging the Powers, vol. 3 of The Powers (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), p. 9.

²⁶Ibid., p. 90.

²⁷Ibid.

Chapter 3

Theology alone does not provide a holistic understanding of systemic evil and the power structures within which it is embedded. Sociology is an indispensable tool in the struggle to come to a more thorough knowledge of this multi-faceted phenomenon. Theology and ethics help one become aware of how an understanding of systemic evil relates to the Christian belief system and is grounded in our understanding of God and God's created order. However, one must turn to sociology if one desires to understand how and where systemic evil resides in the urban power structures of society. Thus, chapter 3 will be devoted to a sociological analysis of urban power structures.

A sociological analysis will aid in developing a model for confronting evil within urban power structures in that it will help in understanding what the power structures are within which systemic evil resides in the urban areas of the United States, and how that evil is manifested within those structures. The analysis of urban power structures will begin with a critique of American capitalism which, in the United States, is the foundational urban power structure. It is not sufficient, however, simply to rely on a critique of American capitalism for an analysis of urban power structures. Unless one plans to develop a new economic system and persuade the United States to adopt that system, one has no choice but to live and function within America's present economic system. Therefore, systemic evil within American capitalism will also be discussed, focusing on the major urban power structures found within American capitalism: economic institutions, corporations, the government, and cultural institutions.

Chapter 4

When analyzing a particular power structure within an urban area, one must have a method for discovering the individuals within that power structure who hold the power. This helps in locating the pressure points of change. Chapter 4 will offer a practical eight-step method for determining power distribution, that allows considerable modification for different issues and needs.²⁸

In addition to aiding in understanding systemic evil within urban power structures, sociology can also help in understanding why it is often so difficult to bring about change within these structures. In developing a model for confronting evil within power structures, it is very important to have an understanding of what it is about the nature and function of power structures that often make them appear impervious to change. Specifically, modern conflict theory sheds light on this phenomenon.

Conflict theory is the major alternative to functionalism as an approach to analyzing the general structure of society, and it has become increasingly popular and important in modern sociology. Conflict theorists are interested in the rivalries among different groups within systems, and the continual struggle for power that can be seen within societal systems.²⁹ I will focus on the ideas and contributions of C. Wright Mills and Ralf Dahrendorf, each of whom combines a conflict perspective with a strong critique of the social order.

Chapter 5

This chapter will be devoted to an examination of three community

²⁸Larry Lyon, The Community in Urban Society (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1987), p. 206.

²⁹Ruth A. Wallace and Alison Wolf, Contemporary Sociological Theory, 2nd rev. ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1986), p. 62.

organizations that offer excellent illustrations of what is involved in struggles against urban power structures. An examination of these organizations, their strategies, their experiences, and their struggles, will aid in the development of a model for confronting evil within urban power structures. The first example is drawn from Saul Alinsky's organizing of Rochester, New York's, African-American community against poverty and racism. I chose to include one of Alinsky's community organizing efforts because of his unparalleled stature in the field of community organizing. Jacques Maritain, the French philosopher, has called Alinsky "one of the few really great men of this century."³⁰ And Charles E. Silberman, in Crisis in Black and White, wrote of him: "No one in the United States has proposed a course of action or a philosophy better calculated to rescue Negro or white slum dwellers from their poverty or their degradation."³¹ Alinsky's work in Rochester received much praise. The Eastman Kodak Corporation acknowledged "that FIGHT, as a broad-based community organization, speaks in behalf of . . . the Negro poor in the Rochester area."³² Through FIGHT, the Black ghetto in Rochester has been enabled to establish a meaningful dialogue regarding housing and education with the city administration.³³

The second example is concerned with the mobilization of Brooklyn, New York's, underclass against the management of the public housing in which they resided. I chose this case because of its timeliness. Although it comes out of the 1960s, the exact situations it describes exist today, and the case is quite applicable to current conditions.

³⁰"Alinsky, Saul (David)," Current Biography, 29th ed., ed. Charles Moritz, (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1968), p. 17.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid., p. 17.

³³Ibid.

Some of the federal regulations have changed, but the organizing principles are as timely as ever.³⁴ In addition, this case is distinctive in its description of the analytic and conceptual steps the organizers took in formulating their objectives, strategies, and tactics.³⁵

The final example, taken from the South Bronx, is of interest because it provides an excellent illustration of an attempt at community organizing which failed despite the existence of "a viable organization with black, white, and Hispanic leadership as well as participation."³⁶ This case presents an issue that is very controversial among community organizers. The author, Steve Burghardt, concludes that the very poor cannot be organized because they are, necessarily, more concerned with survival issues.³⁷

Chapter 6

Chapter 6 will focus on a case study of Kentucky Youth Advocates, a community organization which has met with a great deal of success in confronting systemic evil. This case study will not only illustrate the difficulties expressed above in challenging power structures, but will provide a concrete example of how one contemporary community organization is attempting to challenge and change the principalities and powers of these structures. The case itself will focus on Kentucky Youth Advocates' attempts to bring Kentucky into compliance with the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act.

³⁴Joan Ecklein, ed., Community Organizers, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984), p. 136.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Ibid., p. 68.

³⁷Ibid.

Chapter 7

Chapter 7 will be dedicated to the development of a model for organizational confrontation of evil as found within urban power structures. This model will be developed out of the theological and sociological research of chapters 2, 3, and 4, a reflection upon attempts to change urban power structures as illustrated in chapter 5, and the case study of Kentucky Youth Advocates' encounter with power structures (chapter 6).

Chapter 2

A THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: SYSTEMIC EVIL
IN THE THOUGHT OF WALTER WINK

Walter Wink did not intend to write a trilogy on the biblical concept of the principalities and powers. It was, one might say, "forced" on him during a four-month period he spent in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Peru, Costa Rica, and Nicaragua. The evil he saw in Latin America so overwhelmed him that he became physically ill and engulfed by a sense of despair. Wink writes:

The evils we encountered were so monolithic, so massively supported by our own government, in some cases so anchored in a long history of tyranny, that it scarcely seemed that anything could make a difference.³⁸

During this period, Wink read Wesley Carr's, Angels and Principalities.³⁹ It was, he felt, largely in error, but it gave him the impetus to look afresh at the issue of

³⁸Preface to Walter Wink, Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament, vol. 1 of The Powers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), p. ix.

³⁹Wesley Carr, Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning, and Development of the Pauline Phrase Hai Archai Kai Hai Exousiai, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph, ser. 42 (Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University, 1981).

the principalities and powers and to "reexamine every scrap of evidence from scratch."⁴⁰ The outcome of this massive study was Wink's trilogy entitled The Powers. A theological understanding of systemic evil, derived from Wink's study of the principalities and powers, will form the basis of this chapter. Systemic evil is a theological term used to describe a phenomenon that is both theological and sociological in nature: the existence and function of evil within the urban power structures of society.

Background to Wink's Study of the Powers

Wink's study of the Powers is the culmination of a century-long effort by theologians to understand the biblical concept of the principalities and powers within the context of twentieth-century America. This section will focus on a few of the more significant writers who foreshadowed the discoveries of Wink.

Walter Rauschenbusch

Interest in the Powers began with Walter Rauschenbusch and his founding of the social gospel movement. Reinhold Niebuhr, writing in 1935, described Rauschenbusch as "not only the real founder of social

⁴⁰Preface to Wink, Naming, p. x.

Christianity in this country but also its most brilliant and generally satisfying exponent" ⁴¹ The roots of later understandings of the Powers can be found in Rauschenbusch's writings. Rauschenbusch saw sin as essentially selfishness. ⁴² He saw people seeking to satisfy their covetousness to the injury of society. They were willing to destroy liberty and social justice in whole nations in order to hold on to their social, economic and political privileges. ⁴³ This led Rauschenbusch to conclude that much of sin was and is "a conflict between the selfish Ego and the common good of humanity" ⁴⁴

Growing from his organismic view of society, Rauschenbusch argued for the social transmission of sin. Sin is transmitted by means of social traditions such as alcoholism, lynching, blood feuds and militarism. ⁴⁵ Rauschenbusch writes, "Sin is lodged in unsocial custom and institutions and is absorbed by the individual from his social group" ⁴⁶ For Rauschenbusch, the life of all

⁴¹Reinhold Niebuhr, An Interpretation of Christian Ethics (New York: Harper Brothers, 1935), p. 1.

⁴²Walter Rauschenbusch, A Theology for the Social Gospel (New York: Macmillan, 1918), p. 47.

⁴³Ibid., p. 46.

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 60.

⁴⁶Ibid.

humanity is intertwined, always renewing itself, yet always perpetuating what has been. One generation was corrupted by the one before it, and it in turn corrupts the one following.⁴⁷

Rauschenbusch used the terms, the "super-personal forces"⁴⁸ and "principalities and powers,"⁴⁹ to refer to what today would include urban power structures. When these powerful community forces backslide and become combinations for evil, they add enormously to the power of sin.⁵⁰ The ultimate convergence of such evil for Rauschenbusch is in the "Kingdom of Evil."⁵¹ The Kingdom of Evil is a state in which all people in all places and at all times are bound together in a solidarity bearing the yoke of evil and suffering.⁵² This realm of evil is controlled by the "permanent force of organized evil."⁵³

⁴⁷Claude J. Williams, "Walter Rauschenbusch: A Prophet of Social Righteousness" (Th.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1952), p. 173.

⁴⁸Rauschenbusch, A Theology, p. 69.

⁴⁹Harold Stephen Shoemaker, "Christ and the Principalities and Powers in Representative Twentieth Century Theologians" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1978), p. 82.

⁵⁰Rauschenbusch, A Theology, p. 78.

⁵¹Ibid.

⁵²Ibid., p. 81.

⁵³Walter Rauschenbusch, The Social Principles of Jesus (New York: Association, 1921), p. 155.

"When the social group is evil," writes Rauschenbusch, "evil is over all."⁵⁴ The collective body or social group (power structure) assimilates individuals into itself and transforms the individual.

These evil collective forces usually begin by serving humanity; selfish interests change their role from one of service to one of exploitation.⁵⁵ Once corrupted, these collective forces are difficult to redeem for they fashion structures to carry on beyond the individuals originally in charge. Rauschenbusch writes:

A corporation might be composed of retired missionaries, peace advocates, and dear old ladies, but their philanthropy would cause no vibrations in the business end of the concern.⁵⁶

This is why Rauschenbusch refers to them as super-personal forces.

The battle with these super-personal forces of evil has as its goal the salvation of these Powers. Their salvation consists in coming out of the Kingdom of Evil and into the Kingdom of God--that sphere where the Powers will

⁵⁴Rauschenbusch, A Theology, p. 81.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 72; see also Walter Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order (New York: Macmillan, 1912), p. 394.

⁵⁶Rauschenbusch, Christianizing the Social Order, p. 185.

once again follow a loving and serving purpose.⁵⁷

Reinhold Niebuhr

Reinhold Niebuhr saw sin as both rebellion against God and the order he has established for humanity and as injustice.⁵⁸ This is very similar to Rauschenbusch's view; yet, whereas Rauschenbusch spoke of selfishness, Niebuhr preferred such terms as "rebellion against God," "self-worship," and "man's pretension that he is not contingent."⁵⁹ Niebuhr went much farther in his analysis than did Rauschenbusch and was much more systematic in his thought. Much of Niebuhr's analysis centered around the concept of "pride."⁶⁰ He saw pride as the driving force of sin. Niebuhr spoke of the "pride of power," "intellectual pride," "moral pride," and "spiritual pride."⁶¹ Key to Niebuhr's thought is that these forms of pride can be characteristics of individuals or of groups (systems).⁶²

⁵⁷Rauschenbusch, A Theology, pp. 110-17.

⁵⁸Reinhold Niebuhr, The Nature and Destiny of Man, vol. 1 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949), p. 179.

⁵⁹Bobby Earl Patterson, "Sin and Grace in the Light of Reinhold Niebuhr's Writings" (Th.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1960), p. 82.

⁶⁰See "Man as Sinner," in Niebuhr, Nature and Destiny, vol. 1, pp. 178-240.

⁶¹Niebuhr, Nature and Destiny, vol. 1, pp. 188-203.

⁶²Ibid., p. 208.

According to Niebuhr, pride within groups is much more menacing than individual pride because collective pride "results in a unity which transcends the power and pretensions of the individual ego."⁶³ Niebuhr writes: "The group is more arrogant, hypocritical, self-centered and more ruthless in the pursuit of its ends than the individual."⁶⁴ In addition, groups achieve "a certain authority over the individual and [result] in unconditioned demands by the group upon the individual."⁶⁵ Niebuhr described groups as possessing "an independent centre of moral life,"⁶⁶ thereby constraining individuals to submit to their pretensions and authority even when these go against the individuals' moral values.⁶⁷ Niebuhr's political realism grew out of the conviction that a group's egoism is stronger than its sense of justice.⁶⁸

This raised the question for Niebuhr as to whether collectives can be redeemed. Niebuhr did not demonize the Powers but regarded them as possessing an ethical ambiguity. Groups can be of benefit to persons.

⁶³Patterson, "Sin and Grace," p. 92.

⁶⁴Niebuhr, Nature and Destiny, vol. 1, p. 208.

⁶⁵Ibid.

⁶⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Patterson, "Sin and Grace," pp. 92-93.

Corporations and political parties, for instance, each serve a vital role in a community. However, Niebuhr felt that collectives ultimately fall victim to a sense of arrogance and self-sufficiency seeking their own ends rather than the common good. This results in "a final Nemesis",⁶⁹ which comes in a situation of success as a final form of hybris. As for now, though, there is "life as well as death, virtue as well as sin in these social and political configurations."⁷⁰

⁶⁹Reinhold Niebuhr, Faith and History (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), p. 221.

⁷⁰Ibid.

Jacques Ellul

The eschatological battle with the principalities and powers is a major theme of Ellul's work. For Ellul, the Powers are structures of sin and evil which are a mixture of spiritual power and the work of people.⁷¹ He identifies "technique" and "the city" as two examples of principalities and powers which must be fought as spiritual Powers. "Technique" is those methods, in their totality, which are rationally arrived at and possessing absolute efficiency in every field of human activity.⁷² Ellul says of this Power:

What seems most disquieting is that the character of technique renders it independent of man himself The important thing is that man, practically speaking, no longer possesses any means of bringing action to bear upon technique Technique is essentially independent of the human being, who finds himself naked and disarmed before it.⁷³

The city also is an independent entity which is a mixture of spiritual power and the work of persons and which has an orientation toward evil.⁷⁴ He describes in

⁷¹Shoemaker, "Christ and the Principalities and Powers," p. 179.

⁷²Introduction to Jacques Ellul, The Technological Society (New York: Vintage, 1964), p. xxv.

⁷³Ibid., p. 306.

⁷⁴Jacques Ellul, The Meaning of the City (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), pp. 15, 114, 169.

graphic terms the demonic control the city has over individuals: "He is used, consumed, eaten away, possessed in heart and soul" ⁷⁵ Ellul argues that although these Powers have been defeated by Christ, they refuse to admit their defeat and are battling more fiercely than ever. ⁷⁶

William Stringfellow

Stringfellow stresses the fallenness of creation. All creation, including the principalities and powers, is fallen. The sole issue confronting Christian ethics is "how to live humanly during the Fall." ⁷⁷

Stringfellow asks, "Who are the Principalities and Powers?" and answers his own question. They are images (Marilyn Monroe, motherhood, sex), ideologies (communism, capitalism, socialism, materialism), and institutions (governments, corporations, universities, the family). The list of Powers can also include money, class, fashion, and race. ⁷⁸

⁷⁵Ibid., p. 169.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 166.

⁷⁷William Stringfellow, An Ethic for Christians and Other Aliens in a Strange Land (Waco, TX: Word, 1973), p. 19.

⁷⁸Shoemaker, "Christ and the Principalities and Powers," p. 191.

Stringfellow makes a number of statements to describe the Powers⁷⁹:

(1) The Powers are legion. As shown above, they exist in a multitude of forms.

(2) The Powers are creatures. The Powers have an existence above, beyond, and apart from individuals. They have their own corporate personalities which are different from, and more than, the sum of the persons who participate in them.

(3) The Powers are fallen. They are alienated from God, seek to exist as autonomous beings, and seek domination over human beings. Thus, they have a profound confusion as to their true identity.

(4) The Powers represent an inverse dominion. Instead of being directed and controlled by persons, they dominate and enslave human life.

(5) The Powers are aggressors. They make human beings their victims through such tools as racism, sexism, capitalism, and greed.

(6) The Powers have acolytes. Domitian was the acolyte of the demonic principality, Rome, and Melvin Laird was an acolyte of the Pentagon.

(7) The principalities and powers enter into

⁷⁹Stringfellow, An Ethic for Christians, pp. 77-94. See also his work, Free in Obedience (New York: Seabury, 1964), pp. 50-73; and Shoemaker, "Christ and the Principalities and Powers," pp. 191-92.

rivalries and fornication with each other (Rev. 18: 7-15).

For examples of this, one need look no further than the Military-Industrial-Educational complex, or the rivalry of nations.

(8) The Powers have one morality--the ethic of survival. All ethical decisions are subsumed under the question, "What action will ensure our survival?"

Stringfellow argues, in spite of all he has said, that the principalities and powers are not inherently evil.

He argues that they are redeemable and the Church's task is to call them to their vocation--the enhancement of human life. Stringfellow continues:

Confronting the powers with their creaturehood--admonishing the principalities about their vocation as creatures called to serve the social need of humans--is a requisite for Jerusalem (the company of Christians).⁸⁰

However, neither are the Powers benign. Stringfellow argues that such a view is both theologically false and empirically unwarranted. How can it be seriously argued, Stringfellow asks, that the Principalities are only somewhat or sometimes fallen and that the Fall is not an essential condition of disorientation affecting all of creation. Further, this view dismisses the enormity, pervasiveness, and interminableness of human suffering of all sorts prevalent in this world which is only properly

⁸⁰Stringfellow, An Ethic for Christians, p. 57.

attributable to the fallenness of the principalities and powers. Stringfellow points to the biblical understanding of the principalities and powers expressed in the wantonness of Babylon, the great nation which destroys, squanders, and devours human life for the sake of her own vainglory and enrichment and power (Rev. 18:7-8, 24).⁸¹

⁸¹Ibid., pp. 83-84.

Walter Wink's Concept of Systemic Evil

Walter Wink develops his concept of systemic evil out of an exhaustive analysis of the biblical understanding of the Powers. Wink offers no definition of the term power in his writings, arguing instead that everyone knows what it means until forced to define it.⁸² The dictionary definition serves his purpose adequately as long as the term "is not pressed to answer for the myth with which it presently keeps company."⁸³ By this, Wink refers to the modern Western tendency to regard power in purely materialistic terms rather than "as the confluence of both spiritual and material factors"⁸⁴

In his study of the Powers, Wink navigates largely uncharted terrain. Despite a number of excellent studies that have been undertaken on the principalities and powers,⁸⁵ no treatment, as comprehensive as Wink's, has

⁸²Wink, Naming, p. 3.

⁸³Ibid.

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵Wink points to a number of such studies including Heinrich Schlier, Principalities and Powers in the New Testament (New York: Herder & Herder, 1961); H. Berkhof, Christ and the Powers (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1962); Clinton Morrison, The Powers that Be (London: SCM, 1960); G. B. Caird, Principalities and Powers (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956); E. Gordon Rupp, Principalities and Powers (London: Epworth, 1952); G. H. C. MacGregor, "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies, 1 (1954), 17-28; James S. Stewart, "On a

been attempted. Most studies have focused on the Pauline epistles or even one chapter of the Pauline epistles (e.g. Romans 13), ignoring the language of Power throughout the rest of the New Testament.⁸⁶ Most of these studies focus on the questions as to whether these Powers are evil spirits or social institutions and whether they are good or evil.⁸⁷ Wink takes the issue back a step and begins by seeking to understand how power was conceived by people in the first century generally and by the New Testament authors in particular. Wink offers a comprehensive examination of the uses of the terms for power in virtually all New Testament and cognate literature. The Greek terms for power Wink examines include arch and arch n, exousia, dynamis, thronos, kyriot s, and onoma. Other words and phrases relevant to the discussion which Wink examines include the concepts of angels, fallen angels, evil spirits, demons, and elements of the universe.

Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology," Scottish Journal of Theology, 4 (1951), 292-301; John Howard Yoder, The Politics of Jesus (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1972), pp. 135-214; William Stringfellow, Free in Obedience (New York: Seabury, 1964) and An Ethic for Christians and Other Aliens in a Strange Land (Waco, TX: Word, 1973); W. A. Visser't Hooft, The Kingship of Christ (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948); Albert H. van den Heuvel, These Rebellious Powers (New York: Friendship, 1965).

⁸⁶Wink, Naming, p. 6.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 4.

The Language of Power

From his study, Wink draws a number of conclusions on the language of power in the New Testament which form the groundwork of the entire trilogy.

First, the language of power pervades the entire New Testament.⁸⁸ Wink discovered that the terminology of power is found on virtually every page of the New Testament. He writes that throughout the New Testament, one finds those "incumbents, offices, structures, roles, institutions, ideologies, rituals, rules, agents, and spiritual influences by which power is established and exercised."⁸⁹ Wink attributes earlier scholarly failure to recognize this pervasiveness to a "preoccupation with personified aspects of power."⁹⁰

Wink's second conclusion is that the "language of power in the New Testament is imprecise, liquid, interchangeable, and unsystematic."⁹¹ He points to numerous examples where an author uses the same word differently in different contexts or uses a number of different words to describe the same idea. This fluidity of language is not confined to the New Testament but, as Wink found, is

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 99.

⁸⁹Ibid.

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 9.

characteristic of other contemporary writings of the period.⁹²

Wink's third conclusion is that despite all this imprecision and interchangeability, clear patterns of useage are still easily discernible. Arch_n, for example, almost always refers to an incumbent-in-office and exousia generally denotes the legitimations and sanctions by which a group maintains power.⁹³

The fourth conclusion Wink draws from his study is that because these terms are somewhat interchangeable, sometimes one or two are made to represent them all.⁹⁴ In Romans 8:38-39, for example, we read:

For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor anything else in all creation, will be able to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord (King James Version).

In Colossians 2:20, the same reality is expressed using just one term: "If with Christ you died to the elements of the universe, why do you live as if you still belonged to the world?" (King James Version).

Wink's fifth conclusion is his assertion that these "Powers are both heavenly and earthly, divine and human,

⁹²Wink, Naming, p. 6.

⁹³Ibid., p. 10.

⁹⁴Ibid.

spiritual and political, invisible and structural."⁹⁵ He supports this claim through an analysis of numerous passages but perhaps the clearest indication is found in Col. 1:16:

For in him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones (thronai) or dominions (kyriotes) or principalities (archai) or authorities (exousia)--all things were created through him and for him (Revised Standard Version).

This passage clearly portrays the Powers as including human beings, social systems, and divine powers.

Wink's sixth conclusion refutes assertions to the contrary by Wesley Carr.⁹⁶ Wink provides irrefutable evidence that the biblical writers viewed the Powers as both good and evil.⁹⁷

The seventh and final conclusion Wink draws from his study asserts that, unless the context specifies, the terms for power are to be understood in their most comprehensive sense; that is, they are to be understood as referring to both heavenly and earthly, divine and human,

⁹⁵Ibid., p. 11.

⁹⁶Wesley Carr, Angels and Principalities (New York: Cambridge University, 1981). In this book, Carr maintains that all references to the Powers in the New Testament depict them as good and that it is not until the second century that a belief in demonic forces (other than Satan) arises.

⁹⁷See, for example, Dan. 10:13, 20, 21.

good and demonic powers.⁹⁸ In his word studies, he demonstrates that every term the ancient writers employed for power is used in each of these ways. No explanation for their varied use is ever offered and Wink thus concludes "that the original hearers of the New Testament, whether Jewish or Gentile, understood the language to be the comprehensive vocabulary for power in general and took the meaning from the context."⁹⁹

Interpreting the Powers

Following the completion of his study of the Powers, Wink attempts to interpret the biblical language of power in a way that is faithful to the original intent of the New Testament writers yet is relevant to a world standing on the verge of the twenty-first century. He condemns attempts either to spiritualize or to materialize the concept of the Powers. The former view attempts to treat the Powers as nothing more than non-material, invisible, heavenly beings with particular characteristics--what Wink calls "bad people with wings"¹⁰⁰--while the latter view regards the Powers as simply "the personification of

⁹⁸Wink, Naming, p. 39.

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Walter Wink, Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination, vol. 3 of The Powers (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), p. 9.

human institutional and cultural arrangements."¹⁰¹ Such a view reduces the Powers to aspects of social structures or institutions while swallowing up their realities in sociology, depth psychology, and general systems theory. Wink points to author Frank Peretti as one who is guilty of the former imbalance,¹⁰² while some liberation theologians have been guilty of the latter.¹⁰³

"The Powers are the inner aspect of material reality."¹⁰⁴ In seeking to interpret the biblical language of the Powers for today, Wink attempts to juxtapose the ancient mythic language with the emerging postmodern world view to discover how they might mutually illumine each other. He describes the ancient myth in this way:

¹⁰¹Wink, Naming, p. 103.

¹⁰²Wink, Engaging, p. 9. See Peretti's two best-selling novels (Frank E. Peretti, This Present Darkness [Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 1986]; and his Piercing the Darkness [Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1989]).

¹⁰³Wink, Naming, p. 103. James Cone, an exponent of Black theology (a form of liberation theology) is guilty of the latter imbalance. In his book, God of the Oppressed, Cone argues that the principalities and powers are "represented concretely in the structures of injustice that oppress the weak and humiliate the poor. They are the demonic forces of white racism that enslave black, red, and brown people . . ." (James Cone, God of the Oppressed [New York: Seabury, 1975], p. 236).

¹⁰⁴Wink, Naming, p. 104.

The ancients regarded the spiritual Powers . . . as the good creations of a good God, but all of them have "fallen," becoming more or less evil in intent, and may even be set on the destruction of humanity. They were called angels, gods, spirits, demons, devils. This view was carried by the momentum of Jewish apocalyptic thought right into the New Testament¹⁰⁵

Wink sees Paul as having begun the process of demythologizing the ancient language of the Powers by means of his categories of sin, law, the flesh, and death.¹⁰⁶ Wink proposes to continue that process, not by abolishing the New Testament myth (any more than Paul did), but by interpreting it in the light of the emerging postmodern world view. Perhaps Wink can best describe the reinterpretation he proposes. He suggests we view

the spiritual Powers not as separate heavenly or ethereal entities but as the inner aspect of material or tangible manifestations of power. I suggest that . . . the "principalities and powers" are the inner or spiritual essence, or gestalt, of an institution or state or system; that the "demons" are the psychic or spiritual power emanated by organizations or individuals or subspects of individuals whose energies are bent on overpowering others; that "gods" are the very real archetypal or ideological structures that determine or govern reality and its mirror, the human brain; . . . and that "Satan" is the actual power that congeals around collective idolatry, injustice, or inhumanity, a power that increases or decreases according to the degree of collective refusal to choose higher values.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁵Ibid.

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., pp. 104-05.

This alluring but enigmatic quotation will be fleshed out later in this chapter. The important thing to understand at this point is that the Powers, according to Wink, do not have a separate, spiritual existence. They are encountered essentially in relation to the material reality of which they are the inner essence. These spiritual realities cannot exist without embodiment in "cellulose or in a culture or a regime or a corporation or a megalomaniac."¹⁰⁸ At the same time, however, Wink is not simply personifying institutional qualities that would exist whether or not they were personified. To the contrary, "the spirituality of an institution exists as a real aspect of the institution even when it is not perceived as such."¹⁰⁹ This is best illustrated using Wink's example of the "mob spirit". A mob spirit is not an ethereal demon hovering in the sky waiting to leap down on unruly crowds at a soccer match. It is the actual spirit constellated when the crowd reaches a critical flashpoint of intensity and frustration. The spirit comes into existence in that moment, causes people to act in ways they would never have thought themselves capable, and then ceases to exist the moment the crowd disperses.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 105.

¹⁰⁹Wink, Naming, p. 105.

¹¹⁰Ibid.

The key issue, then, is not whether one believes in these Powers but whether one can learn to identify them as they are encountered in the persons, systems, and structures of society. Can they be identified--what Paul calls "discerning the spirits?"¹¹¹--even as the destructiveness and fragmentation they create in persons, communities, and nations is witnessed?¹¹² Wink asserts that the Church followed the error of the gnostics when it found itself "wooned" by Constantine. Invited to become a part of the "power structure" of the empire and legitimate the state, the Church soon abandoned much of its social consciousness and forsook its God-given task of critiquing the social order. The result was that the Powers were "driven" from political affairs and made into ethereal spirits who preyed only on individuals. The prophetic voice of the Church was effectively silenced.¹¹³

¹¹¹See 1 Cor. 12:10. Unless otherwise noted, all Scripture verses are taken from the New International Version of the Bible.

¹¹²Wink, Naming, pp. 106-107.

¹¹³Ibid., p. 113. Prophetic voices were raised now and then but, for the most part, the prophetic voice of Christianity was lost. John Helgeland, for example, points out that during the terrible persecution of Christians in Lyons-Vienne in 177 under the reign of Emperor Marcus Aurelius, Eusebius of Caesarea, a Christian, deflected responsibility from the emperor by arguing that the Church's battle was not against the Roman government but against devils and spiritual rulers (Eccl. Hist. V, preface-4). Helgeland comments: "In shifting the blame from the visible Roman authorities to the invisible demons,

This move away from the New Testament view of the Powers to a much more nebulous view was not simply an error in thinking that developed over time; it was the result of intense political pressure by powerful forces. Throughout history, any time the Church has chosen to engage the spirituality of institutions in their concrete embodiments, it has been persecuted. Far from expressing gratitude at being recalled to their vocation under God, the Powers have exploded "in a frenzy of rage and retaliation."¹¹⁴

The Powers are ignorant of God's plan.¹¹⁵ Wink draws another aspect of the Powers from the mythic language of the New Testament: "None of the archons of this age understands 'the hidden wisdom of God,' 'for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory' (1 Cor. 2:7, 8)."¹¹⁶ Using this passage and others,¹¹⁷ Wink asks how

Eusebius avoided direct criticism of the government; it was the government's favor he courted He did not wish to say that the demon wore a toga" (John Helgeland, "Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine," Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II.23.1: 760-61).

¹¹⁴Wink, Naming, p. 113.

¹¹⁵Ibid.

¹¹⁶Ibid.

¹¹⁷See, for example, 1 Tim. 3:16 where Paul stresses the revelation that angels themselves received when Christ, following His resurrection, was "seen by angels" and "believed in the cosmos" (Wink's translation, Naming, p. 114).

it is possible for the Powers to be ignorant of their own principle of systemicity¹¹⁸--how it is possible for them to be ignorant of him in and through and for whom they were created.¹¹⁹ Wink answers his own question:

. . . . the universe itself is blind to its own principle of cohesion. It operates cohesively, but without the parts perceiving that fact. Put in a more modern mode, the universe is late in arriving at awareness of itself as a unity, and this awareness has come into the world for the first time with humanity.¹²⁰

With the coming of Jesus Christ, a whole new dimension was added. Jesus, the just Man, is killed. The very embodiment of God's will is executed by God's servants. The incarnation of the harmonic principles of the universe is crucified by the supposed guardians of that harmony. The very source and core of spiritual power in the universe is destroyed by the spiritual powers. The parts do not or cannot know the effect their actions will have on the whole, and some, by their worship of their own selfish short-term interests, become detrimental to the good of the whole. Neither the angels nor the captains and jailers and chief priests and governors recognized the Lord

¹¹⁸See Wink, Naming, p. 114 and Col. 1:17. Synest ken is the etymological root of the English word, "system."

¹¹⁹See Col. 1:16.

¹²⁰See Wink, Naming, p. 114.

of glory. The cosmic process of reconciliation could not commence until they "saw" him.¹²¹

This is exactly why so much of the New Testament¹²² is so adamant in stressing that Christ is already seated at God's right hand, has already unmasked the Powers, has already put these Powers under his feet and has already had bestowed on him the Name that is above every name--even though empirical evidence for such claims may seem totally nonexistent.¹²³ In a wave of inspired eloquence, Wink puts the situation as it exists now following the coming of Christ in words that cannot be confused:

For if the crucified Jesus is "Lord"--if the marred and disfigured form of the one truly human being who ever lived has become the criterion and norm of ultimate truth, life, and reality--then we and every power in heaven and on earth and under the earth are forever and utterly without excuse. We can no longer act in ignorance of the Whole or pretend to be oblivious to the value of the Human over every proximate goal. We can no longer act as if the world is not a single system converging on the One in and through and for whom it exists. We are, indeed, free to pretend not to know, and even to deceive ourselves into believing that our own values and goals are ultimate. But . . . we will have to learn the truth very precisely in order to conceal it the more carefully. And this suppression will force us to become the more violent and brutal against all we love, in order to mask our remembered

¹²¹Ibid.

¹²²See, for example, Phil. 2:9-11, Col. 2:15, and Eph. 1: 19-23.

¹²³See Wink, Naming, pp. 114-15.

deception from ourselves. We can ravage the ecology, suppress the poor, murder protesters, adulterate the gospel, shake our fists defiantly at God, and declare the world a mechanism and human beings machines. But the System of the systems remains the ultimate arbiter, and we can no more secede from its jurisdiction than we can stop breathing air. The judgment comes again, and again, and finally. For the angels have seen. And the gospel has been preached to the nations.¹²⁴

The Church's task is simpler than might first appear. The Church does not have to seek to bring the Powers to a place they have never been nor to a recognition they have never experienced. The Church is called simply to remind the Powers to Whom they belong.¹²⁵

The implications of this view of reality for the confrontation of evil is profound. If Wink is right, then the dichotomy that has been drawn between evangelism (defined as the verbal proclamation of the gospel) and social action (defined as attempts to transform unjust power structures) is false for they are both inner and outer approaches to the same phenomenon of power. Many modern Christians unfortunately allow themselves to become polarized along one side of the spectrum or the other.¹²⁶

¹²⁴Ibid., p. 115.

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 116.

¹²⁶Large segments of the Church have fallen into the error of dichotomizing evangelism and social action. Many prominent contemporary Christian leaders, while acknowledging that a relationship does exist between evangelism and social action, still draw a sharp distinction between them. Billy Graham, in his keynote

Some Christians even go so far as to understand injustice in materialistic terms alone and fail to recognize the need to convert people from the spirituality which binds them to a particular expression of power.¹²⁷ Even as a model is

address at the International Congress on World Evangelization at Lausanne, Switzerland said, "Evangelism and the salvation of souls is the vital mission of the church (Ronald J. Sider, "Evangelism, Salvation, and Social Justice: Definitions and Interrelationships," International Review of Mission, 64 [July 1975], 251). The Lausanne Covenant itself states that "in the church's mission of sacrificial service, evangelism is primary" ("The Lausanne Covenant," The International Review of Mission, 63 [1974], 571). John Stott asks if we can "seriously maintain that political and economic liberation is just as important as eternal salvation" (John R. W. Stott, Christian Mission in the Modern World [Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1975], p. 35.) Even Ron Sider, in arguing for the essential interrelatedness of evangelism and social action, still stresses that they must not be confused with each other (Ronald J. Sider, "Evangelism, Salvation, and Social Justice," International Review of Mission, 64 [July 1975], 265).

¹²⁷Wink, Naming, p. 116. The secular theologies enunciated in the 1960's by theologians such as Harvey Cox (The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective [New York: Macmillan, 1965]) and Gibson Winter helped to give this view credibility. Defining salvation as humanization, Winter asserted: "Secularization recognizes history and its problems of meaning as the sphere of man's struggle for salvation The categories of biblical faith are freed from their miraculous and supernatural garments Why are men not simply called to be human in their historical obligations, for this is man's true end and his salvation" (Gibson Winter, The New Creation as Metropolis [New York: Macmillan, 1963], pp. 60-61)? This secularized understanding of salvation made it all the way to a preparatory statement for the World Council of Churches' 4th Assembly at Uppsala (1968): "We have lifted up

developed for the confrontation of urban power structures, it must be remembered that it is not enough merely to change social structures as if material forces alone determine the destiny of individuals. It must be recognized that people are the victims of the very spirituality that American society has fostered, even as American society is itself the spin-off of a particular spirituality. In a new society, people will continue to behave on the basis of the old spirituality unless not only the society but their own psyches as well are reorganized.¹²⁸

Wink points out rather forcefully that many Christians have rejected the validity of evangelism, for what they see passing under that banner is a bastardized form of evangelism which has become wedded to the power structures of society and, while ignoring the causes of oppression, serves to relieve distress only by pointing to a "blessed hope" in an afterlife. The disdain with which many liberal Christians regard evangelism reflects their failure to understand that all liberation involves conversion. Whenever evangelism is carried out in full awareness of the Powers, whether in confronting those in power or liberating the oppressed, proclaiming the sovereignty of Christ is by that very act a critique of

humanization as the goal of mission" (Ronald J. Sider, "Evangelism," p. 255).

¹²⁸Wink, Naming, pp. 116-17.

injustice and idolatry. It is not enough to work for structural change; the heart and soul must also be reunited with their source.¹²⁹

The converse is true as well. Wink demonstrates that social action is always evangelism if it is carried out in full awareness of Christ's sovereignty over the Powers. Jesus did not only forgive people their sins, he gave them a new world. Unfortunately, some people have argued against virtually any social responsibility on the part of the Church, maintaining that such concerns are outside the realm of Church responsibility.¹³⁰ Yet, it is also true that too much of what passes as social action today is as devoid of spirituality as evangelism has been politically innocuous.¹³¹ Wink writes, "Too often we have told the Powers that they were wrong but not Whose they are."¹³² Wink points to the hymns, gospel songs, eucharists and prayers of people like Martin Luther King, Jr., and

¹²⁹Ibid., p. 117.

¹³⁰L. Duane Brown, writing as President of Denver Baptist Bible College and Seminary, argues that Christians do not "have a duty to provide for the needy of the world, nor to change the political structure of society, nor to challenge the iniquities, prejudices, and evils which plague mankind" (L. Duane Brown, Confronting Today's World: A Fundamentalist Looks at Social Issues [Schaumburg, IL: Regular Baptist, 1986], p. 22).

¹³¹Wink, Naming, p. 117.

¹³²Ibid.

Cesar Chavez as indispensable forms of struggle in and of themselves.¹³³ He argues that had they left these aspects of worship out of their activism, they would have been engaging the Powers on their (the Powers) own terms, thus guaranteeing that the victor, whoever it was, would perpetuate the same terms. Only God can work changes which do not themselves lead to new evils.¹³⁴

Traditional definitions of evangelism and social action must be discarded. True evangelism is social action and social action is evangelism. Rather than dichotomizing them, one must recognize that they are simply related approaches (inner and outer) to confronting the Powers.

Heaven is the transcendent "within" of material reality.¹³⁵ Wink confronts the reader with a poignant question arising from Ephesians 3:10. He asks, "[W]hat does it mean to communicate the manifold wisdom of God to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places?"¹³⁶ In order to understand what the biblical writer means here, one's understanding of heaven may have to undergo a fundamental shift. Wink asks what would happen if heaven

¹³³Ibid.

¹³⁴Ibid.

¹³⁵Ibid., p. 118.

¹³⁶Ibid., p. 119.

was regarded not as a "transcendent, otherworldly sphere qualitatively distinct from human life, to which the dead go if they have been good," but rather as the "realm of 'withinness,' the metaphorical 'place' in which the spirituality of everything is 'located'" Heaven, in this view, is the habitat of angels and spirits but also of demons and Satan and all the Powers "in the heavenly places." Heaven is simply the dimension in which they "reside."¹³⁷

But heaven is a great deal more than this. It is where God is enthroned, and it is the source of the transformative possibilities that God presents to every human being.¹³⁸ Wink borrows from Whitehead and process theology the idea that heaven is that place where one is presented with "heavenly possibilities"--the challenge to go beyond all that one's background, one's temperament, one's conditioning, and one's habits dictate, to go beyond one's identity as oppressor or oppressed, one's fears, one's neuroses, one's paranoidias to the "heavenly" places, the home of "creative novelties" which present new possibilities for living.¹³⁹

When the latter is chosen, one has a sense of

¹³⁷Wink, Naming, p. 119.

¹³⁸Ibid.

¹³⁹Ibid.

becoming more "real"; there is a sense of "rightness" about it that resonates throughout the universe and unites one with the larger purposes of God. This is what Jesus called "The Kingdom of God."¹⁴⁰ As one increasingly dies to one's own selfish interests and abandons oneself to God, one comes to dwell more and more in the Kingdom of Heaven--the Realm of God. This is the truth Paul was seeking to express when he wrote:

But God, who is rich in mercy, out of the great love with which he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ . . . and raised us up with him, and made us sit with him in the heavenly places with Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:4-6).¹⁴¹

Finally, heaven is also the "negation of possibilities."¹⁴² The choices one makes when confronted with the heavenly possibilities (either to embrace them or reject them) are fateful and often irreversible; that which is possible also confronts one as judgment for lost opportunity, squandered gifts, or rejected love. In this light, one can understand John when he sees "thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgment was committed" (Rev. 20:4).¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰See Mark 1:15; 10:14; John 3:3, 5.

¹⁴¹Wink, Naming, pp. 119-20.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 120.

¹⁴³Ibid.

But what has any of this talk of Heaven to do with Wink's concept of systemic evil, the focus of this chapter?

If one joins Wink in locating spirit at the very heart of matter--if one sees it as the "within" of actual people, institutions, and the state--then the transformation of those institutions which hinder the full and free development of people is more than an optional movement at the fringe of Christianity--it is an indispensable aspect of the vision of God's Reign. It is, to use Wink's phrase, "the very stuff of existence before God."¹⁴⁴

The biblical writers of both the Old and New Testaments were right. There is a "war in heaven"¹⁴⁵ and for those who possess a true understanding of the Powers, there is no mistaking its nature nor the Church's calling in the midst of it:

[The war in heaven] is the unseen clash of values and ideologies, of the spirituality of institutions and the will of God, of demonic factionalism and heavenly possibilities. The unique calling of the church in social change lies in making clear the dual nature of our task. We wrestle on two planes, the earthly and the heavenly--what I have called the outer and inner aspects of reality.¹⁴⁶

The spiritual reality behind human institutions.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 125.

¹⁴⁵See Rev. 12:7; 2 Macc. 5:1-4; Dan. 10:13, 20, 21.

¹⁴⁶Wink, Naming, p. 130.

The ancient world, including Israel, believed in two planes of existence, what is called the macrocosm/microcosm view of reality--the view that whatever happens on earth (the "microcosm," or small world) is a mirror image of the activities of the Powers in heaven (the "macrocosm," or large world). Israel's version was modified somewhat to prevent its being used to legitimate tyranny. The Jews subsumed the notion of evil spirits, fallen angels, and Satan within a framework in which Yahweh was ultimately sovereign. For the Jews, angelic and demonic activity in heaven was reflected in events on earth but did not serve to justify these events, since God remained the final judge over all things and angels, too, could sin.¹⁴⁷

It has been suggested by sociologists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (among others) that this view of reality was the conscious invention of the powerful and that the spiritual arrangement depicted in the myths was simply the projection into the heavens of the power arrangements of the state.¹⁴⁸ They argue that the powerful in any given society validate their institutions by attributing their origins to divine agency or natural laws. This is done, so they argue, to withdraw the human origin of their institutions from sight and thus from criticism.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 131-32.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 133.

¹⁴⁹Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social

Wink, while readily acknowledging that the heavenly hierarchies were thinly veiled depictions of the structure of human governments lifted up to the domain of the gods,¹⁵⁰ rejects the view that all such myths were "mystifications of actual power relations aimed at providing divine legitimation for earthly institutions."¹⁵¹ Institutions are not as subject to human inclination as Berger and Luckmann would have people think. The spirituality of institutions is highly resistant to change.¹⁵² Wink does not deny that projection is involved. Humans can know some truths no other way.¹⁵³ He differs from Berger and Luckmann in that he regards these entities as the "spirituality of the state,"¹⁵⁴ the inner and actual essence of its institutions, systems, and forces. Thus, for Wink, the myth is not a disguise but a revelation showing by the exact correspondence of the earthly and heavenly that it has faithfully brought to expression the actual power relations at work. The myth

Construction of Reality (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967), p. 90 n. 63.

¹⁵⁰Wink, Naming, p. 133.

¹⁵¹Ibid. Wink argues that Israel's prophets also depicted the "divine council" in this manner even in passages where the legitimacy of the king was being challenged (e.g., 1 Kings 22:19-23).

¹⁵²Wink, Naming, p. 135.

¹⁵³Ibid.

¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 134.

provides a fairly accurate portrayal of the actual state of affairs in a particular society. It does not conceal power relations; it depicts them as they really are. The myths simply work to declare what is.¹⁵⁵

It cannot be said, therefore, that human beings create their gods. Such an answer is too simplistic. The spirituality of institutions emerges with the institutions themselves and is only subsequently understood as their inner essence. They are real. They act upon individuals whether they are acknowledged or not. They are not dependent on one's belief for their efficacy.¹⁵⁶

The real issue for Wink is the degree to which the spirituality of an institution is, at a particular time and place, idolatrous. In seeking to answer this question in relation to ancient Israel, Wink takes the Old Testament prophets seriously, asking who or what gives them their message. Wink's thesis is that often it is the "angel" of the institution who does so; the spirituality of the institution can be "read" by any discerning person.¹⁵⁷ The intriguing aspect of Wink's view is that, for Israel, the ongoing battle between true versus false prophecy ends in a draw, for both were true insofar as each gave voice to a genuine spirituality:

¹⁵⁵Ibid.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., p. 136.

¹⁵⁷Ibid., p. 135.

False prophets tended to register the "within" of the nation or court in terms of a narrow view of Israel's self-interest as seen from the perspective of those in power. True prophets were those who saw Israel's self-interests as wholly subservient to the will of Yahweh, which transcended and often stood in judgment on Israel's own policies.¹⁵⁸

Wink does not deny that myths of power are used to legitimate exploitative and oppressive institutions. Evil men and women can twist myths to serve their own agendas, but they do not create the myths. The reality is more complex, for we struggle not against flesh and blood alone but against principalities and powers as well. Institutions can be changed but not if one naïvely assumes that one is seeking only to change human beings. Wink describes American institutions as "suprahuman"¹⁵⁹ by virtue of their age and the immense power they possess. Institutions have their own spirits, take on a momentum of their own, and tend to preserve themselves through all the shifts of personnel. They can be changed, but genuine change can come about only when both their structures and their spirits are addressed. There must be a "conversion" of the spirit to the vision of its role in the larger whole.¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁸Ibid.

¹⁵⁹Wink, Naming, p. 137.

¹⁶⁰Ibid.

One can understand Paul's notion of the "body of Christ" in these terms as the quite literal reality of the Christian community. As the "within" or spirit of the Church, Christ calls it forward toward those transformative human possibilities for liberation, compassion, and love. The "body of Christ" is that human community which has as its avowed purpose the manifestation of Christ's Spirit in the world. For Wink, there can be no Spirit of Christ apart from its concretions in the world.¹⁶¹

¹⁶¹Ibid., p. 138.

"Unmasking the Powers"¹⁶²

In the second volume of his trilogy, Wink sets about the task of "unmasking" the Powers to which he has introduced the readers in his first volume. Wink focuses on the many ways that evil infiltrates people's lives. The concern here will be with unmasking the Powers as they operate on the structural or institutional level. Four expressions of the Powers will be looked at.

Satan. The popular view of Satan is that of a personal being whose main concern is with tempting individuals to commit acts of sexual promiscuity, adolescent rebellion, crime, passion, and greed. While there is some truth in this, such a depiction obscures "the massive satanic evils that plunge and drive our times like a trawler before an angry sea."¹⁶³ Wink argues that while preachers concern themselves with personal morality, evil is running rampant through corporate boardrooms and even churches. With striking force Wink writes that the evil in society today has become so monstrous as to be virtually "autonomous, unrepresentable, beyond comprehension."¹⁶⁴

¹⁶²Walter Wink, Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence, vol. 2 of The Powers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986).

¹⁶³Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁶⁴Ibid., p. 10.

Who is Satan? A clue is found in Luke 4:6 where Satan declares that he can give Jesus all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. Wink declares that Satan was not lying for God allows Satan to possess such power but has not handed it over to him; we are the ones who have handed such power over to Satan as a consequence of all the consciously or unconsciously evil choices we have made as individuals and as a collective against what God desires.¹⁶⁵

Satan, for Wink, has become
 the symbol of the spirit of an entire society alienated from God, the great system of mutual support in evil, the spirit of persistent self-deification blown large, the image of unredeemed humanity's collective life.¹⁶⁶

The impression might be given here that Wink views Satan as a personal entity. For Wink, Satan is not so much a person as an experience--the experience real people have of a numinous, vital power. More precisely,

Satan is the real interiority of a society that idolatrously pursues its own enhancement as the highest good. Satan is the spirituality of an epoch, the peculiar constellation of alienation, greed, inhumanity, oppression, and entropy that characterizes a specific period of history as a consequence of human decisions to tolerate and even further such a state of affairs.¹⁶⁷

Wink is well aware of the hazards inherent in

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 24.

¹⁶⁶Ibid.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., p. 25.

attempts to label an act "satanic" because of all the baggage that term carries in the minds of people. Yet, he maintains that there are evils too malevolent to be labeled anything else. Further, naming something correctly helps people look at it in the proper perspective. When one calls slum landlording "satanic," for example, one helps people see that their struggle is not with a particular individual but goes much deeper.

By whatever name it is called, the universal human experience would seem to be that there is some power in the universe which cannot be humanized, cured, or integrated, but only contained for periods. Wink calls this "a concentration of evil in a directional pull counter to the will of God."¹⁶⁸ There are experiences when one comes face-to-face with an evil so raw, so malevolent, so unredeemable that the only counsel Jesus gives is to pray to be delivered from it.¹⁶⁹ Further, this power is never more diabolical than when it is linked to human beings.

Terrifying as this type of inhuman evil is when encountered on a personal level, it is even more destructive when it takes up residence in the structures and institutions of society. The history of evil did not begin with us. Individuals enter a world already organized

¹⁶⁸Wink, Unmasking, p. 28.

¹⁶⁹Matt. 6:13; Luke 11:4 by implication.

for evil. As Wink puts it, "The satanic is already crystalized in the institutional values and arrangements in which we find ourselves."¹⁷⁰ When economic or political arrangements take on satanic qualities, they "suck the life out of whole generations of people."¹⁷¹ The vast majority of people in society, including the leaders of our churches, have no comprehension of the grip Satan has on our entire civilization. Wink asks the poignant question:

Why should Satan reveal himself more often in individual cases, when he can, from invisibility, preside over an entire global culture that spreads out over the whole surface of the planet like a cancer: a civilization that systematically erodes traditional religions, that treats people as robots for producing and serving things, that denies not only the spiritual but even the poetic, the artistic, the inner, that propagates belief in the ultimate power of money, and that organizes an economic system exploitative of most of the people of the world and anchored in a permanent war economy?¹⁷²

Demons. The Bible does not depict Satan as an independent agent. He is accompanied by his own satanic host. Scripture calls Satan "the prince of demons."¹⁷³ The aspect of Wink's concept of the demonic that is most

¹⁷⁰Wink, Unmasking, p. 31.

¹⁷¹Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁷²Ibid.

¹⁷³Mark 3:22.

interesting is the embodiment of the demonic within dehumanizing institutions and social systems. Wink refers to this as the "social demonic" and identifies it as the "actual inner spirit of . . . suprahuman entities."¹⁷⁴ Wink describes the social demonic as the spirit of a corporate structure that has turned its back on its divine vocation and has made its own will ultimate. The demonic is more than the consequences that result from self-worshipping institutions; it is the spirit that comes to "possess" those key persons whose compliance the institution seeks in order to extend its sway. When a demonic institution functions normally, it does so by the enthusiastic and willing consent of these key persons, or at least with their terrified compliance. Wink describes the phenomenon this way: "The policeman steps off the corner and into their heads. The Powers rule from within" (emphasis mine).¹⁷⁵

The demonic in this age has a peculiar predilection for institutional structures. Wink says it is as if the "smaller cousins"¹⁷⁶ of demons were left to torment individuals while the worst of the demons swelled to the monstrous proportions of transnational corporations,

¹⁷⁴Wink, Unmasking, p. 42.

¹⁷⁵Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁷⁶Ibid., p. 69.

military establishments, university systems, and governmental bureaucracies.¹⁷⁷

The most graphic examples of demonic institutions in the United States are connected with the possibilities of nuclear and ecological catastrophe. This has nothing to do with political loyalty, for leaders of both parties, when they gain power, find themselves the prisoner of a spirituality they can neither name nor discern, but which compels them, against the best interests of humanity, toward the brink of ultimate destruction. Some forms of institutionalized evil appear simply too massive and intractable to face, so society individualizes evil, blaming the sins of an entire institution or nation on a single individual in order to relieve a pervasive sense of hopelessness.¹⁷⁸

Others close their eyes to the demonic around them. They refuse to see the demonic installed at the heart of national policy. They allow the national administration, Congress, the armed forces, the CIA to do for them what is required to maintain American economic and political dominance in the world.¹⁷⁹ They close their eyes to the

¹⁷⁷Ibid.

¹⁷⁸Wink, Unmasking, p. 55.

¹⁷⁹Martin Luther King, Jr., declared in 1967 that the United States is the greatest purveyor of violence in the world. Wink maintains that this statement is even truer today than when first uttered (Wink, Unmasking, p. 51).

atrocities committed by the government on their behalf. They are content to be passive and ignorant beneficiaries.¹⁸⁰

Angels. Wink was first confronted with the reality of angels when, in 1964, he was teaching a Bible study to a group of teenagers. He was arrested by the fact that in the second chapter of Revelation John addresses each angel as a single entity, responsible for the church in its care, yet then begins to exhort the whole congregation (or specific groups of individuals within the church) with no apparent transition. Wink concluded that angels and people are the inner and outer aspects of one and the same reality. That reality can be a church or any other collective entity that has continuity through time. The angel is not something separate from an institution but represents it as a totality. Through the angel, the institution steps forth as a single entity. One must guard against merely thinking of the angel as the personification of an institution. It is more than that; it is the actual spirituality of an institution as a single entity. The angel of an institution has no separate existence apart from the people but the reverse is also true. The people have no unity apart from the angel. Wink writes:

The people incarnate or embody the angelic spirit; the

¹⁸⁰Wink, Unmasking, p. 52.

angel distills the invisible essence of their totality as a group. The angel and the [institution] come into being together and, if such is their destiny, pass out of existence together. The one cannot exist without the other.¹⁸¹

The angel is held responsible for the behaviour of its institution, yet the institution is virtually indistinguishable from the angel. "They are the visible and invisible aspects of a single corporate reality."¹⁸²

The angels are not perfect heavenly beings; rather, they encompass every aspect of an institution's current reality, good and bad alike. The angel encompasses both what the institution is and what it is called to be.¹⁸³ Wink calls the current nature of an institution's angel its "personality" and what it might become its "vocation."¹⁸⁴ Wink writes:

The angel gathers up into a single whole all the aspirations and grudges, hopes and vendettas, fidelity and unfaithfulness of a given [institution], and lays it all before God for judgment, correction, and healing.¹⁸⁵

Every collective entity that has continuity through time is possessed by this interiority or spirituality.

¹⁸¹Ibid., p. 70.

¹⁸²Ibid., p. 71.

¹⁸³Wink, Unmasking, p. 72.

¹⁸⁴Ibid., p. 73.

¹⁸⁵Ibid.

General Motors has a unique spirit or gestalt that sets it apart from every other corporation. Universities thrive on a "school spirit" and disintegrate without it. Political parties are very aware of how dependent they are on public support (hence the continual hype with which the public is constantly bombarded).¹⁸⁶

This helps to explain the remarkable resiliency of corporate structures. Wink writes that if all the employees at General Motors were fired and replaced with new ones, GM would probably go on in much the same manner as it always had. Now, this is not to say that informed and benevolent corporate executives cannot make a difference; they help to establish the tone, morale, and profitability of a particular business. Yet, all executives must function under the severe constraints of the market, competition, and limited resources. The oft-heard remark by executives that they feel powerless to assert any real change in their company attests to the sheer inertia that institutions achieve over time and points to the fact that real change must affect more than just the visible forms an institution takes; somehow the very spirit, or core essence, of the institution as a whole must be transformed.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁶Ibid., p. 79.

¹⁸⁷Ibid., pp. 79-80.

The gods. Gods are the collective spirituality of a society. They are not mere personifications of social processes. They are what Wink refers to as the "mentality" and "communicability" of institutions, that is, their capacity to speak to individuals and a society as a whole.

The gods are the very structures by which personality and society are formed. Without them, humanity would not exist.¹⁸⁸

The gods cannot be reduced to mere projections of subjective states; they are as real as anything in the world. However, they are neither ultimate nor absolute. While Wink describes them as transcendent and suprahuman, he is also careful to note that they can be influenced and even transformed. The gods must be "handled" very carefully. They can be honoured but must never be worshiped. They are manifestations of the divine, yet must never be identified with the godhead. If they are ignored, they will act from concealment. If they are demonized, their blessing is lost. If they are worshiped, they will possess their worshipers and alienate them from their relatedness to the whole.¹⁸⁹

One should not attempt to draw rigid distinctions between the biblical categories of gods, angels, spirits,

¹⁸⁸Ibid., p. 119.

¹⁸⁹Wink, Unmasking, pp. 119, 127.

and demons. The language of the Powers in the New Testament is so fluid and imprecise that it is often impossible to maintain distinctions among these spiritual entities. Wink writes, "Generally speaking, what pagans called gods, Jews and Christians called angels or demons, and everyone spoke of them interchangeably as spirits."¹⁹⁰

Gods become known through myths which function as the "dreams of a people."¹⁹¹ They function as "cultural or political compulsions"¹⁹² within the people of a society. Each god possesses components of both good and evil. The capacity to be faithful in one's encounters with the gods, and to transform the evil one finds and encompass the good one encounters, adds to the "goodness" of a particular society. It is therefore important to relate to the gods that one might confront what is evil in them while at the same time embracing what is good.¹⁹³

Problems arise, as has been suggested, when the gods are worshiped. The collective compulsions of society, through which the gods are encountered, can appear with such seeming almighty power that individuals not only fail to resist them but are awed into submission. What

¹⁹⁰Ibid., p. 108.

¹⁹¹Ibid., p. 118.

¹⁹²Ibid., p. 125.

¹⁹³Ibid.

individuals worship enslave them even as they forge their own chains. This is true idolatry for it takes the reverence due to the Creator and transfers it to that which is itself a creation. When this happens, the god becomes demonic. However, the demonic quality does not reside in the god per se but in the way one relates to the god.¹⁹⁴ The model that is developed in the final chapter of this dissertation will suggest ways to relate to the gods without worshiping them and becoming enslaved.

The Domination System

Up to this point, the Powers have been spoken of as though they were separate entities which act independently of one another. While this is sometimes the case, it is also true that the Powers are the most dangerous when they act in concert one with another, drawing from and giving strength to one another. Wink uses the phrase, "the Domination System," to signify what results "when an entire network of Powers becomes integrated around idolatrous values."¹⁹⁵ In other words, the Powers are those structures and institutions (in both their outer and inner manifestations) which embody the Domination System at a

¹⁹⁴Ibid.

¹⁹⁵Wink, Engaging, p. 9.

particular historical point,¹⁹⁶ and Satan is the "world-encompassing spirit of the Domination System."¹⁹⁷

It is important to note that no one person or group inflicted the Domination System upon us; it came unbidden.

It was born out of countless struggles for power beyond anyone's ability to control or avoid. Wink describes this process as a type of natural selection which "molded change inevitably toward power maximization in human societies."¹⁹⁸

Power may tend to corrupt, but it is just as true that often it is the most ruthless and corrupt who tend to gain power.¹⁹⁹

Nor are these leaders themselves free. They appear to make choices but that is simply the role conferred upon them by the System:

"The powerful get to speak because the unchosen structure of the system determines which message will be heard That which chooses the chooser determines the choice."²⁰⁰ Decisions are determined not by what would enhance the quality of human life but by what will increase competitive power.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁶Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁹⁷Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁹⁸Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁹⁹Ibid.

²⁰⁰Andrew Bard Schmockler, The Parable of the Tribes: The Problem of Power in Social Evolution (Berkeley: University of California, 1984), p. 62.

²⁰¹Wink, Engaging, p. 42.

People are thus the slaves of their systems rather than civilized society being the servant of its members. To the extent that one's blessings are incidental by-products of the colour of one's skin, one's sex, or the wealth and position of one's parents, one's well-being may be more a result of injustice than of divine favour.

The Domination System goes beyond any of the individual Powers which are a part of it. These Powers are not the System; they are merely the particular institutions and structures governed by the Domination System. The Domination System is what results when an entire network of Powers becomes "hell-bent on control."²⁰² Wink poignantly describes the Domination System as a system of Powers "in a satanic parody of God" and as "the System of the systems."²⁰³

The authors of the Bible were well aware of the reality of the Domination System. They often used the terms "world," "aeon," and "flesh" to depict this reality which has been obscured for many readers of the Bible. With these terms, the biblical writers named the Domination System, thus stripping it, for those who had eyes to see, of its invisibility and legitimacy. The insights the Bible offers into the Domination System are essential for a full

²⁰²Ibid., p. 49.

²⁰³Ibid.

understanding of it.

Kosmos. The Greek word, kosmos, can mean world, universe, the creation, humanity, the planet earth, the theater of history.²⁰⁴ Alongside these conventional usages stands another New Testament usage that is unique in that period. In the New Testament, kosmos can refer to "the human sociological realm that exists in estrangement from God."²⁰⁵ "World" in the New Testament has this wide-range of

²⁰⁴Ibid., p. 51. Put more abstractly, the term "world" designates an aspect of reality experienced by a particular subject in a typical way, or the structure of identity that is valid or common for a discrete group of people (Stephen Strasser, The Idea of Dialogal Phenomenology [Pittsburgh: Duquesne University, 1969], pp. 24-36; see also Alfred Schutz, "The Problem of Social Reality," Collected Papers, vol. 1 [The Hague: Martin Piaget, 1962], p. 208; Jean Piaget, A Child's Conception of the World [New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929]).

²⁰⁵Wink buttresses this assertion by reference to several scholars. David Rensberger, in his discussion on John's Gospel, points out that the "world" is "human society as such, as it is organized and maintained for the good of some but to the harm of others and to the detriment of the love of God" (David Rensberger, Johannine Faith and Liberating Community [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988], p. 148). Albert Curry Winn speaks of "world" in the Gospel of John as "a series of ordered, structured, interlocking systems that are actually and potentially destructive of human values of the most basic kind and are therefore opposed to God who is the source of such values" (Albert Curry Winn, A Sense of Mission [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981], p. 70. José Porfirio Miranda relates "world" to "all civilization and not only to any one civilization in particular" (José Porfirio Miranda, Being and the Messiah [Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1977], pp. 101-02). This

meanings because it refers to the totality of human social existence. As Wink writes, "world"

refers to the totality of human social existence. It is the good creation of a good Creator (John 1:10ab), it is estranged or fallen existence (John 1:10c and the vast majority of other references), and it is capable of redemption (John 12:47).²⁰⁶

In John's Gospel, Jesus is depicted as responding to the high priest at his arraignment, "I have spoken openly to the world (kosmos], I have always taught in synagogue and in the Temple."²⁰⁷ Wink points out that the parallelism in this sentence indicates that here kosmos

definition is very close to Wink's concept of the Domination System. See also Hermann Sasse, "Ai n," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 1 (1964), 197-209; and "Kosmos," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 3 (1965), 867-98; Wolfgang Schrage, "Die Stellung zur Welt bei Paulus, Epiktet und in der Apokalyptik: Ein Beitrag zu I Kor. 7, 29-31," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 61 (1964), 125-54; G. Johnston, "'Oikoumene' and 'Kosmos' in the New Testament," New Testament Studies, 10 (1964), 352-60; G. Bornkamm, "Christus und die Welt in der Urchristlichen Botschaft," Gesammelte Aufsätze, vol. 1 (Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1958), pp. 157-72; R. Völkl, Christus und Welt nach dem Neuen Testament (Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1961); Rudolf Schnackenburg, "The Concept of the World in the New Testament," in his Christian Existence in the New Testament, vol. 1 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1968), 196-228; and Helmut Flender, "Das Verständnis der Welt bei Paulus, Markus und Lukas," Kerygma und Dogma, 14 (1968), 1-27.

²⁰⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 51.

²⁰⁷John 18:20 (Wink's translation).

includes the central religious institutions of Judaism where Jesus had declared his message. The term has a structural sense to it and refers to a religious system that is unaware of its alienation from God.²⁰⁸ Because the range of meaning assigned to the term "world" is so wide, Wink prefers to use the term "system" when referring to the special New Testament sense of world as an alienating and alienated ethos.²⁰⁹

In light of Wink's understanding of the Domination System, the translation of kosmos as "system" opens up a new dimension of meaning. For example, John quotes Jesus saying to his brothers who will not believe in him: "The System [kosmos] cannot hate you, but it hates me because I testify against it that its works are evil."²¹⁰ Whenever Christians have understood this verse as referring to the physical world, they have tended to reject the created order, sexuality, and even their own bodies, and to fail to see its reference to systemic evil. However, when the term "System" is used, a much different impression is given--one where the created world is not condemned but a System of Domination that sees in Jesus a moral threat and executes him. The System hated Jesus because he testified against

²⁰⁸Wink, Engaging, p. 51.

²⁰⁹Ibid., p. 52.

²¹⁰John 7:7.

it that its works were evil.²¹¹

Similarly, when the Pharisees challenged Jesus' authority to criticize their religious order, he responded, "You are of this kosmos (System), I am not of this kosmos (System).²¹² Again, as long as this term is understood as referring to the created world, Jesus is seen as otherworldly, a nonhuman, and opens the door to those with docetic tendencies. However, John here is seeking to make the point that Jesus belonged to God's System rather than the Domination System. It is not the world that Jesus rejected but the System of Domination.²¹³

When the New Testament is read with this understanding of kosmos in mind, it requires little effort to understand why Jesus was so vociferous in his condemnation of the Domination System. Jesus saw what the Domination System does to human beings. It teaches people, first of all, what to believe. It offers those beliefs which society, at any given moment in time, declares to be credible. From decade to decade, acceptable beliefs keep changing, revealing the arbitrary nature of such beliefs.²¹⁴

Second, the Domination System teaches people what

²¹¹Wink, Engaging, p. 55. See also John 7:7.

²¹²John 8:23.

²¹³Wink, Engaging, p. 55.

²¹⁴Ibid., p. 53.

they can value. Generally, it teaches people to value power. In any particular society, however, power is given specific shape based on the conditions existing at the time. What characterizes American society is the unprecedented value ascribed to money.²¹⁵ People of every age have coveted wealth but few have idolized the entrepreneur as American society does. The entire social system of the United States has become an economy; this is a situation that is unique to this period. As Wink writes:

Profit is the highest social good. Consumerism has become the only universally available mode of participation in modern society. The work ethic has been replaced by the consumption ethic, the cathedral by the skyscraper, the hero by the billionaire, the saint by the executive, religion by ideology. The Kingdom of Mammon exercises constraint by invisible chains and drives its slaves with invisible prods. (How rare it is for rich people to say, "I have enough"). But Mammon is wiser in its way than the dictator, for money enslaves not by force but by love.²¹⁶

Third, the Domination System teaches people what to see. Every first-year sociology student learns that individuals not only live within a sociocultural organism but the sociocultural organism lives within each individual. Individuals are not simply entities within a society but society is represented and incarnated within

²¹⁵See Jacques Ellul, Money and Power (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1984).

²¹⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 54.

each individual. Thus, whatever the Domination System tells people is real is what they are allowed to notice; everything else is ignored.²¹⁷ As Anne Schaeff puts it, "We give the system the power to make the known unknown."²¹⁸ Or, as Jürgen Habermas asserts, "What is real is that which can be experienced according to the interpretations of a prevailing symbolic system."²¹⁹ Thus, the Domination System teaches people to mistrust their own experiences. Within the Domination System, every observation is a directed observation, that is, an observation for or against a particular point of view. And every mind is a "contaminated mind," a mind built from a foundation of interrelated suppositions and assumptions. Everything that is seen is paradigm-conditioned and value-laden.²²⁰ The

²¹⁷Ralph Wendell Burhoe, "Religion's Role in Human Evolution: The Missing Link Between Ape-Man's Selfish Genes and Civilized Altruism," Zygon, 14 (June 1979), 144.

²¹⁸Anne Wilson Schaeff, When Society Becomes an Addict (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), p. 108.

²¹⁹Jürgen Habermas, Knowledge and Human Interests (Boston: Beacon, 1971), p. 192.

²²⁰A simple example of this are Marxist and pro-capitalist sociologists who will not only describe the same behaviour in completely divergent ways, but their conceptual frameworks will actually cause them to see different behaviours. The behaviour they observe will be completely different in each case. (For a fuller treatment of this see Henry Skolimowski, "The Twilight of Physical Descriptions and the Ascent of Normative Models," in The World System, ed. Ervin Laszlo [New York: George Braziller, 1973], pp. 99-100).

result of this "boundary" on what people are allowed to see is a "miniaturization of [their] living world."²²¹

As mentioned earlier, Satan is lord of the Domination System. Jesus said to his disciples:

I will no longer talk much with you, for the ruler [arch_n] of this System [kosmos] is coming. He has no power over me; but I do as the Abba has commanded me, so that the System may know that I love the Abba.²²²

To love God openly is to undermine in the most fundamental way the mentality of domination with its satanic lust for control. Hence, Satan's most insidious temptation involved his offering to Jesus all the power of the Domination System itself, if only he would submit himself to the spirit of the System:²²³

Then the devil led him up and showed him in an instant all the kingdoms of the Domination System. And the devil said to him, "To you I will give their glory and all their authority; for it has been given over to me, and I give it to anyone I please."²²⁴

The result of society's enslavement to the Domination System is that people have become alienated from nature, from one another, and from God. Therefore, humanity needs a Saviour. Wink writes, "Christ Jesus came

²²¹Wink, Engaging, p. 54.

²²²John 14:30-31 (Wink's translation).

²²³Wink, Engaging, p. 57.

²²⁴Luke 4:5-6 (Wink's translation).

into the System [kosmos] to save those who have missed the point of living."²²⁵ However it comes, God's system will replace the Domination System, not by violent confrontation, but as increasing numbers of people find themselves drawn toward the values it represents. Until then, the Domination System will attempt to crush every vestige of authentic living from the people who call themselves Christians.²²⁶

Ai n. The second biblical term, often used interchangeably with kosmos and translated "world" in most English versions, is ai n. Just as the connotation of kosmos is spatial or systemic, that of ai n is temporal. Hence, it refers, not to the structure of reality, but to the flow of time from its inception--to a succession of epochs. Any major time period within temporal limitations can be referred to as an ai n, used here in the same way as the English derivative, "aeon."²²⁷

The present world-period is under the sway of evil. Here again, as was seen with the term kosmos, ai n is used

²²⁵1 Tim. 1:15 (Wink's translation). Hamartōlos, usually translated "sinner," refers to one who has missed the mark (see Wink, Engaging, p. 344 n. 20).

²²⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 58.

²²⁷Ibid., p. 59; see, for example, Matt. 12:32; 13:39; Eph. 1:21; 1 Tim. 6:17; Titus 2:12.

in a unique sense in some New Testament passages. The biblical writers speak of the "the present evil epoch [ai n]" (Gal. 1:4), organized under Satan, "the god of this world-period [ai n]" who "has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ" (2 Cor. 4:4).²²⁸ Satan's subordinates can even be characterized by their relationship to this present age; they are "the arch ns [rulers] of this ai n who are doomed to perish" (1 Cor. 2:6; see also 2:8).²²⁹

To summarize what has been said here, John uses the term kosmos to denote the Domination System from a structural point of view, whereas Paul uses the term ai n to demarcate what Wink calls the "Domination Epoch."²³⁰ Paul writes in Eph. 2:2 that he and his readers "walked according to the ai n of this kosmos."²³¹ Wink declares this "a remarkable phrase that combines both the structural and temporal elements of the alienating system into a single God-hostile front."²³²

²²⁸Wink, Engaging, p. 59 (Wink's translation).

²²⁹Ibid (Wink's translation).

²³⁰Ibid.

²³¹Ibid., p. 60 (Wink's translation).

²³²Ibid.

Sarx. According to Wink, one of the most unfortunate mistranslations in English Bibles has been the translation of "flesh" for the Pauline phrase, kata sarka.

Sarx can refer to the physical substance of which human beings are made,²³³ the physical body,²³⁴ the self or one's being,²³⁵ or human beings or humanity in general.²³⁶ Less often, it can denote physical genetic descent or ethnicity,²³⁷ earthly existence,²³⁸ or, very rarely, sexual desire.²³⁹ But its most striking and theologically significant use, found especially in Paul, is in reference to "the self in its alienated mode."²⁴⁰ Life lived

²³³Luke 24:39; 1 Cor. 15:39,50; Col. 1:22.

²³⁴John 6:51-56; Acts 2:31; Rom. 2:28; 2 Cor. 4:11; 7:1,5; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:29.

²³⁵Matt. 19:5-6; Mark 10:8; Acts 2:26; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:31.

²³⁶Matt. 16:17; 24:22; Luke 3:6; John 1:14; 17:2; Acts 2:17; Rom. 3:20; 1 Cor. 1:29; Gal. 1:16; Eph. 6:12; 1 Pet. 2:4.

²³⁷Rom. 1:3; 4:1; 9:3, 5, 8; 11:14; 1 Cor. 10:18; Eph. 2:11.

²³⁸Matt. 26:41; Rom. 6:19; 1 Cor. 7:28; Eph. 6:5; Phil. 3:3-4; Col. 3:22; Heb. 12:9.

²³⁹John 1:13; Jude 7.

²⁴⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 61. See John 3:6; 6:63; 8:15; Rom. 7:5, 18, 24; 8:3-9, 12-13; 13:14; 1 Cor. 1:26; 5:5; 2 Cor. 1:17; 5:16; 10:2-3; 11:18; Gal. 3:3; 4:23, 29; 5:13, 16-17, 19, 24; 6:8, 12-13; Eph. 2:3, 14; Col. 2:11, 13, 18, 23; 2 Pet. 2:10, 18; 1 John 2:16.

"according to the flesh" [kata sarka] denotes the self socialized into a world of inauthentic values claiming ultimacy--values that lead the self away from its own centredness in God. Wink describes the flesh as the "beachhead" that the Domination System establishes in the hearts of people. For him, it is more than "the pursuit of the merely human, the earthly transitory"²⁴¹--it is nothing less than the pursuit of the values of the Domination System.²⁴²

Popular Christianity has been correct in labeling as "fleshly" a life that has abandoned the transcendent and become fixated on personal satisfactions. But these are not merely lustful desires, for Paul refers even to asceticism and self-denial as fleshly when they are practiced as a way of trying to secure one's life by one's own power (Col. 2:20-23). As Wink explains Paul's attitude: "Everything an alienated person does is infected by alienation, even the quest for God. Therefore, God has taken the initiative and come searching for us."²⁴³

Wink's paraphrase of the term kata sarka is

²⁴¹Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 238.

Bultmann's work betrays a complete failure to recognize the social dimension inherent in the term.

²⁴²Wink, Engaging, pp. 61-62.

²⁴³Ibid., p. 62.

"dominated existence"²⁴⁴--"a life lived according to the dictates of the Domination System."²⁴⁵ It denotes "existence robbed of its authenticity by the imposition of domination."²⁴⁶

The Nature of the
Domination System

Wink continues his analysis of the Domination System with a look at its nature. He makes three assertions about the Domination System: the Powers are good, the Powers are fallen, and the Powers will be redeemed.²⁴⁷

The Powers are good. In Col. 1:16-17, the Powers are depicted as having been created in, through, and for Christ:

For by him all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or powers or rulers or authorities; all things were created by him and for him.

These verses, against the very grain of human suffering, assert that the principalities and powers which are the

²⁴⁴Ibid.

²⁴⁵Ibid.

²⁴⁶Ibid.

²⁴⁷Ibid., p. 65.

cause of so much evil and anguish in this world are neither autonomous, nor independent, nor eternal, nor utterly depraved. It is essential to understand this point for it will be important in the development of a model for confronting evil within urban power structures. The social structures of reality are creations of God and are thus mortal, limited, and responsible to God. They are by nature called to "serve the humanizing purposes of God in the world."²⁴⁸

Wink insightfully points out that it is not a matter of indifference to God that the principalities and powers exist. Ideas cannot materialize into action outside of institutions. Institutions are indispensable for human existence²⁴⁹ and are rightfully concerned for their own survival. But their reason for existence is not survival; they were created to serve human needs and values which God has declared to be of ultimate value.²⁵⁰

A word of caution is in order here. To assert that God created the Powers is not meant to imply that God endorses any particular Power at any given time. Capitalism and socialism are not creations of God, but there must be some kind of economic system. As Wink points

²⁴⁸Wink, Engaging, pp. 55-56.

²⁴⁹Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), pp. 161-65.

²⁵⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 66.

out, Christians are expected to maintain a very delicate balance:

. . . . God at one and the same time upholds a given political or economic system, since some such system is required to support human life; condemns that system insofar as it is destructive of full human actualization; and presses for its transformation into a more humane order. Conservatives stress the first, revolutionaries the second, reformers the third. The Christian is expected to hold together all three.²⁵¹

The Powers are an inextricable part of God's system. The nature of God's system was personified in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The Powers are accountable to God for their actions and face judgment to the degree to which they fail to manifest God's ultimate concerns. Wink writes, "[Institutions] do not exist for themselves. They were bought with a price (Col. 1:20). They belong to the God who ordains sufficiency for all."²⁵²

The Powers are fallen. Wink asserts that the doctrine of the Fall is essential for understanding both ourselves and the Powers. First of all, it affirms the radicality of evil over against a society that will go to almost any extreme to deny its existence. Wink speaks of such evil with a soberness that would give the most

²⁵¹Ibid., p. 67.

²⁵²Ibid., p. 68.

strident optimist pause to think:

We are speaking now of a deeper evil--a layer of sludge beneath the murky waters that can be characterized only as a hellish hatred of the light, of truth, of kindness and compassion, a brute lust for annihilation. It is the sedimentation of thousands of years of human choices for evil (not wrong choices merely, but actual choices for evil) that has precipitated Satan as the spirituality of evil. Call it what you will, it is real. The doctrine of the Fall is merely a mute pointer to that sludge, lest we deny its reality and foolishly attempt to erect a society on this base.²⁵³

Second, the biblical doctrine of the Fall is not simply about an event that occurred once in time but also describes what is a structural aspect of all personal and social existence. While it is true that the Fall can be described as having occurred within time (the Powers were good, they fell, they will be redeemed) there is a timeless sense to the Fall as well. A given Power performs a necessary function and is created in, through, and for Christ. It is also fallen, yet it may experience moments when it does, for a time, live up to the purposes for which it was created.²⁵⁴ As William Stringfellow writes, it is possible, right in the midst of the reality of this present world, for both people and Powers to taste and live in relative emancipation from the power of death.²⁵⁵

²⁵³Ibid., p. 69.

²⁵⁴Ibid., p. 70.

²⁵⁵Stringfellow, An Ethic for Christians, p. 43.

Third, the doctrine of the Fall keeps one from delusions as to the perfectibility of oneself and one's institutions as well as from the diabolical belief that one is somehow responsible for everything that happens. The very success of a reform effort leads to its decline since the improved situation reduces the public outrage necessary to sustain opinion and activity on behalf of change. A sociological understanding of social change and the forces of inertia constantly at work can take a lot of pressure off people to expect perfection of themselves and others.²⁵⁶

Finally, the doctrine of the Fall reminds Christians that nothing within the Power System can save them from the Powers; only something that transcends the System can set them free. The Fall teaches that people and the Powers are not essentially evil; on the contrary, evil is unnatural, a disorder, a perversion. Human beings and the Powers are the good creations of a good God. As Wink puts it, "Evil is not our essence. God intended us for better things."²⁵⁷ Fallenness may characterize the Christian's existence, but it does not touch his or her essence.²⁵⁸

²⁵⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 71.

²⁵⁷Ibid., p. 72.

²⁵⁸Ibid.

The Powers will be redeemed. The Jesus who died at the hands of the Powers died as much for the Powers as he did for people.²⁵⁹ His death involved more than a mere unmasking of the Powers for what they are (Col. 2:15); it was an effort to transform the Powers into what they are meant to be.²⁶⁰ Therefore, the gospel is not about personal salvation from the world, but a message of a world transformed right down to its basic structures. Wink writes:

Redemption means actually being liberated from the oppression of the Powers, being forgiven for one's own sin and for complicity with the Powers, and being engaged in liberating the Powers themselves from their bondage to idolatry.²⁶¹

The good news involves nothing less than a cosmic salvation, a restoration of all creation (Acts 3:21), when God will "bring all things in heaven and on earth together under one head, even Christ" (Eph. 1: 10). At that time, the Powers will enter the new Jerusalem redeemed and transformed (Rev. 22:2), "bearing as their 'glory' all the artistic, cultural, political, scientific, and spiritual contributions whereby they have enriched the world (Rev. 21:24)."²⁶²

²⁵⁹See Col. 1:20.

²⁶⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 82.

²⁶¹Ibid., p. 83.

²⁶²Ibid., pp. 83-84.

These three statements (the Powers are good, the Powers are fallen, the Powers must be redeemed) must be held together, for each, by itself, is not only untrue but leads to gross injustice. Christians cannot affirm economic, cultural, or political institutions as good unless they, at the same time, recognize their fallen state. Conversely, Christians cannot confront an institution's sometimes overwhelming iniquity and intractability unless they remember that it is a part of God's good creation. Further, an understanding of the creation and fall of these Powers will appear only to legitimate them and subvert hopes for change unless it is insisted at the same time that these Powers can and must be redeemed. Wink writes:

It is precisely because the Powers have been created in, through, and for the humanizing purposes of God in Christ that they must be honored, criticized, resisted, and redeemed.²⁶³

Unmasking the
Domination System

Wink concludes his critique of the Domination System with a cogent examination of the means used by the Domination System to maintain control over the millennia it has been in existence. He asks a number of rhetorical questions designed to awaken in the reader questions as to

²⁶³Ibid., p. 10.

why people allow the Domination System to control them:
Why do people not rise up against a system that provides so much to so few and misery to so many? Why do so many women oppose the Equal Rights Amendment? Why did so many people passively watch as the Reagan administration scuttled the graduated income tax in order to provide tax relief to a tiny fraction of wealthy people, while the real incomes of the rest of the American population were in sharp decline? Why do the poor and homeless fail to unite to form a powerful political interest to win their universal human right to adequate food and housing?²⁶⁴

Wink answers these questions himself, arguing that the vast majority of Americans have internalized the values of the Domination System. A popular adage of the 1960s ran, "The hardest battle isn't with Mr. Charlie. It's with what Mr. Charlie has done to your mind."²⁶⁵ Many Americans apparently regard economic stratification and oppression as ordained of God. Wink puts it as one of the central tasks of the Church to expose the delusional system for what it is--a lie that has penetrated the ethos of the American people, befooling their minds and judgment so that what is false will be accepted as true. The Powers are most powerful when they can act from concealment:

²⁶⁴Wink, Engaging, pp. 87-88.

²⁶⁵Ibid., p. 88.

To drop out of sight and awareness into the general surroundings, to masquerade as the permanent furniture of the universe, to make the highly contingent structures of current oppression appear to be of divine construction--such is the genius of their deceptive art.²⁶⁶

Unmasking the delusional system. Wink seeks to expose the deception of the Domination System by unmasking "the basic delusional system [that] has altered little since the ascendancy of the Domination System some five thousand years ago."²⁶⁷ This delusional system has successfully held the vast majority of humanity in its sway through a series of largely unexamined assumptions--what Paul calls the "stoicheia tou kosmou"²⁶⁸: "the fundamental assumptions of the Domination System."²⁶⁹ These assumptions have continually appeared in different countries over the five millennia that the Domination System has existed:

- The need to control society and prevent chaos requires some to dominate others.
- Those who dominate may use other people as a means to achieve their ends.
- Men are better equipped by nature to be dominant than women, and some races are naturally suited to dominate others.
- A valued end justifies the use of any means.
- Violence is redemptive, the only language enemies

²⁶⁶Ibid.

²⁶⁷Ibid., p. 95.

²⁶⁸See Col. 2:8 and 20.

²⁶⁹Wink, Engaging, p. 95.

understand.

- Ruling or managing is the most important of all social functions.
- Therefore rulers and managers should be rewarded by extra privileges and greater wealth of all kinds.
- Those who have military strength, who control the most advanced technology, the greatest wealth, or the largest markets, are the ones who will and should survive.
- Money is the most important value.
- The possession of money is a sign and proof of political and social worth.
- The production of material goods is more important than the production of healthy and normal people and of sound human relationships (or the former automatically produces the latter).
- Property is sacred, and property ownership an absolute right.
- In an organization or nation, great size is proof of its power and value.
- Institutions are more important than people.
- There is no higher value or being or power than the state. If there is a God, God is the protector and patron of the state.
- God, if there is one, is not revealed to all, but only to select individuals or nations and their rulers and priesthood.²⁷⁰

As long as these delusional assumptions remain unconscious, they are almost impossible to transcend effectively. The Church's most important task is to expose these delusionary assumptions.

Liberation from the delusional system. It is important to understand that both the oppressed and the oppressors are victims of the delusional system. People

²⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 95-96.

are socialized into their roles through means of the delusional assumptions from infancy and those who oppress are socialized to deny to themselves and others the fact that their role as oppressor is oppressing to them. Jesus commands Christians to pray for their enemies, not because it is the pious thing to do, but because they are capable of recognizing the inequity of the present system. Further, society so reinforces and justifies the mistreatment of oppressed groups that the oppressed tend to believe the same misinformation about themselves on which the oppressors act.²⁷¹

In spite of this, all those who are victims of the delusional system are responsible for how they have been shaped. Otherwise, individuals would not be moral agents responsible for their actions. Further, if they are responsible, they can choose to be liberated. Wink notes: "This is the paradox of moral maturity: we are responsible for what we do with what has been done to us. We are answerable for what we make of what has been made of us."²⁷² Capitulation to the delusional system may be involuntary, but in some deep recess of the self, an individual knows its wrong. Human beings are so constituted that no Power on earth can finally quench

²⁷¹Wink, Engaging, pp. 96-98, 354.

²⁷²Ibid., p. 98.

within them the capacity to recognize truth. However long it lies buried, or however severely it has been betrayed, truth will win out.²⁷³

The strategy of the delusional system is to cut down opposition by a sense of "induced powerlessness."²⁷⁴ The refrain of the dragon-worshippers of Revelation is, "Who is like the Beast, and who can fight against it?"²⁷⁵ The oppressed feel powerless against a System that seems, at times, omnipotent and omniscient. The Domination System purposefully works to keep the poor feeling "nonexistent, valueless, humiliated."²⁷⁶

People not only choose to be oppressed, they often conclude that due to God, fate, or their own inadequacies, they deserve it. Wink tells of a Bolivian Indian woman who, after participating in a Bible study in a Christian base community, asked in astonishment, "Do you mean that nowhere in that book does it say we have to starve?"²⁷⁷ In the United States, one has only to listen to radio commentators such as Rush Limbaugh to hear the

²⁷³Ibid.

²⁷⁴Ibid., p. 99.

²⁷⁵Rev. 13:3-4 (Wink's translation).

²⁷⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 101.

²⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 101-02.

"Americanized" version of this lie.²⁷⁸ "Individuals all leave from the same starting gate of life," one is told, "and if some people are way ahead and others far behind, then those who are lagging have no one to blame but themselves for failing to make more of their lives." Such statements implicitly deny the reality of the advantages some have over others due to family wealth, education, race, gender, and family status. Victims blame themselves and systemic evil is ignored. Wink writes, "The gospel does not teach that we are born equally, but born incomparably, each utterly unique, utterly beloved by God."²⁷⁹ He concludes:

Those who have internalized their oppression, who are awed by the Beast and its powers into passive obedience, and who worship its show of might, provide it all the permission it needs continually to extend its power."²⁸⁰

One must be careful, however, not to fall into the trap of many conservatives who view powerlessness as simply a problem of attitude.²⁸¹ As has been seen, there are very

²⁷⁸See Rush H. Limbaugh III, The Way Things Ought to Be (New York: Pocket, 1992).

²⁷⁹Wink, Engaging, p. 103. See also Glenn E. Tinder, The Political Meaning of Christianity: An Interpretation (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1989), p. 32.

²⁸⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 103.

²⁸¹Pat Buchanan, for instance, blames the so-called "Welfare State" for creating a permanent, Black underclass psychologically dependent on the state for the means of

real structures--economic, political, religious, and social, and only then psychological--that oppress people and resist all attempts to end their oppression.²⁸² The Church is often guilty of spending too much time trying to adjust people to the System rather than adjusting the System to people.

Finally, it must be recognized that systemic injustice, especially in the United States, may be invisible to its perpetrators. A person may be quite free of racial prejudice yet still support structures that perpetuate the systemic oppression of one group by another.

As Ward Ewing puts it, "Racism acts as a spiritual force within our social structure even when the people causing it have no intention of acting from prejudice and are unaware of doing so."²⁸³

The relevance of Wink's interpretation of the biblical concept of the Powers to the development of a model for the confrontation of evil within urban power structures should by now be evident. Any attempt to confront evil within urban power structures must take into consideration both their inner and outer aspects--both

existence (Patrick J. Buchanan, Right from the Beginning [Boston: Little, Brown, 1988], p. 338).

²⁸²Wink, Engaging, p. 102.

²⁸³Ward Ewing, The Power of the Lamb (Cambridge, MA: Cowley, 1990), p. 47.

their inner spirituality and the outer manifestations of political, economic, and cultural institutions. Wink writes:

Only by confronting the spirituality of an institution and its concretions can the total entity be transformed, and that requires a kind of spiritual discernment and praxis that the materialistic ethos in which we live knows nothing about.²⁸⁴

Jesus' Third Way

What action, then, can not only restore dignity to the oppressed but even bring about the redemption of the oppressor? According to Wink, the strategy Jesus counseled his followers to adopt is nonviolent direct action. Why is "Jesus' third way"²⁸⁵ the only viable alternative? The answer is simply that it is the only alternative that seeks the redemption of the oppressor, while maintaining the dignity of the oppressed. Nonresistance is deadly both to the perpetrator and to the victim. Women beaten by their husbands are told to "turn the other cheek" and let themselves be brutalized in the hopes of redeeming their

²⁸⁴Wink, Engaging, p. 10.

²⁸⁵Wink's term for Jesus' espousal of nonviolent direct action as a means for engaging evil. This is a "third way" to differentiate it from two traditional strategies for dealing with evil: violence and nonresistance. (See chap. 9 of Wink, Engaging.)

husbands. Such a strategy not only endangers the lives of women and destroys their self-respect but dehumanizes the perpetrator; each time he strikes his wife he loses a little more of his humanity, falls a little further from what God intended for him to be, and makes the climb back more difficult and more unlikely.

Violence, on the part of the oppressed, is just as unviable. Violence dehumanizes the oppressed for in adopting the same method used by the oppressor, the oppressed actually becomes that which he or she is struggling against. Wink writes:

We become what we hate. The very act of hating something draws it to us. Since our hate is usually a direct response to an evil done to us, our hate almost invariably causes us to respond in the terms already laid down by the enemy. Unaware of what is happening, we turn into the very thing we oppose.²⁸⁶

The arms race was a perfect example of this process. The United States felt threatened by the Soviets, so they increased their weapons. This, in turn, threatened the Soviets; they escalated production, which led in turn to American cries that they were "behind" the Soviets. Yet, every weapon made left Americans feeling more insecure. No matter how much more powerful the United States became, Soviet resistance grew at the same pace.²⁸⁷

²⁸⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 195.

²⁸⁷Ibid.

A. J. Muste developed an axiom from his observation of this behaviour: "If you arm yourself, you arm your enemy."²⁸⁸ Or as that great mystic poet, William Blake, put it, "They looked at one-another & became what they beheld."²⁸⁹

In their rivalry with the Soviets, the United States took on some of the very qualities in the Soviets that they claimed to be resisting. To keep communism from spreading in Africa, Asia, or Latin America, the United States moved in with troops, manipulated elections, unseated legitimately elected governments, and assassinated leftist leaders. To prevent revolution in client states, the United States beefed up and trained local police and soldiers, only to watch the military itself become the gravest threat to democracy in one country that was supported after another. To counter Soviet espionage, a spy network was created; to make sure that no one cooperated with the enemy, U.S. citizens were spied on.²⁹⁰

Jesus' third way is thus the only viable alternative. The oppressed are called not, on the one hand, to be supine and complicit in their oppression nor,

²⁸⁸A. J. Muste, Gandhi and the H-Bomb (Nyack, N.Y.: Fellowship, [1950] 1983), p. 11.

²⁸⁹William Blake, "Jerusalem," chap. 2, plate 30, in The Complete Poetry and Prose of William Blake, rev. ed., ed. David V. Erdman (Berkeley: University of California, 1982), p. 177.

²⁹⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 196.

on the other hand, to react violently to it either. Rather, they are exhorted to find a third way that can secure their human dignity, while holding out hope for the redemption of the oppressor. The oppressed are instructed to turn the other cheek, thus indicating to the one slapping that his attempts to shame another into servility have failed. They are instructed to strip naked and parade out of court when their garment is demanded, thus taking away the momentum of the law and the whole debt economy. The oppressed are instructed to walk a second mile, surprising the occupation troops with a sudden challenge to their control. These are, of course, not rules to be followed literally but examples to spark an infinite variety of creative responses to evil. They show how the cycle of humiliation can be broken with humour and even ridicule, exposing the injustice of the System.²⁹¹ Jesus' third way will be discussed more fully in chapter seven as it is an important aspect of the model that is developed there.

²⁹¹Ibid., p. 185. There is not space here to discuss in detail the biblical basis for nonviolent direct action. Wink offers a convincing argument that Jesus taught nonviolent direct action, rather than passivity, to his followers. For a detailed exegetical study of Matt. 5:38-42, see Walter Wink, "Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way," *Forum*, 7 (1991), 5-28. See also chapter 9 of his Engaging.

A Brief Evaluation of Wink

Walter Wink's study represents a quest to grasp the nature of systemic evil in light of the biblical evidence.

Wink's interpretation of the Powers has already wielded a tremendous influence on evangelical scholars, especially in the area of social ethics.²⁹² The impact his thinking has had on this dissertation is easily discernible not only in this chapter but also in the model that is developed. It is not necessary, though, to accept everything Wink says "hook, line and sinker" to benefit from his study. For example, Wink approaches his study with a definite bias. He candidly admits that he regards demonic and angelic powers as impersonal forces that operate without conscious thought.²⁹³ I have no problem believing in the personal and conscious nature of Satan, demons, and angels. Am I, then, to reject Wink's study on these grounds?²⁹⁴ There is nothing

²⁹²See, for example, Lowell Noble, "Stage III: In Search of a Theology of Society," Faculty Dialogue, 12 (1989), 116. In this article, Nobel adopts Wink's view of the Powers as the starting point for his study of social evil within the context of a theology of society.

²⁹³Wink, Engaging, pp. 8-9.

²⁹⁴This is, in fact, what Clinton Arnold does. Arnold candidly admits that his main basis for rejecting Wink's argument lies in the fact that he believes in the personal, conscious reality of angels and demons. He admits that if he could get past this hurdle, he "would find his argument to be quite plausible." As it stands, however, he rejects Wink's study as "unnecessary and even

inherent to Wink's study that automatically rules out the personal and conscious nature of angels and demons. Wink admits, in fact, that his view is a bias and is, therefore, not central to his argument.²⁹⁵ Satan and his demonic host can be understood as acting with purpose and volition within the power structures of society and within the entire Domination System without taking away from the validity of Wink's argument.²⁹⁶

Similarly, I do not accept fully Wink's contention that Paul took key steps toward demythologizing²⁹⁷ the language of demons, evil spirits, and devils by interpreting them into the abstract categories of sin, law,

erroneous," while failing to give any convincing arguments as to why he does other than his belief in the personal, conscious nature of demons and angels. (See Clinton E. Arnold, Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters [Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1992], p. 199).

²⁹⁵Wink, Engaging, pp. 8-9.

²⁹⁶I further modify Wink's argument along a related line. I draw a more rigid division between that which is angelic and that which is demonic than Wink does (see Wink, Unmasking, p. 108). Rather than understanding the angel of a structure as capable of both good and evil, I attribute the good that a power structure sometimes shows itself to be capable of to the influence of angelic hosts and evil to the influence of the demonic.

²⁹⁷Wink means this term in the sense of withdrawing "the mythic projection of the real determinants of human existence out onto the cosmos and their identifications as actual physical, psychic, and social forces at work in us, in society, and in the universe" (Wink, Naming, p. 62).

flesh, and death.²⁹⁸ Wink offers no persuasive argument as to why Paul could not have understood the language of the Powers in a dual sense.²⁹⁹

This in no way affects the basic truth behind what Wink writes. There is no doubt Paul understood that evil spirits extend their demonic influence beyond that of individuals and the Church.³⁰⁰ Wink offers an extremely

²⁹⁸Wink, Naming, p. 104.

²⁹⁹As Arnold points out, Wink appears to be imposing a post-Enlightenment mind-set on the first-century writers (see Clinton E. Arnold, Ephesians: Power and Magic. The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph 63 [Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University, 1989] p. 50). Wink is willing to recognize that the ancients did believe in a real Satan, evil angels, and demons, yet he is unwilling to grant that Paul might have shared this belief with his contemporaries, while, at the same time, adding another dimension to the language of the Powers. Further, Wink is unclear in explaining the extent to which the Powers were regarded simply as mythical in the first century. Were there just a few who were enlightened or were all inhabitants of the Hellenistic world aware of the mythical nature of the Powers (Ibid). Wink also neglects to take into account the evidence compiled by MacGregor and Lee affirming a widespread belief in astral spirits (see Ibid.) as well as the relevance of the magical tradition for a more accurate understanding of the first-century view of the Powers. Wink refers to the magical papyri once in a footnote only to dismiss this evidence as too late (Ibid.). The widespread belief in astral spirits as well as the presence of magic in the Hellenistic world (which implies a belief in evil spiritual forces) does not contradict Wink's assertion that the Powers reside in the systems and structures of society, as Arnold insists (Ibid.), but adds another dimension to it.

³⁰⁰Even Arnold acknowledges this point (see his

persuasive argument for the fact that the demonic is alive and active in the systems and structures of society and need to be engaged because such engagement is an essential aspect of the mandate given by God to His Church. One does not need to agree wholeheartedly with Wink either to benefit from his study nor to put the model that is developed in chapter seven into practice. To conclude, Wink has written a cogent and persuasive theological rationale for the existence of evil within the systems and structures of society. It is one to which I will come back, time and again, as I develop a model for the confrontation of evil within urban power structures.

Powers of Darkness, p. 201).

Chapter 3

A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: URBAN POWER
STRUCTURES AS THE EMBODIMENT
OF SYSTEMIC EVIL (I)

Theology is an indispensable tool in coming to an understanding of systemic evil. Theology alone, however, does not provide a holistic understanding of systemic evil and the multi-faceted power structures within which it is embedded; sociology, too, is necessary. The emphasis of this chapter, and the next, will be on gaining a fuller understanding of systemic evil within urban power structures through sociological analysis. The focus of this chapter will be on discovering where and how evil resides within urban power structures and on gaining an understanding of the nature of these structures themselves.

The Critique of Domination: "God's
Domination-Free Order"³⁰¹

How does one critique an urban power structure? What scale or standard does one employ in determining whether a particular structure is just or unjust? In the previous chapter, the nature of systemic evil was analyzed from a biblical perspective partly through a focus on Wink's concept of the Domination System. This section will adopt a parallel focus in that a biblical standard for critiquing urban power structures will

³⁰¹See chap. 6 of Walter Wink, Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination, vol. 3 of The Powers (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

be developed through a focus on his concept of "God's Domination-Free Order." Wink delineates the kind of world God desires by holding up the words and life of Jesus against the backdrop of the Domination System. To the degree that he is faithful in this task, the perceptual lens that Wink develops for critiquing evil within urban power structures will be, in fact, Jesus' critique of the Domination System.

Servanthood

Jesus rejected any attempt by one person or group to dominate another. Jesus' Kingdom is to be domination-free (see Luke 22:24-27 and Mark 10:32-45). Jesus did not condemn ambition or aspiration in and of themselves; he merely challenged the way they are manifest: "If anyone wants to be first, he must be the very last, and the servant of all" (Mark 9:35b). Jesus did not reject power, but only its use to dominate others. He did not reject greatness, but the one who would be great must be in solidarity with the poor and the oppressed (Matt. 5:3-12; Luke 6:20-23). Jesus' rejection of domination could scarcely be more explicit than when he told his disciples:

It will be good for those servants whose master finds them watching when he comes. I tell you the truth, he will dress himself to serve, will have them recline at the table and will come and wait on them (Luke 12:37).³⁰²

Only one blinded by the Domination System can read such verses without realizing that in Jesus is found one who is not simply a minor reformer but an egalitarian prophet who repudiates the most basic premise of domination: the right of one person or group to lord it over another by means of power, wealth, shaming, or titles.³⁰³ Wink writes:

In his beatitudes, his healings, and his table fellowship with outcasts and sinners,

³⁰²Wink, Engaging, p. 111.

³⁰³Ibid., p. 112.

Jesus declares God's special concern for the oppressed. God sides with the poor, not because of their virtue, but because of their suffering; not because of their goodness, but because they have been sinned against. And he proclaims them blessed, not because poverty is holy, but because their poverty gives them a perspective to understand Jesus' condemnations of wealth. He declares those who weep fortunate, not because their suffering produces character, but because it opens their eyes, as in the consciousness-raising funerals of black South Africans and Palestinians. Indeed, what are the Beatitudes if not a systematic and explicit repudiation of the Domination System?³⁰⁴

The washing of his disciples' feet (John 13:1-20), Jesus' farcical entry into Jerusalem on a donkey (John 12:12-15), the "king" who had no place to lay his head (Luke 9:57-58) all reveal a man who resisted the Domination Order. Even the first witnesses to his birth (shepherds) and his resurrection (women) were on the lowest rungs of the hierarchical ladder in ancient Israel.³⁰⁵ The same theme can be found in Matthew's account of the homage of the Wise Men (2:1-12), in the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55), in the claim in Matthew 28:18 that "all authority in heaven and on earth has been given" to this lowly and crucified carpenter, and in Paul's hymnody over the self-renunciation of the Christ in becoming a slave (Phil. 2:5-11).

Economic Equality

Domination is founded upon economic inequality. Ranking, domination hierarchies, and classism are all built on power gained through excessive wealth. Jesus, therefore, championed economic equality. His gospel enables the poor to find ways of

³⁰⁴Ibid.

³⁰⁵Shepherds were regarded by the "righteous" as dishonest, unclean, and no better than Gentile slaves. They were, therefore, forbidden to act as witnesses (see Wink, Engaging, p. 113, and J. Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969], pp. 304-11). Women were viewed as the sexual property of their husbands (Wink, Engaging, p. 132).

transcending the Domination Epoch while still in it. John the Baptist was the first to define what the Kingdom of God is to be characterized by: "The man with two tunics should share with him who has none, and the one who has food should do the same" (Luke 3:11). Jesus, for his part, challenged creditors not only to forego interest but to ask no repayment whatever (Luke 6:34). Those who wish to follow him are told to sell everything and the rich are told they have no access to his Kingdom.³⁰⁶

The Kingdom of God is, in fact, central to Jesus' teaching. The earth, he insisted, is so constituted that it will provide all our needs if we will but share equitably: "Seek first the reign of God and God's justice, and all these things [necessities of life] will be given to you as well" (Matt. 6:33/Luke 12:31--Wink's translation). In parable after parable, Jesus speaks of the Kingdom of God using imagery drawn from farming and what was considered women's work. The Kingdom is not described as coming from on high down to earth; it rises quietly and imperceptibly out of the earth. It is brought in not through military might but rises ineluctably from below, in the midst of the common people. The symbolism Jesus uses to describe it is not masculine (kings, swords, chargers, spears) but feminine (water, soil, dough, women, a home).³⁰⁷

While most faithful Jews looked heavenward for divine intervention, Jesus pointed to God's Kingdom growing up in the very midst of them. While scholars debated as to when the promised time would come, Jesus showed that the Kingdom had already arrived ("But if I drive out demons by the finger of God, then the kingdom of God has come to you"--Luke 11:20). While the faithful in Israel waited for God to transform

³⁰⁶See Luke 12:33-34; Matt. 6:19-21; Luke 14:33; Mark 10:17-31; Matt. 13:44-46.

³⁰⁷Wink, *Engaging*, pp. 114-15. See also Mark 4:1-9, 26-29, 30-32; Matt. 13:33, 44-46; Luke 15:8-10; Matt. 18:23-35; 20:1-16; 21:28-32; 25:1-13, 14-30; 25:31-46.

Israel into a mighty military power (Ezek. 17:22-24), Jesus described the Kingdom of God as a tiny mustard seed that grows wild yet becomes "the largest of all garden plants" (Matt. 4:32). Thus, Jesus did not seek to bring in a Kingdom where power is wielded to impose God's will on the world; he came instead to inaugurate a domination-free society where all people are free to realize their full potential.³⁰⁸

Racial and Ethnic Inclusion

The life and teachings of Jesus served to break down ethnic and racial divisions. In Jesus we see one who healed the daughter of a Syrian woman from Phoenicia (Mark 7:24-30), who healed a demoniac in the Decapolis who was probably a Gentile (Mark 5:1-20), and who predicted that many would come from east and west and sit at a table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob when God's reign is realized, while heirs of the Kingdom would find themselves excluded.³⁰⁹

However, it was left to Jesus' followers to fling the doors of the Kingdom open to Gentiles under the irrepressible logic of his teaching of God as Abba, his preferential love for the marginalized and excluded, and his repudiation of the laws about holiness and defilement. Paul saw the breaking down of the wall of enmity between Jew and Gentile as one of the great watersheds in history. If all humanity is created in the image of God, then all have access to God.³¹⁰ The Church early on realized that God shows no partiality and is no respecter of persons.³¹¹

³⁰⁸Wink, Engaging, p. 115.

³⁰⁹Ibid., p. 117--Matt. 8:11-12. See also Luke 2:32; 3:6; 4:27; 14:22-23; 17:16b; Mark 8:1-10; Matt. 10:18; 12:21; John 10:16; 12:20-26.

³¹⁰Rom. 1:16; 9-11; 15:9-12, 16-29; Gal. 3:28.

³¹¹Wink, Engaging, p. 117. See also Matt. 5:45; Acts

Equality for Women
and Children

Jesus' treatment of women was unprecedented since the rise of patriarchy some 3,000 years earlier. In every single encounter he had with women, Jesus violated the norms of his day. Respectable Jewish women were not to speak to men in public, yet Jesus conversed freely with women (John 4:4-42; Mark 5:33-34; Mark 7:34-30). A woman was to touch no man but her spouse; Jesus was touched by women and touched them (Mark 5:24b-34; Luke 13:10-17; Mark 1:29-31; Mark 5:21-24a, 35-43; Luke 7:36-50; John 20:17 reading "cling"). When a prostitute burst into an all-male banquet, knelt at Jesus' feet and began to kiss them, washing them with her tears, wiping them with her hair, and anointing them with oil, Jesus accepted her gift and its meaning despite the stern reproof of his guests. Further, he took her side, even though she had, according to Jewish law, rendered him unclean and scandalized the guests (Luke 7:36-50).³¹²

One of Jesus' most astounding encounters with a woman occurred when he called a woman who had been plagued with a spinal disease for eighteen years out into the middle of the synagogue, laid his hands on her, and healed her of her affliction. Wink points out the entire series of mores that Jesus broke in this one encounter beginning with his reference to her as a "daughter of Abraham," an expression found nowhere else in all of ancient Jewish literature! Wink writes:

Women were saved through their men; to call her a "daughter of Abraham" was to make her a full-fledged member of the covenant and of equal standing before God with men (Luke 13:10-17). To heal her on a Sabbath was to liberate the Sabbath to be a jubilee of release and restoration. To touch her was to revoke the holiness

10:34; Rom. 2:11; Gal. 2:6; Eph. 6:9; Col. 3:25; Jas. 2:1, 9.

³¹²Wink, Engaging, p. 129.

code with its male scruples about menstrual uncleanness and sexual advances. To speak to her in public was to jettison male restraints on women's freedoms, restraints born of sexual possessiveness and the caricature of women as seducers. To place her in the midst of the synagogue was to challenge the male monopoly on the means of grace and access to God. To assert that her illness was not divine punishment for sin, but satanic oppression, was to declare war on the entire Domination System, whose driving spirit is Satan.³¹³

In freeing this woman from Satan's power, Jesus simultaneously released her from the chains of patriarchy, male religious elitism, and the mores of society used to disadvantage some in order to preserve the advantage of others. This one incident reveals the precariousness of the Domination System. Jesus succeeded in shattering its hold at a single point and thus effectually threatened its stability all along the line.³¹⁴

There is no space here to elaborate fully on the egalitarian role women played in the ministry of Jesus and in the life of the early Church. It should be noted, though, that women received the Holy Spirit as the founding event of the Church (Acts 1:14; 2:1), received prophetic gifts (Acts 2:17-21; 1 Cor. 11:5; 12:4-11, 28-31), headed house churches (Acts 12:12; 16:14-15, 40; Rom. 16:1-2, 3, 5; 1 Cor. 16:19; Col. 4:15), opened new fields for evangelism (Phil. 4:2-3), and were Paul's coworkers (Rom. 16:3, 6, 12; Acts 18:1-3, 18-19, 24-26; 1 Cor. 16:19; 2 Tim. 4:19-21). They were persecuted and jailed (Acts 8:3; 9:1-2; 22:4-5; Rom. 16:7), were named apostles (Rom. 16:7),³¹⁵ disciples

³¹³Ibid.

³¹⁴Ibid., pp. 129-30.

³¹⁵Wink notes that "Junia," referred to in Rom. 16:7, is clearly a feminine proper noun. The translators of the RSV, unable to fathom the possibility of women apostles, simply assumed that Junia had to be a man. Hence the translation: "Greet Andronicus and Junias my kinsmen and my fellow prisoners; they are men of note among the apostles." This mistranslation was corrected in the NRSV. See Wink, Engaging, p. 362 n. 98.

(Acts 9:36-42), deacons (Luke 8:3; Mark 15:40-41; Rom. 16:1-2; 1 Tim. 3:8-13), led churches (Philm. 1-2), and even, in one case, had authority over Paul himself (Rom. 16:1-2--"for she [Phoebe] has been a ruler over many, indeed over me").³¹⁶

Even children were offered a new freedom in Jesus' Kingdom. Children, in fact, exemplify the way to enter it (Mark 10:13-16; 9:36-37). This constituted a radically new view of children in a world where children, like women, were considered of little value. Wink argues that the sayings of Jesus regarding children were not intended to encourage childlike innocence or naiveté but were a challenge to those who seek to obtain power and domination over others.³¹⁷ Jesus treated women and children as he did, not in order to be "nice," but because the restoration of women and children to their full humanity in partnership with men is integral to the coming of the Kingdom of God.³¹⁸

Healing and Exorcism

Jesus' life and ministry were marked by compassion. Consequently, the healings and exorcisms which played such a major role in his work were not simply patches on a body destined for a grave but were manifestations of God's Kingdom, a foretaste of the coming restoration of all things to their original perfection: "But if I drive

³¹⁶Wink, Engaging, p. 133. See also Leonard Swindler, Biblical Affirmations of Women (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979), pp. 310-11). Note also that Walter Bauer lists under the Greek word "prostatis" "protector, patroness, helper" (The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, 2nd rev. ed., trans. and augmented by W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker, [Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979]).

³¹⁷Wink, Engaging, p. 130.

³¹⁸Ibid., p. 134.

out demons by the finger of God, then the kingdom of God has come to you" (Luke 11:20).³¹⁹

Jesus' life and ministry gave witness to numerous other manifestations of the Kingdom of God (what Wink calls God's domination-free order): new values, new assumptions, new strategies for social as well as personal transformation. What makes Jesus' message so powerful, however, is the fact that he did not articulate his message as an ideal, unattainable in this world and to be passively awaited in the near or distant future. Wink writes, "[Jesus] lived it. He acted on it. He brought it to reality by actually freeing people from bondage."³²⁰ Jesus went beyond revolution. His assault was against the very structures of oppression themselves and the presuppositions which give them their strength.³²¹ And the values Jesus articulated will be the values used in this dissertation to critique the urban power structures of the United States.

A Critique of Urban Power Structures

The purpose of this section is to discover the forms evil takes within the urban power structures found within American capitalism and, indeed, in American capitalism itself. It is important that the reader understand what will not be attempted here. It will not be the purpose of this section to compare and contrast American capitalism with other economic models nor to offer alternatives to American capitalism. Other economic systems may or may not be more just and equitable. The purpose here is not to debate the pros and cons of various economic approaches but simply to critique

³¹⁹Ibid.

³²⁰Ibid., p. 135.

³²¹Ibid., p. 136.

one system--American capitalism.³²² Second, no attempt will be made to give a thorough explanation of the history, nature, and operation of American capitalism except as it is relevant to the discussion. Finally, in that the focus of this study is on systemic evil, no attempt will be made to focus on the positive aspects of American capitalism; the concern

³²²I use the term, "American capitalism," to refer to the very specific form of capitalism found within the United States. Various authors have referred to American capitalism with such terms as "market-place ethics," "laissez-faire individualism," "laissez-faire capitalism," "consumerism," and "unrestrained laissez-faire capitalism." (See, for instance, J. Philip Wogaman, The Great Economic Debate: An Ethical Analysis [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977]; and Larry L. Rasmussen, Moral Fragments and Moral Community: A Proposal for Church in Society [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993]). While this chapter will describe in some detail the characteristics of this form of capitalism, it can be identified briefly as an economy where the market becomes the model of society itself and not a segment of society only; in other words, capitalism becomes a culture and a society and not simply the means for economic exchange (Rasmussen, Moral Fragments, p. 65). One should not see in these pages a complete rejection of capitalism as a system or even of all aspects of American capitalism. As Wogaman points out, the free market is potentially a useful servant although it is almost certainly a very poor master. He points out that social market capitalism is, in effect, based on this principle. Those who support the idea of a "mixed economy" do so out of the conviction that the capitalistic apparatus is an immensely productive tool. However, they balance this view with the conviction that this tool needs to be harnessed to social objectives determined outside the marketplace itself. In other words, the free-enterprise system should be encouraged to function as productively as possible, and then the fruits of this productivity should be used, more or less, for social purposes. One can see these principles incorporated into the platforms of the Labour Party in Britain and the social democratic parties of such countries as Sweden, France, and Italy (Wogaman, The Great Economic Debate, pp. 98-99).

of this paper is with the unjust aspects of American capitalism.³²³

The Nature of Power

The first question that must be asked is, "What is power?" Max Weber offered what has become a classic formulation of the definition of power:

In general, we understand by "power" the chance of a number of men to realize their own will in a communal act even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action.³²⁴

"Chance" in this context refers to the opportunity or ability for effecting one's will.

Viewed in this light, it is not so much the act of control as the potential to act--the social expectation that such control is possible and legitimate--that defines power.³²⁵ Power is, according to Weber, the capacity or potential of persons in certain roles to make decisions that influence the conduct of others in the social system.³²⁶ Sociologist Robert O. Schultze puts it this way:

. . . . [A] few have emphasized that act as such rather than the potential to act is the crucial aspect of power. It seems far more sociologically sound to accept a Weberian definition which stresses the potential to act. Power may thus be conceived as an inherently group-linked property, an attribute of social statuses

³²³Again, one should not see in this focus an implicit rejection of all forms of capitalism or even of all aspects of American capitalism but only of the unjust aspects of unrestrained laissez-faire capitalism currently found in the United States.

³²⁴Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., From Max Weber (New York: Oxford University, 1946), p. 180.

³²⁵Thomas R. Dye, Who's Running America? The Bush Era, 3rd rev. ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), p. 4.

³²⁶Ibid.

rather than of individual persons. . . . Accordingly, power will denote the capacity or potential of persons in certain statuses to set conditions, make decisions, and/or take actions which are determinative for the existence of others within a given social system.³²⁷

Power, then, is the expected and legitimate capacity to direct, manage, and guide programs, policies, and activities of the major institutions of society.³²⁸ Further, power is an attribute, not of individuals, but of social organizations.³²⁹ C. Wright Mills observed:

No one . . . can be truly powerful unless he has access to the command of major institutions, for it is over these institutional means of power that the truly powerful are, in the first instance, powerful.³³⁰

Adolf A. Berle, who spent a lifetime studying private property and the American corporation, expressed a similar sentiment:

Power is invariably organized and transmitted through institutions. Top power holders must work through existing institutions, perhaps extending or modifying them, or must at once create new institutions. There is no other way of exercising power--unless it is limited to the range of the power holder's fist or his gun.³³¹

³²⁷Robert O. Schultze, "The Bifurcation of Power in a Satellite City," in Community Political Systems, ed. Morris Janowitz (Glencoe, IL: Free, 1961), p. 20.

³²⁸Dye, Who's Running America?, p. 5.

³²⁹Of course, power can be exercised by individuals, for example, when a robber stops a person on the street and demands his wallet or when one person shoots another in a drive-by shooting. Great power, however, is found only in institutional roles.

³³⁰C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University, 1956), p. 9.

³³¹Adolph A. Berle, Power (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1967), p. 92.

Individuals do not become powerful simply because of their personal qualities, skills, ambitions, or personalities. These assets may help one to gain power, but it is the position itself that gives an individual control over the activities of others.³³² There is an intricate relationship between power and institutional authority in modern society:

If we took the one hundred most powerful men in America, the one hundred wealthiest, and the one hundred most celebrated away from the institutional positions they now occupy, away from their resources of men and women and money, away from the media of mass communication . . . then they would be powerless and poor and uncelebrated. For power is not of a man. Wealth does not center in the person of the wealthy. Celebrity is not inherent in any personality. To be celebrated, to be wealthy, to have power, requires access to major institutions, for the institutional positions men occupy determine in large part their chances to have and to hold these valued experiences.³³³

³³²Dye, Who's Running America?, p. 5.

³³³Mills, The Power Elite, p. 9.

The Foundational American
Power Structure:
Capitalism

What is capitalism? Capitalism can be defined in an abstract manner as an economic system based preponderantly on the private ownership and use of capital for the production and exchange of goods and services with the aim of earning a profit.³³⁴

This definition, however, gives little indication of what capitalism has grown to become within much of the world and especially in the United States of America. Capitalism is the dominant reality of contemporary American society. It encompasses economic, political, and social realities. How, then, can one begin to grasp the breadth of this multifaceted phenomenon? Any ethical analysis of American capitalism must begin with the understanding that capitalism is a relatively modern invention. It finds its roots primarily in the thought of the Protestant reformer, John Calvin, with his belief in the dignity of the common man or woman, the ethical viability of self-interest, and the religious acceptability of economic activity, all to be performed under the sovereignty of God. It was commitment to the absolute supremacy of God that provided restraints on the self-interest vitally important to the success of capitalism.³³⁵

What has happened in the centuries since Calvin, however, is that America has lost this religious commitment which functioned as a restraint on inordinate greed.³³⁶ Consequently, capitalism, within the United States,

³³⁴David S. Landes, The Rise of Capitalism (New York: Macmillan, 1966), p. 1.

³³⁵J. Arthur Baird, The Greed Syndrome: An Ethical Sickness in American Capitalism (Akron, Ohio: Hampshire, 1989), pp. 10-11.

³³⁶Ibid., p. 11.

has developed into a system whereby a relatively small elite exploits and oppresses the majority of American citizens. As such, capitalism is the primary source of a great many of the economic, political, cultural, and environmental evils in the modern world.³³⁷

Bishop Dale White of the United Methodist Church places the issue in stark terms:

All of us, really, are hostages . . . to a vast political economic system of cruelty structures which are preordaining that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. . . . These systems are . . . so powerful, so destructive . . . that perhaps the word which Khomeini used for them, the word "Satanic," is the only word which is aptly descriptive.³³⁸

As one looks at American capitalism in light of Wink's ideal of God's domination-free order, one can begin to understand why Bishop White, and many others, have spoken against capitalism in such uncompromising terms.

Covetousness. Undoubtedly, one of the clearest aspects of American capitalism is one which has already been alluded to: covetousness. Art Gish comments that covetousness "is the engine of the capitalist economy."³³⁹ Wes Michaelson writes that capitalism "depends on and fosters human selfishness."³⁴⁰ And Jim Wallis has stated that capitalist

³³⁷Craig M. Gay, With Liberty and Justice for Whom? (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 22-23.

³³⁸John Jefferson Davis, Your Wealth in God's World: Does the Bible Support the Free Market? (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1984), p. 72.

³³⁹Ed Gish, "A Decentralist Response," in Wealth and Poverty: Four Christian Views of Economics, ed. Robert G. Clouse (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1984), p. 76.

³⁴⁰Wes Michaelson, "Evangelicalism and Radical Discipleship," in Evangelicalism and Anabaptism, ed. C. Norman Kraus (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1979), p. 78.

economic institutions act to make profit, accumulate wealth, and exploit the poor, workers, and consumers, while ravaging the environment instead of providing for the equitable distribution of goods and services.³⁴¹

Even such staunch defenders of capitalism as Michael Novak readily admit to the centrality of the greed principle within capitalism. Novak goes so far as to admit that basing economics on greed creates "in some ways an evil, corrupt, inefficient, wasteful and ugly system."³⁴² Ultimately, however, the individual sin of greed, according to the proponents of capitalism, is transformed into a collective virtue in that selfishness becomes the primary force behind the greater productivity of capitalism. As each person seeks his or her own interest, more goods are produced, resulting in a greater social advance in total wealth.³⁴³ One can easily see why proponents of such a view argue in favour of open and unrestrained competition in the marketplace.

The concept of a free market where unrestrained competition is encouraged is false. Indeed, "competition" and the "market" within the context of capitalism are myths. Andrew Kirk comments that while capitalism undoubtedly encourages the freedom of some, this freedom always and inevitably comes at the expense of the freedom of others.³⁴⁴ Real economic freedom is possessed only by those who are part of the small

³⁴¹Jim Wallis, Agenda for Biblical People (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1976), p. 63.

³⁴²Michael Novak, "An Underpraised and Undervalued System," in Moral Issues and Christian Response, ed. Paul Jersild and Dale Johnson (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1982), p. 227.

³⁴³Paul D. Simmons, "Capitalism: A Theological Critique," Review and Expositor, 81 (Spring 1984), 185.

³⁴⁴Andrew Kirk, The Good News of the Kingdom Coming: The Marriage of Evangelism and Social Responsibility (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1983), p. 77. Fred Pearson expresses a similar thought: "We do not have a

elite which controls the processes of production and manipulates the economic behaviour of most other members of society toward the maximization of profit.³⁴⁵ Danny Collum of

Sojourners has perhaps put it most bluntly, insisting that the gross inequalities of wealth and poverty in the U.S. are the natural result of a social, political, and economic system that places the maximization of private profit above all other social goals. The human, social, cultural, and spiritual benefits that would result from a more just distribution of wealth and power will never show up on the all-important quarterly profit and loss statement.³⁴⁶

The covetousness inherent in the modern capitalist system is ultimately a symptom of a largely unconscious but deeply embedded atheism which operates at all levels of society but is especially conspicuous in the area of economics.³⁴⁷ Arthur Baird asserts that the operation of greed within capitalism has resulted in an economic system that is governed by the ideals of

profit over principle, money before the things of the spirit, self over others and God, no fault or responsibility, demanding more than we need or deserve, exaggerated expectations, expediency, opportunism, dishonesty, taking unfair advantage of the weak.³⁴⁸

perfect society in the United States, but we do have 'one best way.' We believe in a system of individual competition which automatically, so we suppose, produces the most satisfaction for all of us. . . . But a win-lose system requires losers" (Fred Pearson, They Dare to Hope: Student Protest and Christian Response [Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1969], pp. 97-98).

³⁴⁵Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 24.

³⁴⁶Danny Collum, "Assault on the Poor: The Reagan Administration's Economic Policies," Sojourners, 10 (July 1981), 16.

³⁴⁷Baird, The Greed Syndrome, p. 11.

³⁴⁸Ibid., p. 197.

Every person has a legitimate right to basic economic and financial security. Capitalism, however, encourages the prioritizing of profit over other, more human, concerns. If profit is to be maximized, anything that adds to the "cost" side of production is looked on as a great handicap. Refusing just wages and decent working conditions for employees, dumping harmful waste into the environment, poor quality workmanship, and unscrupulous business practices all may be justified by the maxim of profit over principle.³⁴⁹

Concentration of wealth. A second dominant aspect of capitalism involves the concentration of wealth in the hands of an elite whose numbers have grown progressively smaller, thus becoming increasingly powerful in American society.³⁵⁰ This is evidenced by the increasingly uneven distribution of product and income in the United States, a situation that has essentially resulted in an "assault on the poor" by a wealthy business elite.³⁵¹

³⁴⁹Simmons, "Capitalism," p. 188.

³⁵⁰Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 25. Jim Wallis echoes this point in his Agenda for Biblical People where he writes of "the growing concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a few persons and institutions. Certain people, classes, and institutions possess an enormous and illegitimate amount of power which is exercised for their own benefit and against social justice and especially against the poor. . . . In the United States, such power is centered in the small number of large corporations which shape the political economy. The decision-making of these large corporations is in the hands of the very few and the very rich (Wallis, Agenda for Biblical People, p. 85). See also Richard K. Taylor, Economics and the Gospel (Philadelphia: United Church, 1973), p. 73.

³⁵¹Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 25. See also Collum, "Assault on the Poor." This article is critical of

Control of the political process. Within the United States, the same "power elite" (to use C. Wright Mills' phrase) which has conspired to control the economy has also successfully conspired to control the American political process and manipulate this process to its own advantage.³⁵² Bill Tabb sees politicians and citizens as essentially helpless in relation to the large American corporations.³⁵³ Money has come to hold such a dominant place in American politics that those without money consider the political process as completely irrelevant to their lives. Michael Walzer describes this sense of induced hopelessness as "a kind of practical knowledge that is learned from experience and [passed] on to [one's] children" and argues that the result of it is "passivity, deference, and resentment."³⁵⁴

It is difficult to speak of "democracy" in such a state. In fact, it has been argued that capitalism is the opposite of democracy since rather than being an economic system owned and run for the people by the people, it is in fact owned and run by a plutocracy, that is, by the rich and super-rich.³⁵⁵ To speak of such things as "democracy,"

the plan of the Reagan administration to cut the federal budget in 1982.

³⁵²Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 27.

³⁵³See Bill Tabb, "The Demise of Our Free Enterprise System: Why Our Economy Has Become Something Far Different from What Adam Smith Propounded," The Other Side, 15 (December 1979), 47-48.

³⁵⁴Michael Walzer, Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality (New York: Basic, 1983), pp. 310-11. See also John Gaventa, Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley (Champaign: University of Illinois, 1982).

³⁵⁵Eugene Toland, Thomas Fenton, and Lawrence McCulloch, "World Justice and Peace: A Radical Analysis

"freedom," "growth," and "opportunity" in the United States is nothing more than rhetoric which reflects a political ideology that has been created and promulgated by the ruling elite.³⁵⁶ As will be seen later in this chapter, this ruling elite also dominates America's cultural institutions.

Dehumanization of the labour force. Even the strongest defenders of capitalism acknowledge the validity of this argument.³⁵⁷ First put forward by Karl Marx, this argument uses insights borrowed from the philosophy of Hegel. Marx argued that capitalism causes worker alienation in a number of ways. First, employees are alienated from that which they produce, becoming dominated and controlled by the things created by the economic system. Second, employees become estranged from the labour process itself. It is not difficult to note how many people hate their jobs yet feel trapped within them. Third, employees under capitalism become alienated from other people, a fact easily attested to by the widespread competitiveness, hostility, and animosity that exist in American society. Finally, employees even become alienated from themselves³⁵⁸-- victims of a system that treats labour as a thing, similar to land and capital, and which separates so-called "human capital" from the personhood of employees.³⁵⁹ Richard

for American Christians," The Other Side, 12 (January-February 1976), 57.

³⁵⁶Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 27.

³⁵⁷See, for example, Ronald Nash, Social Justice and the Christian Church (Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1983), pp. 135-36.

³⁵⁸Ibid.

³⁵⁹Ronald H. Preston, Religion and the Ambiguities of Capitalism: Have Christians Sufficient Understanding of Modern Economic Realities? (London: SCM, 1991), pp. 44-45.

DeGeorge concludes:

There is something wrong with a society that values goods more than people, that dehumanizes people in the labor process, and that fragments human beings into competitors, preventing them from social cooperation and mutual respect.³⁶⁰

These four major aspects of capitalism-- covetousness, the concentration of wealth, control of the political process, and worker alienation--have resulted in ripples which have spread well beyond the very poor. The "power elite" is responsible for treating employees as "one more resource to be cheaply exploited,"³⁶¹ for requiring "near depression-level unemployment,"³⁶² for thrusting largely useless products on consumers,³⁶³ for creating frequent periods of inflation and recession,³⁶⁴ for negligence in

³⁶⁰Richard T. DeGeorge, "Moral Issues in Business," in Ethics, Free Enterprise and Public Policy, ed. Richard T. DeGeorge and Joseph A. Picheler (New York: Oxford University, 1978), p. 12.

³⁶¹John Bookser-Feister, "The Struggle for Work Place Justice," The Other Side, 21 (April-May 1985), 48.

³⁶²Danny Collum, review of The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism, by Michael Novak, Sojourners, 12 (May 1983), 40.

³⁶³John Alexander, Your Money or Your Life: A New Look at Jesus' View of Wealth and Power (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986), p. 103.

³⁶⁴Danny Collum, "Economics: The Way America Does Business," Sojourners, 14 (November 1985), 14. While the critics of American capitalism are often long on generalities and short on specifics, Collum is one who has been penetratingly incisive on specific matters of economic policy (see Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 26 n. 16). In his article, Collum argues that the American economy is becoming increasingly dependent on transnational corporations which are not particularly concerned about the state of the U.S. economy. The American economy has been sustained in the short run through massive military expenditures and consequent reductions in social spending.

modernizing basic industries,³⁶⁵ for developing the "national security state,"³⁶⁶ for squandering nonrenewable natural resources,³⁶⁷ and for the general deterioration that can

The growing federal deficit, however, will be disastrous to this "solution" in the long run. Collum offered a similar critique following the "Black Monday" Wall Street Crash of 1987. He wrote that the long-term downward economic trend of the economy and the Crash were the result of an "international economic order created to benefit multinational corporations and investment institutions, with little consideration for workers at home or abroad" (Danny Collum, "The Crash of '87," Sojourners, 17 (January 1988), 4. See also Collum, "The Big Picture: Where We Are and How We Got Here," in The Rise of Christian Conscience: The Emergence of a Dramatic Renewal Movement in the Church Today (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987), pp. 3-16.

³⁶⁵John Zingaro and Philip Harnden, "Since Steel Went Down," The Other Side, 21 (April-May 1985), 30-36.

³⁶⁶"The Failure of Conventional Wisdom: Economic Realities in the '80's," Sojourners, 10 (January 1981), 13-18. This article consists of excerpts from a "Forum on Economics" held by Sojourners in November 1980. The participants in the forum, Richard Barnet, Larry Rasmussen, Jeremy Rifkin, and Robert Hamlin, argue that the U.S. economy will be unable to continue growing as rapidly as it did between 1950 and 1970. If they are right, this will bring to the forefront issues involving redistribution and military expenditures. These forum participants also asserted that America has shifted from a "social welfare state" to a "national security state"; that is, from an economy emphasizing social harmony to one that has become disastrously competitive (see also Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 26 n. 18).

³⁶⁷Writers such as Wes Michaelson have helped people understand that natural resources are fixed and limited and the use of natural resources by one nation necessarily comes at the expense of other nations: "In a world where resources are finite, the rich nations' monopoly of wealth is the prime . . . cause of the poor's plight" (Wes Michaelson, "Evangelicalism and Radical Discipleship," in Evangelicalism and Anabaptism, ed. C. Norman Kraus

be seen in the entire economic process.³⁶⁸ Danny Collum has predicted that if those who profit from the capitalist system continue to focus away from the expansion of human potential in favour of the maximization of profit, a situation will be created in which only two classes of persons exist in American society:

an increasingly wealthy and isolated managerial and professional elite and an ever-larger class of the permanently left-behind who will either be unemployed or channeled into low-pay and low-dignity "service" jobs.³⁶⁹

Furthermore, the type of capitalist economic growth that Americans have come to view as normal cannot be sustained indefinitely. Tom Sine predicted in 1981 that by the close of the century Western growth and American affluence will have ended, followed by a future of scarcity and limits due to the rapid deterioration of nonrenewable resources.³⁷⁰

Urban Power Structures
Within American
Capitalism

It is important for the activist to have a knowledge of American capitalism as a system in order to understand something of the vastness of the system against which he or she stands. It is not sufficient, however, simply to rely on a critique of American capitalism for an analysis of urban power structures. Unless one plans to develop a new economic system and force the United States to adopt that system, one has no choice but to live and function within America's present economic system. Therefore, this section

[Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1979], p. 77).

³⁶⁸Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 26.

³⁶⁹Collum, "Economics," p. 15.

³⁷⁰Tom Sine, The Mustard Seed Conspiracy (Waco, TX: Word, 1981), pp. 45-46.

will discuss systemic evil within American capitalism, focusing on the economy, corporations, the government, and cultural institutions. Because the structures of capitalism are intertwined and interdependent, some overlap will be involved in discussing the forms evil takes within each of these institutions.

The economy. As has been seen, capitalism is a monolithic system involving much more than the economy. While it is impossible to talk about capitalism without discussing economic issues, the previous section was purposefully general in discussing the economic implications of capitalism within the United States. This section will look more specifically at evil within American economic institutions.

What is the economy? Larry Rasmussen defines the economy this way:

"The economy" is that part of a nation's or region's social system which has to do with the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services. Institutions, resources, processes, labor, regulations, and finance are all involved in this enterprise.³⁷¹

This quotation gives a hint of the vastness of the field with which one must deal. Economics is not only a vast field, however; it is one which has been tremendously influential on the ideologies and world views of men and women across many different cultures and eras. The renowned economist, John Maynard Keynes, wrote:

The ideas of economists and political philosophers both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men who believe themselves to be exempt from any intellectual influences are usually the slave of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority who hear voices in the air are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back. I am sure that the power of vested

³⁷¹Larry L. Rasmussen, Economic Anxiety & Christian Faith (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981), p. 22.

interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas.³⁷²

America's capitalist economy, indeed, has played a great role in perpetuating evil within American society touching on virtually every aspect of our common life. First, capitalism and the ideals of capitalist economics have entrapped generations of Americans in a cycle of poverty from which they are unable to escape. The extent of poverty in the United States continues to be a great embarrassment to this world power. According to the 1990 U.S. census, 33.6 million people (13.5%) live below the poverty level. This was an increase of 2.1 million people (0.7%) from the previous year. If one compares 1990 to previous years, it will be noted that 1990 was the first year since 1983 to show an increase in the percentage of those below the poverty level.³⁷³

Are capitalist economics to blame for poverty? Supporters of the "Orthodox Economic Theory" of poverty argue "no." At the core of this theory is the belief that the abilities of each worker determine his or her income.³⁷⁴ Working on the idealistic assumptions of perfect competition and market equilibrium, this school of economics argues that there is a high correlation between wages and marginal productivity.³⁷⁵ Thus, if people complain that their incomes are too low, it is because they are not working hard enough (their productivity is too low). To increase their incomes, they must work harder,

³⁷²Roy McCloughry, The Eye of the Needle (Leicester, England: Intervarsity, 1990), p. 44.

³⁷³U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, ser. P-60, no. 175, and earlier reports.

³⁷⁴For a more detailed explanation of this theory see D. M. Gordon, Theories of Poverty and Unemployment (Lexington, MA: Lexington, 1972); and H. Lydall, The Structure of Earnings (London: Oxford University, 1968).

³⁷⁵Harrell R. Rodgers, Jr. The Cost of Human Neglect: America's Welfare Failure (Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1982), p. 36.

thereby increasing their productivity. To these economists, it is not the structure of the job market that determines productivity but the abilities of individual workers. This explanation clearly places the blame for poverty squarely on the shoulders of the poor. Some economists have given this theory distinctly racist and sexist tones, suggesting that the distribution of abilities naturally leaves a disproportionate percentage of minorities and women in low-income jobs.³⁷⁶

The "Orthodox Economic Theory" of poverty is flawed in the sense that it attempts to explain a highly complex phenomenon using a single factor. A more adequate explanation requires consideration of a number of factors that work together to cause poverty. In what Harrell Rodgers has termed the "subclass" theory, poverty is explained in terms of five variables.³⁷⁷

The first variable is "elite rule." As used by Rodgers, the concept of elite rule simply argues that a relatively small percentage of the American population actually runs the American political system.³⁷⁸ Most middle- and lower-income citizens play a relatively insignificant role in the political process and do not possess much power to influence public policies. Moreover, those in power usually have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo and thus work against policies that would empower the poor and upset the status quo.

The second variable Rodgers mentions is welfare capitalism. America's economic system has two very important consequences for the poor. First, as has been seen, the philosophy of capitalism advances a number of widely accepted beliefs that put the blame for poverty squarely at the feet of the poor, thus creating a hostile attitude

³⁷⁶Ibid.

³⁷⁷Ibid., pp. 39-46.

³⁷⁸Ibid.

towards the poor. Second, despite beliefs to the contrary, the effect of capitalism has been that, even in relatively prosperous times, the economy provides inadequate opportunities and compensation for millions of American citizens.

Rodgers next discusses two variables together: racism and sexism. America's long history of racism and sexism, down through the present day, are major causes of poverty and its continuation. Throughout American history, women and minorities have been discriminated against in the job market, barred from job-training programs, and excluded from institutions of higher learning.

Finally, Rodgers discusses geographic isolation. Millions of Americans live outside the social and economic mainstream of the nation. They live in segregated areas of cities containing little or no industry or major businesses, thus having little opportunity for employment in their areas.

The systemic oppression of the poor within the American capitalist economy can also be seen when one looks at the "positive" benefits of poverty within a capitalist economy. While it may seem callous to write of such a thing, from the perspective of capitalist economics, there are positive benefits to having poverty in society--"benefits" which further point to the systemic oppression of the poor fostered within capitalism. C. Herbert J. Gans speaks of these benefits.³⁷⁹ In addition to describing numerous social, cultural, and political functions of poverty, he singles out four specifically economic functions of poverty. First, the existence of poverty makes sure that "dirty work" gets done. Every economy has work that is physically dirty or dangerous, temporary, dead-end, underpaid, undignified, and menial. These jobs can be filled by requiring people who have no other choice to do the dirty work and at low wages. In America, poverty

³⁷⁹C. Herbert J. Gans, "The Positive Functions of Poverty," in Poverty and Economic Injustice: A Philosophical Approach, ed. Robert H. Hartman (New York: Paulist, 1984), pp. 188-98.

functions to provide a low-wage labour pool that is willing--or, rather, unable to be unwilling--to perform dirty work at low cost.³⁸⁰ Indeed, many economic activities which involve dirty work depend heavily on the poor: restaurants, hospitals, parts of the garment industry, industrial agriculture, etc. could not continue in their present form without their dependence on the substandard wages they pay to their employees.³⁸¹

Second, the poor "subsidize," directly and indirectly, many activities that benefit the affluent.³⁸² For instance, the poor have long supported both the consumption and investment activities of the private economy by virtue of the low wages they receive. At the same time, the poor also subsidize the governmental economy. Due to the fact that local property and sales taxes and the ungraduated income taxes levied by many states are regressive, the poor pay a higher percentage of their income in taxes than do the rest of the population, thus subsidizing the many state and local governmental programs that serve more affluent taxpayers.³⁸³ In addition, the poor support medical innovations as patients in teaching and research hospitals, and as guinea pigs in medical experiments, subsidizing the more affluent patients who alone can afford these innovations once they are incorporated into medical practice.³⁸⁴

Third, poverty creates jobs for a number of occupations and professions which deal with the poor. Penology, for example, would be minuscule without the poor as would the police, since the poor provide the majority of their "clients."³⁸⁵ Other

³⁸⁰Ibid., p. 189.

³⁸¹Ibid.

³⁸²Ibid.

³⁸³Ibid., p. 190.

³⁸⁴Ibid.

³⁸⁵Ibid.

persons and activities which flourish because of the existence of poverty are the numbers game, the sale of drugs and cheap wine and liquors, pentecostal ministers, faith healers, prostitutes, pawn shops, and the peacetime army, which recruits mainly from among the poor.³⁸⁶

Fourth, the poor buy goods which others do not want such as day-old bread, fruits and vegetables which would otherwise have to be thrown out, second-hand clothes, and deteriorating automobiles and buildings, thus prolonging their economic usefulness.³⁸⁷ The poor also provide incomes for doctors, lawyers, teachers, and others who are either too old, poorly trained, or incompetent to attract more affluent clients.³⁸⁸

Poverty is a serious and pervasive problem in the United States. It is not, however, the only form of systemic evil created by capitalist economics. The unemployed are victims of the same system that oppresses the poor generally. Many economists, noting a positive relationship between an individual's employment status and economic status, argue that the United States cannot have both price stability and full employment at the same time-- the pursuit of one necessarily means the abandonment, or at least neglect, of the other. Furthermore, because the potential destruction of currency and market function that might accompany really serious inflation is widely feared, price stability is viewed as being a foremost policy goal. As a consequence, some unemployment is tolerated as part of the cost of maintaining existing price levels.³⁸⁹

Wealthy employers oppose programs to reduce unemployment because they

³⁸⁶Gans, "Positive Functions," p. 190.

³⁸⁷Ibid.

³⁸⁸Ibid.

³⁸⁹Bradley R. Schiller, The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination, 4th rev. ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984), p. 58.

do not want to pay the taxes needed to support job programs. They also oppose such programs because unemployment and the fear of it among the marginally employed help keep wages down and workers docile. It is also worth noting that wealthy people are much more likely than the poor to say that unemployment and poverty stem from a lack of effort on the part of the individual rather than from social injustice and other circumstances beyond the individual's control. This application of the ideology of individualism is another form of socialization which enables the wealthy to be charitable to the poor if they so choose, while ignoring the economic and political foundations of poverty. Charity, including government doles, blunts political protests and social unrest that might upset the status quo.³⁹⁰

Economic considerations play a major role in other forms of systemic evil which will be looked at later in this chapter. The treatment of women and the elderly within the American economy could also be discussed. However, the areas that have been discussed here, as well as the ones which will be looked at, provide a clear indication of how the American capitalist economy contributes to the oppression of Americans in virtually every facet of life.

Corporations. Although huge corporations are a relatively recent arrival on the economic scene in the United States, they have rapidly come to dominate it.³⁹¹ Legally, a corporation is a fictitious person. Unless dissolved, it is immortal. It can enter into contracts, incur debt, and even claim most of the rights accorded to the individual in

³⁹⁰James William Coleman and Donald R. Cressey, Social Problems, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), p. 183.

³⁹¹Ibid., p. 36.

society.³⁹² Unlike businesses owned by individuals or partners, corporations are owned by their stockholders. Large corporations usually have thousands of owners, although some are controlled by a few major stockholders. Because it would be impossible to run a corporation if all stockholders were involved in decision-making, stockholders elect a board of directors to set general policies and oversee the running of the corporation. Executives and managers who are full-time employees of the corporation make the day-to-day decisions and carry on the work of the corporation. Many of these executives have worked their way up the "corporate ladder" from the lower rungs of management.³⁹³

How powerful are corporations? If all the world's largest enterprises, including governments, were listed in order of the amount of assets they control, half would be corporations.³⁹⁴ The largest corporations in the United States have assets in the billions of dollars. According to 1992 figures, General Electric controls 193 billion dollars in assets, General Motors has assets worth 191 billion dollars, the Ford Motor Company has amassed 181 billion dollars in assets, IBM controls 87 billion dollars in assets, and Exxon is worth 85 billion dollars.³⁹⁵ In fact, according to 1986 figures, the top one hundred industrial corporations in the United States control over 61 percent of the nation's industrial assets with a net worth of 2,022 billion dollars (that's over 2 trillion dollars)!³⁹⁶

³⁹²Walter L. Owensby, Economics for Prophets: A Primer on Concepts, Realities, and Values in Our Economic System (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), p. 59.

³⁹³Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 36.

³⁹⁴Ibid.

³⁹⁵"The 1993 Directory of U.S. Corporations," Fortune (New York: n.p., 1993), p. 8.

³⁹⁶Dye, Who's Running America?, pp. 17-19.

With this great wealth has come even greater power. While antitrust laws prohibit these huge corporations from monopolizing an entire industry, many corporations have gotten around these laws by expanding into related fields, buying out suppliers and distributors. Others have become conglomerates, owning businesses in many areas of production and distribution.³⁹⁷

Another indicator of the amount of power possessed by these corporate giants is their market control. The markets for many important products, ranging from automobiles and gasoline to aspirin and broadcasting, are dominated by just three or four huge corporations. In fact, about 60 percent of all the goods and services produced in the United States (excluding those produced by the government) are made in industries dominated by these oligopolies. And even these oligopolies are usually dominated by one monster corporation that is larger and stronger than any other.³⁹⁸

According to Coleman and Cressey, the growth and power of these corporate oligopolies have effectively shattered the American concept of competition in a free market. Because many important markets are home to so few major corporations, it is relatively easy for them to restrict competition. The largest corporation in an industry often determines the price of merchandise, whose lead is then followed by other corporations, ignoring the principles of competition.³⁹⁹

Corporate giants also increase the range of their influence through what are known as "interlocking directorates." While it is illegal for a member of the board of directors of one large firm to sit on the board of a competing firm, it is not illegal, but

³⁹⁷Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, pp. 36-37.

³⁹⁸Ibid., p. 37. See also Paul Steidlmeier, People and Profits: The Ethics of Capitalism (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992), p. 6.

³⁹⁹Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 37.

customary, for a particular board member to sit on several boards in different industries concurrently.⁴⁰⁰

Who controls these corporations? This is a very difficult question to answer. A given corporation is in relationship with and is influenced by its competitors, banks, subcontractors, suppliers, stockholders, directors and managers, workers, unions, as well as various local and national governments. These relationships are very complex and often change without warning. For obvious reasons, researchers who try to determine who or what controls this network rarely have the cooperation of the corporations themselves. They, therefore, must rely on secondhand data and, as a result, sometimes come to contradictory conclusions.⁴⁰¹

Supporters of the corporate system often claim that corporations are democratic institutions owned by many different people. As evidence they point to the fact that over thirty million people own stock in American corporations.⁴⁰² However, as Thomas Sye points out, the millions of Americans who own corporate stock have virtually no influence over corporate decision-making. Indeed, most stockholders sign over proxies to top management so that the top management can cast proxy votes at the annual meetings of stockholders. Management, itself, usually selects its own nominations for the board of directors and elects them with the help of the proxies.⁴⁰³ In addition, although millions of people own some stock, most stock is owned by a small group of wealthy individuals.⁴⁰⁴ In fact, a study undertaken by the U.S. Federal Reserve

⁴⁰⁰Ibid., p. 38.

⁴⁰¹Ibid.

⁴⁰²Ibid.

⁴⁰³Dye, Who's Running America?, p. 27.

⁴⁰⁴Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 39.

system found that the wealthiest 1 percent of American families own an incredible 61 percent of all corporate stock!⁴⁰⁵

Institutional stockholders such as banks, insurance companies, and investment companies hold major blocks of stock as well.⁴⁰⁶ More than half of all public trading on the New York Stock Exchange is by institutional stockholders.⁴⁰⁷ Coleman and Cressey write that considering

the huge size of the modern corporation and the interlocking of corporate directorships, the top business leaders in the United States are a relatively small group--perhaps 5,000 to 10,000 people.⁴⁰⁸

As will be seen in chapter 4, C. Wright Mills argued that these business leaders, along with other wealthy individuals, make up a "power elite," which pursues its own agenda and interests at the expense of society at large.⁴⁰⁹

In recent years, large corporations have expanded across national boundaries, exerting a tremendous influence over the economies of other nations. These multinationals, as they have come to be called, have generated tremendous controversy. Sixty-two of the top one hundred American firms have production facilities in six or more nations and about 60 percent of the world's largest corporations are American.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁵Frank Ackerman et al., "The Extent of Income Inequality in the United States," in The Capitalist System, ed. Richard C. Edwards et al. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972), p. 211.

⁴⁰⁶Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 38.

⁴⁰⁷Morton Mintz and Jerry S. Cohen, America, Inc.: Who Owns and Operates the United States? (New York: Dial, 1971), p. 61.

⁴⁰⁸Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 39.

⁴⁰⁹Mills, The Power Elite.

⁴¹⁰Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 39.

It is little wonder that along with the wealth and power of these huge American corporations have come ample opportunities and temptations for injustice. Innumerable forms of injustice have been perpetrated by corporations in the United States. It is against the law, for example, to sell an inferior product while making false claims for it, yet there are countless examples of such fraud in diverse industries from cosmetics to automobiles. Such illegal deception was uncovered in the meatpacking industry where several companies were found to be selling cheap cuts of meat to the U.S. Army, while representing them as high grades of beef. To make matters worse, meat inspectors were offered special favours to look the other way.⁴¹¹ Some fraudulent claims about products can endanger the health or even the life of a customer. John Fuller describes the case of a pharmaceutical company which marketed a drug found to lower cholesterol levels in the blood. The Food and Drug Administration approved the drug before allowing it to be marketed, but it was subsequently found to cause severe side effects including inflammation of the skin, hair loss, and loss of sex drive. The fraud in this case was the silence of the corporation. In its own early tests, the company had discovered these side effects but had suppressed the findings.⁴¹²

Price fixing (collusion by several companies to cut free-market competition by setting uniformly high prices) takes many forms. Though illegal, price fixing is prevalent in the United States.⁴¹³ A group headed by Ralph Nader surveyed the heads of the 1,000 largest manufacturing corporations asking whether they thought "many" corporations engaged in price fixing. Among the heads of the 500 largest corporations,

⁴¹¹Ibid., p. 41.

⁴¹²John G. Fuller, 200,000,000 Guinea Pigs: New Dangers in Everyday Foods, Drugs, and Cosmetics (New York: Putnam, 1972), pp. 82-91.

⁴¹³Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 41.

47 percent agreed that price fixing is a common practice. Of the remaining 500 corporations, 70 percent of the heads agreed.⁴¹⁴ Coleman and Cressey suggest that violations of the law against price fixing may cost consumers more than any other single crime.⁴¹⁵

Industrial espionage is another common form of corporate crime. The offices and telephones of competing companies are "bugged," computer data is stolen, employees of competing companies are bribed to cheat their own companies or governments by paying exorbitant amounts for products.⁴¹⁶ A few years ago, after Lockheed Aircraft Corporation was discovered to be bribing foreign officials, a government amnesty program resulted in ninety-five major corporations admitting their involvement in commercial bribery.⁴¹⁷

Many companies have resorted to illegal practices in order to drive their competitors out of business. One technique involves a large company selling certain products at a loss in order to force a smaller competitor into bankruptcy. The loss is recovered and long-term gains made by selling products at much higher prices after the competition has been eliminated. A similar technique involves selling at a low price to an affiliated company and at a higher price to independent companies, eventually forcing the latter out of business. A more blatant variation of this technique is for a giant corporation simply to refuse to sell raw materials to its smaller competitors.⁴¹⁸

⁴¹⁴Mark J. Green, The Closed Enterprise System: Ralph Nader's Study-Group Report on Anti-Trust Enforcement (New York: Grossman, 1972), pp. 147-50.

⁴¹⁵Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 42.

⁴¹⁶Ibid.

⁴¹⁷Lester A. Sobel, Corruption in Business (New York: Facts on File, 1977), p. 151.

⁴¹⁸Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 42. See

Corporations also contribute to systemic evil through abuse of the environment and natural resources. Corporate proponents of free-enterprise capitalism, ideologically justifying their actions through concepts such as "deregulation," "corporate competitiveness," "cost-effectiveness," and "personal freedom," have shown themselves thoroughly unable to grasp, let alone solve, the disastrous and often irreversible effects of their production policies.⁴¹⁹ This should not be surprising. As has been seen, self-interest and profit serve as key motivating forces under capitalism. Such a narrow focus cannot but produce manufacturers with little concern for America's heritage of lakes, rivers, seas, air, and sky. While it is true that the market system has provided us with great material abundance, it has failed in encouraging a responsible use of the environment. Many businesses give little attention to environmental responsibilities whenever these conflict with the profit line, while socially responsible firms, which willingly bear abatement costs, lose out in the competition.⁴²⁰ A few years ago, the L.A. Weekly published a list of Los Angeles County's largest toxic polluters. The list included oil companies such as Mobil, Chevron, Texaco, Shell, and Arco; military producers such as Northrop, Douglas Aircraft, and Lockheed; and industrial manufacturers such as General Motors, Reynolds Metals, Miller Brewing Company, and the Niklor Chemical Company.⁴²¹ Further, an In These Times article reported that some large corporations in the United States pay middlemen to accept their toxic waste. These intermediaries in turn

also Edwin H. Sutherland, White-Collar Crime (New York: Dryden, 1949), pp. 56-88.

⁴¹⁹Eric Mann, "Environmentalism in the Corporate Climate," Tikkun, 5, no. 2 (March-April 1990), 60.

⁴²⁰Robert Kendrick Klay, Counting the Cost: The Economics of Christian Stewardship (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), p. 75.

⁴²¹Mann, "Environmentalism," p. 62.

pay Third World governments, desperate for American currency, to accept the toxins. This article likened the chemical despoliation of the West Coast of Africa to the slave trade that ravaged the social structures of the same peoples only a few centuries ago.⁴²²

Eric Mann puts it bluntly:

Fundamentally, the environmental crisis is a crisis of institutional and corporate production. Acid rain, global warming, pollutants in the air, pesticides, internal combustion engines are products of the chemical, atomic, automobile, electrical, and petroleum industries.⁴²³

Corporations can contribute to systemic evil through legal means as well. One of the worst examples of this occurred in 1978 when the business lobby was instrumental in defeating a bill creating a consumer protection agency. The legislation had already passed the House or Senate on five separate occasions, had the support of President Jimmy Carter, the speaker of the House, 150 consumer, labour, and other groups, and had the support of the general public by a two-to-one margin. However, through widespread distribution of prepared editorials and cartoons to some 4,000 newspapers across the country (approximately 2,000 of which never, incidentally, acknowledged their source), sizable contributions to undecided congressmen, and political pressure applied to congressmen, the bill failed in the House 227 to 189.⁴²⁴

Government: Every society develops some kind of political system through which social control is exercised over its members. Emile Durkheim saw political

⁴²²Ibid., p. 63.

⁴²³Ibid., p. 64.

⁴²⁴Dennis Gilbert and Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure: A New Synthesis, 3rd rev. ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1987), p. 233.

institutions, like all social facts, emerging sui generis from the meaningful interactions of members of society. Through a political system, order is maintained, deviants are prevented from disrupting the life of society, and those decisions are made which determine the destiny of society. The political structures which serve these functions may be as simple as a kinship system ruled by the elders of the tribe or they may be as complex as the bureaucratic monstrosities which have come to characterize such highly industrialized societies as are found in the United States and Canada.⁴²⁵

Regardless of their nature or degree of complexity, these political systems exercise power over the members of society. In fact, it could be argued that power is the overriding characteristic of political institutions. This is certainly true in the United States. The American government has the power to determine what is a criminal act and what is not, the power to start or avoid wars, the power to collect enormous sums of money and spend it on everything from paper clips to nuclear bombs. Those who possess political power regulate thousands of aspects of the daily lives of Americans, everything from issuing birth certificates to requiring burial licenses.⁴²⁶

The American government, too, is pervasive. Peter Drucker points out that

the most despotic government of 1900 would not have dared probe into the private affairs of its citizens as income-collectors now do routinely in the freest society.⁴²⁷

Much of this change has taken place in response to changes in society and other social institutions. Previous to 1900, the federal government was relatively distant and

⁴²⁵Anthony Campolo, "Politics and Principalities and Powers," in A Reader in Sociology: Christian Perspectives (Scottsdale, PA: Herald, 1980), p. 491.

⁴²⁶Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 66.

⁴²⁷Peter F. Drucker, The Age of Discontinuity (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 212.

uninvolved in people's lives. Important decisions were made locally and were based on custom and tradition. As these smaller and local institutions grew less effective and lost much of their influence, the federal government grew compensatorially. For example, as the American family has become smaller and less stable, the government has had to assume some of the functions that the family once performed, such as educating children and caring for the elderly. The emerging industrial economy has also shown considerable instability and the conditions existing during the Great Depression practically forced the government to get more involved in the economy.⁴²⁸

Drucker also emphasizes the sheer immensity of government today compared with a few generations back:

There is no country in the world today where the entire government establishment of 1910 could not comfortably be housed in the smallest of the new government buildings now going up, with room to spare for a grand-opera house and a skating rink.⁴²⁹

In 1940, government spending equalled about 10 percent of the gross income of the United States; by 1980 it equaled 22.6 percent.⁴³⁰ By 1984, the economy was about twenty times larger than it was in 1900, but government expenditures were sixty-five times larger. In the same period, civilian employment in federal, state, and local government increased from one million to over twelve million.⁴³¹

⁴²⁸Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 67.

⁴²⁹Drucker, The Age of Discontinuity, p. 172.

⁴³⁰Daniel R. Fusfeld, Economics, 2nd rev. ed. (Lexington, MA: Heath, 1976), pp. 686-87; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1981 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981), p. 245.

⁴³¹Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 66.

Given the massiveness, pervasiveness, and power of government, the political institutions in which it abides are obviously of crucial importance. Problems that are found in government will quickly spread to other social institutions. Thus, when the government fails to function properly, it is the whole society's problem.⁴³²

However one views the government, it is clear that the government is a source of tremendous political power which it uses to advance the interests of those who control it. How groups maintain control will be discussed in chapter 4 when power is looked at from a conflict perspective. Right now, the government will be looked at as a perpetrator of systemic evil.

Inordinate military spending is one aspect of systemic evil perpetrated by the American government. This evil is intricately tied up with what has become known as the military-industrial complex. One of the most unexpected yet incisive warnings on the nature and power of this complex came from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a career army officer. In his farewell address to the nation on February 6, 1961, President Eisenhower warned of the growing influence of the military establishment in conjunction with a growing arms industry, which he called "the military-industrial complex." In his speech, Eisenhower issued a somber warning to Americans:

... We must guard against the acquisitions of unwarranted influence whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.⁴³³

Eisenhower feared that the growing interdependence between the military

⁴³²Ibid.

⁴³³Dwight D. Eisenhower, "President Eisenhower's Farewell to the Nation," in Making War/Making Peace: The Social Foundations of Violent Conflict, ed. Francesca M. Cancian and James William Gibson (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1990), p. 171.

and giant corporations would lead to the domination of the United States by these forces. Such corporations as General Dynamics, Lockheed, and Rockwell International earn their profits primarily from military contracts. Hundreds of other companies also sell a substantial percentage of their products to the military. In addition, this "complex" has many friends in Washington among senators and representatives of states with high concentrations of military bases or defense industries. While all this does not add up to military control of the American government, the American military, corporations, and the government all have many common interests and together wield a tremendous amount of influence and power.⁴³⁴

The result has been disastrous. For most of the past thirty years, total real expenditure on defense (that is, expenditures with purely inflationary increases removed) have remained relatively constant except for dramatic increases during the Korean and Vietnam wars. However, throughout the Reagan and Bush presidencies, military expenditures rose sharply. During the first three years of President Reagan's initial term of office (1981-84), the defense budget grew from 150 billion to 300 billion dollars, or 31 percent after adjusting for inflation.⁴³⁵ In fact, the 245 billion dollars spent by the Reagan administration each year was five times the domestic poverty gap (the amount by which the combined incomes of all poor American households fall below the official poverty line).⁴³⁶ These huge numbers may not mean much to the average American. However, the cost of a single one of these modern fighters would have inoculated three million children against serious childhood diseases, and the cost to produce one submarine armed with missiles could have provided one hundred thousand working years of nursing

⁴³⁴Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 85.

⁴³⁵Klay, Counting the Cost, pp. 168-69.

⁴³⁶Ibid., p. 166.

care.⁴³⁷ Military spending creates only half as many jobs as does money spent on school teachers, road and bridge repair, job training, and other public needs. As a result, cutting spending for public need and transferring it to the military buildup has caused joblessness overall, especially among the unskilled. This condition is accentuated by the fact that jobs created through military production are largely among those groups where shortages already exist, such as skilled machinists, engineers, and scientists. And the trend is for military production to become progressively more capital-intensive (i.e., a high ratio of capital investment compared to jobs created). These conditions leave behind precisely those ranks of working people who are most in need of work: the yet-to-be-employed (largely minorities) and laid-off blue-collar workers who need retraining. The consequence of all this has been a shrinkage of the number of middle-class workers and a migration of the American work force toward the twin poles of low-skill, low-pay and high-skill, high-pay jobs.⁴³⁸ In addition, investing in bombs and missiles doesn't produce anything useful for the economy. Countries that have invested heavily in military buildup have found that their economies have grown much less than countries like Japan or Germany which have invested in useful manufacturing and in improving energy efficiency.⁴³⁹ Dwight D. Eisenhower was right when he said:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the

⁴³⁷See Olof Palme et al., "Military Spending: The Economic and Social Consequences," Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs, 24 (September-October 1982), 5.

⁴³⁸Richard W. Gillett, The Human Enterprise: A Christian Perspective on Work (Kansas City: Leaven, 1985), p. 62.

⁴³⁹See Richard D. Bartel, ed., The Challenge of Economics: Readings from Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs (New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1984), pp. 297-323.

final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed; those who are cold, and are not clothed.⁴⁴⁰

Klay quotes an anonymous source as saying that it will "be a great day when our schools get all the money they need and the air force has to hold a bake sale to buy a bomber."⁴⁴¹

Further, once a company gets hooked on military-related production, addictive processes begin to set in. Military products don't have to compete in price since there is only one buyer; thus, there are fewer incentives for a company to remain efficient. It loses its habits of cost-competitiveness and, in order to survive, must continue to win military contracts at the cost of a progressive dulling of the competitive edge.⁴⁴²

The educational system of the United States is another area of systemic oppression with which the American government has failed to deal. It is difficult to argue with the fact that, in the United States, the children of middle- and upper-class parents do better and go farther in school than do the children of the poor. The Coleman Report as well as numerous other studies have found social class to be the single most effective predictor of a student's achievement in school.⁴⁴³ Students from the middle and upper classes tend to get higher scores on standardized achievement tests, do better in school, and stay in school longer than do other students.⁴⁴⁴

While there are undoubtedly multiple reasons for this, one of the primary

⁴⁴⁰Klay, Counting the Cost, p. 164.

⁴⁴¹Ibid.

⁴⁴²Gillett, The Human Enterprise, p. 60.

⁴⁴³See Harvey A. Averch et al., How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Synthesis and Review of Research Findings (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology, 1974).

⁴⁴⁴Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 104.

reasons centers around the fact that expensive private schools still provide a superior education for children from the upper classes, while public schools which serve the poor are underfunded, understaffed, and growing worse. As might be expected, the wealthy will invest money in schools for their own children much more readily than in schools for other children. In addition, free public education for all children is a relatively new idea, and many poor children must still drop out of school to help support their families.⁴⁴⁵

Further, the old system of officially segregated education and the current system of de facto segregation are specifically intended to enable the children of those at the top of the ladder to occupy their parents' position at the top. This fact is well supported in the way schools are financed. Glaring inequalities both in how taxes are levied and in how they are spent are evident with even the most cursory glance at the American system of school finance. Students who live in wealthy tax districts have much more money spent on their education than do students from poorer districts.

Approximately 55 percent of the funds for American public schools come from local school districts, 39 percent from state taxes, and 7 percent from federal taxes.⁴⁴⁶

Even more unjust is the way school taxes are assessed. Those who live in wealthy school districts often pay a lower percentage of the assessed value of their property in taxes than do people who live in poor districts. In addition, because families in poor districts tend to have more children, while the property in rich districts has a higher total value, less money is usually spent on the education of children in the poor districts.⁴⁴⁷ A study of the educational system in New York, for example, concluded that

it is unconscionable that a poor man in a poor district must often pay local taxes at

⁴⁴⁵See *Ibid.*, pp. 104-09.

⁴⁴⁶*Ibid.*, p. 106.

⁴⁴⁷Coleman and Cressey, *Social Problems*, p. 106.

higher rates for the inferior education of his child than the man of means in a rich district pays for the superior education of his child. Yet, incredibly, that is the situation today in most of the 50 states.⁴⁴⁸

More subtle, yet arguably more devastating to minorities, has been the use of schools as powerful agents of socialization, that is, as a tool for the ruling class to exercise its cultural dominance over minorities. Until quite recently, young American Indians were likely to be taught that their ancestors were bloodthirsty savages, and African-Americans often read in history textbooks that their forebears were happy-go-lucky "darkies" who lived full and satisfying lives as slaves.⁴⁴⁹ My wife, a Mexican-American, was brought up in the Texas school system in the '70's and early '80's. At that time, she recalls, Mexican-American students were all placed in remedial classes because they were considered "incapable of learning." Guidance counselors and teachers encouraged them to go on to technical school rather than college since "Mexican-Americans are good with their hands" (i.e., not intelligent). They were forbidden to speak their native language and faced suspension or expulsion if they persisted in doing so. This is the reason many second-generation Mexican-Americans, today, are not fluent in their native tongue. Furthermore, textbooks of the era glorified the most inhumane elements of Texas history, including the slaughter of thousands of Mexicans by the Texas Rangers and the theft of Mexican land by the United States government.⁴⁵⁰

Urban power structures can be as oppressive in what they do not do as in what they do. The American government is an excellent example of an institution that

⁴⁴⁸Manley Fleischmann et al., The Fleischmann Report on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in New York State, vol. 1 (New York: Viking, 1973), p. 57.

⁴⁴⁹Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 121.

⁴⁵⁰Interview with Yvette V. Jackson, July 22, 1994.

practices this type of injustice, as can be seen in the area of health care. Until recently, those who could not afford health care simply did without. As late as 1967, the president of the American Medical Association viewed health care as a privilege not a right.⁴⁵¹ Things have changed, however, and most Americans now believe that all people have a right to health care even if they cannot afford it, and that it is the government's responsibility to see that they have access to it.⁴⁵²

In the United States, health care is provided largely on a fee-for-service basis similar to other goods and services. The obvious result of this is that the wealthy receive excellent care while the poor receive markedly inferior care. Until recently, poor people in the United States saw physicians much less often than did the wealthy. With the government's adoption of Medicare for the aged and Medicaid for the poor, the poor have begun to seek medical attention more often. There is still a long way to go, though, before equality will be reached. There is a disproportionately large number of elderly people among the poor, and they naturally require more medical attention than does the general population. Also, the elderly tend to have much more serious illnesses than do other people. As a result, a poor person is still less likely to see a physician than a wealthy person with a similar problem is. Furthermore, recent eligibility changes in the Medicare and Medicaid programs have excluded a growing number of people from government-supported health care systems.⁴⁵³

Regardless of how often poor people visit doctors, the quality of care they receive is decidedly lower than that received by wealthier patients. For one thing, they are less likely to be cared for by specialists.⁴⁵⁴ For another, many of the top physicians

⁴⁵¹Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 226.

⁴⁵²*Ibid.*, p. 228.

⁴⁵³*Ibid.*

⁴⁵⁴See Nathan Glazer, "Paradoxes of Health Care," The

refuse to accept Medicare and Medicaid patients because of the paperwork involved and because the government will not pay the high fees these physicians normally charge.⁴⁵⁵ Geographic distribution is another factor--the best specialists practice in wealthy residential areas.⁴⁵⁶ Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the entire American health care system is the widespread fraud and corruption in government-sponsored medical programs. Some inner-city clinics, known as "Medicaid mills," process enormous numbers of patients in a superficial manner and charge for unnecessary medical tests, thus cheating the government and ultimately taxpayers who finance Medicaid. The low-quality service offered by these "mills" also cheats their patients, sometimes even endangering their lives.⁴⁵⁷

Widespread disorganization is another serious problem facing the American health care system. Independent physicians, small medical groups, and the largest of the hospitals all compete for the same wealthy patients. Further, despite a great shortage of general practitioners, young doctors flock to the over-crowded specialties, such as surgery, because this is where the big money is. Waste and inefficiency on a grand scale is the inevitable consequence of this disorganization.⁴⁵⁸

In the final analysis, the problems and deficiencies of the American health care system stem from the fact that it is designed to serve the needs of the rich and powerful, including doctors themselves. Health care in the United States is a business dominated by business people with medical degrees who sell their services to the highest

Public Interest, 22 (1971), 62-77.

⁴⁵⁵Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 228.

⁴⁵⁶Ibid.

⁴⁵⁷Ibid.

⁴⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 228-29.

price, thus neglecting the needs of low-income groups. Further, because physicians have a legally-enforced monopoly on medical services, they are in a perfect position to rig prices. Only the rich and well insured are in a position to pay the inflated bills charged by physicians, and programs that would reduce profits or require physicians to provide cheap health care for the poor are opposed.⁴⁵⁹ It is true that the Federal Government is not solely responsible for the state of the American health care system; the medical establishment, itself, the Church, and the American people, must assume their share of responsibility for the inequities of the system and the lack of any united voice demanding change. The Federal Government, however, has done little to address the growing injustices of a system that provides top-quality care only for the rich and the well insured.⁴⁶⁰

Cultural institutions. A power elite not only dominates the economic and political systems of the United States but also the contemporary culture. Danny Collum writes that the media, schools and universities, the arts, and conservative churches are all held "under the sway of corporate power."⁴⁶¹ This domination of the cultural life of the United States by American big business has resulted in a cultural decadence that manifests itself in excessive consumerism resulting from the artificial stimulation, by means of manipulative advertising, of ever-increasing "needs" for useless and sometimes

⁴⁵⁹Ibid., p. 244.

⁴⁶⁰The Clinton health care plan of 1994 offered hope that at least some of the inequities of the present system would be alleviated. However, it was ultimately defeated and with the new Republican Congress, it is doubtful that any wholesale changes in the system will be considered.

⁴⁶¹Collum, "Assumptions from on High," p. 41.

even harmful products.⁴⁶² This manipulation appeals to base human drives such as greed, envy, and fear and fosters a selfish individualism at the expense of any kind of social or communal spirit.⁴⁶³

The Church, too, has been victimized by this enculturation into the values of the American Dream. And despite the witness of such modern day prophets as Tony Campolo, Ron Sider, and Tom Sine, it is unlikely that the Church in America will escape from what Sine calls "the captivity of the Christian Mind."⁴⁶⁴ The prime seducers of the Christian young today are not the New Age Movement, Communism, radical feminists or homosexuals but "the sirens of the Great Consumer Society."⁴⁶⁵ As Walter Brueggemann has said:

The contemporary American Church is so largely enculturated to the American ethos of consumerism that it has little power to believe or to act. This enculturation is in some way true across the spectrum of church life, both liberal and conservative.⁴⁶⁶

⁴⁶²Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 28. The capitalist system victimizes consumers by promoting the artificial and continuous creation of new needs and by making its fundamental priority continuous economic growth rather than individual happiness (Enrique M. Ureña, Capitalism or Socialism? An Economic Critique for Christians [Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1988], p. 162). See also Kirk, The Good News of the Kingdom Coming: The Marriage of Evangelism and Social Responsibility (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1983), p. 63; and Ronald J. Sider, Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1977), pp. 46-49.

⁴⁶³Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 28.

⁴⁶⁴See chap. 8 of Tom Sine, Wild Hope (Dallas: Word, 1991).

⁴⁶⁵Ibid., p. 207.

⁴⁶⁶Walter Brueggemann, The Prophetic Imagination

Tom Sine traces the development of the American Dream to the desire to understand and master the natural world more fully. Describing it as a "mechanistic model,"⁴⁶⁷ Sine defines the American Dream paradigm as a by-product of the Enlightenment and a strategy for subduing the natural world and bringing it under human control. Gibson Winter agrees with Sine:

From its inception, this [model] has been marked by a search for power over its world. . . . The passion for mastery led to advances in science, exploration of distant lands, the conquest and enslavement of peoples throughout the globe, and the development of techniques for mass production and distribution of goods.⁴⁶⁸

The mechanistic model is premised on a linear view of time. Growing out of the Judeo-Christian tradition, time was viewed as beginning in creation and ending in consummation. In the Middle ages, this linear view of time had a vertical dimension with believers waiting for the consummation of history and the establishment of God's Kingdom on earth. Sine argues that during the Enlightenment a horizontal dimension replaced the vertical and in the process became much more secular, focusing on a desire to build a terrestrial paradise. Leaders of the Enlightenment assured all who would listen that if they cooperated with natural law, their entire society would progress economically and technologically.⁴⁶⁹

In the American version of this dream, the better future has come to be seen as ever-increasing levels of economic growth, technological progress, and personal

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), p. 11.

⁴⁶⁷Sine, Wild Hope, p. 209.

⁴⁶⁸Gibson Winter, Liberating Creation: Foundations of Religious Social Ethics (New York: Crossroad, 1981), p. x.

⁴⁶⁹Sine, Wild Hope, p. 210.

consumer consumption. Sine quotes an anonymous author who has written:

Marxism says all there is is matter. Capitalism says all that matters is matter. But they are both inherently materialistic world views, lacking any sense of transcendence.⁴⁷⁰

The key to understanding the American Dream and the accompanying captivity of the Christian mind can be seen in the driving force behind them: the artificial creation of "need" for ever-increasing levels of stimulation.⁴⁷¹ John Rader Platt, a professor of physics at the University of Chicago, asserts that humanity in the modern era has created a fifth need to accompany the basic survival needs of air, water, food, and shelter:

[T]he fifth need is for novelty--the need throughout our waking life for continuous variety in the external stimulation of our ears, eyes, sense organs and all our nervous network.⁴⁷²

This indoctrination into the need for novelty, begun early in this century, is now proceeding at an alarming pace. A constant onslaught of advertising has conditioned Americans to chase after products they had never even considered before they saw them advertised. The result has been the creation of a society the economic health of which depends on constantly increasing consumer appetites, not only in the United States but in the rest of the world as well. And it is precisely these expanding appetites which are creating the garbage which threatens the air, water, and land, and, even more devastating, undermines people's spirituality. Sine puts it bluntly: "The powers have persuaded us as

⁴⁷⁰Ibid., p. 211.

⁴⁷¹Ibid.

⁴⁷²Stuart Ewen, "Waste a Lot, Want a Lot: Our All-Consuming Quest for Style," UTNE Reader, September/October 1989, 81.

a culture that our ultimate human purpose is to become successful consumers."⁴⁷³

As mentioned earlier, both mainline and evangelical Christians have bought into the American Dream. Evangelical Christians, for the most part, have not only made the American Dream their own, they often look on their material success as evidence of God's blessing on their lives. Consequently, evangelicals tend to confuse the progress of the American Dream with the advancement of God's Kingdom. Too many evangelicals fail to realize that God has put them here not to preserve and advance the present order but to cooperate with God in the inbreaking of a radically new and different one. It is no exaggeration to say that most evangelical leaders in both their pronouncements and their affluent lifestyle seem to sanction the American Dream and all that goes along with it. With all the talk about the Lordship of Christ in evangelical churches, for example, the message the young people seem to be hearing is one of getting their career under way, getting their houses in the suburbs, and getting their affluent lifestyles started. Then, with the time and resources they have left, they can serve Christ.⁴⁷⁴ The end-product of this attitude is "one-dimensional" people who are so oriented toward personal consumption that they have no sense of communal or social responsibility.⁴⁷⁵ As Collum puts it:

It's hard to expect people to give of their own resources to meet the needs of poor people when the schools, the work process, and the relentless cry of advertising are encouraging them every day of their lives to be greedy, competitive, and conspicuously consumptive.⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷³Sine, Wild Hope, p. 212.

⁴⁷⁴Ibid., p. 213.

⁴⁷⁵Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 28. See also Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society (Boston: Beacon, 1962).

⁴⁷⁶Collum, "Assault on the Poor," p. 16.

Mainliners have different concerns from evangelicals, generally wanting to see the system operate more justly and with greater economic opportunities for all regardless of race, sex, or age. They are, as Sine writes, "intent on trying to build an escalator into the [American] Dream, even changing some of the structures of society so the poor get a taste of the 'good life,' too."⁴⁷⁷ In the process, mainliners may sometimes criticize capitalism but rarely do they criticize the American Dream or the values on which it rests.⁴⁷⁸

Both evangelical and mainline Christians seem unconcerned with the fact that they are losing their young people to secularism, perhaps because it is often a secularism they share.⁴⁷⁹ Further, as a result of this idolatrous elevation of the American Dream, American Christians have sabotaged their ability to address the challenges of a society standing on the verge of a new millennium. Sine echoes Wink when he writes:

The principalities and powers have seduced us into following a fraudulent dream and embracing false values. And most of us are reluctant to unmask the powers or question the [American] Dream.⁴⁸⁰

In worshiping the American Dream, Christians have pushed God off to a "spiritual" realm. God's activity is largely confined to prayer meetings and revival services, but God is either impotent or uninterested in slum landlording in Chicago or homelessness in Philadelphia or violence in New York city except through the conversion of individual "sinners."

Many mainline Christians seem to worship an even more remote and

⁴⁷⁷Sine, Wild Hope, p. 212.

⁴⁷⁸Ibid., p. 213.

⁴⁷⁹Ibid.

⁴⁸⁰Ibid.

impotent God. Having accepted a rationalistic and empirical world view, for them the God of the Bible has become increasingly a slave of what modern historical science views as rational and believable. God, for many mainliners seems "somewhat stuck in the backwash of history, unable to act in either the spiritual or the societal realm."⁴⁸¹

Regardless of their religious affiliation, for a growing number of people in the United States, God seems no longer relevant to their lives, their society, or their future. For these people, the growing commercialization of our global society has created a world alienated from God--a world with no transcendent purpose, with no meaning beyond the marketplace.⁴⁸²

The consumerism of our market-oriented society has had yet another devastating effect on Americans. Persons are no longer seen as having been made in the image of God, possessing innate worth and immortal life. Instead, persons have been reduced to what can be empirically known about them. Human worth is not innate but derivative. The value of a person is determined by his or her success as a producer/consumer in the larger economic marketplace. Put more simply, persons are identified by where they work, where they live, the cars they drive.⁴⁸³

Torn between two competing world views, American Christians find themselves living a schizophrenic existence where they seek to validate their existence through success in their jobs and their ability to consume, while, at the same time,

⁴⁸¹Sine, Wild Hope, p. 215. For a fuller treatment of this theme see James Turner's work in American intellectual history, Without God, Without Creed: The Origins of Unbelief in America (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1985), pp. 49-202; and Lesslie Newbigin, Foolishness to the Greeks: The Gospel and Western Culture (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986).

⁴⁸²Sine, Wild Hope, p. 215.

⁴⁸³Ibid., p. 216.

struggling to nurture their spirituality. The mechanistic model which governs American society has not only estranged Americans from the creation and from the Creator but from any real sense of human community.⁴⁸⁴

In the mechanistic model which gives substance to the American Dream, the future of continuing economic prosperity and technological sophistication rests in the hands of humankind alone. As scientists, technocrats, economists, and politicians continue to gain power, control, and mastery over nature and society, a prosperous future is assured.⁴⁸⁵

This is exactly the point at which the principalities and powers have seduced the Christian mind. The responsibility of individual Americans is not only to produce an endless array of products and services but also to develop an ever-increasing appetite to consume ever-greater quantities of these goods and services. Americans are assured that pursuing their own economic self-interest will somehow work to the common good. Yet deep down inside most people know the world just doesn't operate that way.⁴⁸⁶

Furthermore, this intensely competitive capitalist spirit also nurtures racism and sexism and contributes to the breakup of families and communities.⁴⁸⁷ John Alexander comments:

My own view is that our [capitalist] system is a juggernaut. It crushes forty thousand kids a day, grows fat selling cigarettes and bombs, installs mind-numbing programs on television, and encourages a climate that destroys marriages.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 217.

⁴⁸⁶ Sine, Wild Hope, p. 217.

⁴⁸⁷ Gay, With Liberty and Justice, p. 28.

⁴⁸⁸ Alexander, Your Money, p. 204.

The driving force that powers American capitalism is the desire of the individual to better his or her material condition. Lesslie Newbigin comments: "The name the New Testament gives to the force in question is covetousness. The Capitalist system is powered by the unremitting stimulation of covetousness."⁴⁸⁹ Despite this, American Christians of all denominations and theological orientations tend to embrace unquestioningly not only the basic premise of economic progress but also the greed which drives it.⁴⁹⁰ Mainline Christians may want to see Western economic progress made more accessible to the poor and to minorities. And they may want to see a more humane society with a greater regard for the created order. Still, they see the initiative for the creation of what Sine calls "a more inclusive [American] Dream as resting in humanity's hands not God's."⁴⁹¹

Similarly, conservative Christians may truly believe that God is in charge of the heavenly future and they may eagerly await Christ's Second Coming. Still, most seem fully to sanction and work for the pursuit of the American Dream since it is usually to their advantage to do so. Thus, conservatives, like their mainline counterparts, tend to see the initiative for the advancement of the American Dream as largely up to humanity.⁴⁹² Sine concludes, "The mechanistic model, with its technological confidence and materialistic outlook, has clearly won the day in the modern world."⁴⁹³

American Capitalism and
God's Domination-

⁴⁸⁹Newbigin, Foolishness to the Greeks, p. 113.

⁴⁹⁰Sine, Wild Hope, p. 217.

⁴⁹¹Ibid.

⁴⁹²Ibid.

⁴⁹³Ibid., p. 224.

Free Order

When one compares the nature of capitalism as it is found in the United States with Wink's understanding of God's domination-free order, one cannot help but notice the contrast between Jesus' ideal and the reality of America's present economic system. Jesus rejected any attempt by one person or group to dominate another--to lord it over another by means of power, wealth, shaming, or titles--yet domination is the hallmark of American capitalism. The system encourages domination through covetousness, the dehumanization of the labour force, and the concentration of wealth and control of the political process by an elite. In addition, the structures within capitalism--economic institutions, the government, corporations, and cultural institutions--all are marked by the domination of one group over another.

Jesus heralded the Kingdom of God where all people are free to realize their full potential--where those who have freely give of their surplus to those who have not. American capitalism, though, is founded upon economic inequality, ranking, and classism. Further, the Kingdom of God is to be brought in by those who reject the selfish pursuit of power and wealth in favour of solidarity with the poor and the oppressed. Selfishness, though, is inherent to the American capitalist economy. These same characteristics also reflect the structures within capitalism. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that virtually every characteristic Wink delineates of God's domination-free order finds its antithesis within the structures of American capitalism and in the system itself. If, in the Palestine of his day, Jesus assaulted the very structures of oppression, one cannot help but ponder where he would direct his efforts in twentieth-century America.

The person who seeks to confront evil within urban power structures must realize that what is being attempted is not simply the confrontation of one structure of society; one is waging war against an entire system founded upon greed, inequality, and

oppression. In other words, to attempt to change one aspect of American capitalism is to take on the entire system. The activist who fails to realize this is doomed to frustration and failure.

Chapter 4

A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: URBAN POWER
STRUCTURES AS THE EMBODIMENT
OF SYSTEMIC EVIL (II)

This chapter continues the emphasis of the previous one on gaining a fuller understanding of systemic evil within urban power structures through the use of sociological analysis. The first section of this chapter focuses on a method for determining the pressure points of change within an organization. The second section is devoted to understanding the intransigence of urban power structures from the perspective of conflict theory.

The Distribution of Power Within
Urban Power Structures

To develop an effective model for confronting evil within urban power structures, one must have a method for discovering which individuals within a particular power structure hold the power. This helps in locating the pressure points of change.

Approaches to Determining
the Distribution
of Power

At this point, a summary of approaches for determining the distribution of power within urban power structures will be offered.

The reputational approach. Floyd Hunter's Community Power Structure⁴⁹⁴ is generally acknowledged as having provided the initial impetus for community power research.⁴⁹⁵ Hunter sought to describe the processes by which important local policies are conceived:

It has been evident to the writer for some years that policies on vital matters affecting community life seem to appear suddenly. They are acted upon; but with no precise knowledge on the part of the majority of citizens as to how these policies originated or by whom they are really sponsored. Much is done, but much is left undone. Some of the things done appear to be manipulated to the advantage of a relatively few.⁴⁹⁶

Hunter set out to discover who the true leaders of a community are and how they gained power. His premise was the same as delineated at the start of this section, that until the local power structure becomes visible, the chance

⁴⁹⁴Floyd Hunter, Community Power Structure (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1953).

⁴⁹⁵See Larry Lyon, The Community in Urban Society (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1987), p. 184.

⁴⁹⁶Hunter, Community Power, p. 1.

for meaningful change remains remote:

If the basic issues which confront individuals and groups in the community are to be adequately met, it would seem necessary for the citizenry to be fully aware of who their real leaders are and how they are chosen. This would seem to be a first order of business for any individual who is interested in civic issues.⁴⁹⁷

But how does one go about discovering who these "real leaders" are? To answer this question, Hunter developed a technique for uncovering the local leadership that has come to be known as the "reputational approach." He began with a list of 175 people who held positions of power in Atlanta (he employed the pseudonym Regional City).

He then showed this list to fourteen local contacts whom he described as knowledgeable of local affairs and representative of various segments within the community. These contacts, whom Hunter called informants, were asked to select ten persons from the list (or names not on the list) they felt were among the most powerful in the city. This produced a list of forty leaders whom Hunter subsequently interviewed. In the course of the interview, each of these forty leaders was asked the same question:

If a project were before the community that required a decision by a group of leaders--leaders nearly everyone would accept--which ten on this list of forty would you

⁴⁹⁷Ibid., pp. 260-61.

choose?⁴⁹⁸

These forty leaders named twelve men consistently enough to convince Hunter that these twelve represented the top echelon of the community power structure in Atlanta.⁴⁹⁹

Interestingly, none of the twelve top leaders held a public political office. In fact, only four of the original forty leaders held any sort of political office. Most were businessmen in the areas of banking, insurance, and manufacturing.⁵⁰⁰ Although these elite leaders held no political office, Hunter concluded that they effectively controlled local government:

It is true that there is no formal tie between the economic interests and the government, but the structure of policy-determining committees and their tie-in with other powerful institutions and organizations of the community make government subservient to the interests of these combined groups.

The government departments and their personnel are acutely aware of the power of key individuals and combinations of citizen groups in the policy-making realm, and they are loath to act before consulting and "clearing" with these interests.⁵⁰¹

Hunter discovered that in Atlanta there was a ruling class that used its economic dominance to structure the local

⁴⁹⁸Lyon, The Community, p. 185.

⁴⁹⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰⁰Ibid.

⁵⁰¹Hunter, Community Power pp. 100-01.

cultural and political values and actions for its own advantage.⁵⁰² C. Wright Mills, who will be discussed later in this chapter, argued that a parallel tendency is affecting the United States on a national level.⁵⁰³

The decisional approach. Hunter's book received a tremendous amount of attention, much of it critical.

Political scientists, especially, were critical of Hunter, regarding sociologists as invaders of their academic turf.

However, it was not until Robert Dahl's Who Governs?⁵⁰⁴ was published in 1961 that an organized series of criticisms accompanied by an alternative theory of community power was presented as a response to Hunter's thesis. Dahl's answer to the question, "Who governs?" in New Haven, Connecticut, was based on a detailed analysis of political decisions. While Hunter focused on the top leaders, Dahl focused on what he felt were the key decisions in New Haven and who made them.⁵⁰⁵

Dahl, employing what came to be known as the

⁵⁰²Lyon, The Community, p. 186.

⁵⁰³Dennis Gilbert and Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure: A New Synthesis, 3rd rev. ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1987), p. 200.

⁵⁰⁴Robert Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1961).

⁵⁰⁵Lyon, The Community, p. 187.

"decisional approach," analyzed decisions made in the areas of public education, political nominations, and, especially, urban renewal, which was "by most criteria the biggest thing in New Haven."⁵⁰⁶ Dahl found an elected official, the mayor, to be the driving force behind urban renewal, and, except for the mayor, leaders making decisions in one issue area were not found to be particularly influential in others. Dahl concluded that New Haven possesses an essentially pluralistic local power structure with only the mayor moving from one competing group to another and from one issue to another.⁵⁰⁷ Thus, whereas Hunter's work suggested that democracy was not working well (if at all) on the local level, Dahl found that representative democracy was functioning quite well.

Larry Lyon notes that although a careful comparison between the work of Hunter and Dahl shows considerably more agreement than the subsequent literature would suggest, one finds in their respective works the beginnings of the polar extremes for the elitist-pluralist debate. Hunter analyzed local opinions to discover a largely elitist power structure based on economic class structure. Dahl analyzed local behaviours and discovered a largely pluralistic

⁵⁰⁶Nelson W. Polsby, Community Power and Political Theory (New Haven, CT: Yale University, 1963), p. 70.

⁵⁰⁷Lyon, The Community, p. 187.

distribution of power based on formal political structure.⁵⁰⁸

Both these approaches have been subjected to valid criticism. Hunter's reputational approach was criticized for assuming what needs to be proven, the existence of a small group of powerful leaders. By asking their informants who the decision makers are, Hunter implicitly assumed the existence of a small decision-making elite.⁵⁰⁹ In other words, Hunter measured the reputation for power rather than power itself.⁵¹⁰ Nelson Polby suggests that the proper question a researcher should ask is not who runs the community but does anyone run the community.⁵¹¹

Second, Hunter assumed that a single elite deals with a broad range of issues. It would not be surprising to discover that decision makers are specialized in their interests and powers, thus forming what is, in effect, "a system of multiple elites," perhaps representing different segments of the community.⁵¹²

Third, Hunter assumed that leaders form a cohesive

⁵⁰⁸Ibid.

⁵⁰⁹Gilbert and Kahl, Class Structure, p. 202.

⁵¹⁰Lyon, The Community, pp. 188-89.

⁵¹¹Nelson Polsby, "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative," in The Structure of Community Power, eds. Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 297.

⁵¹²Gilbert and Kahl, Class Structure, p. 203.

unit. The identification of leaders does not determine whether they agree on issues and exert their power in a concerted fashion.⁵¹³

Fourth, Hunter was accused of downplaying the role of formal institutions by largely ignoring the role of city government, political parties, and elections.⁵¹⁴

Finally, Hunter's narrow focus on the identity of leaders was said to be an asymmetrical conception of power.

He did not take into consideration the fact that policy makers may, in fact, find themselves compelled to take into consideration the probable reactions of other groups as they make decisions. If this is true, then power is in some sense reciprocal.⁵¹⁵

The decisional approach was not without its critics as well. Robert Presthus found that the decisional method identified several government officials as powerful when a more complete and accurate analysis including a reputational method showed them to be no more than highly visible front men with very little decision-making power.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹³Ibid.

⁵¹⁴Ibid.

⁵¹⁵Ibid. For a fuller discussion of criticisms of the decisional method see Robert A. Dahl, Pluralist Democracy in the United States (Chicago: Rands McNally, 1967); Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott, eds., The Structure of Community Power (New York: Random House, 1970).

⁵¹⁶Robert Presthus, Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power (New York: Oxford University, 1964).

A related argument sees the decisional method as biased toward attributing power to the public officials and civic leaders who are most formally and actively associated with each issue area. It is unlikely that the decisional method will uncover a small elite of the sort described by Hunter which is quietly involved in a broad array of issues, setting the basic goals which a larger group of more specialized leaders pursue in the public eye.⁵¹⁷

Another criticism had to do with the absence of criteria by which the key local issues were selected. Clearly, the selection of specific issues influenced the findings since other local issues might produce entirely different findings.⁵¹⁸ Yet, there are no generally accepted criteria for specifying a list of community issues which could be said to be "representative" of local power arrangements.⁵¹⁹

Another practical drawback of the decisional approach had to do with the length of time involved in analyzing local politics from this perspective. One had to

Prethus was not arguing that the reputational approach is superior to the decisional approach. Instead, he advocated a combination of approaches which, as will be seen, is the direction power research moved.

⁵¹⁷Gilbert and Kahl, Class Structure, p. 206.

⁵¹⁸Lyon, The Community, p. 189.

⁵¹⁹Gilbert and Kahl, Class Structure, p. 206.

devote at least a year to such a project to get somewhat reliable results.⁵²⁰

Finally, Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz⁵²¹ argued that the decisional approach focuses too narrowly on formal, overt decision making. Using examples from race relations in Baltimore, they demonstrated that formal decision making, the kind analyzed by the decisional approach, is typically limited to "safe" choices that benefit vested interests. Key issues that could challenge dominant groups were never raised.⁵²² When Hunter studied community power in Atlanta, most questions involving equity for Black citizens were in this category of "nondecisions."

Through manipulation of public opinion or institutional procedures (such as the operation of legislative committees) the powerful are frequently able to suppress consideration of matters they prefer to ignore.⁵²³

⁵²⁰Lyon, The Community, p. 190.

⁵²¹Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz, Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice (New York: Oxford University, 1970).

⁵²²Lyon, The Community, pp. 189-90.

⁵²³Gilbert and Kahl, Class Structure, pp. 206-07. For a fuller discussion of criticisms of the decisional method see Aiken and Mott, Community Power; Charles M. Bonjean and Michael D. Grimes, "Community Power: Issues and Findings," in Social Stratification: A Reader, ed. Joseph Lopreato and Lionel S. Lewis (New York: Harper & Row, 1974); G. William Domhoff, Who Really Rules? New Haven and Community Power Reexamined (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1978); and Bachrach and Baratz, Power and

Combination approaches. By the mid 1960's, sociologists and political scientists were beginning to realize that both the reputational and decisional approaches to community power possess serious, inherent methodological problems. With this realization, a strong movement developed along two separate but related lines which sought to combine the reputational and decisional methodologies. The first of these combination approaches involves studying a community by employing both a reputational and decisional methodology and using both sets of findings to describe the local power structure. An early proponent of this approach was a political scientist, Robert Presthus. He found that the employment of both the reputational and decisional methodologies reveals a much more accurate picture of community decision making than either approach in isolation.⁵²⁴ A sociologist, Delbert

Poverty.

⁵²⁴Lyon, The Community, p. 191. Presthus concluded: "In sum, the two methods of ascertaining power used in this study produce somewhat different results. In over 40 percent of the cases, the reputational method does identify individuals who by the decisional test are found to be overtly powerful. It also identifies individuals who possess necessary attributes of power, but who escape the decisional net because they either do not choose to use their power, or, as in several of our Edgewood cases, use it "behind-the-scenes." However, as noted earlier, the use of both methods provides evidence of the existence and the use of the latter type of power. If one were to rely only upon the decisional method, he might well overlook these more subtle facets of community power (Presthus, Men at the

Miller, also used both methodologies and arrived at conclusions similar to those of Presthus.⁵²⁵

The other method of combining the reputational and decisional methodologies involves merging both into a single technique. Generally, those who undertake this approach supplement reputational questioning with a focus on specific decisions.⁵²⁶ This approach is substantially

Top, p. 127).

⁵²⁵Lyon, The Community, p. 191. See Delbert C. Miller, "Decision-Making Cliques in Community Power Structures," American Journal of Sociology, 24 (1958), 299-310; and Delbert C. Miller, International Community Power Structures (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1970). Both Presthus and Miller agreed that the reputational leaders tend to be more concealed, more economically based, and possibly more important. Conversely, decisional leaders were more public, more politically based, and probably more symbolic. Both researchers concluded that the use of both reputational and decisional techniques is clearly more reliable than the exclusive use of either (Lyon, The Community, p. 191).

⁵²⁶Terry Clark's "ersatz decisional method" is an excellent example of this type of combinational approach. (See his "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures, and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," American Sociological Review, 33 [1968], 576-93; and his "Community Structure and Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures, and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities," in Community Politics, ed. Charles M. Bonjean, Terry Clark, and Robert Lineberry [New York: Free, 1971].) Clark describes the approach he employed: "Attempting to collect as much information as possible but to maximize reliability and validity while minimizing costs, we decided to interview eleven strategically placed informants in each community. . . . [T]hese same informants were interviewed about the same four issues: urban renewal, the election of the mayor, air pollution,

easier, quicker, and cheaper than the methodology employed by Presthus and Miller. Whether or not it is as valid as the more time-consuming separate approaches is still unresolved.⁵²⁷

The directions that the study of community power has moved in should not be surprising. In spite of the polemics on both sides of the debate, the methods of the reputational and decisional approaches are remarkably complementary. Both approaches tend to make extensive use of interviews, historical documents, current news reports, and subjective impressions. Furthermore, in the final analysis, both approaches rely on someone's opinion as to the distribution of power. Thus, since their methodologies

and the antipoverty program. These four particular issues were selected because they tend to involve different types of community actors in differing relationships with one another. . . . For each area we posed a series of questions inquiring essentially: 1. Who initiated action on the issue? 2. Who supported the action? 3. Who opposed this action? 4. What was the nature of the bargaining process; who negotiated with whom? 5. What was the outcome? Whose views tended to prevail?" (Clark, "Community Structure and Decision-Making," pp. 296-97).

⁵²⁷Lyon, The Community, pp. 191-92. Lyon's initial analysis of Clark's methodology concluded that it is superior to other techniques (Larry Lyon, "Community Power and Policy Outputs," in New Perspectives on the American Community, ed. Roland Warren [Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977]). However, a subsequent review of Clark's methodology suggested that it may be superficial (Larry Lyon and Charles M. Bonjean, "Community Power and Policy Output: The Routines of Local Politics," Urban Affairs Quarterly, 17, no. 1 [1981], 3-21).

are not mutually exclusive, attempts to combine them did not prove particularly difficult.⁵²⁸

⁵²⁸Lyon, The Community, p. 192.

A Method for Measuring
Local Power

Larry Lyon, in The Community in Urban Society, offers a practical eight-step method for determining power distribution in a local community. I have chosen his method for a number of reasons. First, Lyon writes out of a broad knowledge of the field. Arguing for a "pragmatic eclecticism,"⁵²⁹ Lyon develops a practical methodology which adopts the best that each approach has to offer.⁵³⁰ Second, Lyon's method is adaptable allowing for considerable modification for different needs and issues. His measuring techniques work equally well as a technique for uncovering a community-wide distribution of power or for focusing on power patterns within a single area of community affairs.⁵³¹ Third, Lyon's methodology is simple enough to be of value to the non-professional. His measuring techniques are presented in a step-by-step process that leads the non-professional researcher through the entire process of community analysis. Finally, Lyon's method is not inordinately time-consuming, requiring only a few months to complete all eight steps. Here, then, is Lyon's eight-step method for measuring local power.

⁵²⁹Roland Warren, Foreword to Lyon, The Community, p. viii.

⁵³⁰See Ibid.

⁵³¹Lyon, The Community, p. 206.

Step one: Community overview. One thing that should be clear from the analysis that was undertaken earlier in this chapter of the major urban power structures is that the major structures and institutions within a community do not exist in a vacuum. In other words, community power is interrelated with class structure, economic structure, and religious, cultural, and educational institutions--in short, with all other parts of the community. It is impossible to reach an understanding of a community's power structure without first possessing a great deal of knowledge of that community.⁵³²

How does one gain such knowledge? One way is simply to spend a few weeks in the local library. Past issues of local newspapers and local magazines or newsletters can be valuable data sources as are published histories of the community. More sophisticated research might include analysis of census data (growth patterns, race and age composition, residential segregation, work force participation and composition, etc.), results of previous elections, financial contributors to the campaigns, and master plans for the city. The list of potential sources of information is virtually endless, yet a shortcut may sometimes be available if the community has

⁵³²Ibid., pp. 206-07.

a local urban or community research center that has produced community overviews with much of the needed background information. In addition, urban planning and community development departments in the city government often have statistical profiles of the community. Planners within school districts, county, or other community-wide entities are other possible resources.⁵³³ Lyon presents the following questions which this initial research stage should seek to answer:

1. What are the important environmental factors affecting the community (e.g., regional characteristics, transportation arteries, nearby communities)?
2. What is the demographic structure of the community (e.g., population, size, work force composition, age and race proportions, residential and business land-use patterns)?
3. What are the most important, or at least the most visible, issues before the community? Which groups or individuals are on which side?
4. What are the major values of the community? Are most concerns related to economic growth and a favorable business climate? Do moral or religious issues arise with any regularity? Is there an inherent desire to preserve the status quo, or is there progressive support for change?
5. What are the dynamics of the above question? How have the issues they represent changed over time?⁵³⁴

⁵³³Lyon, The Community, p. 207.

⁵³⁴Ibid., pp. 207-08.

When these questions are answered, the researcher is ready to move on to the second step.

Step two: Choosing the positional informants.

After an overview of the community has been developed, the next step is to select those individuals who can provide the initial responses necessary to learn about the structure of community power. Since these informants will supply crucial information about who will be interviewed next and why, it is important that the individuals chosen possess knowledge about power in the community and how it is used in local issues. Lyon suggests interviewing the following individuals who, because of their positions, are likely to be particularly knowledgeable: (1) The editor of the largest daily newspaper, (2) the president of the largest bank, (3) the superintendent of the largest school district, (4) the director of the Chamber of Commerce, (5) the director of the local NAACP chapter, (6) the director of the local LULAC chapter, (7) the pastors of the largest predominantly Anglo, Black, and Hispanic churches, (8) the mayor of the central city, (9) the city manager of the central city, (10) all minority members (Black, Hispanic, or female) of the city council of the central city, and (11) union leaders.⁵³⁵ The characteristics of a particular

⁵³⁵Ibid., pp. 208-09.

community may, of course, lead a researcher to modify this list somewhat.

Step three: Interviewing the positional informants. This step simply involves interviewing the individuals listed in step two as to their views on the key issues facing their community. Lyon suggests asking each informant the following questions:

1. "In your opinion, what five individuals in this community are the most influential in _____?" (either a general issue, e.g., education, health care, economic growth; or you might simply ask for the entire community, e.g., Waco).
2. "Now, would you please rank those individuals, one through five, in terms of their influence in _____?" (general issue or community).⁵³⁶

After the ranking, the researcher should follow-up with open-ended questions about the issue, the individuals named, and the ranking. The goal of these questions is to gather additional background information about the people and processes involved in the topic of interest. After recording the responses to the open-ended questions, the researcher can move the interview to other issue areas. At this point, questions one and two, and the open-ended follow-up questions are repeated for each issue.⁵³⁷

⁵³⁶Lyon, The Community, p. 209.

⁵³⁷Ibid., p. 210.

Step four: Choosing the reputational leaders.

There are several methods that can be used to combine the information gathered in the first interviews. One of the simplest and most straightforward involves giving everyone mentioned for a particular issue five points for a first place rank, four points for a second, and so on.⁵³⁸

Step five: Interviewing the reputational leaders.

If these reputational leaders are issue-specific, they are asked only about those issues that resulted in their being added to the list. Thus, many reputational leaders will be asked about only one issue in the questioning. As was the case with the interviews with the positional informants, questions one and two are asked to produce a ranking of leaders. And again, these are followed by open-ended questions designed to learn more about the issue and the leaders.⁵³⁹

Step six: Choosing the "top" leaders. After the second series of interviews is completed, issue-specific leadership lists are once again prepared in the same way as they were for the responses from the positional informants,

⁵³⁸Ibid.

⁵³⁹Ibid., p. 211.

i.e., cutoff points are established and top-ranking reputational leaders for each issue are chosen. Because this second list is based on the responses of individuals who are perceived as leaders by knowledgeable informants in key local positions, one can assume that it is more valid than the list of leaders produced by the first set of interviews. Consequently, the top-ranked individuals from the second set of interviews are seen as the most powerful persons in that particular area.⁵⁴⁰

Step seven: Analyzing the top leadership. At this point, the researcher should possess considerable insight into the power structure of a community. However, a great deal more information can be gained through a systematic comparison of the questionnaire responses. For example, comparisons between leadership lists can help determine patterns of decentralization, i.e., the number of leaders per issue (intra-issue decentralization) and the number of leaders with influence in more than one issue (inter-issue decentralization).⁵⁴¹

Further comparisons of the leadership lists can provide information on other dimensions of community power. Leaders who are named as powerful in the first round of

⁵⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 211-12.

⁵⁴¹Lyon, The Community, pp. 212-13.

reputational interviews but who are not listed among the top leadership in the second round of interviews may be assumed to be "symbolic" leaders--leaders whose power is more apparent than real. Leaders who are listed as powerful in both lists may be looked on as "visible" leaders--leaders whose power is both apparent and real. Finally, leaders who are listed as powerful in the second series of interviews but who are not mentioned in the first series are "concealed" leaders--the influence of these leaders is concealed from the view of many in the community. It is, therefore, possible to distinguish between three types of leaders by comparing the two sets of interviews: symbolic leaders, visible leaders, and concealed leaders.⁵⁴²

Still another dimension of community power which may be discerned from this technique has to do with "legitimacy." The legitimacy of the leadership structure is determined by examining the leaders' organizational positions in the community. For example, if the four top leaders in the area of education are a school superintendent, a college dean, the PTA president, and a school board member, they would all be classified as legitimate leaders for this issue area. Conversely, if they do not hold such positions but rather have no more

⁵⁴²Ibid., pp. 213-14.

official authority in the area than anyone else in the community, the leadership structure would rank low in legitimacy.⁵⁴³

Knowledge of the organizational affiliations of local community leaders is necessary in determining the legitimacy of their power. Once these affiliations are determined, however, it becomes possible to learn about the organizational structure of community power. Through the use of sociometric or network analysis, one can trace the patterns of interconnections among key local organizations.

Through charting the organizational affiliations of local leaders, one may find, for example, one or two organizations which include in their membership a significant portion of the community's leaders. In such a case, the organization could be seen as either a base for power in the community or as a meeting place for the powerful.⁵⁴⁴

Mapping the membership patterns of a community's leaders can also uncover various forms of organizational interlock; that is, the same group of powerful people may belong to the same organizations. In such a circumstance, one might assume that these organizations will pursue similar goals and represent similar interests in the

⁵⁴³Ibid., p. 214.

⁵⁴⁴Lyon, The Community, p. 214.

community even though their formal structures and goals appear quite different.⁵⁴⁵

Step eight: Applying the analysis to community change and development. As was stated earlier, in order to confront evil within urban power structures, one must have a clear understanding of where the power resides within these structures. Seeking to confront an urban power structure without an understanding of the structure and dynamics of community power is clearly futile. However, Lyon mentions one important qualifier to applying community power research. The researcher must be careful not to overestimate the influence of local leadership. The reality of modern society is such that the ability of community leaders to affect community events is severely limited. If the major businesses and industries in a community are owned by organizations headquartered thousands of miles away, then the economic impact of local decisions is severely limited. Similarly, if the state and national governments have more rules and money for urban development than the municipal government, then the political impact of local decision making is likewise curtailed. This is not to suggest that a community is a helpless pawn manipulated and controlled by external forces

⁵⁴⁵Ibid., p. 215.

but simply to acknowledge what Lyon calls "the vertical axis of the community"⁵⁴⁶ when incorporating community power characteristics into a strategy for confronting evil within an urban power structure.⁵⁴⁷

The Intransigence of Power Structures:
The Relevance of Conflict Theory

Without explicitly drawing attention to it, this chapter has analyzed societal urban power structures from a conflict perspective. Conflict theory is the major alternative to functionalism as an approach to understanding the general structure of society.⁵⁴⁸ The conflict perspective is based on a particular set of assumptions about the nature of society and comes to particular conclusions as to the causes of social problems.⁵⁴⁹ While they certainly do not share a unified perspective,⁵⁵⁰ conflict sociologists do share a number of

⁵⁴⁶Ibid., p. 216.

⁵⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 215-16.

⁵⁴⁸Ruth A. Wallace and Alison Wolf, Contemporary Sociological Theory: Continuing the Classical Tradition, 2nd rev. ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986), p. 62.

⁵⁴⁹James William Coleman and Donald R. Cressey, Social Problems, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1984), p. 14.

⁵⁵⁰Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 62. For

related views that contain many common elements. As the analysis of urban power structures in this chapter implies, conflict theory sees society as a struggle for power among many different social groups. Conflict is believed to be inevitable and in many cases actually beneficial to society. Many needed social changes, for example, arose from the French Revolution and the American War between the States. Further, the conflict perspective views society in dynamic terms. Because people and groups are constantly struggling with one another to gain power, change is inevitable. One individual or group gains the upper hand only to be defeated in a later struggle.⁵⁵¹ If a particular society appears to have done away with conflict for a period of time, it simply means that one group has been able, temporarily, to suppress its rivals. Many conflict theorists see civil law, for example, as a way of defining and upholding a particular order that benefits some groups at the expense of others.⁵⁵²

The basic "conflict" orientation incorporates three central and related assumptions. The first assumption is

this reason, Johnson suggests that the term conflict theory may be a misnomer (Doyle Paul Johnson, Sociological Theory: Classical Founders and Contemporary Perspectives [New York: Macmillan, 1986], p. 448).

⁵⁵¹Coleman and Cressey, Social Problems, p. 14.

⁵⁵²Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 62.

that people have a number of basic "interests," things they want and attempt to acquire. These things are not defined by one's society but are common to all societies.⁵⁵³

Second, and this is the core of the whole conflict perspective, power is seen as the central element of all social relationships. Power is seen not only as scarce and unequally divided--and thus a source of conflict--but also as essentially coercive. This analysis leads, in turn, to a concern with the distribution of those resources which give people more or less power.⁵⁵⁴

A third distinctive aspect of conflict theory is that values and ideas are seen as weapons used by different groups to advance their own ends. One need look no further than to the American doctrine of "manifest destiny" to see how people develop ideas that suit their own purposes.⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁵³Ibid., pp. 62-63.

⁵⁵⁴Ibid., p. 63.

⁵⁵⁵Ibid.

Intellectual Roots of
Conflict Theory

Despite sharing these common elements, conflict theory has also developed into two quite dissimilar traditions. These differ, among other things, in their view of social science and in whether they believe conflict can ever be eradicated.⁵⁵⁶ One wing finds its roots in the

⁵⁵⁶The proponents of these traditions, called critical theorists (I am not using this phrase in the narrow sense as referring just to the theorists of the Frankfurt school) and analytic theorists, differ in their view of social science, in their view of society, and in whether they believe conflict can ever be expunged from society. The first group of theorists, represented here by C. Wright Mills, believes that social scientists have a moral obligation to engage in a critique of society. These sociologists refuse to separate--or to admit that it is possible to separate--analysis from judgment or fact from value. In addition, their critique tends to focus on the way wealth, status, and power are distributed in society. Theorists of this school tend to see society as divided rather clearly between a small group of powerful and privileged people and an exploited or manipulated mass. They also tend to believe that, in principle, a society could exist without social conflict. Because of this latter view, these theorists have been dubbed Utopian writers. The second group, represented here by Ralf Dahrendorf, views conflict as an inevitable and permanent aspect of social life. Further, this group rejects the idea that the conclusions of social science are necessarily value-laden; in fact, these theorists argue that it is essential they not be. Proponents of this view are seeking to establish a social science with the same canon of objectivity as informs the natural sciences. Finally, these conflict theorists do not analyze all societies as stratified along a single dimension with a ruling group opposed to the masses. They would agree that some societies are of this type but would argue that many others are far more complex in the way power and status are

thought of Karl Marx and the other looks to Max Weber as its source.⁵⁵⁷ I will focus largely on the Marxian wing of conflict theory, and its expression in elite theory.

The European elite theorists, the most prominent of whom are Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923), Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941), and Robert Michels (1876-1936),⁵⁵⁸ developed an understanding of the intransigence of urban power structures which C. Wright Mills and Ralf Dahrendorf would later flesh out. The central argument of the elite theorists was that only a small number of people in any organization can hold authority and that their occupation of these positions automatically places them at odds with those subjected to it. Moreover, the elites who are in control generally share a common culture and are organized, not necessarily formally, but in the sense that they act

distributed; they have interlocking patterns of stratification which do not always line up neatly (Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, pp. 63, 73, 112-13).

⁵⁵⁷Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 63. Weber's contribution to conflict theory is often overlooked by those who see his emphasis on the influence of religious ideas as a repudiation of Marx's materialistic emphasis. Weber was aware, however, that religious ideas themselves may be a source of conflict. Further, he recognized that religious ideals may serve to legitimate the social position of dominant groups in society. Although Weber was less deterministic and more sophisticated in his analysis of conflict than was Marx, Weber actually enlarged the spectrum within which conflict issues could be seen to emerge (Johnson, Sociological Theory, pp. 449-50).

⁵⁵⁸Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 68.

together to defend their position, as well as using their position to their own individual advantage.⁵⁵⁹ As Wallace and Wolf put it, elite theory "presents explicitly the argument that people's self-interest and the intrinsically unequal nature of power make conflict both inevitable and permanent."⁵⁶⁰

Modern Conflict Theory

As mentioned earlier, conflict theory can be divided into two quite distinct traditions. C. Wright Mills and Ralf Dahrendorf represent these different traditions.⁵⁶¹ Although approaching their study from

⁵⁵⁹Ibid.

⁵⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 68-69.

⁵⁶¹Although Wallace and Wolf correctly identify Dahrendorf as a member of the analytic school which finds its primary influence in the thought of Max Weber (Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, pp. 112-13), Jonathan Turner argues that the thought of Dahrendorf "still represents one of the best efforts to incorporate the insights of Marx and (to a lesser extent) Weber into a coherent set of theoretical propositions" (Jonathan H. Turner, The Structure of Sociological Theory, 3rd rev. ed., ed. Robin M. Williams, Jr., The Dorsey Series in Sociology [Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1982] pp. 203-04). Doyle Johnson agrees with Turner, arguing that Dahrendorf "attempted to ground his theory in an updated Marxist perspective that recognizes the pervasiveness of social conflict based on opposition of class-based interests and the consequences of conflict in generating social change (Johnson, Sociological Theory, p. 468). Perhaps it is most accurate to say that although Dahrendorf shares many of the assumptions of the analytic school, his theoretical analysis as such builds on the

different perspectives, both Mills and Dahrendorf reached similar conclusions on the nature, scope, and intransigence of urban power structures.

C. Wright Mills and the "power elite." More than any single social scientist, C. Wright Mills (1916-1962) sparked the ongoing debate of the last three decades concerning power in the United States. Writing his most important and influential works in the 1950's, Mills was a maverick sociologist disputing the generally accepted pluralist depiction of the American power structure.⁵⁶²

Mills believed firmly that sociological analysis should be devoted to showing the connection between the personal troubles of individuals and larger social issues rooted in the basic structure of society. The problems individuals encounter in society, whether they are material problems such as unemployment or poverty or psychological problems such as meaningless work or alienation can generally be shown to have roots in the structures of society.⁵⁶³ Mills argued that the material hardships of the workers of the

writings of Marx, while turning the analysis into a strong argument for democratic theory, much as did Reinhold Niebuhr.

⁵⁶²Martin N. Marger, Elites and Masses: An Introduction to Political Sociology (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1981), p. 211.

⁵⁶³Johnson, Sociological Theory, p. 459.

past have been replaced today by a psychological malaise which finds its roots in worker alienation from what they make.⁵⁶⁴ He saw white-collar workers as apathetic, frightened, and molded by mass culture.⁵⁶⁵ In modern society, he argued,

those who hold power have often come to exercise it in hidden ways: they have moved and are moving from authority to manipulation. . . . The rational systems hide their power so that no one sees their sources of authority or understands their calculation. For the bureaucracy . . . the world is an object to be manipulated.⁵⁶⁶

Mills blames modern bureaucratic capitalism for alienating people from both the process and product of work. Other aspects of social structure strengthen psychological tendencies which make societies liable for exploitation and manipulation.⁵⁶⁷ The fragmented working environment people operate in gives them little understanding of how society works, and they believe that the interventionist government is responsible for insecurity and misfortune. An increasingly centralized

⁵⁶⁴C. Wright Mills, White Collar: The American Middle Classes (New York: Oxford University, 1951), pp. xvi-xvii.

⁵⁶⁵Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 109.

⁵⁶⁶Mills, White Collar, pp. 110-11.

⁵⁶⁷Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills, Character and Social Structure (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953), pp. 460-72.

structure with no remaining traditional beliefs and with permanently anxious people is, according to Mills, highly susceptible to abuse and exploitation.⁵⁶⁸

The most important of Mills' writings on American political society is The Power Elite, published in 1956. In this book, Mills identifies the key institutions in the United States wherein the most important and far-reaching decisions are made:⁵⁶⁹ giant corporations, the top echelons of the Federal government, and the military.

Mills then studies the power elite's sociological characteristics and finds that the members are quite similar in general outlook, interests, and social background. They had attended the same schools, exhibited similar career patterns, and for the most part, had been exposed to common socialization experiences. They were, in short, a socially cohesive group.⁵⁷⁰

In addition to their common social characteristics, and possibly of greater importance as a source of cohesion among them, is their close working relationship. Because their institutions overlap functionally, the elites of business, government, and the military find themselves interacting with each other on a regular basis. They form

⁵⁶⁸Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, pp. 109-10.

⁵⁶⁹Marger, Elites, p. 211.

⁵⁷⁰Ibid., p. 212.

a loose coalition of sorts, coming together often on issues which are of common concern.⁵⁷¹

An example of this overlapping of interests is the arms buildup. Following World War II, the American government expanded its power most noticeably in the area of foreign affairs and as a result established a tremendous arms budget. This, in turn, corresponded with the needs and world view of the military and with those giant corporations which are the chief producers of arms and therefore the chief economic beneficiaries of military spending.⁵⁷²

Given these interconnections between institutional spheres, elite roles are interchangeable. Businessmen move easily into top government posts, generals retire to positions in the corporate world, etc. There is a constant back-and-forth movement of personnel among these three realms of power. Thus, there are not three power elites but one.⁵⁷³

Now, Mills does not claim that there is a conscious conspiracy among the economic, military, and political elites, or that there is always complete agreement among them, or that they share exactly the same interests. The

⁵⁷¹Ibid.

⁵⁷²Ibid.

⁵⁷³Marger, Elites, p. 212.

interdependent and interlocking nature of these elite circles results from the tremendous size and high degree of centralization of the economic, military, and political institutions, which requires that the top-level decision makers in each of them must consider the others. None can isolate itself from the others and each can facilitate or hinder the others in carrying out their various projects. The high degree of centralization means that the decisions and actions of those at the top of the power hierarchy in each institution will have major and broad ramifications both within the institution and the larger society in which it resides.⁵⁷⁴

Mills argues that the range and amount of oppression and exploitation perpetrated by this power elite on the masses of society have been steadily rising as the level of technology has increased:

From even the most superficial examination of the history of western society we learn that the power of decision-makers is first of all limited by the level of technique, by the means of power and violence and organization that prevail in a given society. In this connection we also learn that there is a fairly straight line running upward through the history of the West; that the means of oppression and exploitation, of violence and destruction, as well as the means of production and reconstruction, have been progressively enlarged and increasingly centralized.⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁷⁴Johnson, Sociological Theory, pp. 460-61.

⁵⁷⁵Mills, The Power Elite, p. 23.

In sum, urban power structures are so intransigent because the power elite share a similar background, a similar outlook, and overlapping interests and functions which cause them to come together in a working relationship, further strengthening their common social and psychological orientations.⁵⁷⁶ Thus, to confront one is to confront them all and to seek to change one is to threaten them all.

This is further complicated by the existence of a middle level of power between the power elite and the masses. This middle level consists essentially of Congress, organized labor, important state and local political officials, and various pressure groups.⁵⁷⁷ Often, groups that are attempting to confront structural injustice focus their attention and efforts on these middle levels of power, failing to realize that the power level of these groups is of minimal significance when the most important issues of society are being decided.⁵⁷⁸ As Mills comments:

Undue attention to the middle levels of power obscures the structure of power as a whole, especially the top and bottom. American politics, as discussed and voted and campaigned for, have largely to do with these middle levels, and often only with them.⁵⁷⁹

⁵⁷⁶Marger, Elites, pp. 212-13.

⁵⁷⁷Ibid., p. 213.

⁵⁷⁸Ibid.

⁵⁷⁹Mills, The Power Elite, p. 245.

None of these groups is able to shape basic policies to which they, like the masses, are subject.⁵⁸⁰

The issue of confronting corrupt urban power structures is complicated still again by the fact that the majority of the populace is relatively disorganized, inert, and in the process of becoming a "mass"--that is, a society which responds with no countervoice to decisions made by the power elite. Mills saw this transformation of the American public into a mass society as a result of the nature of mass communications in which most people only receive but cannot respond to opinions voiced by organized authorities. The public is manipulated for political ends through such means as television.⁵⁸¹ In Mills' own words:

. . . . [T]he public is merely the collectivity of individuals each rather passively exposed to the mass media and rather helplessly opened up to the suggestions and manipulations that flow from these media.⁵⁸²

Mills' analysis of the power elite points to the seriousness of the challenge facing those working for justice in the United States amidst powerful urban structures.

Mills argues, then, that power in American society

⁵⁸⁰Marger, Elites, p. 213.

⁵⁸¹Ibid., p. 214.

⁵⁸²Mills, The Power Elite, p. 305.

is attached to critical institutional positions. Power is an inherent part of institutions such as governments and corporations, and those who occupy the command positions of these most important societal institutions thus constitute the power elite.⁵⁸³

Ralf Dahrendorf. Ralf Dahrendorf (b. 1929) is one of a handful of living European sociologists who is known and respected in both Europe and North America. As a teenager in Nazi Germany, Dahrendorf was sent to a concentration camp for his involvement in a high school group opposing the state, and he has continued to be deeply involved in political affairs.⁵⁸⁴

Dahrendorf was an early and persistent critic of Parsonian functionalism and its static view of an American society based on consensus and integration. He argued that society has two faces--one of consensus, the other of conflict. He implored sociologists to begin analyzing society's "ugly face" and abandon the utopian image created by functionalism.⁵⁸⁵ To leave utopia, Dahrendorf offered sociologists the following advice:

Concentrate in the future not only on concrete problems

⁵⁸³Marger, Elites, p. 213.

⁵⁸⁴Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 113.

⁵⁸⁵Turner, Sociological Theory, p. 203.

but on such problems as involve explanations in terms of constraint, conflict, and change. This second face of society may aesthetically be rather less pleasing than the social system--but, if all sociology had to offer were an easy escape to Utopian tranquility, it would hardly be worth our efforts.⁵⁸⁶

According to Dahrendorf's theory of society, the crucial determinant of social structure is the distribution of power.⁵⁸⁷ Dahrendorf accepts Weber's definition of power:

the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests.⁵⁸⁸

Dahrendorf views power as basically coercive and understands it as intimately intertwined with the process of institutionalization . For Dahrendorf, institutionalization involves the creation of "imperatively coordinated associations"⁵⁸⁹ (ICAs) that, in terms which Dahrendorf fails to specify, represent a distinguishable organization of roles. These organizations are characterized by power relationships with persons in

⁵⁸⁶Ralf Dahrendorf, "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis," American Journal of Sociology, 64 (September 1958), 127.

⁵⁸⁷Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 114.

⁵⁸⁸Ralf Dahrendorf, Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society (Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1959), p. 166.

⁵⁸⁹Turner, Sociological Theory, p. 204.

particular roles having power to coerce conformity from others. Although Dahrendorf is somewhat vague on this point, it appears that any social unit--from a small group or formal organization to a community or an entire society--can be considered for analytical purposes an ICA if roles displaying power differentials exist. In addition, although power denotes the coercion of some by others, these power relations in ICAs tend to become legitimated and viewed as authority relations in which some positions have the "accepted" or "normative right" to dominate others. Dahrendorf thus considers the social order as maintained by processes creating authority relations in the various types of ICAs existing through all layers of social systems.⁵⁹⁰

At the same time, however, power and authority are scarce resources over which subgroups within a designated ICA compete and fight. They are therefore the major sources of conflict and change in these institutional patterns. However, even though particular roles in ICAs possess varying degrees of authority, any particular ICA can be typified in terms of just two basic types of roles, ruling and ruled. The ruling cluster of roles has an interest in preserving the status quo while the ruled cluster seeks to redistribute power and authority.⁵⁹¹

⁵⁹⁰Ibid.

⁵⁹¹Turner, Sociological Theory, p. 204.

Dahrendorf's view of societal norms develop naturally out of his view of the nature of society. Like other conflict theorists, Dahrendorf does not see societal norms as defined by nor emerging from social consensus.⁵⁹² He argues that norms "are established and maintained . . . by power, and their substance may well be explained in terms of the interests of the powerful."⁵⁹³ This is evidenced by the fact that norms are backed by sanctions. Vivid examples of this can be seen in Soviet Russia, where dissidents risked prison camp or a mental hospital or in the pre-Civil Rights South where "uppity" Blacks or nonconforming Anglos stood to lose their livelihood if not their lives. In turn, sanctions involve the control and use of power, particularly the power of law and punishment.⁵⁹⁴ "In the last analysis," Dahrendorf argues, "established norms are nothing but ruling norms."⁵⁹⁵

Sometimes, under certain specified conditions, groups within ICAs can become aware of their contradictory interests with the result that they polarize into conflict groups, which then engage in a contest over authority. The

⁵⁹²Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 115.

⁵⁹³Ralf Dahrendorf, Essays in the Theory of Society (Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1968), p. 140.

⁵⁹⁴Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, pp. 115-16.

⁵⁹⁵Dahrendorf, Essays, p. 174.

resolution of this conflict will occur when authority is redistributed within the ICA, thus making conflict the source of change within social systems. This pattern can repeat itself over and over again. This is why conflict theorists typify social reality in terms of an unending cycle of conflict over authority within the various types of ICAs which comprise the social world. Sometimes, incidentally, conflicts within diverse ICAs in a society can overlap, leading to major conflicts cutting across large segments of the society.⁵⁹⁶

Dahrendorf's view of the relationship of the state to conflict aids in understanding the intransigence of urban power structures. The crucial lines of conflict in the state are between those who give and those who receive orders. The state is the most powerful structure in society,⁵⁹⁷ and the ruling class is, in a sense, the elite group that holds the top positions in the state hierarchy.

The ruling class, though, is not composed solely of this group. The bureaucracy, too, belongs to the ruling class

⁵⁹⁶Turner, Sociological Theory, p. 205.

⁵⁹⁷Glen Stassen, Professor of Ethics at Southern Baptist Seminary, disagrees with Dahrendorf on this point. He argues that the Federal government is growing ever weaker as corporations and the wealthy grow ever stronger and that Dahrendorf is overlooking the power of the economic elite to manipulate the government, media, educational system, and churches. (Comment written on earlier version of this manuscript).

even though it does not determine the concerns and objectives of the state. For Dahrendorf, the larger the authority-bearing class, the larger the group that will react against any threat to it from an organized conflict group of subordinates. Wallace and Wolf point out that the implication of Dahrendorf's argument is the view that the state and bureaucracy are together a separate institution, not simply a reflection of other social groupings, and that other powerful social groups will inevitably oppose the state's authority and try to restrict its control over them.⁵⁹⁸

Conclusion

Conflict theory is a rich resource in an attempt to understand the intransigence of urban power structures. Conflict, as has been seen, is an inevitable and pervasive feature of social systems and manifests itself in the opposition of interests most notably over the distribution of power and wealth. Ruling elites (those which possess great power and wealth) hold on to their positions through a plethora of means some of which include: coercion, cunning (moral and intellectual persuasion), the control of resources, cohesive organization, mutual cooperation,

⁵⁹⁸Wallace and Wolf, Sociological Theory, p. 121.

legitimation obtained through the ideas of the age, control of the flow of information, control of the training and recruitment process of future leaders, a large bureaucracy, and the apathy and disorganization of the masses. These factors together mean that activists have most of the cards stacked against them when they attempt to change an unjust structure. In spite of these hindrances, activists can still successfully engage and transform urban power structures, which will be seen in the model that is developed in chapter 7.

Chapter 5

CONFRONTING EVIL WITHIN POWER STRUCTURES:
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS IN ACTION

An organization's goals for change can vary dramatically. They may be limited to confronting a slum landlord or getting a local candidate elected to office. Conversely, they may extend to restructuring the health-care system, mobilizing opposition to nuclear weapons, or addressing the need for fundamental change in the existing socioeconomic system. In either case, organizers for change must realize that neither moral superiority nor purely intellectual analysis will ever, in and of themselves, bring about change. Until there is a successful union of intellectual analysis with what Joan Lancourt calls "hard-nosed, pragmatic 'street savvy,'" ⁵⁹⁹ existing systems will remain untouched. Since those in power will rarely voluntarily relinquish that power, the fundamental question that seekers of change must address is, "How can sufficient support for a change effort be mobilized so that change may be implemented and

⁵⁹⁹Joan E. Lancourt, Confront or Concede: The Alinsky Citizen-Action Organizations (Lexington, MA: Lexington, 1979), p. 1.

maintained?"⁶⁰⁰ This chapter and the one to follow will seek to unite the previous systematic intellectual inquiry with examples of pragmatic social action. Specifically, this chapter will be devoted to an examination of three community organizations which offer excellent illustrations of what is involved in struggles against urban power structures. An examination of these organizations, their strategies, their experiences, and the lessons that can be learned from them will aid in developing a model for confronting evil within urban power structures.

The Alinsky Model: FIGHT--The Organizing
of Rochester's Black Community

The first example of community organizing is drawn from Saul Alinsky's organizing of Rochester, New York's, African-American community against poverty and racism under the name "FIGHT"--an acronym for the words Freedom, Integration, God, Honour, Today.⁶⁰¹ I chose to include one of Alinsky's community organizing efforts because of his unparalleled stature in the field of community organizing. Jacques Maritain, the French philosopher, has called

⁶⁰⁰Ibid.

⁶⁰¹Ibid., p. 14. In 1967 "Integration" was changed to "Independence."

Alinsky "one of the few really great men of this century."⁶⁰²

Charles E. Silberman, in Crisis in Black and White, wrote of him: "No one in the United States has proposed a course of action or a philosophy better calculated to rescue Negro or white slum dwellers from their poverty or their degradation."⁶⁰³ And Joan E. Lancourt described him as "one of the foremost practitioners of the pragmatic social action mode"⁶⁰⁴ A great deal of the community organizing that goes on today owes a tremendous debt to the methods Alinsky developed. Through a study of Alinsky's techniques, the community organizer can come to an understanding of the origins of many of the present-day techniques.

FIGHT illustrates the classic Alinsky technique as it had developed by the mid-1960's. The case is issue-specific and gives attention to the way in which Alinsky and other organizers from his Industrial Areas Foundation prepared a community to engage in social action. FIGHT documents a conscious, well-conceived strategy for building a grass-roots people's organization. Through a study of this case, one can see Alinsky's techniques of selecting a

⁶⁰²"Alinsky, Saul (David)," Current Biography, ed. Charles Moritz, 29th ed. (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1968), p. 15.

⁶⁰³Ibid.

⁶⁰⁴Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 1.

cadre of qualified local people for leadership, of dealing with symbolic local issues in a creative and innovative manner, and of using humour to throw the foolishness of a power structure's intransigence back into its own face. In addition, this case documents Alinsky's firm convictions that organizers must win specific victories of symbolic importance and must be prepared to exploit situations so as to help the organization be perceived, as well as to perceive itself, as powerful. Alinsky was convinced that this perception alone may result in actual power distribution.⁶⁰⁵

Alinsky's work in Rochester received much praise. Even the Eastman Kodak Corporation acknowledged "that FIGHT, as a broad-based community organization, speaks in behalf of . . . the Negro poor in the Rochester area."⁶⁰⁶ FIGHT enabled the Black ghetto in Rochester, among other things, to establish a meaningful dialogue regarding housing and education with the city administration.⁶⁰⁷

Background to the Action

The African-American population of Rochester, New

⁶⁰⁵Joan Ecklein, ed., Community Organizers, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984), p. 13.

⁶⁰⁶Current Biography, p. 17.

⁶⁰⁷Ibid.

York, in the mid 1960's numbered 35,000 and was concentrated primarily in two areas: Ward 7, a solidly low-income area, and Ward 3, which consisted of more middle-class persons. Although Rochester's unemployment level in 1966 was only 1.8 percent, well below the national average, Black unemployment was 16 percent. In July of 1964, Rochester's peaceful exterior was shattered by a major riot in her ghetto areas.⁶⁰⁸ When order was restored, the Rochester Minister's Conference extended an invitation to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) to help develop solutions to the problems of the ghetto areas. When this failed to generate any interest within the Black communities, discussions were initiated to investigate the possibility of inviting Alinsky to organize the seventh and third wards. Negotiations with Alinsky were begun in late 1964.⁶⁰⁹ The possibility of an invitation being issued to Alinsky polarized the community.⁶¹⁰ The Gannett press, the Catholic Bishop, top business leaders, and many major

⁶⁰⁸Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 14. It has been suggested by some that the riots were a revolt against the Rochester police following a history of incidents of police brutality. Others, pointing to a rally held by Malcolm X in Rochester which 800 Blacks attended, argued that the riots were, in fact, the beginning of a Black rebellion (see Robert Perlman, "Alinsky Starts a Fight," in Joan Ecklein, Community Organizers, pp. 43-44).

⁶⁰⁹Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 14.

⁶¹⁰Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 44.

social agencies voiced disapproval at the prospect. In fact, the possibility of Alinsky's arrival led the United Fund and other social agencies to raise 40,000 dollars to invite the Urban League to Rochester.⁶¹¹ On March 15, 1965, Alinsky formally agreed to develop a community organization in Rochester.⁶¹²

The Birth of FIGHT

In agreeing to come to Rochester, Alinsky stressed the fact that there must be no rioting in the summer of 1965. If riots occurred, he said, it would mean the end of the organization. Further, steps had to be taken to define issues and rally community support before a public announcement could be made. At a second meeting, Alinsky introduced Ed Chambers as the organizer he was assigning to Rochester. A press and television interview followed this meeting.⁶¹³

⁶¹¹Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 14. On the other side, the Protestant ministers who had begun negotiations with Alinsky expended great energy in defending and explaining Alinsky and neutralizing the growing opposition. In addition, petitions asking Alinsky to come were circulated throughout the Black communities. Individual civic leaders including a member of the board of the Council of Social Agencies, a Jewish businessman, a prominent Republican, and others let it be known, mostly in private conversations, that they supported Alinsky's coming to Rochester (Perlman, "Alinsky," pp. 44-45).

⁶¹²Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 14.

⁶¹³Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 46.

Chambers assumed the organizational responsibility at this point and recommended a structure consisting of an organizing committee, a steering committee, and preparations for a "convention of delegates" of local organizations to be held within six weeks.⁶¹⁴ Fearing another "long, hot summer," Chambers telescoped the preorganizational phase into a lightning-fast three-month push.⁶¹⁵ On April 20, 400 people, half of them Black, met as "the body" of FIGHT and heard representatives of organizations give evidence of their support. Four committees (constitution, policy and issues, convention arrangements, and urban renewal) were set up at this meeting. In addition, the Steering Committee was legitimized by "the body" and authorized to take action against slum landlords. This issue was selected by the Steering Committee and Chambers because it would draw universal support and was symbolically meaningful.⁶¹⁶

At this point, Chambers made a decision to concentrate his organizational efforts in Ward 3 because the residents of this ward were more stable and "church-oriented." He felt that this was important to his main concern at the time, which was simply getting the

⁶¹⁴Ibid., p. 47.

⁶¹⁵Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 14.

⁶¹⁶Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 46.

organization started.⁶¹⁷ Chambers then hired a number of organizers, all Black, from Ward 3. Shortly thereafter, FIGHT staged a picketing demonstration against a particular slum landlord.⁶¹⁸

Throughout this period, the Steering Committee was meeting every week or two. In the middle of May, a public meeting took place during which new organizations affiliated with FIGHT. The convention, which had been prepared for in just six weeks, was held on June 11 and attended by some 700 delegates. At least 130 organizations were represented and hundreds of white people attended as observers.⁶¹⁹ FIGHT was born!

Action and Outcome

The main issues which occupied FIGHT during its first year were the Third Ward urban renewal and the struggle for influence on the local antipoverty board. After several months of continuous organizational pressure,

⁶¹⁷Alinsky and Alinsky organizers have been criticized for this approach and for their frequent reliance on previously organized Black middle-class groups. In his defense, Chambers did not give up his determination to maintain, and in the long run increase, the participation of the more antichurch and militant group from the seventh ward. (Ibid.)

⁶¹⁸Ibid.

⁶¹⁹Ibid.

the Board gave FIGHT three seats. FIGHT then applied to the Board for a civil service training grant which it received in 1966. Testimony at the urban renewal hearings resulted in an increase in the percentage of low-income housing units as well as the inclusion of an explicit relocation plan.⁶²⁰ During its first year, FIGHT was also involved in a small, successful recruitment and training program with the Xerox Corporation.⁶²¹

One of FIGHT's biggest battles took place against the Kodak corporation, following FIGHT's June 1966 convention, during which the delegates resolved that "Eastman Kodak be singled out for special investigation this year."⁶²² Why was Kodak, in particular, made the focus of FIGHT's efforts? In many ways, Kodak had behaved like a model corporate citizen. It had publicly cooperated with President Kennedy's Committee on Equal Opportunity Plan for Progress, had supported the United Negro College Fund, and had generally gone out of its way to comply with both the letter and the spirit of the equal employment provisions of

⁶²⁰Lancourt, Confront or Concede, pp. 14-15. See also Jay Schulman, IAF in Rochester: Phase Two, A Progress Report (Rochester, NY: Board for Urban Ministry, 1966), pp. 10-12.

⁶²¹Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 15.

⁶²²S. Prakash Sethi, Business Corporations and the Black Man: An Analysis of Social Conflict: The Kodak-FIGHT Controversy (Scranton, PA: Chandler, 1970), p. 113.

the Civil Rights Act. FIGHT's motivation appears to have been twofold. First, Kodak's pivotal position in the Rochester economy, employing as it did 13 percent of the labour force, made it a logical target for any group concerned with the economic condition of the community's residents.⁶²³ Anticipating the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's (EEOC's) affirmative action guidelines, Bernard Gillford, president of FIGHT between 1969 and 1971, commented:

The real question is: What were the results of Kodak's hiring policy on its work force composition? Issuing great policy papers on equal employment opportunities without supplying back-up muscle . . . is like feeding a hungry man the sizzle rather than the sausage. . . .

We knew that Kodak did not plan on bombing the ghetto, but if it did not provide jobs for people who lived in the ghetto, then maybe it would have been more merciful if it in fact did bomb the ghetto.⁶²⁴

Kodak's economic importance made it an ideal vehicle for Alinsky to use in expanding the boundaries of a corporation's responsibility for the welfare of the community of which it was a part. Ed Chambers, Alinsky's

⁶²³David Vogel, Lobbying the Corporation: Citizen Challenges to Business Authority (New York: Basic, 1978), p. 31.

⁶²⁴"FIGHT and Eastman Kodak," a case prepared by Francis Sheridan under the direction of Professor Howard F. Bennett, incorporating new material prepared by Linda Waters under the direction of Professor George C. Lodge (Boston: Inter-Collegiate Case Clearinghouse, no. 9-373-207, 1973), p. 12.

chief organizer, said that one of Alinsky's major objectives was "to force corporate America to live up to its previous statements about corporate social responsibilities."⁶²⁵ Alinsky told Business Week: American industry had better recognize--and some do-- that they have a special obligation. . . . [T]he Kodak situation dramatically reveals that today's ghettobound, militant urban Negro may generate even more problems for business than the civil rights struggle in the South created.⁶²⁶

The idea was to create a domino effect: ". . . . [W]e knew that if we could get Kodak in line every other business would follow."⁶²⁷

Second, Kodak was a major political force in Rochester; Alinsky regarded Kodak as the most powerful institution in the city, controlling the banks, the local university, hospitals, and charitable organizations.⁶²⁸ "Had its management agreed to work with FIGHT," Alinsky commented, "it would have been a substantial step toward bringing Negroes into the mainstream of Rochester."⁶²⁹ Drawing on the analogy of the racial struggles in the South, Alinsky compared Rochester to a southern plantation,

⁶²⁵Vogel, Lobbying, p. 32.

⁶²⁶Sethi, Business Corporations, p. 118.

⁶²⁷Ibid., p. 21.

⁶²⁸Vogel, Lobbying, p. 32.

⁶²⁹Sethi, Business Corporations, p. 22.

arguing that what was needed was not paternalism, but democratic participation.⁶³⁰ FIGHT's first president, the Reverend Franklin Florence, put it simply and succinctly: "Taking on Kodak was something else. That just wasn't done in Rochester."⁶³¹

An investigation of Kodak's minority employment record resulted in a request for Kodak to increase its training and hiring programs. A series of meetings between FIGHT and Kodak began on September 2, 1966, during which Kodak was asked to train and employ 600 African-Americans over an eighteen-month period. After several meetings and a breakdown in talks, Kodak finally agreed on December 20 to train 600 people in a twenty-four month period. On December 21, the Executive Board of the Kodak corporation changed its mind and repudiated the agreement.⁶³² In explaining its shift, Kodak said:

We [cannot] enter into an arrangement exclusively with any organization to recruit candidates for employment and still be fair to the thousands of people who apply on their own initiative or are referred by others. We [cannot] agree to a program which would commit Kodak to hire and train a specific and substantial number of people which would extend so far into the future.⁶³³

⁶³⁰Vogel, Lobbying, p. 32.

⁶³¹Sethi, Business Corporations, p. 22.

⁶³²Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 15.

⁶³³Sheridan, FIGHT and Eastman Kodak, p. 6.

At a December 23 meeting, FIGHT suggested that the agreement be reworded to incorporate these limitations.⁶³⁴

Kodak, manifesting blatant insincerity, refused, promising to continue the discussions at another meeting on December 27 but then canceling that meeting. Other meetings were held, but Kodak refused to budge.⁶³⁵

The conflict generated considerable ill will on both sides. Business Week commented:

No business would find it easy to keep pace with Alinsky's fast moving, bare-knuckles style of civil rights campaign. . . . Kodak's dealings with FIGHT, in fact, starkly dramatize the clash of modern, radical Negro tactics with well-meaning but traditionalist business attitudes.⁶³⁶

The relative importance of Kodak and FIGHT to their respective communities considerably increased the level of tension. Kodak was concerned, not simply with the challenge to its autonomy, but with the effect an agreement would have on the power of FIGHT within the Black community.⁶³⁷ They did not want to give FIGHT "patronage power in the ghetto areas-- . . . power which would render Kodak more vulnerable to future demands . . . and undermine

⁶³⁴Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 15.

⁶³⁵Ibid.

⁶³⁶Sheridan, Fight and Eastman Kodak, p. 118.

⁶³⁷Vogel, Lobbying, p. 33.

more moderate influences."⁶³⁸ Indeed, Kodak's President, Eilers, charged that "unemployment is only an issue or device being used to screen what FIGHT is really doing--making a drive for power in the community."⁶³⁹ On its part, FIGHT wanted official recognition for precisely these reasons; it would help FIGHT in its efforts to mobilize the Black community.⁶⁴⁰

After extended negotiations, an agreement was signed between FIGHT's president, Reverend Florence, and John Mulder, the assistant general manager of Kodak Park Works and a company assistant vice-president. The corporation agreed to recruit 600 unemployed people over the next two years and FIGHT agreed, at its own expense, to provide counseling for employees selected by Kodak. FIGHT considered the agreement a major victory. Apparently, so did Kodak's senior management, who, the next day, repudiated the agreement, apologizing for any misunderstanding.⁶⁴¹

The struggle began to escalate, shifting, in the process, from the local to the national level and from a

⁶³⁸Sethi, Business Corporations, p. 79.

⁶³⁹James Ridgeway, "Attack on Kodak," New Republic, 156 (January 21, 1967), p. 12.

⁶⁴⁰Vogel, Lobbying, p. 33.

⁶⁴¹Ibid.

debate on the nature of Kodak's social responsibility to a discussion of its integrity.⁶⁴² Florence noted:

When they tore up that agreement they tore up the hopes of the poor people of Rochester. The issue is, have they signed an agreement with us--are they honorable men? Do their signatures mean one thing to white men, another to black?⁶⁴³

One public relations counselor observed:
[It] fell like a bombshell into the pro-civil rights milieu of contemporary America. A company dependent on good will went against the current social mores and folkways. It was a colossal public relations blunder that will go down in history.⁶⁴⁴

FIGHT appealed to and elicited support from the National Council of Churches, the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty, and other national civil rights groups. Stokely Carmichael, on a visit to Rochester, promised a national boycott of Kodak products,⁶⁴⁵ and FIGHT made plans for a mass protest at Kodak's annual stockholders' meeting in Flemington, New Jersey, in April 1967. Numerous church organizations and private investors agreed to turn over

⁶⁴²Ibid.

⁶⁴³Sethi, Business Corporations, p. 33.

⁶⁴⁴Ibid., p. 120.

⁶⁴⁵Robert Perlman describes this boycott as a "dismal flop" that proved that FIGHT could not rely on help outside Rochester. He comments that there is a "certain aloneness" in a local organization which is not part of an organized national movement, a criticism which has often been leveled at Alinsky's organizations (Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 54).

their stock proxies to FIGHT for this meeting. In an effort to head off this confrontation, a group of ministers and businessmen tried to develop a compromise job program called Rochester Jobs, Inc. (RJI) to train and hire 1,500 people in an eighteen-month period. Although FIGHT joined the program, it stated that this in no way affected its struggle with Kodak.⁶⁴⁶

The struggle between FIGHT and Kodak continued to escalate, with Kodak continuing to claim that its negotiating team had no authority to sign any agreement. For FIGHT, the issue became one of dignity as well as of jobs. The protest in Flemington drew nationwide publicity and pressure mounted on both sides for a settlement. Finally, on June 23, 1967, Kodak President Eilers sent a telegram to FIGHT President Florence expressing Kodak's willingness to cooperate with FIGHT in recruitment and training for employment. Although future negotiations did not produce any specific new Kodak programs,⁶⁴⁷ RJI continued

⁶⁴⁶Lancourt, Confront or Concede, p. 15.

⁶⁴⁷Both sides claimed victory. Kodak recognized that FIGHT "speaks in behalf of the basic needs and aspirations of the Black poor in the Rochester area" (Sheridan, "FIGHT and Eastman Kodak," p. 11) and agreed to send interviewers into the city's poorest areas, accompanied by representatives of FIGHT. Conversely, Kodak's management prerogatives were left intact: it did not commit itself to any specific hiring quota. FIGHT's efforts did result in securing between 200 and 600 jobs with Kodak for Rochester's Black unemployed (Vogel, Lobbying, p. 35).

to be immensely successful, and Kodak was instrumental in the creation in January 1968 of the Rochester Business Opportunities Corporation (RBOC). RBOC acted to encourage independent small businesses in the inner city. The largest RBOC project was a cooperative venture with FIGHT, Xerox, and the Department of Labour for FIGHTON, a Black owned and operated manufacturing company.⁶⁴⁸ When asked to reflect on his corporation's behaviour during the extended and widely-publicized dispute, Eilers remarked, "I think we used too much patience."⁶⁴⁹

FIGHT did not rest on its laurels, but in subsequent years became involved in numerous community issues including housing, education, the criminal justice system, and in 1973 and again in 1975 political campaigns, resulting in the election of a Black county legislator and a Black city councilman.⁶⁵⁰

General Analysis and Evaluation

Perlman compares Alinsky's community organization

⁶⁴⁸Lancourt, Confront or Concede, pp. 15-16. See also Sethi, Business Corporations, pp. 35-46.

⁶⁴⁹Sheridan, "FIGHT and Eastman Kodak," p. 13.

⁶⁵⁰Lancourt, Confront or Concede, pp. 16-17. See also FIGHT, "10th Anniversary Commemorative Brochure, 1964-1974" (n.p., 1974), p. 11.

efforts with the process of organizing a local labour union. As the union moves into a plant or a community that is unorganized, the organizers make contact with particular individuals who have indicated an interest in organizing. The union then determines whether there are sufficiently good prospects for expanding this nucleus to warrant an investment of a union's time and resources in an organizing drive. During this initial process, the union explains that the goal is to set up a permanent organization. The union also makes it clear that the basic responsibility for organizing rests with the workers and particularly with the nucleus of emerging leaders. The union offers its experience and technical assistance to the organizing drive.⁶⁵¹

This analogy can only be taken so far. It breaks down in one important respect. Ultimately, the union must convince a majority of the workers to become card-carrying members of the union. In the Alinsky style of operation, this is usually neither feasible nor necessary. In fact, Alinsky considered it a success if he was able to build a community organization with 5 percent of the target population.⁶⁵² These considerations lead directly into a series of four propositions which Perlman develops as a

⁶⁵¹Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 47.

⁶⁵²Ibid.

summary of the guiding principles which give shape to Alinsky-style community organizing.⁶⁵³

Step one: A nucleus of support and financial resources outside the disadvantaged community must be available in order to initiate an organizing process. The invitation Alinsky received to come into a community was often initiated by members or leaders of low-income neighbourhoods or through community action groups. The former rarely, if ever, possessed the financial resources necessary to carry out the task and the latter were often acting on their own initiative rather than through the direction of the community itself. Both prerequisites were necessary for Alinsky to consider organizing a community. In Rochester, Alinsky made it clear to the white Protestant leadership that he must have an invitation "from the people" as well as financial support from the churches. Further, the money had to be made available in advance in order to protect the organizers' income when things got rough and pressure was applied to call off the organizing. Finally, once the sponsors advanced the money, they had no voice in determining actions taken; the community itself would make its own decisions.⁶⁵⁴

⁶⁵³Ibid., pp. 47-53.

⁶⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 47-48.

Step two: Alinsky set certain tests as conditions for his coming, which led the local leadership to begin the process of organization before Alinsky committed himself to enter the situation. Alinsky met with the group in Rochester intermittently for months before committing himself to come to Rochester. As time went by, more and more people were asking him to come. At one meeting, Alinsky's first question was, "What is the mood of the churches--is it militant?" The honest response was that the churches were not leading and that some of them feared reprisals. At the end of the meeting, Alinsky told them he would come when they had organized themselves. In March, the Black leadership finally committed themselves to bringing in Alinsky. They asked how they could prepare for this and how they could mobilize support to convince Alinsky that there was a strong base to warrant his coming. Following this, Alinsky committed himself to coming.⁶⁵⁵

Step three: Alinsky helped the local leadership meet his set of conditions. Perlman points out that Alinsky employed a number of devices to educate his leadership. He talked about past successes in order to convince the local leaders that change was possible; he

⁶⁵⁵Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 48.

sought to increase the militancy of the group by polarizing the situation, by identifying the enemy, and by analyzing the situation in terms of "good guys" and "bad guys"; he helped the leadership to anticipate some of the problems they would encounter such as the role of informers and sell-outs; he provided leadership in setting goals and helped them to anticipate the kind of tactics they would need to employ; and he constantly reiterated to them the mutual rights, responsibilities, and expectations of his role as the professional organizer and their role as the local leadership.⁶⁵⁶ Ecklein concludes:

Alinsky helped the local leadership to meet the conditions he had set and thereby accelerated the process of organization. Simultaneously he offered them technical assistance, such as instruction in how to set up a press conference, and confronted them with the choice of whether in fact they wanted to play the role that he defined for them.⁶⁵⁷

Step four: As soon as Alinsky committed himself to organizing, his overriding objective involved the development of a militant and disciplined core of people. Issues and programs were converted into tactics to achieve that objective. One illustration of this is found in the suggestion that Alinsky often made that a group use a

⁶⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁶⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 51.

"program ballot" in which people were asked to state their goals at the beginning of an organizing campaign. In reality, this was essentially a tactical device which Alinsky used to build and protect the developing organization. His rationale for this device was that it made people in the community aware of the organization's existence, it gave many of them a sense of participation, it helped in identifying potential recruits for the organization, and it was a defense against charges of lack of democracy in the organization. Put simply, Alinsky used the program ballot not to formulate goals but to build the organization.⁶⁵⁸

When Alinsky moved into action in Rochester, one of his first statements to the group was, "Don't be specific on issues." Perlman interprets this statement as a recommendation to keep the stance of the organization flexible in order to seize opportunities as they presented themselves. He also points out that Alinsky stressed the use of humor, ridicule, and surprise to throw "the enemy" off balance while unifying "your side."⁶⁵⁹

Alinsky, thus, was concerned with developing "people's organizations" which would seek to change the attitudes and behaviour, with respect to power, of its

⁶⁵⁸Ibid., pp. 51-52.

⁶⁵⁹Perlman, "Alinsky," p. 52.

members. The essence of the Alinsky process was to exploit action situations so that the "people's organization" would perceive itself as more powerful. Forming a disciplined organization, Alinsky led it to test its power, inevitably finding itself increasingly effective in asserting its interests against those in authority who hitherto had disregarded the group because they had perceived it as powerless. The growth and development of the people within the organization was always his overarching goal. Particular policy objectives were always simply a means to this end. As Perlman puts it:

The salient point here is that the Alinsky-style operation is designed to redistribute power in the decision-making arena and to place more of it in the hands of the previously powerless. It is quite different from efforts that are directed toward some specific policy change, such as improving the quality of education for disadvantaged children or enhancing the job skills of school dropouts. Concrete program objectives are the means for Alinsky, not the ends.⁶⁶⁰

The Organization and the
Powers

Walter Wink would agree with the goal of the Alinsky-style operation, for Alinsky sought to redistribute power in the decision-making arena and to place more of it in the hands of the powerless. Alinsky could have set a much simpler task for his organization, such as improving

⁶⁶⁰Ibid., p. 53.

the quality of education for disadvantaged children or enhancing the job skills of those without a high school education. Had he chosen this route of specific policy changes, he might have received the full backing of the Kodak company. After all, Kodak supported the United Negro College Fund, publicly cooperated with President Kennedy's Committee on Equal Opportunity Plan for Progress, and enjoyed a reputation for complying with both the letter and the spirit of the equal employment provisions of the Civil Rights Act. Supporting these types of organizations gave Kodak a good reputation in the community, while not threatening the basic community power structure.

The reason Alinsky encountered so much resistance from Kodak was precisely because he was not content with these types of cosmetic changes. He understood that rather than being dependent on the power structure for charity, the only way for lasting change to occur in the lives of the poor in Rochester was for them to become empowered and take control over their own lives. Measures which would have accomplished this--action situations, to use Alinsky's terms--were recognized as the threat they were and were vigorously opposed. As Wink showed, the Domination System can be very menacing when it is threatened.

The upper management at Kodak knew exactly what was going on. They knew that Alinsky was concerned with changing the attitudes and behaviours, with respect to

power, of the poor. In addition, Alinsky was not seeking simple acts of charity from the benevolent power structure.

FIGHT wanted real power, and Kodak's president, Eilers, betrayed this fear when he accused FIGHT of "making a drive for power in the community."⁶⁶¹ There was some truth to this, for the empowerment of Ward 3 depended on the empowerment of FIGHT. Kodak was under no misconception--power redistribution was Alinsky's goal.

In its resistance, Kodak provided a vivid depiction of the intransigence of urban power structures. Numerous meetings were held between Kodak and FIGHT, with Kodak continually refusing to budge. Kodak struck blows at the credibility of FIGHT, questioning the motives of its leaders publicly. Twice Kodak signed written agreements with FIGHT, only to renege on them later. All this resistance was brought against what were, in reality, fairly fundamental demands. Kodak's intransigence was raised to comical proportions with Eilers remark that he felt that Kodak had erred in showing too much patience. Neither Mills nor Dahrendorf would be surprised at Kodak's actions, for the actions are vivid examples of the intransigence of power structures. Wink, too, would not be surprised, for he wrote that a threat to the Domination System as one point is a threat to the entire System. In

⁶⁶¹Ridgeway, "Attack on Kodak," p. 12.

meeting such a threat, the Domination System will bring every resource at its disposal to its defense.

There's a paradox here that needs to be recognized.

While it is true that Alinsky's goal was true power redistribution, Alinsky realized that this could not be the means. Chapters 2, 3, and 4 show beyond doubt the immense power at the disposal of the Domination System and the power structures which make it up. In order to hold out any hope for victory, FIGHT had to be content with limited battles and limited success. As in the case with Kodak, they had to be content with getting the Powers to "bend," without forcing them to give up their power positions. When one considers the power of the Domination System, even getting them to flinch was a major victory. However, concrete program objectives were always the means for Alinsky, never the ends.

The paradox does not end here. The very concessions that Alinsky was forced to make strengthened the Powers because the concessions served to pacify the oppressed and gave the impression that the power structure was really quite benevolent. Activists will find themselves in the position of Alinsky, working against their ultimate goals by settling for what can be achieved.

Alinsky and Wink both agreed, too, on the necessity of nonviolence. In coming to Rochester, Alinsky stressed that there must be no rioting that summer. If rioting

occurred, he said, it would mean the end of the organization. No indication is given as to the reason for Alinsky's insistence on nonviolence. It is likely that he knew that public opinion (so important to his actions) would be against them if they resorted to violence. In addition, he was probably aware that they were no match, strength-wise, for the Domination System, and he may have had ethical reasons for refusing to resort to violence. What is certain is that Alinsky did not share Wink's desire to redeem the oppressors. Wink argued against violence because it is the only alternative that seeks the redemption of the oppressor, while maintaining the dignity of the oppressed. While Alinsky was concerned with the dignity of the oppressed, he was not the least concerned with the redemption of the oppressor. He sought to polarize the situation by identifying the "enemy" and analyzing the situation in terms of "good guys" and "bad guys." Wink would be very uncomfortable with such a strategy.

Alinsky's organizer, Chambers, showed wisdom in concentrating his organizational efforts in Ward 3, a relatively stable area of Rochester. This was a smart move from both a theological and sociological perspective. Theologically, it has been shown that the poor are victims of a delusional system. The strategy of the Domination System is to cut down opposition by a sense of induced

powerlessness. The delusional system works to keep the poor feeling nonexistent and valueless. Sociologically, the systems of society work together to keep the oppressed in their place, such as in the case of Mexican-American students in the Texas school system in the 1970s. As will be seen in the third case, the degree to which individuals have been oppressed by the Domination System is related to their sense of hopelessness and helplessness. An organizer's ability to mobilize the poorest of the poor is severely limited due to the extent and duration of oppression under which they have had to live. By choosing to organize Ward 3, Chambers worked with a more stable population, one which had not been as oppressed and dehumanized by the System as those in poorer neighbourhoods.

Related to this was Alinsky's strategy of building a grass-roots people's organization. Alinsky never entered an area without an invitation from the people. Further, upon entering an area, one of his first moves was that of selecting a cadre of qualified local people for leadership.

As was seen in the theological analysis, oppressed people often conclude that due to God, fate, or their own inadequacies, they deserve nothing better--that it is somehow their fault that they are oppressed. In order to escape from this internalized oppression, the oppressed must be participants in their own emancipation. They must

be helped to understand that they are not responsible for their own oppression, although they do have the collective ability to achieve liberation. In line with this, education, or what I will call in chapter 7 a process of conscientization, was a major focus of Alinsky's efforts. Alinsky had to undo some of the damage done by the Domination System. He gave hope to people who had long lived without hope by talking about past successes and convincing the local leaders that change was possible; he gave a sense of power to the powerless by polarizing the situation, by identifying the enemy, and by analyzing the situation in terms of "good guys" and "bad guys"; and he gave a sense of participation to the disenfranchised by encouraging people to state their goals at the beginning of an organizing campaign. The growth and development of the people within the organization was always Alinsky's overarching goal.

Before Alinsky committed himself to come to Rochester, he asked, "What is the mood of the churches--is it militant?" The response given was that the churches were not leading and that some of them feared reprisal. The threat of reprisal is real and will be dealt with in the model that is developed. As Wink showed, one must die to the Powers before one can be liberated from them--dying, not by striking back, but by dying out from under their jurisdiction and command.

The Achilles' Heel of corporations is public opinion. Wink pointed out that the Church does not have to make Christ the Lord of the Powers; He already is. The Church has the privilege of calling attention to the fact that the world already belongs to Christ. Corporations spend billions trying to convince themselves and persuade others that they abide by moral values. People already know that they belong to a greater whole. Regardless of their personal and corporate ethics, they want to be treated by others according to human values. People know in their spirits that kindness is right and domination is wrong. This means, among other things, that corporations are vulnerable to public opinion. In eliciting support from the National Council of Churches, the Citizens' Crusade Against Poverty, and other national civil rights groups, FIGHT brought tremendous public opinion to bear upon Kodak. While Alinsky may not have been trying to remind the Powers to whom they belong, as Wink would have had him do, he did recognize a corporation's vulnerability to public opinion.

The Brooklyn Challenge: The Mobilizing
of Brooklyn's Underclass

Since the mid 1960s, community organizers have increasingly directed their attention to problems related

to housing. This concern is practical in that most organizing with low-income groups is neighbourhood-based, and neighbourhood conditions are intimately interrelated with housing. I have chosen the example of mobilizing Brooklyn, New York's, underclass against the management of the public housing in which they resided because of its timeliness. Although it comes out of the 1960's, the situation it describes exists today in many urban areas and the case is quite applicable to current conditions. Some of the federal regulations have changed, but the organizing principles are as timely as ever.⁶⁶² In addition, this case is distinctive in its description of the analytic and conceptual steps the organizers took in formulating their objectives, their strategies, and their tactics.⁶⁶³

Background to the Struggle

Students and faculty at a graduate school of social work, all with some organizing experience, decided to seek to organize a large, sprawling low-income housing project in Brooklyn, New York. They selected this particular housing project because of its national reputation as one of the worst places to live in the United States. Constant thefts and muggings, urine in the hallways, and a recent

⁶⁶²Ecklein, Community Organizers, p. 136.

⁶⁶³Ibid.

rape in an elevator resulted in tenants not answering knocks on their doors after 3:00 p.m. More than half the apartments were occupied by single-parent families. A palpable sense of hopelessness filled the building.⁶⁶⁴ As Grossman insightfully puts it, "The locked doors not only kept people out, but also added to the feelings of those inside that there was no exit."⁶⁶⁵

Initial Action

The community organizers began simply by hanging around benches talking to mothers, asking them what they thought was wrong with the project and what they wanted to change. Following these informal discussions, the organizers arranged a meeting with the housing project manager with whom they discussed their goal of tenant self-management. The manager suggested the names of twelve tenants who he said would be good material for a tenants group. The organizers interviewed seven of them and concluded that "any organization built through these individuals would not be action-oriented."⁶⁶⁶

⁶⁶⁴Lawrence Grossman, "Organizing Tenants in Low-Income Public Housing," in Ecklein, Community Organizers, pp. 139-40.

⁶⁶⁵Ibid., p. 140.

⁶⁶⁶Ibid.

Initial Reflection

At this point, the organizers devoted a couple of days to "stock-taking" and drew some conclusions from their efforts up to that point. They realized that the tenants shared a common exposure to a particular set of social conditions, which had consequences for the life choices and lifestyles of each tenant. Further, every tenant, consciously or unconsciously, had to find some way of adapting to these conditions. Finally, the social milieu of the project created an atmosphere which made it very difficult for the tenants to maintain a sense of self-esteem as individuals or create any sense of community or general well-being among themselves as a collectivity.⁶⁶⁷

With regard to the last point, the organizers felt that numerous sociological factors played into the destruction of self-esteem which they witnessed in the community. Some of these follow.

Managerial monopolization of power. The manager acted, in effect, as a "legal guardian" towards the tenants, entering their apartments at will, interpreting, changing, and enforcing rules governing countless aspects of tenant behaviour, and hitting tenants with "discretionary fines" that he used when he wished. No

⁶⁶⁷Ibid.

legal recourse was open to the tenants.⁶⁶⁸

Managerial monopolization of knowledge. Not only were there myriad rules, but the exact nature of these rules was kept from the tenant. Many of the infractions that brought fines, for instance, were not listed anywhere but were left to the manager's discretion.⁶⁶⁹

Lack of tenant access to decision-making power. The manager was a distant authority with the "shadowy omnipotence of the state legislature and the City Housing Commission"⁶⁷⁰ behind him and his receptionist, housing assistants, assistant manager, and secretary in front.⁶⁷¹

Prison-like uniformity and monotony of housing units. All the apartments were painted in one drab colour.⁶⁷²

Societal perception of tenants. Local newspapers

⁶⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 140-41.

⁶⁶⁹Grossman, "Organizing Tenants," p. 141.

⁶⁷⁰Ibid.

⁶⁷¹Ibid.

⁶⁷²Ibid.

regularly described the project as filled with crime, filth, and corruption. Tenants felt a stigma from the project's reputation which added to the general stigma of being low-income and Black in a culture that respects neither.⁶⁷³

Breakdown of relations with housing police. The management and the housing police were under separate administrative control and did not cooperate. The tenants suffered from this lack of reciprocal responsibility. The manager sometimes charged a fee when a tenant called the police. Tenants thought the police were doing the charging and this, combined with the slow and erratic quality of police response, caused tenants to be afraid to use this legally-protected means of protection.⁶⁷⁴

Tenant informing as a control measure. The manager encouraged tenant informing as a means of control, which further separated and degraded tenants.⁶⁷⁵

Faced with these dehumanizing policies, the tenants developed a number of coping mechanisms in response to power and status deprivation. A large number of the

⁶⁷³Ibid.

⁶⁷⁴Ibid., pp. 141-42.

⁶⁷⁵Ibid., p. 142.

tenants became apathetic, accepting the situation as it was. As Grossman puts it, "They came to incorporate second-class citizenry, pessimism, and fear into their overall self-image."⁶⁷⁶

Other tenants (a much smaller group) nurtured hostility and anger towards the management. Because it is very difficult to continue angry where there are no outlets for it, most of these tenants carried their hostility as a secondary stream beneath one of the other adaptations.⁶⁷⁷

Other tenants did what they had to do to keep out of trouble, but manipulated or cheated the system whenever they could to gain a sense of control. They shut themselves off emotionally from their dehumanizing existence and as a result came to deny the emotional significance of most of their activities.⁶⁷⁸

A final group of tenants coped by identifying with authority and seeking to distance themselves from other tenants, often through informing on them. These tenants eagerly sought contact with authority as an entry-point to an upper-class world. Needless to say, the development of community among tenants in groups one, three, or four would be very difficult.⁶⁷⁹

⁶⁷⁶Ibid.

⁶⁷⁷Ibid.

⁶⁷⁸Grossman, "Organizing Tenants," p. 142.

⁶⁷⁹Ibid., pp. 142-43.

Follow-Up Action

One of the organizers got a group of eleven tenants together at the start.⁶⁸⁰ They were told that they had come up with so many good ideas that the organizer wanted to bring them together so as to figure out which things might come first. During the course of the meeting, the organizer made appointments to see each participant in her own apartment, asking each of them to invite other residents from their own and adjacent floors. The main purpose of these meetings was to gain publicity for a large open meeting to be held a short time later. This strategy was very successful; the first open meeting had over 300 in attendance. Five new active recruits for the core were also discovered, two of whom were males.⁶⁸¹

The manager had been approached prior to their attempting any organizing in order to develop communication channels, assuage any fears he might have, and establish

⁶⁸⁰All of these tenants were women. Of the eleven, two were "identifiers" from the manager's original list. The other nine were from among those whom the organizers had met on the benches around the project. Of these, six were "apathetics," one was "angry," and the other two did not fit neatly into their schema. The organizers felt that this combination of tenant types would be most likely to result in an action-oriented group. Just one organizer was present. They wanted it to be clear that this was to be a tenants' organization (ibid., p. 144).

⁶⁸¹Grossman, "Organizing Tenants," pp. 144-45.

the organization's clear independence. In addition, prior to the first open meeting, he was presented with a list of three issues that concerned the core committee, one of which involved a request for a bicycle path. He was asked to prepare answers on these requests. When the manager arrived at the open session, he was rather intimidated to see 300 people crammed into a room built to hold 200. The intimidation factor at first led him to begin negotiations, but he shortly began to go back on some of the agreements that had been determined with the organizers during their earlier discussion. He had clearly had time to regain some of his composure and determine that his best strategy would be to do some intimidating himself. He had some small success in taking some of the steam away from the tenants, but the lasting impact of the meeting in the minds of most of the tenants was the picture of a white man in a suit, sweating to keep up with them at the front of a room where their members overwhelmed him.⁶⁸²

The manager and the organizers retained a successful, if somewhat guarded, relationship with each other throughout the entire organizing period. Once a strong tenants association had been firmly established, the manager needed the organizers more than they needed him, and they found it quite easy to maintain complete

⁶⁸²Ibid., pp. 145-46.

independence, while still receiving information from him as well as a number of concessions. Both sides seemed to be interested in preserving communication lines.⁶⁸³

The issues that the tenants association chose to pursue were picked with great care. Generally, there were three types of program issues confronted by the association. These aimed at (1) ameliorative changes, (2) significant structural changes, and (3) symbolic changes. Because early victories are so important to the development of confidence and cohesion, it was necessary to aim for small, likely successes at the start. Some of these early successes included the manager's agreeing to weekly negotiation meetings with a committee of four tenants, waiving the rule about bike riding, promising a bike path for the future, and publishing the rules and regulations governing tenant-manager relations. The major initial victory of the tenants association was winning a traffic light without which a park and middle-class neighbourhood across the street were inaccessible.⁶⁸⁴

Fortunately, there were no early program failures. There were, however, a number of internal struggles involving program issues. These struggles were usually between the "identifier" types and other tenants. In most

⁶⁸³Ibid., p. 146.

⁶⁸⁴Grossman, "Organizing Tenants," p. 146.

cases, the organizers openly threw their weight behind the non-identified tenants as they believed that the identifiers were no longer necessary to the successful functioning of the association. They could either adapt to the new philosophy or get out.⁶⁸⁵

General Analysis and Evaluation

The goals the organizers had for the tenants association included giving it an action orientation, building tenant skills and confidence, assuring a respect for democracy, and preparing effective and democratically-oriented leaders in anticipation of their withdrawal. These objectives were difficult to accomplish, given the different "types" present in the organization. The "apathetics" were often difficult to motivate and the "authority-oriented" ones were a problem in terms of democratic participation. If the organizers moved quickly on issues in order to keep the "apathetics" interested, the "authority-oriented" ones could manipulate the fast movement into a strengthening of their nondemocratic style. The "authority-oriented" ones also used slower processes to encourage formalism. For these reasons, the organizers decided to maintain full control of the association for the

⁶⁸⁵Ibid., p. 147.

first seven months of its existence. They discouraged any elections during that period for fear they would result in control by the "identifiers." Every means was used during these months to build up some of the non-authority-oriented types, including putting them on the committee that met with the manager and mentioning their names whenever possible.⁶⁸⁶

Through various means the organizers maintained an action focus rather than a formal organizational focus. Large open meetings were called, for example, only when there was something large to be done. Certain larger policy decisions were worked through by as many members as was feasible prior to the open meetings.⁶⁸⁷

To counterbalance their generally aggressive role, the organizers made a point of never going with the tenants when they met with the manager. They discussed what happened at the meetings with the tenants when the tenants requested it, but after the first two visits, they never prompted such discussions themselves.⁶⁸⁸

The organizers freely admit that they manipulated the tenants in the election of their first president. They were deathly afraid that if an "identifier" type were

⁶⁸⁶Ibid., p. 148.

⁶⁸⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸⁸Grossman, "Organizing Tenants," p. 149.

elected, this person would destroy the organization's effectiveness if not its life. The manipulation worked and the organization elected as its first president "a bright young nonidentifier, non-'any type'"⁶⁸⁹ woman who had proven herself as spokesperson for the group that met with the manager. The organizers faced the dilemma of organizational effectiveness versus self-determination and resolved it by choosing effectiveness in such a way as to engender greater self-determination over the long run. The woman who was elected was the one candidate who would not allow any outsider (including the organizers) to push her around successfully.⁶⁹⁰

By the end of the first year of organizing, a fairly powerful tenant organization existed with 387 family memberships, four active committees, and a dependable core of twenty to twenty-three hard workers. It is true that the organizers had "manipulated" the tenants. Yet, at times the tenants had allowed themselves to be "manipulated" because they wanted to grow into a successful organization.

It can also be said that the tenants were testing the skills of the organizers and were thus, in a sense, using them.

In the final analysis, this case teaches the importance of

⁶⁸⁹Ibid.

⁶⁹⁰Ibid.

the organizers knowing what, how, and why particular actions are undertaken. In other words, it is important for organizers to rationalize their actions before, rather than after, the fact. If this is done, the good organizer will have a much better chance of giving birth to a vibrant, independent organization.⁶⁹¹

The Organization and the Powers

The second case study repeats many of the emphases that were highlighted in the previous one. Perhaps the most vivid observation that one can make is the degree to which the System worked to create in the tenants a sense of helplessness and hopelessness. Wink speaks of the Domination System as appearing to be omnipotent and omniscient to those held under its sway and of purposefully working to keep the poor feeling nonexistent, valueless, and humiliated. This case provides a textbook example of Wink's point. The sociological characteristics of the housing project, from managerial monopolization of power and knowledge to the lack of tenant access to decision-making power and the prison-like uniformity and monotony of housing units all worked together to keep the poor in their place. And just as the Bolivian Indian woman Wink talked

⁶⁹¹Ibid., p. 150.

of in chapter 2 came to believe that she had been born to starve, Lawrence Grossman says of the tenants, "They came to incorporate second-class citizenry, pessimism, and fear into their overall self-image."⁶⁹²

The organizers here, as in the previous case, sought to build a grassroots organization, making the tenants themselves the agents of their own emancipation. Here, too, the intransigence of the power structures is vividly depicted. As Wink pointed out, any challenge to the authority of the power structure is considered a serious threat to the whole System because the Domination System is built on a delusion. This explains why such seemingly harmless requests as a bicycle path and a traffic light were met with such resistance. The power structures know that if the oppressed begin to recognize that they possess power, the whole foundation of the Domination System will collapse.

The same dilemma is encountered here as was seen in the previous one. HUD is too powerful a structure to defeat in a head-on assault. In order to hold out any hope for victory, the tenants had to be content with getting HUD to bend, without giving up their power position. As has been seen, such a strategy is inherently dangerous, for it carries with it the risk of making the power structure look

⁶⁹²Grossman, "Organizing Tenants," p. 142.

benevolent and supportive, thus working against the real goal of community organizing--power redistribution.

The community organizers did not demonize the "opposition" to the extent to which Alinsky did, but neither did they seek to engage them, which Wink sees as one of the goals of organizing. The manager and organizers maintained a successful, yet guarded, relationship, but no attempt was made to remind the manager or HUD to whom they belong.

When Community Organizing Fails:
The Story of the South Bronx

The final example of community organizing, taken from the South Bronx, is of particular interest because it provides an excellent illustration of an attempt at community organizing which failed despite the existence of "a viable organization with black, white, and Hispanic leadership as well as participation."⁶⁹³ This case, as will be seen, presents an issue which is very controversial among community organizers.

Background to the Action

This attempt at community organizing took place in

⁶⁹³Ecklein, Community Organizers, p. 68.

Morrisania, the poorest part of the South Bronx. The organizers were by no means novices in the field.⁶⁹⁴ In addition, they had friends in the area who were working with Legal Services. These friends saw in Morrisania a real opportunity to do neighbourhood revitalization work and encouraged Steve Burghardt, the author of this case, and his colleagues, to get involved in the community. The organizers who committed themselves to Morrisania shared a commitment to the working-class and minority populations of the area.⁶⁹⁵

These seasoned organizers entered the community with no illusions. They knew that this project was going to be "incredibly difficult."⁶⁹⁶ Morrisania had more burned-out buildings in it than good ones. The residents of the community had been chronically unemployed most of their lives. The ones who did work usually found themselves in the service sector working at low wages. Burghardt described it as a "lumpen population"⁶⁹⁷ who had real

⁶⁹⁴Steve Burghardt, for instance, one of the leaders in this attempt at community organizing and the author of the case, is hardly a novice in the field. He has been a community organizer and political activist for several years. In addition, he teaches community organizing at Hunter School of Social Work (Steve Burghardt, "President Jimmy Carter Came to Visit," in Ecklein, Community Organizers, p. 81).

⁶⁹⁵Ibid.

⁶⁹⁶Ibid.

problems housing and educating their families.⁶⁹⁸

The organizers who went into the community were seasoned enough to recognize the difficulties involved in working with this type of population. They also recognized that since most of the organizers were white, they would also have to deal with their own subtle racism and fears of working in the neighbourhood. The people there were mainly African-Americans, with a few Hispanics. The organizers knew that if they were going to achieve their goal of developing a solid multi-racial organization, they were going to have to avoid the twin pitfalls of condescension and romanticization (that is, viewing people as wonderful just because they are oppressed).⁶⁹⁹

In fact, their concerns were well-founded. The initial problems the organizers encountered centered around their fears and vestiges of racism. When challenged as to their reasons for coming into the community, they initially tried to tell neighbourhood residents how much they cared, not realizing how paternalistic that sounded. Eventually, they learned to be blunt, telling residents that as organizers they had skills to offer the community and things they could actually do for the community. Further,

⁶⁹⁷Ibid., p. 82.

⁶⁹⁸Ibid., pp. 81-82.

⁶⁹⁹Burghardt, "President Jimmy Carter," p. 82.

as they got to know the community residents, the organizers began to realize that they too had real talents and abilities that could be used for the good of their own community--abilities that had been denied or underdeveloped--but abilities nonetheless.⁷⁰⁰

⁷⁰⁰Ibid.

The Action

The organizers determined that the best way to use everyone's skills, their's as well as the residents', was in rehabilitating some of the housing stock. Burghardt explains their primary goal in centering on this issue:

We would go with people to the bureaucracy, help them fill out the forms, try to get them to get a sense of what power is. They had a sense of what powerlessness was, but not power. Our idea was to show them that by working on different institutions, you could get them to do something.⁷⁰¹

In addition to this primary goal, the organizers also tried to convey skills related to how to function in meetings and how to communicate effectively with people. Because the residents had never genuinely communicated with one another, they did not know how to work together. They had to be taught the normal kinds of very basic organizing skills necessary to maintain a simple community group. In fact, the rudimentary skills these people needed extended to learning what was needed in order to go for a job, how to be on time for interviews, etc.⁷⁰²

In planning their work on the housing rehabilitation, the organizers decided to focus their efforts on just one building. They began by drawing up a

⁷⁰¹Ibid.

⁷⁰²Ibid.

list of tasks that needed to be accomplished and cross-referencing them with the indigenous skills that were available in the neighbourhood. Often, the residents would deny or simply not recognize that they had skills that would be helpful, and it was the organizers' job to help them recognize their talents and where they could best be used.⁷⁰³

In the next stage of their work, the organizers began to move from talking about what the residents wanted to accomplish and what was possible to specifying how they wanted the organization actually to function. The biggest challenge at this stage came in giving people organizational roles. This was a much more difficult task than might first appear because the people lived in a "street culture," which does not value long-term commitments. In a culture where day-to-day survival is uncertain, to say the least, people are not encouraged to plan even a month down the road. How can one be expected to plan for tomorrow when there is no food on the table today? To plan for tomorrow may be to miss the approach of danger today. Given this, consistency and planning for the future were things the organizers really had to work to build into an organization like their's.⁷⁰⁴

⁷⁰³Burghardt, "President Jimmy Carter," pp. 82-83.

⁷⁰⁴Ibid., p. 83.

Formal leadership was another problem the organizers had to face. The organization could have been set up with only the community residents as leaders. This would have been a denial, though, of the reality that there were tasks that the organizers had to do simply because the residents had not as yet acquired the skills to do them. To pretend otherwise would have been to plant seeds of resentment and hostility in the residents who would have been forced to pretend that they were indeed the leaders, when they knew, in reality, they were not. Eventually, the resentment would bubble to the surface and the organization would fall apart. To avoid this, the organizers developed a leadership that reflected the reality of the situation as it existed and had both organizers and residents as a part of it.⁷⁰⁵

The organizers realized that with the residents taking responsibility for organizational roles, they would have to tackle something that would be successful and would not involve a long-term action. They decided to ask the city to lease them the building and/or give them a small grant to help pay for its maintenance. This little symbol of success would be very important to the residents. They needed to see something that was real. They named the building the Freedom Spot, received a grant of 2,500

⁷⁰⁵Ibid.

dollars, and were able to begin.⁷⁰⁶

The organizers began the process by getting the residents to go to the bureaucracy and showing them what they had as an organization. The residents wanted to do this, but at times it was very difficult to get the people to go to these meetings, to show up on time, to present themselves as best they could. Sometimes, it was environmental stress that prevented the residents from showing up (such as having to go to the hospital with a child), and sometimes it was simply vestiges of the attitude, "I can't do it." The organizers had some real confrontations with the residents over this. They made demands on the people. Burghardt remembers an organizer saying at one point, "Look, you've got to do it. I'll do it with you, but this is bullshit. I'm not doing it alone any more."⁷⁰⁷ This kind of thing was said not out of anger but out of a need to challenge and motivate the residents to action.⁷⁰⁸

Despite all the difficulties and challenges, progress was being made. By the beginning of summer, the organization boasted about twelve people, who were working more or less at varying levels of activity. Burghardt and

⁷⁰⁶Ibid., pp. 83-84.

⁷⁰⁷Burghardt, "President Jimmy Carter," p. 84.

⁷⁰⁸Ibid.

the other organizers were ecstatic:

The group had maintained itself. We had a small grant and had moved from a group to an organization. We were moving ahead toward the establishment of concrete objectives that could be reached through the rehabilitation work. Politically we had moved ahead in the development of a method that was really beginning to make us mutually share our work because of our understanding not only of politics but of our personal lives. In general there was a sense of movement. . . .

At this stage, we felt safe in an area that police were afraid to come into. It was terrific.⁷⁰⁹

The Collapse of the Organization

It was at this point, amidst these feelings of euphoria, that the organization collapsed. The unintended cause of the collapse was none other than President Jimmy Carter. Carter decided, that summer, to take a walk through Morrisania to show his concern for the poor. His walk took him to within a block and a half of the Freedom Spot. The residents of this community had not even seen a state representative, and here was the President of the United States practically on their doorsteps. The event had an overwhelming impact on the people of Morrisania and, consequently, all the old assumptions as to how change takes place cropped up--how when wonderful leaders show up they will do everything for you. There was a tremendous

⁷⁰⁹Ibid.

elation on the part of the neighbourhood residents that he had been there, that the head of HUD (Housing and Urban Development) had come walking through as well, and that they had talked about hundreds of millions of dollars of investment to revitalize the South Bronx.⁷¹⁰

All this talk never really amounted to anything, but, nevertheless, had a tremendous impact on this group of people who had been so oppressed. Here they were piddling around with a small grant and a chance that, if they really struggled and applied themselves, they might have a clean building to live in. They could then use the skills they had developed to get other jobs. Now they saw a chance for a lot more and a lot more easily. The whole effort fell apart. While they continued to work together for about four more months, their whole emphasis was lost in talking about what could be done to get Carter's money, how they could hook up with the political machine in order to get things done. The residents were dreaming and were no longer willing to deal with the reality of the situation. As Burghardt put it, "They wanted quick bucks and we could do all the political raps we wanted and it didn't matter what we said. So it fell apart."⁷¹¹

⁷¹⁰Ibid., pp. 84-85.

⁷¹¹Burghardt, "President Jimmy Carter," p. 85.

General Analysis and
Evaluation

One of the chief lessons Burghardt took from this experience was the importance of not underestimating the power of the official leadership and the media in making people feel as if change was easy and accessible merely by some leader's presence. It is important that community organizers recognize this from the very beginning and educate their people as to this reality and the importance of self-determination. Still, Burghardt maintains that this type of political education did take place in Morrisania--not in a heavy-handed way--but through "the metaphors of the actual work that was going on at the time."⁷¹² Through the concrete situations that they encountered together as an organization, the organizers talked about power, the nature of change, and so forth. They even talked about socialism at an appropriate time and in a way that they felt made sense.⁷¹³

What, then, would have made a difference? Burghardt writes, "Quite simply and sadly, but it is a reality that I think an organizer has to face, I would have worked with a different population."⁷¹⁴ The conclusion

⁷¹²Ibid.

⁷¹³Ibid.

⁷¹⁴Ibid.

Burghardt draws from this experience is that it is impossible to work with the poorest of the poor and to expect long-term success. They may be good people, they may have innate ability and a tremendous amount of potential; still, in the final analysis, the level of oppression determines their ability to mobilize on a long-term basis. A community organizer can mobilize such a population group for the short term on a variety of issues ranging from rent strikes to playground development to after-school activities. But the stresses in the lives of the very poor are too great and have been too great for too long to allow them to remain focused on anything but the immediate present. Burghardt does not mean this as a criticism of the population; yet, a community organizer has to look at context, and context includes the people and what they are capable of doing over the long term, given the psychological and sociological realities of their existence. It is important for community organizers to balance what they wish were possible and what they want to have happen with these other realities.⁷¹⁵

Had Burghardt to do it over again, he would have organized another part of the South Bronx. He notes that the South Bronx has several areas in it with a far more stabilized working-class population of Hispanics and

⁷¹⁵Burghardt, "President Jimmy Carter," pp. 85-86.

African-Americans, where people are doing a lot of things themselves to bring about better conditions for their lives. These neighbourhoods which have stabilizing environmental factors free people to be able to work on long-term problems. In the final analysis, a terrific methodology, experienced organizers, and very good and dedicated people cannot offset entirely the realities of a completely debilitating environment.⁷¹⁶

The Organization and the Powers

Some of the dynamics that were encountered in the previous cases are repeated here. Once again, it is easy to see the sense of induced powerlessness that the Domination System creates in those whom it oppresses. There is truth in the conclusion that Burghardt draws that the very poor cannot be mobilized over the long term because the stresses in their lives are too great and have been too great for too long to allow them to remain focused on anything but the immediate present.

A sense of the intransigence of urban power structures is evident in the organizers' simple request of the city that it lease them the building and/or give them a small grant to help pay for its maintenance. One gets the

⁷¹⁶Ibid., p. 86.

feeling that if the organizers had asked for anything more, they would have met with steep resistance from HUD. Too, as in the other case studies, these organizers sought to develop a grass-roots people's organization, where the tenants themselves would work for their own betterment.

There are other dynamics at work unique to this case. Unlike in the previous cases, I do not get the impression that the organizers were aiming small because they recognized that in order to hold out any hope for victory against the Domination System, they would have to be content with limited battles and limited success. The organizers seemed to ignore the structural oppression that the residents were living under, focusing, instead, on teaching the residents how to fit in with the power structure. The so-called rudimentary skills that the organizers sought to teach the residents were nothing more than attempts to make the people more acceptable to the power structure, which they seemed to view as quite benevolent. What is wrong with this? In one sense, there is nothing wrong with it. In order to function in society people have to learn such skills as knowing what is needed in order to get a job, how to be on time for interviews, etc. In another sense, there is everything wrong with it.

By focusing solely on changing the individual, the impression is given that there is nothing wrong with the System and the fault for one's condition lies entirely with

the individual. This is one of the lies that the Domination System fosters. Further, chapters 3 and 4 provide ample sociological evidence of the elitist nature of power structures, and its values, which conflict with those of the poor. In effect, what these organizers were attempting to do was to make the oppressed acceptable to the power structure which was oppressing them and which was actively working against their emancipation. This amounts to nothing more than further oppression of the oppressed.

The disingenuousness of the power structure is evident in the walk that the head of HUD took through the streets of Morrisania. Simply mentioning the possibility of hundreds of millions of dollars of investment flowing into the South Bronx was all it took to kill this fledgling organization. Why should the power structure attack people head-on when simply holding out false hope accomplishes the same task just as easily and a lot less messily? The role the media played in this process by publicizing HUD's "false hope," without, apparently, holding them accountable to follow through on their promise is significant as well.

In addition, Burghardt spoke about all the old assumptions as to how change takes places cropping up--the attitude that wonderful leaders would do everything for them. What he failed to recognize was that the attitude he accused the residents of having was, in fact, also his own.

As has been said, Burghardt gave the very strong

impression that he looked on the power structure as being quite benevolent. The attitude the residents had was simply a reflection of the organizers' own attitude. This case teaches that organizers who are not sensitive to the theological and sociological reality of the Domination System and the power structures which make it up can become unwitting accomplices to the oppression of the poor. It is a position not to be relished.

Conclusion

These case studies have shown that there are probably as many ways of confronting evil within urban power structures as there are community organizations. For this reason, the model that is developed in chapter 7 will not, for the most part, point to specific strategies. What is important is that the chosen strategies grow out of a strong theory base. Without this theory base, one will be left with a hit-or-miss strategy. As in the case of the final organization, one may find oneself cooperating with the very power structures one is supposed to be confronting.

Chapter 6

"ENGAGING THE POWERS": KENTUCKY'S NON-
COMPLIANCE WITH THE FEDERAL JUVENILE
JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY
PREVENTION ACT

By this point, the reader should have a good grasp of the theological nature of systemic evil and a sociological understanding of the power structures in which it resides. We can appreciate what is involved in actual struggles against urban power structures. Clearly, it is extremely difficult to challenge and change these structures. This chapter will focus on a case study of Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc. (KYA), a child advocacy organization concerned with confronting injustices and bringing about positive changes in the power structures affecting Kentucky's children.⁷¹⁷ This case study will not

⁷¹⁷Within sociological circles, single-case studies have long been considered a valid and reliable form of ethnographic research. The single-case study has been incorporated into numerous sociological studies including those of Graham T. Allison in Essence of Decision-Making: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis (Boston: Little, Brown, 1971); Neal Gross et al. in Implementing Organizational Innovations (New York: Basic, 1971); and Elliot Liebow's classic study, Tally's Corner (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967). Indeed, William F. Whyte's study, Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1943), has for

only illustrate the difficulties expressed above in challenging power structures but adds another important dimension to the study. Unlike the case studies in the previous chapter, KYA does not attempt to deal with evil in urban power structures; it operates on the state level. Why, then, is it included in a dissertation on evil within urban power structures? The answer lies in the fact that not all forms of systemic evil have their roots within urban power structures even though symptoms may appear on the local level. Churches that wish to confront issues such as gun control, the death penalty, or even providing lunches for children in schools can do only so much on the local level. In order to effect real change in these issues, power structures on the state and national level must be dealt with. This case provides a vivid example of a state injustice impacting the children in local communities and one attempt to confront it.

decades been recommended reading in community sociology (Robert K. Yin, Case Study Research, 2nd rev. ed., ed. Leonard Bickman, Applied Social Research Methods Series, vol. 5 [Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989] p. 15). Robert Yin, in his book, Case Study Research, offers a defense of single-case studies. He argues that single-case studies have validity under several circumstances, one of which is in situations where the investigator is exploring a circumstance where the descriptive information alone will be revelatory (Yin, Case Study Research, p. 48).

Introduction

In 1974, Congress passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP A) as a means of alleviating the problems imposed by the justice system on children in trouble.⁷¹⁸ As originally passed, the Act mandated the complete separation by sight and sound of children from adults during their incarceration in jails. In 1980, the JJDP A was amended by Congress to mandate the **complete removal** of all children from adult jails, lockups, and institutions.⁷¹⁹ Those states which are moving towards complete compliance with the Act are given grants to help offset the cost of compliance. Those which fail to make serious efforts to comply lose the grant money. The federal Act allows private, non-profit organizations to apply for the money in those states which are denied the grants. The grant money is to be used by the organizations to bring their states into compliance with federal law.

On April 26, 1994, then-Secretary of Justice, Billy Wellman, sent a letter to John Wilson, Acting Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency

⁷¹⁸These problems will be fleshed out later in this chapter.

⁷¹⁹Kentucky Youth Advocates, Some Preliminary Issues in Removing Juveniles from Kentucky Jails--First 1982 Interim Report, 1982 (unpublished paper, photocopy), pp. 5-6.

Prevention, officially withdrawing Kentucky from participation in the formula grant program under the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993. This letter drew to a close recent efforts to try to persuade the 1994 Kentucky General Assembly to pass legislation that would have brought the state into compliance with the federal JJDP. Today, Kentucky is one of only two states not complying with the JJDP. This case study tells the history of KYA's attempts to bring Kentucky into compliance with the Act.⁷²⁰

A Description and History of
Kentucky Youth Advocates

Kentucky Youth Advocates is a private, non-profit organization which, through the efforts of members of civic groups as well as professionals, seeks to improve the quality of services to the children of Kentucky. Unlike most organizations, KYA does not directly serve Kentucky children, preferring to focus its efforts on changing existing policies, laws, or the level of appropriations as they affect children. Incorporated in 1977, KYA has been

⁷²⁰National Juvenile Detention Association in Partnership with Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc. and Children's Law Center, Kentucky Plan for Compliance with the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) (unpublished paper, photocopy), p. 1.

recognized as one of several prominent class advocacy organizations for children in the United States.⁷²¹ Since its inception, KYA has served as a voice for children's needs, insisting that Kentucky's treatment of her children is not only a political issue but "a moral imperative, a social responsibility, and an economic necessity."⁷²² KYA has described itself as a "burr under the saddle of complacency"⁷²³ and has the distinction of having been at the forefront of many of Kentucky's major initiatives.⁷²⁴ Since

⁷²¹KYA's Origins: A Narrative Description (revised 12/05/83) (unpublished paper, photocopy), p. 1.

⁷²²David W. Richart, First: Kentucky Youth Advocates: On the Cutting Edge for Children: A Report by Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc. Commemorating Sixteen Years of Service to Kentucky's Children and Their Families, June 1993 (unpublished paper, photocopy), n.p.

⁷²³Ibid.

⁷²⁴I cannot verify the extensive claims in Richart, "First," but the list is so extensive that even if there are some undocumented precedents, I conclude that KYA is providing significant initiative. In relation to foster care, KYA is the first group to conduct an independent study of Kentucky's foster care system (1978), the first to advocate local foster care review boards (1978), and the first to document graphically the continuing and widespread problems associated with the state's foster care system (1983). In relation to early childhood services, KYA is the first group to conduct a landmark study of prenatal care which precipitated a health care reform debate (1983), the first organization to help pass legislation regulating hot water heaters to prevent scalding (1984), the first to provide maternal and child health data and information on barriers to health care for each county (1993), and the first to develop a comprehensive plan to combat teen pregnancy in Louisville (1993). In regards to education,

its inception, the Board of Directors of Kentucky Youth

Kentucky Youth Advocates is the first group to report on the inequalities present in public education (1984), the first Kentucky organization to oppose tracking (grouping children in classrooms based on their perceived abilities) (1984), the first to identify the educational needs of at-risk students (1987), and the first Kentucky organization to oppose corporal punishment (1985) and draft legislation to abolish corporal punishment (1988). In regards to the treatment of Kentucky youth with emotional problems, KYA is the first organization to conduct an independent analysis of programs for youth with emotional problems (1978), the first to help develop a new statute on the rights of mentally disturbed children (1985), the first to call for an independent board of inquiry into cases of youth who die in state facilities (1987), the first to investigate the treatment of children in a state psychiatric facility (1988), the first to help develop a youthful offender law to deal with serious juvenile crime (1979), and the first to expose mistreatment of youth at the Northern Kentucky Treatment Center (1986). In relation to juvenile delinquents, Kentucky Youth Advocates is the first organization to help develop a model juvenile-detention center and alternative programs in Fayette County (1978), the first to develop, test, and refine "intake and release criteria" guidelines in Jefferson County (1979), the first to sue local county judges and jailers to ensure their compliance with state law (1981), and the first to design a statewide juvenile-detention and placement plan (1982). In relation to the protection of children, Kentucky Youth Advocates is the first organization to track state and federal funding trends for child protective services (1985), the first to document that local officials were not responding to child sexual abuse cases (1990), the first to advocate and assist in developing a comprehensive state plan to address child sexual abuse (1992), the first to recommend ways to hold public officials accountable in child sexual abuse proceedings (1992), the first to document the research on the credibility of child witnesses in child sexual abuse cases (1992), and the first to estimate Kentucky's economic costs of child sexual abuse (1992).

Advocates has consistently manifested courage in taking stands even when such stands have been blatantly unpopular and have been met with great resistance. The journey has not always been an easy one. In Kentucky, children's needs have often taken a back seat to those of better financed special interests. Still, the media attention that KYA has generated has made children's issues more public and has helped to create a more receptive climate in which solutions to the problems Kentucky children and their families encounter can be discussed.⁷²⁵

Kentucky Youth Advocates was born through the combined efforts of the National Council of Jewish Women\Louisville Section (NCJW/LS) and the Junior League of Louisville (JLL). Each organization has a well-deserved reputation for responding to community needs. Each was heavily involved in a study of the Jefferson County Detention Center in 1973. As a result of this study, members of the NCJW/LS and JLL committed themselves to seeking to improve the quality of services for children. One of the first lessons these groups learned was that a large, involved group of citizens is essential in order to gain public support for children's programs inasmuch as children do not vote. It was agreed that the most effective way of mobilizing community support on behalf of

⁷²⁵Richart, First, n.p.

children was through the establishment of a more permanent, independent organization. As a result, the members of NCJW/LS, the JLL, and other interested citizens began meeting in 1976 to develop a child advocacy organization. Kentucky Youth Advocates was incorporated in May 1977.⁷²⁶

Throughout the summer and autumn of 1977, the Board of Directors focused its efforts on developing funding to support the staff, which was necessary to expand the activities already begun by volunteers. After six months, sufficient funds had been raised to hire Dave Richart as the Executive Director in November 1977. Due to Richart's involvement in the planning of the corporation, KYA was able to begin operating immediately. Since its inception, federal and state grants as well as donations from foundations, civic groups, and individuals have supported KYA's efforts on behalf of children.⁷²⁷

An Overview of KYA's Engagement Strategies

In its child advocacy work, KYA makes use of four strategies to influence public policy and decision-making.

Administrative Advocacy

⁷²⁶KYA's Origins, p. 1.

⁷²⁷Ibid.

Most work with the executive branch of government requires KYA to engage in administrative advocacy. Administrative advocacy comprises a series of activities which often concludes with direct negotiation with decision-makers. KYA negotiates with administrator-bureaucrats in relation to three broad types of policy and practice: (1) **regulations** that interpret federal or state laws, (2) **written policies** that provide an even more prescriptive interpretation of the regulations, and (3) **procedures and practices** by which street-bureaucrats actually implement the laws, regulations, and policies.⁷²⁸

KYA always begins the process of administrative advocacy with the all-important process of gathering information by both formal and informal means. KYA uses various tactics to gather information at different times and with different issues. These tactics include: (1) listening for "internal rumblings," (2) facilitating "whistleblowers" within government, (3) monitoring, and (4) collecting data.⁷²⁹

Verifying "initial rumblings" and conducting

⁷²⁸David W. Richart and Stephen R. Bing, Fairness is a Kid's Game: Children, Public Policy, and Child Advocacy in the States (Louisville, KY: Kentucky Youth Advocates and the Task Force on Children Out of School, 1987), p. 105.

⁷²⁹Ibid.

surveys of the literature. The first step of the administrative advocacy process is the determination that there is a real problem relative to the way children or their families are treated. KYA refers to this preliminary information as "initial rumblings." These rumblings can come through an informal network of trusted people or through unsolicited complaints received through case advocacy mechanisms.⁷³⁰

After receiving these reports or complaints, KYA seeks to determine if the problems it has identified exist beyond a few individual cases. KYA also checks to see if the problems are part of some emerging national or state trend. KYA advocates pore over national newspapers, news magazines, scholarly studies, and journal articles. These national sources alert KYA to major problems in services to children. KYA has found that almost invariably these national sources have mirrored information received from children, parents, and professionals in Kentucky. After appraising the initial rumblings and checking with its contacts within the systems, KYA must then decide whether to continue foraging for more information or proceed with more concerted efforts.⁷³¹

⁷³⁰Ibid.

⁷³¹Richart and Bing, Fairness, p. 105.

Facilitating "whistleblowers" within government.

Advocates can engage in administrative advocacy without using "whistleblowers," but many advocates have found cultivating insiders within government to be a valuable tool.⁷³² Whistleblowers are individuals who "sound an alarm from within the very organization within which they work, aiming to spotlight neglect or abuses that threaten the public interest."⁷³³

Monitoring. Generally, the next step KYA takes in the administrative advocacy process is called "monitoring."

Successful monitoring requires both data collection and research. Monitoring also involves keeping a careful watch on programs to see that they are available and are implemented properly, successfully, and in accordance with the law.⁷³⁴ Such monitoring confirms initial rumblings and identifies children and families who later may play an important role in confirming and publicizing the actual problem. KYA has a remarkably successful record of

⁷³²Ibid., p. 106.

⁷³³Sissela Bok, "Blowing the Whistle," in Public Duties: The Moral Obligations of Government Officials, ed. Joel L. Fleishman, Lance Liebman and Mark H. Moore (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1981), n.p.

⁷³⁴Beatrice Gross and Ronald Gross, eds., The Children's Rights Movement: Overcoming the Oppression of Young People (Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1977), p. 267.

documenting systemic problems by listening to the experiences of children and their families.⁷³⁵

Collecting data. Data collection at the state and local level is an essential aspect of administrative advocacy. KYA does not do original, scientifically-based research; it simply analyzes and compares data collected by government agencies themselves. KYA has found this to be sufficiently revealing on its own.

Policy Analysis. In addition to listening to whistleblowers, monitoring, and data collection, KYA also engages in an activity called "policy analysis." Policy analysis involves coming to an understanding of the positions particular groups hold in relation to an issue and the reasons they are holding these positions. Policy analysis is, in many ways, a political activity:

[I]t means asking: What are the political issues: Who is for, and who is against, which alternatives and why? [Policy analysis] means talking to interest-group spokespersons on all sides of the question to make sure that something important is not being missed A few key problems and policy choices gradually emerge from such discussions.⁷³⁶

⁷³⁵Richart and Bing, Fairness, p. 108.

⁷³⁶Andrew S. McFarland, Common Cause: Lobbying in the Public Interest (Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1984), n.p.

Policy analysis also involves coming to an understanding of the intent of public policy and what it actually accomplishes once implemented. KYA asks four questions in seeking to determine this:

(1) What problem was the policy intended to address as evidenced by the shapers of the policy? (2) What commitment of resources was directed to the implementation of the policy? (3) How much of the committed resources actually flowed to implementation, and (4) what outcomes resulted from the policy?"⁷³⁷

KYA tracks a proposed policy from its original inception as an idea to its actual implementation in practice, determining what gaps may exist between the two as well as the reasons for these gaps.⁷³⁸

Once KYA has documented a particular issue using these four steps, it usually understand the issue as well or better than any of the legislators. It is now time to move on to the succeeding steps involved in administrative advocacy.

Early negotiations. Before going public, KYA seeks to inform and negotiate directly but informally with the officials involved with the issue. KYA seeks, at this stage, to be low-key, cooperative, and accommodating. In

⁷³⁷Richart and Bing, Fairness, p. 112.

⁷³⁸Ibid.

those instances where a public agency has conceded that a serious problem does exist and has agreed to a timetable and a plan of action, KYA has won a major victory with a minimum of effort. Concurrently, it has built a trusting relationship, which has often proved helpful later.⁷³⁹

"Going public." In many cases, a bureaucracy will deny that a problem exists or minimize its seriousness. Administrators may deflect criticism onto some other problem or they may procrastinate, saying they are "working on something." When this occurs, KYA's next strategy is to go public--it seeks to make the problem a public issue by publicizing the results of the research and monitoring. Public reaction to a problem can drive bureaucrats to the bargaining table faster than anything else. Going public involves preparing a formal written report, which is made available to the news media. The report is written to accomplish several purposes: (1) To document the existence and prevalence of a widespread social issue and to make it a public and political issue; (2) to suggest possible ways to resolve the problem by setting an agenda for action; and (3) to stake out an ideological and practical position from which standards can be set.⁷⁴⁰ Following this, KYA seeks

⁷³⁹Ibid., pp. 112-13.

⁷⁴⁰Ibid., pp. 115-16.

remedies in public or private forums over which the decision-maker may have little or no control. KYA publicizes problems in the media, in legislative hearings or forums sponsored with other community organizations, or in court proceedings, until the administrative body agrees to a timetable and change.⁷⁴¹

Follow-through. KYA has found that commitments to reform made by government officials often are not kept. Consequently, KYA continues monitoring the system's performance to determine if the agreed-to solutions are actually being implemented. Because change occurs in increments, KYA keeps an eye on the progress of reform through periodic monitoring and data collection. For this reason, as Richart and Bing point out, the process of advocacy is never a finished job:

[A]dvocacy is a never-ending cycle in which we document children's needs, monitor, propose reforms, negotiate with administrators, go public with problems if necessary, secure support for reforms and follow through.⁷⁴²

Sometimes, too, KYA has found that the public will not rally to support its concern. In those cases, KYA has no choice but to wait for another day--what it calls a

⁷⁴¹Richart and Bing, Fairness, p. 124.

⁷⁴²Ibid., p. 122.

"critical moment." When such a critical moment occurs and public attention begins to focus on the issue, KYA is ready to re-issue its reports to focus public attention on the extent of the problem and ways in which the system can be reformed.⁷⁴³

Legislative monitoring
or lobbying

The second strategy KYA makes use of is legislative monitoring or lobbying. Richart and Bing define lobbying as "influencing legislators to initiate or pass a law to meet an unmet need or to defeat a law that would be harmful to children's interests."⁷⁴⁴ In relation to its role as lobbyists within the legislative process, KYA seeks to raise new issues, draft legislation, collect and use data in support of legislation, generate public support, and react to legislation proposed by others. In lobbying, KYA focuses on two general initiatives: (1) developing entitlements for children, and (2) assuring funding for effective programs or education for children.⁷⁴⁵

At the state level, there are three major ways that KYA lobbies: (1) by developing a "grassroots constituency"

⁷⁴³Ibid., p. 124.

⁷⁴⁴Ibid., p. 127.

⁷⁴⁵Ibid.

of citizens, (2) by developing and working with coalitions of interest groups, (3) and by finding a key legislator or legislative committee which will "champion" a bill with the help of KYA.⁷⁴⁶

Litigation and Other
Legal Strategies

KYA employs litigation as a means to resolving children's issues only as a last resort. KYA has found that negotiating with administrators is usually preferable to litigating issues. However, some issues are so important to the protection of children and their rights that litigation is essential after negotiation fails.⁷⁴⁷ KYA has a number of criteria it consults in determining whether to litigate:

The seriousness of the issue: Are there clear and specific injuries to children which can be identified and documented?

Other prior strategies: Have other strategies been thoroughly exhausted? Are there other ways short of litigation to generate public support for systemic changes in the treatment of children?

Public and legal support: Is there an organization or a constituency which can be called upon or organized to support the litigation over a period of years? Is there financial support for court costs which will be incurred? Does the organization have the resources to

⁷⁴⁶Ibid., p. 129.

⁷⁴⁷Richart and Bing, Fairness, pp. 144-45.

monitor the implementation of a consent decree, out-of-court settlement, or court decision?

Forum: Is there reason to believe that the state or federal court will grant relief? Do these courts have a record of understanding the plaintiffs' claims?

Precedent: Has some other advocacy group in some other state previously litigated this issue? Did this litigation result in an out-of-court settlement or consent decree? Or did a court ruling establish a precedent?

Outcomes: What are the advocate's expectations of this litigation? Can the case be won? Might something unintended result?

Choice of counsel: Does the advocacy group plan to use its own in-house counsel to litigate? Have attorneys agreed to litigate this issue pro bono publico (without compensation "for the public good") and dedicate sufficient time to assure aggressive representation of children's interests? What prior experience do these attorneys have with the advocacy group? Will the advocacy group have any control over the lawsuit? What prior experience have these attorneys had with class action litigation?⁷⁴⁸

KYA considers all these criteria when considering litigation. KYA take seriously, however, the words of Robert H. Mnookin of Stanford Law School:

Consider alternatives to litigation. There will be opportunities to press for administrative or legislative reforms that may in some circumstances be more effective than litigation. Going to federal court may sometimes be the best choice--but not always.⁷⁴⁹

⁷⁴⁸Ibid., p. 145.

⁷⁴⁹Robert H. Mnookin, In the Interest of Children: Advocacy, Law Reform and Public Policy (New York: W. H. Freeman, 1985), n.p.

Public Education and Constituency Development

In addition to administrative negotiation, lobbying, and litigation, public education and constituency development is a fourth major strategy that KYA considers when seeking to improve the lives of children. Public education focuses on seeking to educate the public on children's issues usually through use of the media. Constituency development involves the empowerment of specific groups, such as parents, to participate more fully in the political process. Both of these strategies are directed at developing what Richart and Bing call a "constituency for change."⁷⁵⁰ One analyst summarized the need for public support by pointing out that "[c]hallenges tend to be more successful in influencing . . . policies when a substantial public consensus exists that supports their legitimacy."⁷⁵¹

The Importance of Leveraging

In confronting a particular issue, KYA may use

⁷⁵⁰Richart and Bing, Fairness, p. 155.

⁷⁵¹David Vogel, Lobbying the Corporation: Citizen Challenges to Business Authority (New York: Basic, 1978), n.p.

several of these strategies in concert with one another. KYA has often found that one major strategy can "set up" another. For example, if government officials know that KYA is willing to litigate an issue, they may be more inclined to negotiate. Similarly, if Kentucky government officials know that KYA is planning to lobby the state legislature for funds for a special children's program, they may be more inclined to include it in the executive budget. KYA has been so effective in leveraging major strategies that it automatically prepares multiple strategies when preparing to tackle any issue.⁷⁵²

A History of KYA's Involvement with the
General Issue of Juvenile Detention

Before KYA set out to bring Kentucky into compliance with the federal JJDP, it had already developed a long history of involvement with the general issue of juvenile detention. In fact, before KYA had even been officially organized, many professionals and citizens were expressing concern about the conditions under which children were confined while awaiting juvenile court proceedings. Upon being incorporated, this issue was one of the first to present itself to KYA.

⁷⁵²Richart and Bing, Fairness, p. 100.

The Process of Choosing
the Issue

The criteria that KYA employed in determining whether to make an issue of the detention of juveniles in Kentucky is similar to the criteria it uses when examining any issue. Each criterion involves asking several questions.⁷⁵³

Defining and documenting the problem or issue.

What is the problem and how many children are affected by it? Are the problem and number affected by it becoming more or less of a concern? What are the causes of the problem? Is the problem associated with systemic injustice?

Relationship of the issue to KYA. Has KYA

addressed the issue before? Is this an issue which KYA should be addressing? Given the size of KYA and the resources available to it, is it feasible to consider taking on this issue?

Relationship of the issue to other organizations.

Have any other advocacy groups identified this as an issue and do they see it in the same terms as KYA? Have these

⁷⁵³Ibid., pp. 100-02.

organizations sought to make this an issue? How successful were they?

Remedies sought and outcome expected. What are the specific changes, stated in measurable terms, needed? What will need to be done to achieve these changes?

Barriers to seeking change. What barriers must be overcome? Is the political climate open to change?

Resources. What organizational and community resources are available which can impact this issue? What additional resources are needed? Can these resources be secured?

Strategy for change. What is the most direct, simple, and least costly strategy which can effectively address this issue? What are the chances of this strategy being successful? Will it be necessary, or at least advantageous, to seek allies?

Impact on KYA. What are the costs involved in confronting this issue in terms of expenditures, personnel, and the effect on other work activities? How long will it take before real change is seen? How long will KYA remain committed to addressing this issue if no substantial

progress is made?

Selecting the issue. Internally, how and when will KYA select the issue? What is the plan in terms of goals, strategies, time frame, personnel, financing, results expected, and method of evaluation? How will the plan be implemented?

The likelihood of public support. Does the public care about this issue or at least is the public likely to be responsive if the media spotlight focuses on it? Can the issue be expressed in a way that generates concern? How will the issue and strategy likely be interpreted given the existing political culture? Are the media interested or likely to be interested in the issue?

The centrality of the issue. Is the issue based on a cause (e.g., the need for low-income housing for single parents and their children) or a symptom (e.g., homelessness)? Should KYA be proactive or reactive?

Prior experience. Is the issue likely to be responsive to strategies employed by KYA? If not, is KYA willing and able to develop new approaches and strategies?

The affected population. Does the issue address high-risk children, i.e., those most in need of KYA's help?

The Results of the Analysis

Through its research, KYA discovered that in Kentucky nearly 12,000 youths (children who had not been found guilty of any crime) were being housed in county jails. In many cases, these children were not separated from adults and were subject to physical, sexual, and emotional abuse by more hardened offenders.⁷⁵⁴ KYA studies also showed that juveniles in jails are eight times more likely to commit suicide than those lodged in juvenile-detention centers.⁷⁵⁵ In other cases, children who had committed no public offense were being confined with those alleged to have committed serious offenses. In almost every case, these youth were housed in what Dave Richart calls "laboratories for crime," where more sophisticated criminals educated their less-informed apprentices.⁷⁵⁶

⁷⁵⁴Kentucky Youth Advocates, Kentucky Youth Advocates' Prior Efforts to Prevent the Unnecessary Jailing and Detention of Youth and Secure Adequate Remedial Services for These Youth (unpublished paper, photocopy), p. 1.

⁷⁵⁵Mary Ann Roser, "Adult Jails Not for Juveniles, Report Says: Mother, Social Workers Suggest More Use of Alternative Programs," Lexington Herald-Leader, October 21, 1984, sec. B, p. 1.

⁷⁵⁶Advocates, Prior Efforts, p. 1.

Richart argues: "Jailing juveniles is like a time bomb. As long as youth are lodged in county jails, they are in danger."⁷⁵⁷ And Betsy Chandler, a spokeswoman for KYA, says that locking up children just worsens existing problems: It serves no purpose. It keeps them under control just until you let them go and then their mental state is worse. The state is punishment-oriented, not treatment-oriented.⁷⁵⁸

⁷⁵⁷Roser, Adult Jails, sec. B, p. 1.

⁷⁵⁸Bill Weronka, "By Jailing Runaways, State Still Violates Federal Law," The Courier-Journal, Sunday, July 15, 1990, sec. B, p. 4.

An editorial in the Courier-Journal put it bluntly:

The reasons to put juvenile offenders in juvenile detention centers are so numerous--and so persuasive--that every state but Kentucky and Wyoming have stopped putting them in jails and now uses detention centers instead.⁷⁵⁹

KYA's Initial Attempts
at Reform

Beginning in 1978, KYA became persistent in its efforts to secure the passage and funding of a regional juvenile-detention and placement plan. The goal of this effort was to place juveniles in facilities that protect the alleged public and status offenders.⁷⁶⁰ For those juveniles alleged to have committed more serious crimes (youthful and public offenders), KYA recommended that they be placed in regional secure juvenile-detention centers. For those alleged to have committed less serious crimes

⁷⁵⁹Editorial, "Costly Inaction," Courier-Journal, Saturday, July 23, 1994, sec. A, p. 10.

⁷⁶⁰The Kentucky Unified Juvenile Code uses several terms to differentiate children who pass through the criminal justice system. Youthful offenders are those who commit the most serious offenses (e.g., murder, rape). Public offenders are children who commit somewhat less serious crimes than youthful offenders (e.g., car theft). Status offenders refer to children who commit acts that are considered crimes because of the age of the perpetrators (e.g., drinking, truancy). Non-offenders are children who are not guilty of any crime, but who pass through the criminal justice system because of crimes committed against them (e.g., abused children).

(status offenders)--or no crimes at all (non-offenders)--
KYA suggested "alternatives-to-detention" facilities such
as group homes which are less restrictive. Since 1978, KYA
has developed a number of model programs in various
Kentucky counties to test the viability of this plan. One
detention center, located in Fayette County, is considered
a model for counties of its size.⁷⁶¹

In May of 1979, KYA became the first organization
to endorse the hiring of juvenile court support staff to
assist district judges in processing juveniles brought to
their attention. The Court-Designated Worker (CDW) program
was phased in beginning in July 1987 and today is almost
universally recognized as a nearly indispensable part of
Kentucky's plan to remove juveniles from jails.⁷⁶²

KYA's Previous Attempts to Bring
Kentucky into Compliance
with the JJDPA

With the success of its efforts, KYA became even
more ambitious in its goals. In February and June of 1982,
and again in March of 1983, KYA produced detailed reports
outlining how Kentucky could remove juveniles from jails by
developing a statewide juvenile-detention and placement
plan. These reports were the first efforts to design a

⁷⁶¹Advocates, Prior Efforts, p. 1.

⁷⁶²Ibid.

state-funded, regional juvenile-detention plan consistent with federal law (the JJDPA). These proposals were dismissed by state officials who argued that they were both unnecessary and too costly. However, KYA's research documented the efforts of other states in responding to this same jailing crisis. These reports provided strong evidence to support the claim that Kentucky could remove juveniles from jails without jeopardizing public safety.⁷⁶³

KYA followed up these actions in March of 1984 by pressing for the passage of House Joint Resolution 63, which directed a study group to develop a juvenile-detention plan for Kentucky. Seventeen months later, KYA drafted the final report, which was approved by the study group. Unfortunately, this state plan, the first ever developed by a governmental body, was shelved because of the state's fiscal problems and because of resistance by local officials.⁷⁶⁴

KYA allowed the issue to rest until September of 1987. In anticipation of the 1988 Kentucky General Assembly, KYA worked with the Kentucky Juvenile Justice Commission, which refined the 1985 plan. This revised plan was presented to the Kentucky Crime Commission. KYA also held hearings on the plan in thirteen of the state's

⁷⁶³Ibid., p. 3.

⁷⁶⁴Ibid.

fifteen Area Development Districts to provide opportunities for local officials to discuss and amend the plan. Unfortunately, state officials once again declined to implement the plan because of fiscal problems and resistance by local officials.⁷⁶⁵

During the 1994 legislative session, state officials once again tried to pass jail-removal legislation; House Bill 626 was first amended in the House of Representatives, which lessened its impact,⁷⁶⁶ and then died in the Senate Appropriations and Revenue Committee late in the 1994 session.⁷⁶⁷ Shortly thereafter, the Secretary of the Justice Cabinet, Billy Wellman, withdrew Kentucky from the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, making Kentucky one of only two states to become "non-participating states" which still hold juveniles in county jails.⁷⁶⁸

Governor Brereton Jones, responding to appeals by KYA, agreed to reconsider the state's participation in the JJDPa if KYA could secure the support of the Kentucky General Assembly when they met in special session in June

⁷⁶⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶⁶Advocates, Prior Efforts, p. 3.

⁷⁶⁷Editorial, "Kids in Jail? No--Time to Improve Treatment of Juveniles," Lexington Herald-Leader, April 22, 1994, sec. A, p. 12.

⁷⁶⁸Advocates, Prior Efforts, p. 3.

1994. However, both KYA and the Governor's staff were unsuccessful in attempts to secure enough legislative support for the issue to be included in the agenda for the special legislative session. Jones' press secretary, Mindy Shannon Philps, noting that lawmakers wanted to keep the special session as brief as possible, said, "There is little sentiment [among lawmakers] to take up this issue."⁷⁶⁹

As a result, the federal government declared that Kentucky was a non-participating state and pronounced that 1992 and 1993 funds would be made available to non-governmental groups.⁷⁷⁰

As has been seen, beginning in June of 1982 and continuing into 1994, Kentucky Youth Advocates authored or coauthored five jail-removal plans each of which was dismissed as too costly and/or met with resistance from local officials. Further, a sixth attempt authored by the Kentucky Justice Cabinet failed to pass the legislature. Each of these plans contained five key ingredients: (1) the development of statewide intake release and placement criteria which the courts could use to determine which youth should be held in detention and which could be placed in some less restrictive environment; (2) the development

⁷⁶⁹Gil Lawson, "Jones, Legislators Put Off Effort to End Jailing Juveniles," Courier-Journal, Thursday, June 9, 1994, sec. B, p. 4.

⁷⁷⁰Advocates, Prior Efforts, p. 3.

of a sufficient number of regional secure juvenile-detention centers to house those juvenile offenders requiring detention so that they are within a reasonable traveling distance of their home counties;⁷⁷¹ (3) the development of local and regional alternatives-to-detention programs which could be used to place juveniles who pose no risk to themselves or to the public; (4) a transportation or reimbursement system which would permit juveniles to be transported from their home county to counties where they are placed or detained; and (5) a system to finance all of the components of this system.⁷⁷²

In the meantime, Kentucky continues to violate at least three of the four mandated provisions of the federal JJDPa including: Section 223 (a) (12) which prohibits status offenders being held in secure facilities; Section 223 (a) (13) which requires that juveniles be kept separate from adults by sight and sound while they are incarcerated in the same detention facilities; and Section 223 (a) (14) which prohibits juveniles from being held in any detention

⁷⁷¹It is very important that juveniles be held close enough to home to allow their families to visit them on a regular basis. Adolescents tend to experience things very deeply and may sink into depression and become suicidal when isolated from their families in jails.

⁷⁷²Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 3.

facility in which adults are housed.⁷⁷³ The JJDPDA does permit juveniles to be held in a jail for a maximum of six hours if they are held in a section out of sight and sound of adult prisoners.

KYA's Latest Effort to Bring Kentucky
into Compliance with the JJDPDA

In cooperation with two other non-profit organizations (the National Juvenile Detention Association and the Children's Law Center), KYA has applied for the grant money which the federal government has withheld from Kentucky for its failure to comply with the federal JJDPDA.

Their proposal was presented to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) within the United States Department of Justice.

Barriers to Compliance with
the Federal JJDPDA

KYA and the other applicants outline nine barriers which they believe impede Kentucky's compliance with the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. The proposal these applicants have developed addresses each of these barriers.

⁷⁷³Ibid.

Existing profit motive of jailers presently operating juvenile hold facilities not in compliance with the federal JJDP. The Kentucky Unified Juvenile Code was amended during the 1988 session to create a new category of facilities called "Juvenile-Holding Facilities" (JHFs). However, these facilities do not meet separate sight and sound provisions of the JJDP. JHFs also utilize dormitory- style sleeping arrangements and often do not have educational, recreational, and health programs which would be available in a separate secure juvenile-detention facility.

Another problem which the 1988 Kentucky Legislature did not carefully consider when passing the legislation is that it created what is, in effect, a super-category of facilities, which few of Kentucky's 120 counties can afford to operate. As a result, most of Kentucky's rural "sending counties" are forced to transport their youth to one of nine juvenile-holding facilities which "receive" their juveniles. Because of the shortage of these JHFs, Kentucky's nine juvenile-holding facilities are able to charge between fifty and ninety dollars per day to incarcerate the alleged juvenile offenders from other counties.⁷⁷⁴ The effect of this is clear:

. . . . [T]he 1988 legislation created a huge profit center for those jailers operating JHFs. The funds

⁷⁷⁴Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 8.

they received for holding juveniles often offset the expenses associated with housing adult offenders in other parts of the jail.⁷⁷⁵

Inadvertently, the 1988 legislation also created a core of local officials who were opposed to any changes in the existing law which might reduce the revenue they receive by holding juveniles in their JHFS.⁷⁷⁶ According to figures given by the Kentucky Department of Corrections, the potential gross receipts that Kentucky's nine juvenile-holding facilities received during the period October 1, 1992, to September 30, 1993 (the most current data available from state sources) totaled \$1,231,635.⁷⁷⁷ Corrections Commissioner Jack C. Lewis put it this way when speaking before the Kentucky Crime Commission: [County Jailers] see this as their gravy train. It's self-interest and it's monetarily driven."⁷⁷⁸ Lewis blames the defeat of

⁷⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁷⁶Ibid. This view that the jailers operating juvenile-holding facilities are making a profit by holding juveniles in their facilities is not just the opinion of the applicants. Many state officials have expressed a similar view. For example, a letter sent by Justice Secretary Wellman to the OJJDP dated April 26, 1994 reads: "There are adult jails in this state operating juvenile-holding facilities for the purpose of capturing enough revenue to pay off the bonded indebtedness for the adult jail. These facilities constituted the major opposition to our proposal [the 1994 jail-removal legislation]." (Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 8).

⁷⁷⁷Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 9.

⁷⁷⁸Gil Lawson, "Corrections' Top Officials Say

the bill in 1994's General Assembly that would have brought the state into compliance with the federal JJDPa on the jailers.⁷⁷⁹ For their part, the jailers have denied the profitability of housing juveniles. In a letter to the Courier-Journal, Bill Read, the Director of Juvenile Detention for the Franklin County Corrections Complex wrote:

If this were true, then it becomes obvious that Corrections wants the "gravy train" for themselves. However, reality is just the opposite. Holding juveniles is expensive, and an internal cost analysis done in February 1994 revealed that our rate of \$75 a day reflects our cost. Where's the "gravy," Mr. Lewis?⁷⁸⁰

Potential profit motive of jailers in "sending" counties who are considering operating juvenile-holding facilities which would not be in compliance with the federal JJDPa. There are two motivations as well for those counties not currently operating JHFs to create new JHFs. First, some counties are eager to reduce their existing juvenile-detention costs--expenses which are being incurred because they are sending their youth to "receiving"

Jailers Block Centers for Juveniles," The Courier-Journal, Thursday, May 19, 1994, sec. B, p. 5.

⁷⁷⁹Ibid.

⁷⁸⁰Bill Read, "Jailing Juveniles," Courier-Journal, Monday, May 30, 1994, sec. A, p. 10.

counties which operate juvenile-holding facilities. Second, the profit that current juvenile-holding facilities are making from holding juveniles from other counties has not been lost on the "sending" counties. Many of these counties are eager to become "receiving" counties so they can get their share of the profit pie.⁷⁸¹

Failure to educate the public as to the deleterious effects of jailing juveniles. Kentucky legislators feel that the citizenry supports placing status and public offenders in jails where adults reside because they think it will "teach them a lesson." The lessons that these youth learn in adult jails, however, do much to create more criminally-educated juveniles. In addition, the experience of being held in an adult jail where many of the youth are subjected to physical, sexual, and emotional abuse perpetuates a lot of the negative feelings these youth experience--feelings which often encourage, rather than discourage, criminal behaviour.⁷⁸²

Failure of the Kentucky General Assembly to pass legislation in compliance with federal law. House Bill 626, the bill introduced during the 1994 Kentucky General

⁷⁸¹Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 10.

⁷⁸²Ibid.

Assembly, was heralded as the state legislation that would finally bring Kentucky into compliance with the federal JJDP. However, the legislation as introduced--and particularly after it was amended in the House of Representatives--was "poorly crafted, inconsistent, and not in compliance with the mandates of Federal law."⁷⁸³ The applicants argue that "clearly written, well-conceptualized legislation is important if Kentucky is to ever codify jail-removal issues into binding statutes."⁷⁸⁴

Failure of the Kentucky Department of Corrections to develop regulations in compliance with the JJDP. The Kentucky Administrative Regulations (KAR), which form the basis for the state's monitoring of juvenile-holding facilities and intermittent holding facilities, are very weak. In federal court actions, these regulations have actually been used to excuse counties from properly protecting juveniles while they have been incarcerated in buildings which also house adults. Defendant counties have successfully argued that the state's own regulations do not require them to provide any additional security, services or programs from those they are required to provide for adults. In fact, some critics have argued that current

⁷⁸³Ibid.

⁷⁸⁴Ibid., p. 11.

state regulations on JHFs do not meet current constitutional standards based on case-law interpretations or current practices.⁷⁸⁵

Inability of the state to finance alternatives to detention programs due to termination of federal JJDPAs funds. Many of the applicants who did not receive federal funds when the grants were made in the Spring of 1994 may be forced to close down their operations. In addition, with the termination of federal funding, many alternatives-to-detention programs are in jeopardy of not being able to divert juveniles from adult jails. The need for these alternatives-to-detention programs are essential aspects of the state's plan for coming into compliance.⁷⁸⁶

County officials' lack of knowledge about current juvenile-detention practices. Most county officials have little knowledge of the potential liability resulting from holding juveniles in intermittent, or juvenile, holding facilities. To cite one blatant example, one of Kentucky's oldest juvenile-holding facilities in Floyd County has a shower room in it with a "blind spot"--that is, youth taking showers cannot be seen by any adult supervisor.

⁷⁸⁵Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 11.

⁷⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 11-12.

This clear violation of the Fourteenth Amendment may be the most egregious, but it is by no means unusual. At least one Kentucky architectural firm encourages the construction of juvenile-holding facilities which are in clear violation of the intent of both the federal JJDPa and the prevailing case law.⁷⁸⁷

Lack of appointment of counsel and adequate representation for juveniles who are accused of committing status and public offenses. Youth who are taken into custody in many of Kentucky's rural communities are not appointed an attorney to protect their rights and interests. In addition, some District Court judges routinely threaten to cause a considerable delay in holding a juvenile-detention hearing if the youth insist on having an attorney appointed. Besides denying many juveniles their rights, each of these practices artificially inflates the number of Kentucky juveniles who are detained. And placing greater numbers of juveniles in jails puts Kentucky out of compliance with the federal JJDPa.⁷⁸⁸

Lack of a Kentucky plan to overcome minority over-representation. The 1992 amendments to the federal JJDPa

⁷⁸⁷Ibid., pp. 12-13.

⁷⁸⁸Ibid., pp. 13-14.

expressed Congress's concern with the disproportionate number of minority youth who are held in secure facilities.

Section 223 (A) (23), a new section of the Act, requires participating states to

address efforts to reduce the proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure detention facilities, secure correctional facilities, jails, and lockups who are members of minority groups if such proportion exceeds the proportion such groups represent in the general population."⁷⁸⁹

So far as can be determined, Kentucky has not yet made any attempt to conduct a needs assessment regarding this problem nor has it developed a plan of action commensurate with this analysis. Kentucky's failure to meet this requirement of the Act jeopardizes the state's on-going participation in the Act. In addition, it perpetuates current practices that work to the detriment of children of colour in Kentucky.⁷⁹⁰

The Proposal

KYA and the other applicants are convinced that Kentucky needs a "coordinated, integrated, and multi-strategic approach in order to bring the state into compliance with the federal JJDP." ⁷⁹¹ By "coordinated" they

⁷⁸⁹Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 14.

⁷⁹⁰Ibid.

⁷⁹¹Ibid., p. 17.

mean that the methodology that will be looked at shortly resulted from a consensus formed by the three applicants and others with whom they consulted. By "integrated" they mean that each applicant has added its specific areas of expertise into a more unified whole which is more than the sum of their separate parts. By "multi-strategic" they mean that they do not rely on just one strategy. Instead, the programs described in this section utilize public education, technical assistance, fiscal policy, legal, legislative, financial, needs assessment, planning strategies, as well as direct services to youth and their families at the county level.⁷⁹²

Creating financial incentives for counties in compliance. As previously indicated, several jailers currently operating juvenile-holding facilities have created "profit centers" by detaining youth in their facilities. These jailers produce such a comfortable profit from their jails that they resist attempts to develop regional juvenile-detention centers. KYA and the other applicants propose to utilize federal funds to provide per diem incentives for the so-called "sending" counties to place their youth in juvenile-detention centers or in alternative to detention programs that are in

⁷⁹²Ibid.

compliance with the federal JJDP. It is expected that by creating a pool of funds which can be used to reduce the financial burden of sending counties, while at the same time encouraging high-volume counties to send their youth to compliant facilities, the number of juveniles held in several of the state's non-compliant JHFs will be reduced.⁷⁹³

Educating the public, monitoring the policy process, and developing compliant state legislation and regulations. As previously mentioned, the public is largely unaware of the human costs associated with holding juveniles in jails. To combat this, KYA will engage in a sustained effort to educate the public through the media. In addition, KYA will be responsible for monitoring the policy process by assessing proposed changes in legislation and regulations.⁷⁹⁴

Developing and maintaining alternatives-to-detention programs. As was stated earlier, one of the five key ingredients of a successful jail-removal plan is the development of a statewide system of alternatives-to-detention programs where juveniles can be held pending their adjudication. By maximizing the placement of youth

⁷⁹³Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 19.

⁷⁹⁴Ibid., p. 20.

in such alternative programs, the state will, in turn, decrease its use of secure juvenile-detention centers. KYA and the other applicants will conduct a needs assessment of which counties and regions are most in need of such programs and will seek applicants to operate alternative-to-detention programs.⁷⁹⁵

Enhancing appointment of counsel and due process protections. Because juveniles taken into custody in certain counties in Kentucky are not provided counsel during the required detention hearing, some youth are necessarily detained in non-compliant JHFs. Locally-appointed public defenders who are assigned as counsel for juveniles taken into custody may be overwhelmed by other responsibilities or not fully apprised as to how best to represent these youth. The applicants propose to provide more assertive representation for these youth by providing:

- (1) technical assistance to public defenders about individual youth;
- (2) resource materials including sample motions, briefs, and legal research to local attorneys;
- (3) actual representation in selected counties through the employment of in-house counsel or by contracting with some local counsel where denial of representation or detention practices are particularly egregious; and
- (4) in-service training for public defenders and other attorneys which

⁷⁹⁵Ibid., p. 21.

would enhance their capacity to represent juveniles in detention hearings.⁷⁹⁶

Conducting a minority over-representation study and developing a minority over-representation plan. The applicants propose to contract with researchers to conduct a study designed to examine the issue of minority over-representation in secure detention facilities along with possible solutions.⁷⁹⁷

Assisting state and local officials in their compliance efforts. Many local officials within Kentucky sincerely desire to hold juveniles in humane and constitutional settings consistent with practices in other parts of the country. However, due to the range of their responsibilities, many local officials do not have access to the technical expertise that is needed in juvenile-detention matters. They need a knowledgeable and independent consultant who can assist them in: (1) understanding federal law, state statutes, and current juvenile-justice practices which are mainstream ideas long used by local officials in other states, (2) developing efficacious alternatives-to-detention programs, (3)

⁷⁹⁶Ibid., p. 22.

⁷⁹⁷Detention Association, Kentucky Plan, p. 23.

determining which detention facilities to send the youth of their community to, and (4) developing architectural specifications and programmatic details for new, secure, juvenile-detention and alternatives-to-detention facilities.⁷⁹⁸

KYA and the Powers

This case provides a textbook example of the intransigence of power structures that was looked at from a theoretical perspective in chapter 4. The JJDPWA was passed in 1974, and for over twenty years various people and organizations have sought to bring Kentucky into compliance. It is easy to blame individuals for the failure of Kentucky to come into compliance, yet this is too simplistic a solution. It is unlikely that many of the individuals who initially blocked compliance are still involved in the issue today. What, then, is the reason? Sociologically, conflict theory provides some answers, yet one must add theology to sociology to grasp the issue in its entirety. As was seen in chapter 2, Wink wrote that if all the employees at General Motors were fired and replaced with new ones, GM would probably go on in much the same manner as it always had. Why? Real change must affect

⁷⁹⁸Ibid., p. 24.

more than just the visible forms an institution takes; somehow the very spirit, or core essence, of the institution as a whole must be transformed.⁷⁹⁹ This is where KYA and the other organizations involved failed. They sought to pass legislation without touching the spirit of the people and structures that were hindering them. Sociologically, KYA seems to have had a good grasp of the issue; it was a theological understanding that seems to have been lacking.

The lack of a theological understanding of the issue is reflected in KYA's 1981 filing of a class action lawsuit against seventy-eight county judge-executives and sixty-seven jailers. From a sociological perspective, it was a mistake. It polarized the opposition and pushed them into a corner. From a theological perspective, it was also a mistake in that it demonized the opposition rather than engaging them, which is an important aspect of Wink's theology and the model that will be developed in chapter 7.

Wink talked about the importance of individuals dying out from under the jurisdiction, command, and fear of the Powers. The model that will be developed will stress the importance of churches counting the cost of involvement and deciding whether they are willing to pay it before they

⁷⁹⁹Walter Wink, Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence, vol. 2 of The Powers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), pp. 79-80.

become involved in confronting systemic evil. The intransigence of power structures also underscores the necessity of churches to be willing to make long-term commitments to issues they engage.

The case is an excellent example of the importance of dealing with issues on a structural level rather than just as symptoms. KYA could easily have devoted its energies to helping and encouraging individual children who have been victimized by the Kentucky criminal justice system. Had KYA chosen this route, it might have received a lot of community support. Instead, KYA recognized the systemic injustice behind the individual symptoms and has sought to bring about change on that level. The Domination System has recognized this challenge to its jurisdiction and has struck back accordingly.

One reason Kentucky still is not in compliance with federal law has been due to the inability of KYA and the other organizations involved to rally public support behind the issue. From a sociological perspectives, public officials are very dependent on public opinion, and a lot can be accomplished if the public is behind an issue. From a theological perspective, Wink showed that people already know they belong to a greater whole and that kindness is right and domination is wrong. At some level, the jailers know that what they are doing is wrong. This means two things. First, KYA's initial task should simply have been

to call the jailers and the legislature back to their divine vocation--the enhancement of human life. Kentucky churches failed, incidentally, by not encouraging and supporting KYA in this. Second, if the Powers failed to answer this call, public opinion should have been brought to bear on the issue as a way of further reminding the Powers to whom they belong. In defense of KYA, this might have been difficult to do since it appears that public concern over the issue would have been difficult to mobilize.

The same paradox that was described in the Alinsky case study can be seen here as well. KYA has been willing to compromise in its attempts to bring Kentucky into compliance with the JJDPA. If KYA was to take too strident a stand, it would not even be listened to; it would not even be part of the debate. By compromising, however, KYA risks portraying the jailers and others in the opposition as benevolent individuals who have the kids' best interests at heart, thus making real systemic change more difficult.

Wink's emphasis on nonviolence finds embodiment in KYA. Since its inception, KYA has sought to bring about change through legal means alone. Had KYA resorted to violence to achieve its ends, it would have become that which it hated and would probably not be in existence today.

Chapters 3 and 4 described the interlocking nature

of power structures. This case is an excellent example of judicial institutions manipulating political institutions for the sake of economic gain.

There are a number of issues in this case study that are particularly relevant to churches. First and most importantly is the fact that Kentucky churches have played virtually no role in this issue. Both chapters 2 and 3 pointed out how churches have become enculturated into the values of the American Dream and far from confronting the Domination System, have embraced it. This case vividly illustrates this point. Other lessons churches can learn from this case include the importance of teamwork--several organizations have worked with KYA over the years seeking to bring about change; the importance of learning the issues--rarely are issues absolute and churches need to take the time to grasp both sides of any issue they are considering involving themselves in; and the importance of keeping communication lines open--as this case shows, when communication lines get cut, there is little that can be accomplished.

CONCLUSION

This case illustrates the dynamics and complexity of issues surrounding the confrontation of systemic evil. The intransigence of power structures, which was looked at

from a theoretical perspective in chapter 4, takes on living colours in this case study. In chapter 7, the lessons learned from this chapter and the earlier ones will be used to develop a church-based model for confronting evil within urban power structures.

Chapter 7

THEOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY INTERSECTING:
ENGAGING THE URBAN SYSTEMS
OF SOCIETY

This chapter is dedicated to the development of a model for organizational confrontation of evil as found within urban power structures. The model will be developed out of the theological and sociological research of chapters 2, 3, and 4, a reflection upon attempts to change urban power structures as illustrated in chapter 5, and the case study of one particular organization's encounter with urban power structures (chapter 6). To conclude, I shall offer a summary of the contents of the research, a summary of the implications of the research, suggestions for further research, and some final comments.

Introduction

The model that will be developed in the following pages is based on a non-violent philosophy. If this philosophy is not accepted and followed, the model itself will have no efficacious value. In insisting on the absolute necessity of non-violence, I am following the lead

of Jesus Himself. Jesus repudiated violence. When his disciples requested permission to call down fire from heaven to consume a group of Samaritans who they felt had acted inhospitably, Jesus censured them (Luke 9:51-56). Jesus warned against using repressive means to fight repressive Powers (Luke 13:1-3). On their missionary journeys, Jesus' disciples were not to take staffs for self-defense.⁸⁰⁰ When reviled, Jesus' followers were to bless; when cursed, they were to pray for those who abused them. Paul summarizes the apparently universal aversion to violence possessed by the early Church: "The weapons we use in our fight are not the weapons of the Domination System (kosmos) but God's powerful weapons to destroy strongholds."⁸⁰¹ The followers of Jesus were to conform their lives to the life of Jesus by loving their enemies and doing good to those who hated them.⁸⁰²

At the heart of this nonviolent orientation to evil is a refusal to let one's responses be determined by what one deplors. Jesus' revolutionary counsel in confronting evil (turning the other cheek, stripping naked, carrying a

⁸⁰⁰Matt. 10:10 and Luke 9:3; but contradicted by Mark 6:8.

⁸⁰¹2 Cor. 10:4--Wink's translation.

⁸⁰²Walter Wink, Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination, vol. 3 of The Powers (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp. 126-27. See also Matt. 5:43-48; Luke 6:27-28, 32-36; Rom. 12:14-21.

soldier's pack the second mile)⁸⁰³ are not exhortations to acquiesce passively to evil but are examples of a deliberate strategy designed to seize the initiative and overthrow evil.⁸⁰⁴ If this model is to be successful, it must embody a way for activists to oppose evil without becoming evil in the process. The means used must be consistent with the desired end: a society of justice, peace, and equality free of authoritarianism, oppression, and ranking. The methods and goals must both be domination-free.⁸⁰⁵ The four case studies found in chapters 5 and 6 all provide examples of attempts at change through non-violent means.

The Model

The model that is developed in the following pages consists of two main parts. The first section deals with growing a congregation which has a spiritual and emotional desire to engage and transform the urban structures of society. In addition, this section deals with creating the intellectual environment necessary to be effective in such an endeavor. The second section of the model deals with

⁸⁰³Matt. 5:39-41; Luke 6:29.

⁸⁰⁴Wink, Engaging, p. 127. See also Matt. 5:38-42; Rom. 12:14-21; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Pet. 3:9.

⁸⁰⁵Wink, Engaging, p. 127.

the actual engagement of urban power structures through both prophecy and non-violent direct action.

Discerning the Angel of
a Congregation

Chapter 2 described Wink's understanding of angels. It will be remembered that Wink views angels as the actual spirituality of an institution as a single entity. A church's angel is the coincidence of what the church is--its personality--and what God desires for it to become--its vocation. The angel of a congregation and the congregation itself are the inner and outer manifestations of one and the same realities. The congregation incarnates the angelic spirit; the angel distills the invisible essence of the totality of the congregation.⁸⁰⁶ As Wink put it:
The angel gathers up into a single whole all the aspirations and grudges, hopes and vendettas, fidelity and unfaithfulness of a given community of believers, and lays it all before God for judgment, correction, and healing.⁸⁰⁷

The initial task of a pastor, then, is to discern the angel of the congregation. A pastor must understand the spirituality of the congregation before it can be guided to become a congregation capable of engaging urban power

⁸⁰⁶Walter Wink, Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence, vol. 2 of The Powers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), p. 70.

⁸⁰⁷Ibid., p. 73.

structures. It is not easy for those who have been schooled in the Western outlook and do not have a strong background in sociology to discern the angel of a church. Most Americans are brought up with a very individualistic world view and consequently regard a group of people as a mere aggregate of individuals with no characteristics unique to the group. It takes a change in one's world view to perceive a church, a corporation, or a society as a Gestalt with its own history, character, and calling. In addition, our Western outlook tends to be materialistic and implicitly denies that a group can have a spirit. As Wink puts it, we "do not perceive the angel because we have been trained not to live as seeing the invisible."⁸⁰⁸

If one wishes to discern the angel of a church, the first task is to see what is there; one needs to become acquainted with the angel's personality. How is this done?

If a congregation and its physical structures are the outward manifestation of the angelic personality, then the angel of a church can be discerned through an analysis of its congregation. Sociology provides many of the tools necessary for congregational analysis. Using sociology, a pastor can start from the visible, isolate the manifest characteristics of a church, and discover what each reveals as to the personality of its angel.

⁸⁰⁸Ibid.

History. Knowledge of a congregation begins with an understanding of its past--its collective memory--and its expectation for the future. Within the cascade of events that constitute the total past of a congregation, a web connects certain incidents significant for understanding the character of the congregation. It is important to identify those events and persons which seem to have been the instruments of subsequent happenings. Through gathering oral histories, researching written documents, tracing time lines, etc., an understanding can be gained of a congregation's own particular story that traces its life to the present and into the future.⁸⁰⁹

Heritage. The heritage of a congregation is that which a congregation acknowledges to be its inheritance of beliefs and practices about the Christian faith and life and the purpose of the church, which is its reason for being, and which it owns by virtue of being a Christian church and standing in that particular historical stream. The beliefs and practices which comprise the heritage of a particular congregation are contained not only in the Scriptures but in the creeds and confessions, the councils

⁸⁰⁹Jackson W. Carroll, Carl S. Dudley, and William McKinney, eds., Handbook for Congregational Studies (Nashville: Abingdon, 1986), pp. 23-25.

of the church, the writings, liturgies, hymns, and stories of the church through the ages in its variety of denominational expressions. These are mediated to an individual congregation not only through the prism of a particular denomination, but also through the unique experiences of the congregation itself, both in its past and its present. It is this particular distillation of beliefs and practices out of the great tradition of the Church, mixed with elements of the unique history and experiences of a congregation, which give the congregation its peculiar flavour.⁸¹⁰

World view. A congregation's world view is the perspective it uses to make sense of its total life. That life touches not only the personal lives of the members of a congregation, but also the various societies in which a membership participates, as well as what it considers nature and the sacred. A congregation's world view gives shape to what is experienced, giving universal significance to the raw data received through the five senses.⁸¹¹

World views vary. What one person or group finds to be valid, real, feared, or suspected about life may be totally at variance with that of another person or group.

⁸¹⁰Ibid., pp. 25-26.

⁸¹¹Ibid., p. 32.

While world views differ, they do not occur randomly in human groups. One interesting discovery made by sociologists is the roughly common pattern of members' world views. Individuals may both select a local church that possesses a world view congenial with their own, and also, once a part of that congregation, align their own perspectives more closely to the dominant interpretation of life shared by other members.⁸¹²

Symbols. A symbol can be defined simply as that which stands for something else. Virtually everything said and done in a congregation is, therefore, symbolic, representing something different from the actual sights, sounds, and movements that convey their meaning. Individuals participate in congregational life not simply to experience the direct effect of its words and actions; they also long to represent symbolically their association with a reality beyond the specific event they themselves make.

While almost anything can be viewed as symbolic, a little more specificity is needed for the purposes of congregational analysis. For this purpose, one is mainly concerned with symbols that stand for something with a high degree of emotional stimulus but low specificity as to what

⁸¹²Ibid.

that something is. Frequently, a congregation will use the Cross as its primary symbol. While most members will express a relatively high degree of emotion in their association with the Cross, they may have difficulty pinning down in precise terms exactly what the Cross symbolizes.⁸¹³ Symbols, to use Victor Turner's term, are multivocal; they evoke a mysterious complexity of meaning and do so in a way that one's identity is itself caught up in their enactment.⁸¹⁴

The symbols of a congregation may have no patently Christian association. A chandelier in the sanctuary, for example, may convey senses of illumination, beauty, and property important to a congregation's identity but may imply no distinctly Christian quality. In addition, symbols are often unconsciously presented. While objects such as a banner may be deliberately displayed as a symbol, many others, such as furniture arrangements and financial disclosures, represent, symbolically, aspects critical to a congregation's identity.⁸¹⁵

⁸¹³Carroll, Handbook, pp. 35-36.

⁸¹⁴Victor Turner, Drama, Fields and Metaphors (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1974), p. 29. For an extended discussion, see his The Forest of Symbols (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1967), pp. 19-41.

⁸¹⁵Carroll, Handbook, p. 36.

Ritual. Ritual can be defined as "repetitive action that has more than utilitarian significance."⁸¹⁶ It is acts by which groups express meanings and relationships that are of enduring significance to their life. All groups that exist over time will develop rituals through which they communicate what is central to their existence.

Churches are no exception. Within congregations, rituals communicate meanings and relationships that express a congregation's identity--either what its identity actually is (or once was), or what its identity is becoming. Thus, a congregation says something about itself as a community by the sincerity of the ritual greeting that visitors receive at the door of the church. The ways a church ritually celebrates the Lord's Supper, celebrates holidays, and acts at the time of the death of one of its members are just a few of the rituals which reveal something of the identity of the congregation.⁸¹⁷

Demography. Demography involves the careful description of a congregation, typically using statistics.

Demographic analysis can give important clues to a congregation's identity, both its perception of itself and the identity it presents to outsiders. A demographic

⁸¹⁶Ibid., p. 37.

⁸¹⁷Ibid.

analysis of a congregation includes a description of the age, sex, marital status, race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, etc. of its membership. How does this relate to identity? In the case of individuals, personal characteristics comprise some of the elements that provide a sense of who one is. This sense of who one is is not only an identity of one's own making but is partly derived from the culturally defined meanings which others attribute to one in light of their interpretation of one's demographic characteristics.⁸¹⁸

If this is true for individuals, it is also true for congregations. The concern here is not with the individual identities of the congregation's members, but with the demographic picture that the members constitute in the aggregate. This involves the same kinds of characteristics that were looked at in relation to individuals. What is of interest is both the distribution of the various demographic characteristics across the congregation--how homogeneous or heterogeneous the congregation is--and a picture of the typical or average member, if there is such. Both are important ingredients of a congregation's identity--what it is presently, and what it is likely to become.⁸¹⁹

⁸¹⁸Ibid., p. 41.

⁸¹⁹Carroll, Handbook, p. 41.

Character. The character of a congregation refers to the totality of the corporate dimensions of its outlook (heritage and world view), activity (history and ritual), constitution (demographic picture), and expression (symbol). In this sense, character and identity are virtually synonymous. Character, however, also identifies another aspect of identity not yet mentioned. This is the moral dimension of congregational life: its values, its preferred behavioural tone, its ethos, its corporate integrity.⁸²⁰

Like the other elements of identity, character refers both to what a congregation is and to what it may become. On the one hand, character brings together the means by which a congregation simply exists in the world-- what Clifford Geertz calls its "tendencies, capacities, propensities, skills, habits, liabilities, pronenesses."⁸²¹ On the other hand, character refers to the capacity of the congregation to engage in moral deliberation. A church has the freedom to "have character" as well as just to "be" a collection of characteristic traits.⁸²² According to Stanley Hauerwas, character "denotes not only what is distinctive

⁸²⁰Ibid., p. 43.

⁸²¹Clifford Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures (New York: Basic, 1973), p. 95.

⁸²²Carroll, Handbook, p. 43.

but also what is in some measure deliberate, what a man can decide to be opposed to what he is naturally."⁸²³

It is helpful in understanding character to contrast it with world view. While the latter refers to what a congregation perceives, character has to do with what the members prefer or value. As Carroll and his associates succinctly put it, "World view treats what people suspect is going on, character what they wish would go on."⁸²⁴

Transforming the Angel of a Congregation

There is only one way to transform the angel of a congregation, and that is through a process I shall call "conscientization." Just as a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step, the process of conscientization begins with individuals within a congregation. As was seen in chapter 3, the Church has been victimized by its enculturation into the values of the American Dream--what Tom Sine calls "the captivity of the Christian mind."⁸²⁵ The Cross exposes the Church's complicity with the Powers--the

⁸²³ Stanley Hauerwas, Vision and Virtue (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1981), p. 52.

⁸²⁴ Carroll, Handbook, p. 43.

⁸²⁵ See chap. 8 of Tom Sine, Wild Hope (Dallas: Word, 1991).

willingness of Christians to trade their freedom to be all that they can in Christ for temporal advantage. The Church is called to resist the claim of anything finite as absolute. To escape from "the sirens of the Great Consumer Society,"⁸²⁶ individuals must begin to see beyond the myths that they have been born into by virtue of living in a society governed by the Domination System. This is why I use the term "conscientization" rather than "education." Education implies the reception of new knowledge and, while this is necessary, what is needed is not so much new knowledge as a new awareness. Individuals must begin to see through the myths that they have been taught all their lives to the reality behind them. As was seen in chapter 2, the Domination System teaches individuals what to believe, what to value, and what to see. The first step in this process involves simply recognizing that society perpetuates myths that are diametrically opposed to the truth of God. It is not necessary, initially, to understand these myths nor the reality behind them, but there must be a recognition that what one sees and is taught is somehow disingenuous. In other words, an individual must recognize that all is not as it seems even if he or she does not know where truth lies.

I began my journey through this initial stage in

⁸²⁶Ibid., p. 207.

1985. I remember feeling quite dissatisfied with my life, my church, and society as a whole. I felt that I was living in a fantasy world, but I didn't know how to escape from it. I felt distant from God but didn't know how to reach God. I was looking for something, but I wasn't sure what it was nor how to obtain it. I wrestled with these feelings for months. Something within told me that I would never find what I was looking for as long as I remained in my comfort zone, which, for me, was a white middle-class Baptist church in a small city in a small province on the east coast of Canada. I felt God was telling me to go out beyond where I was comfortable and to experience life from the perspective of those who haven't prospered under the myths of the American Dream. I felt led to seek out the God of the oppressed. And so I did just that. Through a program called the Seminary Consortium for Urban Pastoral Education (SCUPE), I was given the opportunity to experience life from a new perspective. I moved to another country (the United States of America), lived in a much larger city (Chicago), worked among the poorest of the American poor (in the Cabrini-Green housing project), in a different culture (African-American), through a different church tradition (Lutheran). I could not have experienced a much more divergent life from what I had been accustomed to without leaving North America altogether. There, among the poor and the oppressed of Cabrini-Green, I began to

experience God through people whose faith was shining brightly amidst guns, drugs, poverty, and death. I realized how little I relied on God--how much my middle-class existence stifled the experience of God's presence--to what extent I placed my trust in things other than God.

All this is simply to say that the process of conscientization begins within individuals who must, themselves, become dissatisfied with their existence and the messages they hear from society and the assumptions they are taught. This is not to say that the pastor of a church cannot encourage this process in his or her congregation, but a pastor must realize that people are at many different points on the spiritual journey. Some will not understand what is being taught about the spiritual journey, and others will be threatened by it. The most a pastor can hope for is to discover who the ones are whom God has prepared to understand the message, and lead them further along the road.

How does a pastor discover these individuals and lead them along the road called conscientization? There are a number of ways. It must be stressed from the outset that the process of conscientization is a lifelong process.

It cannot be rushed. Further, one does not become free from the Powers by defeating them in a frontal assault. Rather, one must die to their control. The Domination System's strategy is to eviscerate opposition by a sense of

induced powerlessness. To accept its lies as true is, in effect, to worship the Domination System, to hold its values to be ultimate, to stake one's life on the permanence of its sway. Wink writes:

Obeisance to the [Domination System] requires as its gesture a continuous shrug "I just carried out my orders. If I hadn't done so, someone else would have" (shrug). "I don't enjoy the violence depicted in my company's films, but this is what the public wants" (shrug). "I didn't want to get on drugs, but I was afraid the other kids would say I was square" (shrug).⁸²⁷

R. D. Laing puts it this way:

Each person claims his own inessentiality In this collection of reciprocal indifference, of reciprocal inessentiality and solitude, there appears to exist no freedom. There is conformity to a presence that is everywhere elsewhere Mind and body are torn, ripped, shredded, ravaged, exhausted by these Powers and Principalities in their cosmic conflict.⁸²⁸

Domination always involves more than power. Dominators exert power by extracting being from the dominated. Capitalists often get more than the labour power and surplus value of their workers; they also degrade the workers' being and puff up their own being.⁸²⁹

Domination is all the more potent when it is not recognized. Poor people are not likely to describe

⁸²⁷Wink, Engaging, p. 99.

⁸²⁸R. D. Laing, The Politics of Experience (New York: Pantheon, 1967), pp. 13, 132.

⁸²⁹Wink, Engaging, p. 101.

themselves as feeling dominated; the emotions they do express, however, are often related to domination. Feelings of being valueless, humiliated, and nonexistent are all related to domination. The oppressed often have little confidence in themselves, and actually believe that the rich know what they need better than they themselves. People not only choose to be where they have been detained, but they often conclude that because of God, the fates, or their own inadequacies, they deserve what they get. Remember the Bolivian Indian woman whose eyes had been opened by a Bible study in a Christian base community who expressed in astonishment: "Do you mean that nowhere in that Book does it say we have to starve?"⁸³⁰ Review the three case studies in chapter 5 to see the extent to which the Domination System succeeded in creating a sense of powerlessness and hopelessness in the residents of the communities. Note, too, how the organizers in the first two studies worked to give to the residents a sense of power and control over their lives.

This kind of empowerment is healing. Simple awareness of the oppression one is experiencing is never enough to effect systemic change, but it is its indispensable precondition. Liberation from negative socialization and internalized oppression is a never-

⁸³⁰Ibid., pp. 101-02.

finished task. To exercise godly discernment, one needs eyes that see the invisible. To break the spell of delusion, one needs a vision of God's domination-free order such as was described at the start of chapter 3.⁸³¹

Here, as always, the Cross is the model: one is liberated, not by striking back at what enslaves--for even striking back reveals that one is still determined by its violent ethos--but through dying out from under its jurisdiction and command.⁸³²

Ephesians speaks of people having been killed by the Powers: "You were dead through the trespasses and sins in which you once walked, following the course of the Domination System (kosmos)."⁸³³ But how can dying raise the dead? Americans are dead insofar as they have been socialized into patterns of injustice. People die, bit by bit, when expectations, foreign to their humanity, are forced upon them. And Christians must die to these expectations and socialized patterns of behaviour if they are to live again. Wink summarizes the situation succinctly:

We died as we began to become complicit in our own alienation and that of others. We died as we grew to love our bondage, to rationalize, justify, and even

⁸³¹Ibid., pp. 103-04.

⁸³²Ibid., p. 157.

⁸³³Eph. 2:1-2--Wink's translation.

champion it. And by a kind of heavenly homeopathy, we must swallow what killed us in order to come to life.⁸³⁴

Those who have grown up surrounded by privilege and wealth may have missed what it means to be truly human by having been nurtured at the center of a universe revolving around their own desires. Others, born in the midst of life-sucking poverty and the contempt of those in authority, may have missed life by never feeling truly human. As Wink writes, "If the advantaged must die to their egocentricity, the underprivileged must die to their hopelessness, fatalism, and acquiescence in their own despoiling."⁸³⁵

The list, of course, does not end here. Rationalists may need to die to idolatry of the mind, proud achievers to their accomplishments, and women to the expectations and prohibitions of androcratic society. Even those who have had their lives stolen from them must lose their lives to find them. As Wink puts it, "They must die to what killed them."⁸³⁶

One must understand clearly that the oppressors

⁸³⁴Wink, Engaging, p. 157. The failure of Western Christianity has been precisely in its assumption that rebirth is a private, inward event only. Western Christianity has largely failed to recognize that one must also die to whatever in one's social surroundings has shaped one inauthentically (Wink, Engaging, p. 158).

⁸³⁵Ibid., p. 158.

⁸³⁶Ibid.

within urban power structures are victims of the same Domination System that oppresses the victims of society. The Domination System acts to socialize people into their roles from the earliest age--and this includes oppressors as well as the oppressed. Wink writes, "We can hold out hope for the transformation of oppressors because to some degree they too are victims of the system and at some level have felt conflicted" ⁸³⁷

Politicians, corporate executives, those in charge of our economic institutions, and business leaders are not aware of whom they are serving. They probably believe the lies they have been taught. Society continually reinforces and justifies the tendency to "blame the victim," which is a ubiquitous characteristic of American society. Oppressors, (as well as the oppressed) tend to "misbelieve" the same misinformation about themselves that the social system as a whole teaches. ⁸³⁸ One must be careful, too, not

⁸³⁷Ibid., p. 97.

⁸³⁸Ricky Sherover-Marcuse, "Unlearning Racism Workshops," and "Towards a Perspective on Unlearning Racism: 12 Working Assumptions," 6501 Dana, Oakland, CA 94609. It should be noted that the model developed here does not adopt the social determinism of Sherover-Marcuse. Oppressors (as well as the oppressed) are not just victims. If they were, they would cease to be moral agents responsible for their oppression. They have been seduced but are responsible for having let themselves be seduced. Wink has written: "This is the paradox of moral maturity: we are responsible for what we do with what has been done to us. We are answerable for what we make of what has been made of us. Our capitulation to the delusional system may

to visualize these societal leaders with horns, tails, and pitch forks. Often, the people one opposes are good parents, contribute to worthy causes, work as deacons in their churches, and are strong supporters of the family and "traditional morality."

The wonder of it all is found in the discovery, on the other side of annihilation, that one is still alive. To give oneself is undeniable proof that one has a self to give. Through dying, the Christian renounces ownership of his or her house and acknowledges that the whole property belongs to God. God graciously allows the Christian to go on living in the house but there is now no doubt whose house it is.⁸³⁹

In helping a congregation die to its fear of the Powers, several different strategies must be employed since no one will fit all people. What are some of these strategies?

Dialogue. It is important that pastors participate in very intentional dialogue. This is not dialogue for the

have been involuntary, but in some deep recess of the self we knew it was wrong. We are so fashioned that no Power on earth can finally drum out of us the capacity to recognize truth. However long it must lie buried, or however severely it has been betrayed, truth will out" (Wink, Engaging, p. 98).

⁸³⁹Wink, Engaging, pp. 159-60.

sake of talking but to discover where the members of a congregation are spiritually. Ask them to relate their spiritual stories. Inquire as to their life journeys and the lessons they've learned. Ask them what is really important to them. Pastors need to share these things about themselves as well. Of course, this kind of dialogue can occur at times other than during formal visitation. Informal discussions can pop up any time and be used by the sensitive pastor for spiritual growth. Through this kind of genuine dialogue, it is possible for pastors to come to an understanding of their people and determine which ones seem to be most open to the type of growth necessary for one to die to the fear of the Powers and for confrontation of systemic evil.

Worship services. Worship services can touch the heart as well as the mind. Pastors can choose themes such as homelessness, child abuse, or poverty and build entire services around these themes. When well prepared, a worship service can bypass resistance people may have in their minds and reach them on an emotional level.

A central role in Jewish and Christian worship has traditionally been given to confession of sin. However, this, too, can be corrupted by the Powers. Confession of sin should involve confessing one's complicity with the Powers, that is, the ways one benefits from the injustices

structured to one's advantage, and the racist and sexual stereotypes that one thoughtlessly perpetuates in one's encounters with others. Instead, Christians tend to confess infractions of the rules the Powers themselves have established. Wink writes:

Forgiveness of sins often functions, not as an act of liberation from the delusional system, but as a rite of reinsertion into it [W]hat we need is not to be cleaned up and sent right back into a corrupt society, but to be lifted out of it altogether, by a sovereign act of God, who wipes the slate clean and offers us a new reality, the reality intended for us from the foundation of the world.⁸⁴⁰

Sermons. Sermons provide a wonderful opportunity for pastors to move members of their congregations further along in their understanding of evil. The positive aspect of sermons is that, if done well, people can take from them what they are ready to hear. People do not have to be at the same point spiritually to benefit from sermons. However, sermons can be detrimental if done poorly. A sermon that is too far beyond the majority of a congregation can leave members feeling puzzled, if not downright hostile. As in everything, sensitivity is called for.

Bible studies. Bible studies can be a valuable

⁸⁴⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 160.

tool for raising the consciousness of the members of one's congregation. Further, those who desire to attend such a Bible study may be the ones most open to such growth. The sensitive pastor who listens to the questions asked and the informal discussion that develops can learn a lot as to who is most open to the type of ministry envisioned.

Literary studies. While conscientization certainly involves more than education, education is vital. Progressive members of a congregation can benefit a great deal from studies of books other than the Bible. Books by such authors as Tony Campolo, Ron Sider, Malcolm Muggeridge, Robert Linthicum, Dieter Hessel, and, of course, Walter Wink can be invaluable tools for a pastor in educating a congregation on the nature of the Domination System. Chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation can be valuable resources in the education of a congregation, providing lessons on the nature of evil within capitalism, on the distribution of power within urban power structures, and on an understanding of society from a conflict perspective. The importance of educating a congregation cannot be over-stressed. As the third case study in chapter 5 illustrates, those who are not sensitive to the theological and sociological reality of the Domination System and the power structures which make it up can become unwitting accomplices to the oppression of the poor. In

addition, through a study of the four case studies found in chapters 5 and 6, members of a congregation can come to appreciate the dynamics involved in engaging urban power structures (especially their intransigence), as well as the challenges and excitement involved in such encounters. The strategies employed by the community organizations in each of the case studies can help to spark the flow of creative juices in the participants so that creative ways of engaging unjust urban power structures can be discovered.

Cross-cultural experiences. Nothing can touch the heart and soul of individuals more than the experience of cross-cultural ministry. In experiencing another culture or way of life, individuals can be confronted with the "underside" of the American Dream and see realities for which their world views have no room. This is especially true with teenagers who generally have not so much emotional investment in their world views as do older generations. The year I spent in Chicago challenged and changed my world view in ways that books or lectures could never have done. I saw how blatant racism still is in American society, even amidst the rhetoric that we are a colour-blind society. I saw violence snuffing out young lives before they had hardly begun. I saw an education system that hinders even the brightest and best-motivated children. I witnessed families torn apart by drugs and

alcohol. I saw the cruel effects of poverty on the human spirit. And most importantly to my social and spiritual development, I began to understand the systemic causes behind these evils.

Mission trips can open the eyes of people to a side of society they have not previously experienced. On an individual basis, churches can encourage their young people to spend a summer involved in organizations such as the Evangelical Association for the Promotion of Education (EAPE) and Kingdom Works.⁸⁴¹ Churches can also plan group trips. These can be relatively modest ventures such as volunteering to work for a weekend with Habitat for Humanity,⁸⁴² or they can be much more ambitious ventures to other countries. In either case, these experiences can change the course of people's lives, providing the Holy Spirit opportunities to speak to individuals in ways to which they previously might not have been open.

One does not necessarily have to leave one's city to benefit from cross-cultural experiences. For example,

⁸⁴¹Founded by Tony Campolo and Bart Campolo respectively, these organizations offer summer and two-year internships for teenagers and young adults who desire to live and minister in another culture, either in Philadelphia or in Haiti. I spent two summers in Philadelphia as an EAPE summer volunteer.

⁸⁴²Habitat for Humanity is a not-for-profit venture where volunteers work with low-income people to build homes. The low-income individuals are given the homes they help to build.

an Anglo suburban church could join hands with an African-American inner-city church in an ongoing project. The list of possible ventures is limited only by one's imagination.

The churches could work together fixing meals for needy seniors. They could renovate housing for low-income families. They could host after-school programs for kids, job-skills programs for the homeless, or support programs for people with AIDS. The churches' contexts will help determine the ministry. If there are a lot of single parents in the community, churches can work together offering support and training to them. Other possibilities include providing relief to disaster victims, refugee sponsorship, and ministries to the handicapped. And, of course, evil within urban power structures can be challenged. If a lot of young people in the community are dying due to a proliferation of guns, churches can work together for gun control and education. The impact inner-city and suburban churches can have by speaking on important issues with one voice is profound. Whatever ministry is decided on, it is important to remember that it is not a ministry from the suburban church to the inner-city church. It is not, after all, just Black inner-city kids who are victims of shootings, get Aids, get pregnant, or need after-school programs. A ministry should be chosen that provides opportunities for both churches to minister.

As the on-going project continues, the churches

need to provide opportunities for the participants to come together for fellowship and dialogue. The communication, encouragement, intimacy, education, and even conflict that arise from these ministries and meetings can have a deep and lasting impact on the participants' world views and life goals.

Special ministries. Churches that get involved in relatively simple ministries such as food programs or clothes closets can have their eyes opened to the reality of suffering in their cities. Some may begin to ask questions as to why there are so many homeless or hungry and if anything more can be done to help them. In answer to such questions, a pastor might sponsor a series of seminars with knowledgeable persons as to the causes versus the symptoms of social ills, and what things can be done to bring healing. In any event, the sensitive pastor will watch for these "kairos" moments and will seek to use them to maximum benefit.

Special events. Special events such as World Hunger Day and AIDS Awareness Day provide valuable opportunities for education and consciousness-raising. Special programs can be developed and speakers brought in to commemorate these events. Activities can be developed for all age groups and inter-generational dialogue can also

be encouraged.

Engaging the Powers: The
Prophetic Task

The destruction and fragmentation that the Powers have created in the persons, systems, and structures of society have been well documented within this dissertation.

Indeed, such evil in the United States is a cancer at the very heart of the nation. The Church has a God-given task of critiquing the social order and calling the nation and her structures back to their godly vocation. How does a church critique an urban power structure? It will be remembered that chapter 3 provides a critique of domination and points to God's domination-free order. In critiquing the activities of a particular power structure, the standard developed in chapter 3 should prove particularly helpful. A church has merely to ask the question, to what extent is the power structure violating the principles of God's domination-free order? That way it can determine whether the structure needs to be called back to its vocation under God. In addition, KYA's process of choosing an issue can easily be adapted for church use.

Remember, in chapter 2 it was pointed out that the Church does not have to make Christ the Lord of the Powers; He already is. The Church has the privilege of calling attention to the fact that the world already belongs to

Him. The Powers, despite their constant effort to deny it, are indissolubly linked to Christ and cannot exist for a single moment, even in their idolatry, apart from Him. The church's initial task is clear. The church is simply to proclaim to corrupt urban power structures that they do not exist as ends in themselves, but for the humanizing purposes of God as revealed in Jesus. The church does not have to relate them to God. By virtue of their creation, they are already related to God. The church simply has to remind them that they exist in and through and for God.⁸⁴³

People already know that they belong to a greater whole. Regardless of their personal and corporate ethics, they want to be treated by others according to human values. People know in their spirits that kindness is right and domination is wrong. Governments and corporations spend billions trying to convince themselves and persuade others that they abide by moral values. The church's initial task is simply to remind wayward power structures of what they already, at some deep level, know.⁸⁴⁴

Thus, odd as it may sound, the church's first task toward oppressors is pastoral: to help them recover their humanity. God's will for corrupt power structures is that they be enabled to rise above their present condition and

⁸⁴³Wink, Engaging, p. 167.

⁸⁴⁴Ibid.

become more of what God created them to be. The enemy is not monolithic; some in the opposition feel conflict and guilt over what they are doing and can be converted. There is "that of God" in everyone that can be appealed to if they recognize that the Church is not out to destroy them.

The Church must pray for its enemies because somewhere within them is a profound longing to become synchronized with God who is the divine Source of all. And deep within the power structures of society, the Source is seeking to stir up the desire to be just.⁸⁴⁵ The church's goal in biblical language is found in Ephesians 3:10--"that through the church the wisdom of God in its rich variety might now be made known to the rulers and powers in the heavenly places."

The church's attempts at social change will never be successful until it learns to utilize the truth and strength in its adversaries. No social struggle can hope to be effective if it only changes structural arrangements with no attempt to alter their spirituality. All the many and varied strategies of social change including letter writing, petitioning, political and community organizing, demonstrating, civil disobedience, prayers, and fasting will ultimately be ineffective unless they move toward the end of recalling the Powers to the humanizing purposes of

⁸⁴⁵Ibid., p. 276.

God revealed in Jesus.⁸⁴⁶ As Wink writes, Christians can help their opponents "grow toward the Light by being open to them, affirming their humanity, and praying for their transformation."⁸⁴⁷

This was one of the major mistakes KYA made in the early stages of their struggle to bring Kentucky into compliance with the JJDPA. KYA was too strident too early and painted the opposition with a "diabolical brush." They pushed members of the opposition into a corner by filing a class action lawsuit against seventy-eight county judge-executives and sixty-seven jailers in 1981. The opposition was left with little choice but to fight back.

All this is simply to say that the first thing that is required is that a church must understand and appreciate the systems and structures which make up the society within which it abides. The church's goal must be to minister to the "soul" of these structures, and this cannot be done unless they are valued and appreciated. Admiration can easily degenerate into idolatry, however, unless the object of the admiration is viewed in light of its true vocation under God. This vocation can only be discerned, in the case of urban power structures, when the angel who bears the message of what the structure might become is known.

⁸⁴⁶Ibid., p. 165.

⁸⁴⁷Ibid., p. 277.

The Powers are active in the persons, systems, and structures of society and Christians must learn to identify them even as the destructiveness and fragmentation they create is witnessed.

As has been seen, the Church largely abandoned its prophetic task when it was invited to become a part of the "power structure" of the empire under Constantine and legitimate the state. By this process, any social critique was effectively eviscerated and rendered harmless. It is time for the Church to reclaim its calling and remind the Powers to whom they belong. It is time for the Church to proclaim that Christ has already conquered the Powers and "testify to a sovereign rule which seems so little in historical evidence[.]"⁸⁴⁸ I call this the prophetic task of the Church. Its object is "that through the church, the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places" (Ephesians 3:10). The Church is assigned the task of calling corrupt power structures to repentance--that is, to demand that they recover their vocation under God's sovereignty. The Church, by this very act, involves itself in critiquing injustice and idolatry.

It is not an easy question as to when a pastor

⁸⁴⁸Bill Kellermann, "Spirits of the Age: Walter Wink's Unmasking of the Powers," Sojourners, 17, no. 5 (May 1988), 24.

should begin the transition from the process of conscientization to the actual engagement of urban power structures. Certainly, there may be no clear demarcation but a gradual shifting in emphases of the congregation as they begin to focus more on the community and the situations existing within it. A pastor may lead a church to begin to deal with relatively simple and clear-cut issues and ones where success is likely to help the congregation grow in confidence and become more cohesive (see the case studies in chapter 5). Certainly, great sensitivity and discernment on the part of the pastor is necessary to avoid pushing the congregation too far too quickly. Here, as in all things, sensitivity to the leading of the Holy Spirit and patience is called for.

Preliminary considerations. Before a pastor leads his or her church in the active confrontation of systemic evil, the pastor must make absolutely certain that the members know what they are getting themselves into and have fully counted the cost. It is far better not to begin the journey at all than to go a few miles and turn back. In addition, there are some strategic considerations that should be addressed that, if followed, will make success much more probable. First, it must be stressed that most confrontations will require a long-term commitment. Not only are people more comfortable with the status quo but

particular individuals often have a very real investment in keeping things the way they are. In addition, the law of inertia dictates that change will only rarely come without a great commitment of time and energy. Members of a congregation or a social action committee within a congregation must honestly ask themselves if they are willing to make a long-term commitment to the cause.

Related to this is the idea that change usually occurs in increments. Churches may be tempted to hold out for all they want because of the assumed righteousness of their cause and because "God is on our side." Churches hate the word "compromise." However, such an attitude is self-defeating. In the real world, people sometimes have to settle for less than they want (but more than they might have gotten). Victories are rarely complete. Pastors can help their churches understand this if they bring them, from the beginning, to an understanding of the incremental nature of change. A review of the three case studies in chapter 5 can aid in this understanding. Each community organization realized that, despite the righteousness of its cause, it would have to settle for what could reasonably be achieved. Each had to be content with getting the Powers to "bend," without forcing them to give up their power positions.

Third, a congregation must be willing to seek to understand both sides of the issue. Issues very rarely are

absolute. They can be very complex with both sides having valid points in their favour. A commitment must be made to seek to understand both points of view. This serves two purposes. First, it will help the church members not to demonize the opposition and become overly self-righteous. Second, it will enable them to defend their own position when they are attacked or criticized. Without a thorough understanding of their own position and that of the opposition, there will be a continual cutting away of their position as they encounter different perspectives on the issue.

Fourth, it is important that a congregation "count the cost" of its involvement. In other words, are the members prepared for the consequences their involvement may bring? One of the first questions Alinsky asked when deciding whether to come to Rochester was, "What is the mood of the churches--is it militant?" The response was that the churches were not leading and that some of them feared reprisals. These churches had apparently counted the cost of their involvement and had decided that it was more than they were willing to pay. If not admirable, such a response is at least honest. It is inevitable that when systemic evil is confronted, certain people will look bad.

And when people look bad they get angry. And when they get angry, they will go after those who brought their actions to light. What does this mean? It may mean that a

pastor will get confronted at a meeting by an influential deacon who will say, "What the hell is our church doing?" That deacon may then put pressure on the pastor and/or key people in the congregation to back off. It may mean that certain members of the church will threaten to withdraw their membership and financial support from the church. It may mean that a clique in the church will try to get the pastor fired. It may mean that certain members will say that what the social action committee is doing is un-Christian and try to get the group disbanded. Similarly, there will undoubtedly be those in the church who will not understand why the church is getting involved in such issues. They will argue that the church should involve itself only in "spiritual matters" or they will argue that the church is not showing love when it starts litigating. And there will be those who side with the opposition, and they will have Bible verses at hand to support their view. They will argue that the church shouldn't get involved in such issues because they divide the church thereby hurting the witness of the church. The above are just a few of the possible consequences that come with the confrontation of systemic evil. Those involved in the action need to be prepared for these situations before they arise. They need to consider seriously whether they are willing to pay the price of confrontation. Of course, it is not possible to foresee every possible consequence of an action. Still, a

church needs to be aware of the cost of involvement and seriously consider whether it is willing to pay it. If a few members decide they do not want to be a part of such an action, they should be encouraged to get involved in another ministry. If a large percentage of the church does not support the action, then the pastor really needs to ponder whether the church should go ahead with it. Perhaps the conscientization process was rushed, and the pastor needs to continue with that process before another action is considered.

Fifth, a church needs to consider uniting with other churches in confronting systemic evil. There is power in numbers. Not only can the churches encourage one another throughout the process, but the repercussions of the action can be spread over a larger body of believers than one lone church.

Sixth, it is important to do everything possible to keep the communication lines open. This can be done much more easily if the issue is not personalized. A pastor needs to stress continually to his congregation that it is not a person they are fighting against but a policy or a practice. The issue of KYA's attempt to bring Kentucky into compliance with the JJDPa is a prime example of what can happen when communication lines are not kept open.

Choosing an issue. Very little needs to be said

here on the process of choosing an issue. Kentucky Youth Advocates employs a very thorough series of questions when it considers taking on an issue, and churches can easily adapt KYA's questions to their own situations. After an issue is chosen, churches must take two steps back and make absolutely certain they have as complete and accurate an understanding of the issue as possible. Churches need to make sure that what they consider the issue to be is, in fact, the real issue and not simply a veneer covering a deeper issue. As a part of this process, the key players connected with the issue need to be identified. This can be done through utilizing Larry Lyon's method for measuring local power (see chapter 4) as well as through a process called "stake-holder mapping." Stake-holder mapping is a technique used to assess the potential impact of all stakeholders on a set of organizational objectives, or a specific plan.⁸⁴⁹ This information provides a strong basis upon which to determine what positions individuals and groups may hold on particular issues and why. Through this method, churches can determine strategies for engaging those who may provide the greatest support or opposition on particular issues. This will aid in preventing the common problem of having to face challenges from groups that did

⁸⁴⁹Management and Behavioral Science Center at The Wharton School, Stakeholder Mapping (unpublished paper, photocopy), summary page.

not even seem to have a stake in particular issues. Examples of stakeholders of private corporations and public organizations include suppliers, customers, owners, creditors, competitors, trade and professional associations, employees, contractors, special interest groups, clients and government agencies.⁸⁵⁰

The process of determining stakeholders and their potential impact on an organization can be accomplished in seven steps:⁸⁵¹

(1) State the organizational objectives: What is the nature of the specific or planned change? Stakeholders' possible reactions to these are what is at issue here.

(2) Brainstorm stakeholders: Brainstorm all the possible stakeholders in a particular issue. They should be identified as specifically as possible, by name, title or group.

(3) Characterize their attitude towards organizational objectives or planned change: Examine the issues through the eyes of the particular stakeholder groups. How will the planned change affect their objectives? In general, personal values (security, power, survival, status, achievement) will dominate organizational

⁸⁵⁰Ibid., p. 1.

⁸⁵¹Taken from *ibid.*, pp. 2-4.

values (efficiency, effectiveness) in influencing stakeholder attitudes.

(4) Identify stakeholder power with respect to the adoption and/or implementation of the issue: It is helpful to subdivide power into two areas--adoption and implementation. A governor or cabinet member may be extremely powerful with respect to adoption yet may have little influence over actual implementation. Other individuals may be very important with respect to implementation, but they may also form a powerful lobby group and influence adoption. Community groups and professional associations may also become powerful lobby groups, and groups of employees (internal stakeholders) may be important with regard to implementation.

(5) Conditions--who influences whom: Stakeholders often increase their influence through forming coalitions. Possible coalitions can be examined through listing who influences the stakeholders and whom they influence.

(6) Rethink solutions to increase implementation chances: The previous five steps have resulted in a quick summary of the stakeholders, their position, power, and coalitions. Now, various subsets of the stakeholders can be looked at. First one, may look at the persons or groups who are strongly opposed and powerful. Are there alternative policies or practices or implementation strategies that could decrease the opposition without

alienating support? One of the benefits of having the stakeholders mapped out is that the impact of possible changes can be quickly assessed by scanning the rest of the list. The second group to examine are those who favour the change but are not particularly powerful. Here, the focus is on ways to enhance their power through organizing, information sharing, etc.

(7) Strategies: After completing the above steps, a clear picture of key opponents and supporters will have been gained as well as a number of options and their possible effect on stakeholders. This information can now be assembled to construct strategies for achieving desired ends. The best strategies are those which encourage the most cooperative behaviour from the most powerful stakeholder groups. Opposition from powerful groups may be reduced by modifying objectives if these do not compromise important organizational values. If conflict appears inevitable, the stakeholder list provides important information regarding potential supporters, opponents, and coalitions.⁸⁵²

⁸⁵²For further information on stakeholder mapping, see the following resources: Russell L. Ackoff, The Art of Problem Solving (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978), pp. 19-49; James R. Emshoff and Edward R. Freeman, Stakeholder Management (Philadelphia: The Wharton Applied Research Center Working Paper No. 3-78, 1978); and Eric Trist, A Concept of Organizational Ecology (Philadelphia: Management and Behavioral Science Center, 1976).

It is at this point that churches can begin to plan their strategy, which is discussed in the upcoming sections. Churches need to keep in mind throughout this process that the goal is engagement not defeat. Questions such as, "How do we win over the people who are straddling the fence?" "How many objections that have been raised can be satisfied?" and "How can a win-win situation be created?"⁸⁵³ need to be asked. Again, churches can act as mediators between divergent parties and choose strategies that meet their moral objective yet, at the same time, offend the fewest people and coop the greatest number of people.

Worship and liturgy. In the previous section, it was pointed out that worship and liturgy were forms of consciousness-raising among church members. Similarly, worship and liturgy are effective forms of consciousness-raising and critique on the societal level. Through liturgy, the Church can remind the Powers whose they are. The Church is the inheritor of a rich fund of symbolism and imagery, liturgy and story. The hymns and gospel songs, the eucharists and prayers, the writings and histories of

⁸⁵³Fisher and Ury's book may prove particularly helpful here (Roger Fisher and William Ury, Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In, 2nd rev. ed., ed. Bruce Patton (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1992).

people such as Martin Luther King, Jr., and Cesar Chavez were not, as many suspected, calculated accommodations to the subcultures within which they worked. They were ways of reminding the power structures of American society and the nation as a whole whose they were.⁸⁵⁴

Much of the Church has, perhaps, forgotten how to worship in this way. We have much to relearn from our sisters and brothers in the Black church tradition and in the Latin American base communities. Wink comments on this rich wealth within the Christian tradition:

That tradition bears within it, neglected but recoverable, a whole vocabulary about the Powers, and models for their confrontation, and wisdom concerning their stratagems. The myth does not provide final explanations, but it preserves a structure by which evil in all its depth can be discerned and held up to consciousness There is, put simply, nothing else quite like it, and we neglect it to our peril.⁸⁵⁵

Collective Exorcism. The act of collective exorcism involves exposing the demonic for what it is. It involves stripping away its cover of respectability and legality for all to see. The march across the Selma bridge by Black civil rights advocates stripped the cover of tradition and legality from the cancer of racism and

⁸⁵⁴Walter Wink, Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament, vol. I of The Powers (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), p. 117.

⁸⁵⁵Ibid., p. 118.

exposed the brutality of Jim Crow. Cesar Chavez's struggle to organize farm workers in California "unmasked the pitiless system of bracero labor and won both dignity and a living wage for some of America's worst-treated workers."⁸⁵⁶

The goal of collective exorcism, then, is to unmask the idolatrous pretensions of the Powers, to identify their dehumanizing values, to strip from them the mantle of respectability, and to disentrall their victims. The church is uniquely equipped to help people unmask and die to the Powers.⁸⁵⁷

The success of the act of collective exorcism has no bearing on its efficacy. It is an act of obedience to God. Its truth may not be acknowledged by the power structure against which it is performed or even by the public at large, but its primary goal is to act as a witness--a witness to the truth in the midst of lies. As Wink insists, "The point of collective exorcism is not in the first place reform, but revelation: the unveiling of unsuspected evil in high places."⁸⁵⁸

The church's task in the face of collective possession can be looked on as a form of conscientization on the societal level--for those caught in the grip of evil

⁸⁵⁶Wink, Unmasking, p. 64.

⁸⁵⁷Wink, Engaging, p. 164.

⁸⁵⁸Wink, Unmasking, p. 65.

perpetrated by unjust power structures, for society at large, and for the perpetrators of the evil. In relation to the latter, it can thus be seen that our first responsibility towards those perpetrating evil is pastoral—we are called on to seek to exorcise them of the demonic which possesses them. Wink writes:

Exorcism in its New Testament context is the act of deliverance of a person or institution or society from its bondage to evil, and its restoration to the wholeness intrinsic to its creation. Exorcism is thus intercession for God's presence and power to liberate those who have become possessed by the powers of death.⁸⁵⁹

The reverberations that can be felt when a church fulfills its prophetic task can shake an urban power structure down to its very foundation. When a church steps out of the system and tells the truth and lives the truth, that church enables others to peer behind the curtain as well. That church has shown that it is possible to live within the truth, despite the repercussions.⁸⁶⁰ A lie can constitute a system only if it is universal. A church which refuses to live within the lie denies it in principle and consequently threatens it in its entirety. If the main pillar of a system is a lie, then it is no surprise that the fundamental threat to it is the truth:

⁸⁵⁹Ibid., p. 59.

⁸⁶⁰Wink, Engaging, p. 98.

For the crust presented by the life of lies is made of strange stuff. As long as it seals off hermetically the entire society, it appears to be made of stone. But the moment someone breaks through in one place--a Solzhenitsyn--when a single person cries out, "The emperor is naked"--when a single person breaks the rules of the game, thus exposing it as a game [delusio!]-then the whole crust is exposed as a tissue on the point of tearing and disintegrating uncontrollably.⁸⁶¹

Engaging the Powers: Non-
Violent Direct Action

It is at this point that I must part ways with Walter Wink as far as his view of the role of the local church is concerned. Wink and I both agree that the Church has a prophetic role in relation to the Powers. Wink, however, refuses to acknowledge any role for the Church beyond that of prophecy. Wink writes that the Church is not commissioned to create a new society; her only task is to "delegitimize an unjust system and to create a spiritual counterclimate."⁸⁶² He argues that the Church is not responsible for suggesting solutions to such problems as homelessness, unemployment, and drug abuse but simply to insist that such things be eradicated.⁸⁶³

⁸⁶¹Jan Vladislav, ed., Václav Havel or Living the Truth (Boston: Faber & Faber, 1987), pp. 45, 56, 59.

⁸⁶²Wink, Engaging, p. 165.

⁸⁶³Ibid.

Such an argument, however, rings hollow. For too long the Church has voiced platitudes in the midst of overwhelming human suffering and failed to offer concrete suggestions for reform. The late twentieth-century Church, living as it is in the midst of environmental, educational, and family crises, to name just a few, must do more than simply call for change. She must use the tremendous latent resources at her disposal to offer concrete proposals for change and pioneer in embodying them as a faithful community. Even at the smallest level, these things will contribute towards bringing the Kingdom of God on earth. The Church will have fallen into a hopeless naivete if it believes that the Powers will repent and reform simply because they have been unmasked. As Reinhold Niebuhr observed, those in power generally do not capitulate simply because the ideologies by which they justify their policies have been discredited:

When power is robbed of the shining armor of political, moral and philosophical theories, by which it defends itself, it will fight on without armor; but it will be more vulnerable, and the strength of its enemies increased.⁸⁶⁴

Jesus' third way. As was pointed out in chapter 2, Jesus' third way is not a rule for action to be applied

⁸⁶⁴Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. 33.

legalistically in every situation. Rather, it is a principle (do not let evil draw you into becoming what you hate) that opens the door to countless creative responses to injustice. Every situation will demand unique responses, and the only limits are the imagination and creativity of those fighting against the injustice. Wink offers a number of principles, however, which act as helpful guides as creative responses to evil are sought:⁸⁶⁵

- Seize the moral initiative
- Find a creative alternative to violence
- Assert your own humanity and dignity as a person
- Meet force with ridicule or humor
- Break the cycle of humiliation
- Refuse to submit to or to accept the inferior position
- Expose the injustice of the system
- Take control of the power dynamic
- Shame the oppressor into repentance
- Stand your ground
- Make the Powers make decisions for which they are not prepared
- Recognize your own power
- Be willing to suffer rather than retaliate
- Force the oppressor to see you in a new light
- Deprive the oppressor of a situation where a show of force is effective
- Be willing to undergo the penalty of breaking unjust laws
- Die to fear of the old order and its rules
- Seek the oppressor's transformation

Helpful as these principles are and universal as the possible strategies are flowing from these principles,

⁸⁶⁵Wink, Engaging, pp. 186-87.

more concrete suggestions may prove helpful. This is where the strategies employed by Kentucky Youth Advocates may prove particularly helpful. Each of KYA's engagement strategies

(administrative advocacy, legislative monitoring or lobbying, litigation and other legal strategies, and public education and constituency development) are consistent with the theological and sociological studies that have been done, as well as the principles outlined above. They can easily be adapted by churches in their attempts to engage unjust urban power structures. The importance of churches' seeking to avoid putting a moral judgment on issues and demonizing the opposition has already been mentioned. In addition, churches are in a unique position to play the role of mediator between divergent parties if they are not too quick to take sides and cast the issue in absolute terms.

One further point needs to be made before we leave this section. Throughout the development of this model, the symbol of the Cross has been a touchstone--encompassing the struggle and the victory at each stage of the journey.

The Cross, however, does more than point the way to victory. The Cross also encompasses defeat. It is an undeniable fact that in the effort to recall the Powers to their divine vocation, the good usually seems to lose. "Take up your cross and follow" (see Matt. 16:24) means

expecting the wrath of the Powers to seek to overwhelm those calling them to their true vocation. Wink writes, "We take up the cross of our tragic impotence and offer it to God, praying for light on the other side of the grave of hope."⁸⁶⁶ That is all Black slaves could do for hundreds of years; yet somehow lifting it all up to God was an act of transcendence even in the midst of untold suffering.⁸⁶⁷ People are desperate for the world to have meaning, for things to work out, for problems to have solutions. Yet sometimes things happen that are meaningless and for which there are no solutions. What then? Speaking out of his own experience, Wink says, "The cross also encompasses the meaninglessness, the sheer God-forsakenness we experience when we are crushed by the Powers."⁸⁶⁸

Strength for the Journey

The struggle against urban power structures is a very short journey for many churches. Burn-out,

⁸⁶⁶Ibid., p. 143.

⁸⁶⁷For an extended discussion of this point, see Theophus H. Smith, "King and Nonviolent Religion in Black America," in Curing Violence: Religion and the Thought of René Girard, ed. Mark I. Wallace and Theophus H. Smith, Forum Fascicles Series, vol. 3 (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1994); and his Conjuring Culture: Biblical Formations of Black America (New York: Oxford University, 1994).

⁸⁶⁸Wink, Engaging, p. 143.

discouragement, and a sense of hopelessness often prey on the most enthusiastic of crusaders. It is important that this be recognized and steps taken to prevent it before it strikes. Below are some disciplines which can help in the ever-present struggle against burn-out.

Prayer. I will not attempt here to make a case for the importance of prayer. Those who pray do so not because they have been intellectually convinced as to the importance of it, but because the struggle to be human in the face of suprahuman Powers demands it. The act of praying is an indispensable means by which the Powers are engaged. It is, in fact, engagement at the most fundamental level because it is by prayer that the "secret spell" of the Powers over an individual is broken and he or she is reestablished in a bit more of that freedom which is the birthright and potential of every Christian.⁸⁶⁹

Prayer is never simply a private act. It may begin privately as an interior battlefield where the decisive victory is first won, before engagement in the outer world is even attempted. This inner liberation is, indeed, vital; for if the individual strands of the nets in which one is caught are not severed, one by one, one's activism may merely reflect a counterideology of some "counter-

⁸⁶⁹Ibid., p. 297.

Power."⁸⁷⁰ One may simply be caught up in a new collective passion and miss the humanizing possibilities of God pressing for realization here and now. Unprotected by prayer, social activism runs the danger of becoming self-justifying good works promoted by people whose inner resources have atrophied, whose wells of love have run dry, and who slowly change into true children of the Powers.⁸⁷¹ True prayer is, in the words of Wink, "an existential struggle against the 'impossible,' against an antihuman collective atmosphere, against images of worth and value that stunt and wither full human life."⁸⁷² In short, prayer is "the field-hospital in which the diseased spirituality that we have contracted from the Powers can most directly be diagnosed and treated."⁸⁷³

To conclude, prayer that fails to acknowledge the Powers ends up blaming God for evils committed by the Powers. But prayer that understands the Powers and their strategy becomes a form of social action. Indeed, no struggle against evil within urban power structures is complete unless it has first discerned not only the outer, political manifestations of the Powers, but also their

⁸⁷⁰Ibid.

⁸⁷¹Ibid., pp. 297-98.

⁸⁷²Ibid., p. 298.

⁸⁷³Wink, Engaging, p. 298.

inner spirituality, and has lifted the Powers, inner and outer, to God for transformation. Otherwise, only the shell is changed; the spirit is left intact. In the final analysis, Christians pray to God, not because they understand prayer, but because they have learned from the Christian tradition and from experience that God, indeed, is sufficient for them, whatever the Powers may do.⁸⁷⁴

Worship. Evil within urban power structures cannot be countered with mere hatred. What is needed is something which recalls these idolatrous Powers to the One in and through and for whom they exist. What exposes and confounds them, what drives them into a frenzy of rage, is being called upon to praise God.⁸⁷⁵ Psalm 29:1-2 shows how this is to be done:

Ascribe to Yahweh, O heavenly beings,
ascribe to Yahweh glory and strength.
Ascribe to Yahweh the glory of God's name;
worship Yahweh in the sacred court.⁸⁷⁶

In these verses, the Principalities and Powers in their spiritual manifestation--that is, as the interiority of earthly institutions--are being called upon to abdicate all pretensions to absoluteness, and to offer praise and

⁸⁷⁴Ibid., p. 317.

⁸⁷⁵Ibid., pp. 166-67.

⁸⁷⁶Wink's translation.

worship to the true God.⁸⁷⁷ Wink explains why the Church must call on the Powers to praise their Creator:

Praise is the homeostatic principle of the universe. It preserves the harmony of the whole by preventing usurpation of the whole by its parts. Praise is the ecological principle of divinity whereby every creature is subordinated to its organic relationship with the Creator. Praise is the cure for the apostasy of the Powers.⁸⁷⁸

Note that the command expressed in this Psalm is not issued by God, but by human beings. In all its simplicity, one of the basic tasks of the Church over against the Powers is to remind the Powers to whom they belong. The Church is simply to proclaim to idolatrous power structures that they do not exist as ends in themselves, but for the humanizing purposes of God as revealed in Jesus. The Church does not have to relate power structures to God; they are, by virtue of their creation, already related to God. The Church simply has to remind them that they exist in and through and for God.⁸⁷⁹

Celebration. One of the most remarkable facts about the New Testament is that, despite its sober exposé of the Domination System, it is free of gloom or

⁸⁷⁷Wink, Engaging, p. 167.

⁸⁷⁸Ibid.

⁸⁷⁹Ibid.

trepidation before the Powers. From beginning to end, a note of victory pervades the pages of the New Testament-- not only a victory in the unknown future but victory even now, in the midst of struggle. Wink writes:

There is an absolute and unshakable confidence that the System of Domination has an end. A new world of partnership, of compassion, of human community, of conscious awareness of the limits of power, awaits us.⁸⁸⁰

This capacity to enjoy victory in the midst of sometimes overwhelming struggle is, to outsiders, one of the most baffling aspects of the Christian hope. The Book of Revelation may be unnerving and even terrifying in places, but it contains not a single note of despair. Powerful as the Dragon appears, he has been stripped of real power. Those still caught in the clutches of the Enemy may not yet have experienced it, but the victory has already been won. The struggle continues, but the outcome is certain:

The far-off strains of a victory song already reach our ears, and we are invited to join the chorus. This is the rock on which we stand: the absolute certainty of the triumph of God in the world.⁸⁸¹

This is why celebration of the divine victory does not take place at the end of the Book of Revelation;

⁸⁸⁰Ibid., p. 319.

⁸⁸¹Wink, Engaging, p. 321.

rather, it breaks out all along the way.⁸⁸² Whatever the apparent power of the Domination System, Christ has already been enthroned above all principalities and Powers (Eph. 1:20-23). This victory is what sustains faith, and this faith is what creates victory.⁸⁸³ Wink writes: "Faith does not wait for God's sovereignty to be established on earth; it behaves as if that sovereignty already holds full sway."⁸⁸⁴ "[T]he battle is won, even though the struggle is not yet over."⁸⁸⁵

Conclusion

In this dissertation, a theological and sociological foundation for confronting evil within urban power structures was established. From this foundation, a model was developed for guiding churches interested in confronting evil within the power structures of their communities. The findings of this study were clear. From a biblical and theological perspective, systemic evil is a

⁸⁸²See Rev. 1:4-8, 17-18; 4:8-11; 5:5, 9-14; 7:1-17; 11:15-19; 12:10-12; 14:1-8; 15:2-4; 16:5-7; 18; 19:1-9.

⁸⁸³Wink, Engaging, pp. 321, 323.

⁸⁸⁴Ibid., p. 323.

⁸⁸⁵Allan Boesak, "The Woman and the Dragon: Struggle and Victory in Revelation 12," Sojourners, 16 (April 1987), 30.

reality that must be understood in relation to the biblical concept of the Principalities and Powers. Further, the reality of ubiquitous systemic evil (the result of an entire network of Powers becoming integrated around idolatrous values) found expression in Wink's concept of the Domination System.

The sociological analysis of chapter 3 aided in understanding how and where systemic evil resides within the urban power structures of society. It was discovered that evil is prevalent not only in American capitalism as a whole, but also finds expression within the major urban power structures of American capitalism: governments, economic and cultural institutions, and corporations. Chapter 4 pointed to a method for locating the pressure points of change within power structures and provided some help in understanding why it is often so difficult to bring about change within these structures. Chapters 5 and 6 provided excellent illustrations of what is involved in struggles against urban power structures, with the latter chapter also providing several examples of effective strategies that can be used when engaging a power structure. From all this, a model was developed for "growing" a congregation interested and capable of confronting systemic evil. The model also provided a strategy for just such a confrontation.

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study

are readily accessible. Systemic evil is an undeniable reality of American society. Further, Scripture provides a strong theological basis for churches interested in confronting systemic evil. With these two premises proven, all that remained was to develop a model to guide churches in confronting systemic evil. Chapter 7 provided just such a model.

Still, the model that has been developed has not been exposed to empirical verification. Further research needs to determine whether the model would, indeed, be effective in engaging the urban structures of society. Such verification, if done properly, may take several years to complete. Such a study, however, would be a worthwhile endeavor.

This study clearly shows the prevalence of evil within the urban power structures of society. There has never been a time when it has been more important for churches to be on the forefront of attempts to confront systemic evil. Yet informal observation would seem to indicate that most churches in the United States do not regard such activities as priorities nor, sometimes, even within the purview of the Church's mandate. If, in some small way, my dissertation can assist attempts to counteract this trend and provide a means and motivation for such activity, it will have served its purpose well.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The 1993 Directory of U.S. Corporations." Fortune. New York: n.p., 1993.

Ackerman, Frank, et al. "The Extent of Income Inequality in the United States." In Richard C. Edwards et al., eds. The Capitalist System. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1972.

Ackoff, Russell L. The Art of Problem Solving. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

Aiken, Michael, and Paul E. Mott, eds. The Structure of Community Power. New York: Random House, 1970.

Alexander, John. Your Money or Your Life: A New Look at Jesus' View of Wealth and Power. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986.

Allison, Graham T. Essence of Decision-Making: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.

Arias, Mortimer. "Evangelization and Social Ethics--Some Reflections." Perkins Journal, 35 (Winter-Spring 1982), 37-45.

Arnold, Clinton E. Ephesians: Power and Magic. The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting. Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph 63. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University, 1989.

_____. Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1992.

Averch, Harvey A., et al. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Synthesis and Review of Research Findings. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technologies, 1974.

Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice. New York: Oxford University, 1970.

Baird, J. Arthur. The Greed Syndrome. Philadelphia: Hampshire, 1989.

Bartel, Richard D., ed. The Challenge of Economics: Readings from "Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs." New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1984.

Bauer, Walter. The Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Trans. and augmented by W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. 2nd rev. ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1979.

Berger, Peter, and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.

Berkhof, H. Christ and the Powers. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1962.

Berle, Adolph A. Power. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1967.

Blake, William. "Jerusalem," Chap. 2, plate 30. In The Complete Poetry and Prose of William Blake. Ed. David V. Erdman. 2nd rev. ed. Berkeley: University of California, 1982.

Bock, Betty. You Can Make a Difference. Birmingham, AL: Woman's Missionary Union, SBC, 1992.

Boesak, Allan. "The Woman and the Dragon: Struggle and Victory in Revelation 12." Sojourners, 16 (April 1987), 27-31.

Bok, Sissela. "Blowing the Whistle." In Public Duties: The Moral Obligations of Government Officials. Ed. Joel L. Fleishman, Lance Liebman and Mark H. Moore. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1981.

Bonjean, Charles M., and Michael D. Grimes. "Community Power: Issues and Findings." In Social Stratification: A Reader. Ed. Joseph Lopreato and Lionel S. Lewis. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Bookser-Feister, John. "The Struggle for Work Place Justice." The Other Side, 21 (April-May 1985), 46-49.

Bornkamm, G. "Christus und die Welt in der Urchristlichen Botschaft." In Gesammelte Aufsätze, vol. 1. Munich: Kaiser Verlag, 1958.

Brown, L. Duane. Confronting Today's World: A Fundamentalist Looks at Social Issues. Schaumburg, IL: Regular Baptist, 1986.

Brueggemann, Walter. The Prophetic Imagination. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.

Buchanan, Patrick J. Right from the Beginning. Boston: Little, Brown, 1988.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Burhoe, Ralph Wendall. "Religion's Role in Human Evolution: The Missing Link Between Ape-Man's Selfish Genes and Civilized Altruism." Zygon, 14 (June 1979), 135-162.

Caird, G. B. Principalities and Powers. Oxford: Clarendon, 1956.

Campolo, Anthony. "Politics and Principalities and Powers." In A Reader in Sociology: Christian Perspectives. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1980.

Carr, Wesley. Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning, and Development of the Pauline Phrase "Hai Archai Kai Hai Exousia". Society for New Testament Studies Monograph. Ser. 42. Cambridge, NY: Cambridge University, 1981.

Carroll, Jackson W., Carl S. Dudley, and William McKinney, eds. Handbook for Congregational Studies. Nashville:

Abingdon, 1986.

Claerbaut, David. Urban Ministry. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983.

Clark, Terry. "Community Structure and Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures, and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities." In Community Politics. Ed. Charles M. Bonjean, Terry Clark, and Robert Lineberry. New York: Free, 1971.

_____. "Community Structure, Decision-Making, Budget Expenditures, and Urban Renewal in 51 American Communities." American Sociological Review, 33 (1968), 576-93.

Coleman, James William, and Donald R. Cressey. Social Problems. 2nd rev. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

Collum, Danny. "Assault on the Poor: The Reagan Administration's Economic Policies." Sojourners, 10 (July 1981), 12-16.

_____. "The Big Picture: Where We Are and How We Got Here." In The Rise of Christian Conscience: The Emergence of a Dramatic Renewal Movement in the Church Today. Ed. Jim Wallis. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

_____. "The Crash of '87." Sojourners, 17 (January 1988), 4-5.

_____. "Economics: The Way America Does Business." Sojourners, 14 (November 1985), 12-17.

_____. Review of The Spirit of Democratic Capitalism, by Michael Novak. Sojourners, 12 (May 1983), 40-42.

Cone, James. God of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury, 1975.

Cox, Harvey. The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Dahl, Robert A. Pluralist Democracy in the United States. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

_____. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University, 1961.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1959.

_____. Essays in the Theory of Society. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1968.

_____. "Out of Utopia: Toward a Reorientation of Sociological Analysis." American Journal of Sociology, 64 (September 1958), 115-27.

Davis, John Jefferson. Your Wealth in God's World. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1984.

DeGeorge, Richard T. "Moral Issues in Business." In Ethics, Free Enterprise and Public Policy. Ed. Richard T. DeGeorge and Joseph A. Picheler. New York: Oxford University, 1978.

Domhoff, G. William. Who Really Rules? New Haven and Community Power Reexamined. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 1978.

Drucker, Peter F. The Age of Discontinuity. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Dye, Thomas R. Who's Running America? The Bush Era. 3rd rev. ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.

Ecclesiastical History. V, preface-4.

Ecklein, Joan. Community Organizers. 2nd rev. ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1984.

Editorial. "Costly Inaction." The Courier-Journal, Saturday, July 23, 1994, sec. A, p. 10.

Editorial. "Kids in Jail? No--Time to Improve Treatment of Juveniles." Lexington Herald-Leader, April 22, 1994, sec. A, p. 12.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. "President Eisenhower's Farewell to the Nation." In Francesca M. Cancian and James William Gibson, eds. Making War/Making Peace: The Social Foundations of Violent Conflict. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1990.

Ellul, Jacques. The Meaning of the City. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.

_____. Money and Power. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1984.

Emshoff, James R., and Edward R. Freeman. Stakeholder Management. Philadelphia: The Wharton Applied Research Center Working Paper No. 3-78, 1978.

Escobar, Samuel E., and John Driver. Christian Mission and Social Justice. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1980.

Ewen, Stuart. "Waste a Lot, Want a Lot: Our All-Consuming Quest for Style." UTNE Reader (September/October 1989), pp. 81-84.

Ewing, Ward. The Power of the Lamb. Cambridge, MA: Cowley, 1990.

"The Failure of Conventional Wisdom: Economic Realities in the '80's." Sojourners, 10 (January 1981), 13-18.

FIGHT. 10th Anniversary Commemorative Brochure, 1964-1974. N.p. 1974.

"FIGHT and Eastman Kodak." A case prepared by Francis Sheridan under the direction of Professor Howard F. Bennett, incorporating new material prepared by Linda Waters under the direction of Professor George C. Lodge. Boston: Inter-Collegiate Case Clearinghouse. No. 9-373-207, 1973.

Fisher, Roger, and William Ury. Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In. Ed. Bruce Patton. 2nd rev. ed. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1992.

Fleischmann, Manley, et al. The Fleischmann Report on

theQuality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education in New York State. New York: Viking, 1973.

Flender, Helmut. "Das Verständnis der Welt bei Paulus, Markus und Lukas." Kerygma und Dogma, 14 (1968), 1-27.

Frenchak, David., and Sharrel Keyes, eds. Metro Ministry. Elgin, IL: David C. Cook, 1979.

Fuller, John G. 200,000,000 Guinea Pigs: New Dangers inEveryday Foods, Drugs, and Cosmetics. New York: Putnam, 1972.

Fusfeld, Daniel R. Economics. 2nd rev. ed. Lexington, MA: Heath, 1976.

Gans, C. Herbert. "The Positive Functions of Poverty." In Poverty and Economic Injustice: A Philosophical Approach. Ed. Robert H. Hartman. New York: Paulist, 1984.

Gaventa, John. Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence andRebellion in an Appalachian Valley. Champaign: University of Illinois, 1982.

Gay, Craig M. With Liberty and Justice for Whom? Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1991.

Geertz, Clifford. The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic, 1973.

Gerth, Hans, and C. Wright Mills. Character and SocialStructure. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953.

_____, eds. From Max Weber. New York: Oxford University, 1946.

Gilbert, Dennis, and Joseph A. Kahl. The American ClassStructure: A New Synthesis. 3rd rev. ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1987.

Gillett, Richard W. The Human Enterprise: A ChristianPerspective on Work. Kansas City: Leaven, 1985.

Gish, Ed. "A Decentralist Response." In Wealth andPoverty: Four Christian Views of Economics. Ed. Robert

- G. Clouse. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1984.
- Glazer, Nathan. "Paradoxes of Health Care." The PublicInterest, 22 (1971), 62-77.
- Gordon, D. M. Theories of Poverty and Unemployment. Lexington MA: Lexington, 1972.
- Green, Mark J. The Closed Enterprise System: Ralph Nader's Study-Group Report on Anti-Trust Enforcement. New York: Grossman, 1972.
- Greenway, Roger S., ed. Disciplining the City: Theological Reflection on Urban Ministry. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Gross, Beatrice, and Ronald Gross, eds. The Children's Rights Movement: Overcoming the Oppression of Young People. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1977.
- Gross, Neal, et al. Implementing Organizational Innovations. New York: Basic, 1971.
- Habermas, Jürgen. Knowledge and Human Interests. Boston: Beacon, 1971.
- Hauerwas, Stanley. Vision and Virtue. South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1981.
- Helgeland, John. "Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine." Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, II.23.1.
- Heuvel, Albert H. van den. These Rebellious Powers. New York: Friendship, 1965.
- Hooft, W. A. Visser't. The Kingship of Christ. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948.
- Hunter, Floyd. Community Power Structure. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 1953.
- Jackson, Yvette V. Personal interview. July 22, 1994.
- Jeremias, J. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus.

Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

Johnson, Doyle Paul. Sociological Theory: Classical Founders and Contemporary Perspectives. New York: Macmillan, 1986.

Johnston, G. "Oikoumene and Kosmos in the New Testament." New Testament Studies, 10 (1964), 352-60.

Kellerman, Bill. "Spirits of the Age: Walter Wink's Unmasking of the Powers." Sojourners, 17, no. 5 (May 1988), 22-25.

Kentucky Youth Advocates. Kentucky Youth Advocates' Prior Efforts to Prevent the Unnecessary Jailing and Detention of Youth and Secure Adequate Remedial Services for These Youth. (Unpublished paper, photocopy).

_____. Some Preliminary Issues in Removing Juveniles from Kentucky Jails--First 1982 Interim Report, 1982. (Unpublished paper, photocopy).

Kirk, Andrew. The Good News of the Kingdom Coming: The Marriage of Evangelism and Social Responsibility. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1983.

Klay, Robert Kendrick. Counting the Cost: The Economics of Christian Stewardship. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Krass, Alfred. Evangelizing Neopagan North America: The Word that Frees. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1982.

KYA's Origins: A Narrative Description. (Revised 12/05/83). (Unpublished paper, photocopy).

Laing, R. D. The Politics of Experience. New York: Pantheon, 1967.

Lancourt, Joan E. Confront or Concede: The Alinsky Citizen-Action Organizations. Lexington, MA: Lexington, 1979.

Landes, David S. The Rise of Capitalism. New York: Macmillan, 1966.

"The Lausanne Covenant." The International Review of Mission, 63 (1974), 570-576.

Lawson, Gil. "Corrections' Top Officials Say Jailers Block Centers for Juveniles." The Courier-Journal, Thursday, May 19, 1994, sec. B, p. 5.

_____. "Jones, Legislators Put Off Efforts to End Jailing Juveniles." The Courier-Journal, Thursday, June 9, 1994, sec. B, p. 4.

Lehotsky, Harry. "Inner-City Ministry." (source lost), (March 1982), 9-13.

Liebow, Elliot. Tally's Corner. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Limbaugh, Rush H., III. The Way Things Ought to Be. New York: Pocket, 1992.

Linthicum, Robert C. City of God--City of Satan. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.

Longacre, Doris Janzen. Living More with Less. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1980.

Lydall, H. The Structure of Earnings. London: Oxford University, 1968.

Lyon, Larry. The Community in Urban Society. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1987.

_____. "Community Power and Policy Outputs." In New Perspectives on the American Community. Ed. Roland Warren. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977.

_____, and Charles M. Bonjean. "Community Power and Policy Output: The Routines of Local Politics." Urban Affairs Quarterly, 17, no. 1 (1981), 3-21.

MacGregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." New Testament Studies, 1 (1954), 17-28.

- McCloughry, Roy. The Eye of the Needle. Leicester, England: Intervarsity, 1990.
- McFarland, Andrew S. Common Cause: Lobbying in the Public Interest. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1984.
- Management and Behavioral Science Center at The Wharton School. Stakeholder Mapping. (Unpublished paper, photocopy).
- Mann, Eric. "Environmentalism in the Corporate Climate." Tikkun, 5, no. 2 (March-April 1990), 60-65.
- Marcuse, Herbert. One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society. Boston: Beacon, 1962.
- Marger, Martin N. Elites and Masses: An Introduction to Political Sociology. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1981.
- Meyers, Eleanor Scott, ed. Envisioning the New City: A Reader on Urban Ministry. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.
- Michaelson, Wes. "Evangelicalism and Radical Discipleship." In Evangelicalism and Anabaptism. Ed. C. Norman Kraus. Scottdale, PA: Herald, 1979.
- Miller, C. Delbert. "Decision-Making Cliques in Community Power Structures," American Journal of Sociology, 24 (1958), 299-310.
- _____. International Community Power Structures. Bloomington: Indiana University, 1970.
- Miller, Kenneth R., and Mary Elizabeth Wilson. The Church that Cares. Valley Forge: Judson, 1985.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University, 1956.
- _____. White Collar: The American Middle Classes. New York: Oxford University, 1951.
- Mintz, Morton, and Jerry S. Cohen. America, Inc.: Who

Owns and Operates the United States? New York: Dial, 1971.

Miranda, José Porfiro. Being and the Messiah. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1977.

Mnookin, Robert H. In the Interest of Children: Advocacy, Law Reform and Public Policy. New York: W. H. Freeman, 1985.

Moberg, David O. The Great Reversal. 2nd rev. ed. Philadelphia: Holman, 1977.

Moore, Richard E., and Duane L. Day. Urban Church Breakthrough. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

Moritz, Charles, ed. Current Biography. 29th ed. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1968.

Morrison, Clinton. The Powers that Be. London: SCM, 1960.

Mullen, William. "The Road to Hell." Chicago Tribune Magazine, 26 (March 31, 1985), 11-30.

Muste, A. J. Gandhi and the H-Bomb. Nyack, NY: Fellowship, 1983.

Nash, Ronald. Social Justice and the Christian Church. Milford, MI: Mott Media, 1983.

National Juvenile Detention Association in Partnership with Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc., and Children's Law Center. Kentucky Plan for Compliance with the Federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJJPA). (Unpublished paper, photocopy).

Nelson, Jack A. Hunger for Justice: The Politics of Food and Faith. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1980.

Neuhaus, Richard John, ed. The Preferential Option for the Poor. Encounter Series. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1988.

Newbigin, Lesslie. Foolishness to the Greeks: The

Gospeland Western Culture. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. Faith and History. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944.

_____. An Interpretation of Christian Ethics. New York: Meridian, 1958.

_____. Moral Man and Immoral Society. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

_____. The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.

Noble, Lowell. "Stage III: In Search of a Theology of Society." Faculty Dialogue, 12 (1989), 113-119.

Novak, Michael. "An Underpraised and Undervalued System." In Moral Issues and Christian Responses. Ed. Paul Jersild and Dale Johnson. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1982.

Noyce, Gaylord B. Survival and Mission for the City Church. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.

Owensby, Walter L. Economics for Prophets: A Primer on Concepts, Realities, and Values in Our Economic System. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Palme, Olof, et al. "Military Spending: The Economic and Social Consequences." Challenge: The Magazine of Economic Affairs, 25 (September-October 1982), 4-21.

Patterson, Bobby Earl. "Sin and Grace in the Light of Reinhold Niebuhr's Writings." Th.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1960.

Pearson, Fred. They Dare to Hope: Student Protest and Christian Response. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1969.

Peretti, Frank E. Piercing the Darkness. Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1989.

_____. This Present Darkness. Wheaton, IL:Crossway, 1986.

Piaget, Jean. A Child's Conception of the World. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929.

Polsby, Nelson W. Community Power and Political Theory. New Haven: Yale University, 1963.

_____. "How to Study Community Power: The Pluralist Alternative." In The Structure of Community Power. Ed. Michael Aiken and Paul E. Mott. New York: Random House, 1970.

Presthus, Robert. Men at the Top: A Study in Community Power. New York: Oxford University, 1964.

Preston, Ronald H. Religion and the Ambiguities of Capitalism: Have Christians Sufficient Understanding of Modern Economic Realities? London: SCM, 1991.

Rad, Gerhard von. Old Testament Theology, vol. 1. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Rasmussen, Larry L. Economic Anxiety & Christian Faith. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

_____. Moral Fragments and Moral Community: A Proposal for Church in Society. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. Christianity and the Social Crisis. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.

_____. The Social Principles of Jesus. New York: Association, 1916.

_____. A Theology for the Social Gospel. New York: Macmillan, 1918.

Read, Bill. "Jailing Juveniles." The Courier-Journal, Monday, May 30, 1994, sec. A, p. 10.

Rensberger, David. Johannine Faith and Liberating Community. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.

Richart, David W. First: Kentucky Youth Advocates: On the Cutting Edge for Children: A Report by Kentucky Youth Advocates, Inc. Commemorating Sixteen Years of Service to Kentucky's Children and Their Families. June 1993. (Unpublished paper, photocopy).

_____, and Stephen R. Bing. Fairness is a Kid's Game: Children, Public Policy, and Child Advocacy in the States. Louisville, KY: Kentucky Youth Advocates and the Task Force on Children Out of School, 1987.

Ridgeway, James. "Attack on Kodak." New Republic, 156 (January 21, 1967), 11-13.

Rodgers, Harrell R., Jr. The Cost of Human Neglect: Americas's Welfare Failure. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1982.

Roser, Mary Ann. "Adult Jails Not for Juveniles, Report Says: Mother, Social Workers Suggest More Use of Alternative Programs." Lexington Herald-Leader, October 21, 1984, sec. B, pp. 1-2.

Rupp, E. Gordon. Principalities and Powers. London: Epworth, 1952.

Santa Ana, Julio, ed. Towards a Church of the Poor: The Work of an Ecumenical Group on the Church and the Poor. Geneva: Commission on the Churches' Participation in Development, World Council of Churches, 1979.

Sasse, Hermann. "Ai n." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 1 (1964), 197-209.

_____. "Kosmos." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, 3 (1965), 867-98.

Schaef, Anne Wilson. When Society Becomes an Addict. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

Schiller, Bradley R. The Economics of Poverty and Discrimination. 4th rev. ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.

- Schlier, Heinrich. Principalities and Powers in the New Testament. New York: Herder & Herder, 1961.
- Schmookler, Andrew Baird. The Parable of the Tribes: The Problem of Power in Social Evolution. Berkeley: University of California, 1984.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "The Concept of the World in the New Testament." In his Christian Existence in the New Testament, vol. 1. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1968.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. "Die Stellung zur Welt bei Paulus, Epiktet und in der Apokalyptik: Ein Beitrag zu I Kor. 7, 29-31." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 61 (1964), 125-54.
- Schulman, Jay. IAF in Rochester: Phase Two, a Progress Report. Rochester, NY: Board for Urban Ministry, 1966.
- Schultze, Robert O. "The Bifurcation of Power in a Satellite City." In Community Political Systems. Ed. Morris Janowitz. Glencoe, IL: Free, 1961.
- Schutz, Alfred. "The Problem of Social Reality." In Collected Papers, vol. 1. The Hague: Martin Piaget, 1962.
- Sethi, S. Prakash. Business Corporations and the Black Man: An Analysis of Social Conflict: The Kodak-FIGHT Controversy. Scranton, PA: Chandler, 1970.
- Shaver, John V. "How Will You Compete with Horses?" Touchstone, 1, no. 3 (October 1983), 21-27.
- Sherover-Marcuse, Ricky. "Towards a Perspective on Unlearning Racism: 12 Working Assumptions." 6501 Dana, Oakland, CA 94609.
- _____. "Unlearning Racism Workshops." 6501 Dana, Oakland, CA 94609.
- Shoemaker, Harold Stephen. "Christ and the Principalities and Powers in Representative Twentieth Century American Theologians." Ph.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist

Theological Seminary, 1978.

Sider, Ronald J. Cry Justice: The Bible on Hunger and Poverty. New York: Paulist, 1980.

_____. "Evangelism, Salvation, and Social Justice: Definitions and Interrelationships." International Review of Mission, 64 (July 1975), 251-267.

_____. Rich Christians in an Age of Hunger. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1977.

Simmons, Paul D. "Capitalism: A Theological Critique." Review and Expositor, 81 (Spring 1984), 181-195.

Simon, Arthur. Christian Faith and Public Policy. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987.

Sine, Tom. The Mustard Seed Conspiracy. Waco, TX: Word, 1981.

_____. Wild Hope. Dallas: Word, 1991.

Skolimowski, Henry. "The Twilight of Physical Descriptions and the Ascent of Normative Models." In The World System. Ed. Ervin Laszlo. New York: George Braziller, 1973.

Smith, Theophus H. Conjuring Culture: Biblical Formation of Black America. New York: Oxford University, 1994.

_____. "King and Nonviolent Religion in Black America." In Curing Violence: Religion and the Thought of René Girard. Ed. Mark I. Wallace and Theophus H. Smith. Forum Fascicles Series, vol. 3. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1994.

Sobel, Lester A. Corruption in Business. New York: Facts on File, 1977.

Steidlmeier, Paul. People and Profits: The Ethics of Capitalism. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1992.

Stewart, James S. "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology." Scottish Journal of Theology, 4 (1951), 292-301.

Stott, John R. W. Christian Mission in the Modern World. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1975.

Stoutzenberger, Joseph. The Christian Call to Justice and Peace. Winona, MN: Saint Mary's, 1987.

Strasser, Stephen. The Idea of Dialogal Phenomenology. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University, 1969.

Stringfellow, William. An Ethic for Christians and Other Aliens in a Strange Land. Waco, TX: Word, 1973.

_____. Free in Obedience. New York: Seabury, 1964.

Sutherland, Edwin H. White-Collar Crime. New York: Dryden, 1949.

Swindler, Leonard. Biblical Affirmations of Women. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979.

Tabb, Bill. "The Demise of Our Free Enterprise System: Why Our Economy Has Become Something Far Different from What Adam Smith Propounded." The Other Side, 15 (December 1979), 44-49.

Taylor, Richard K. Economics and the Gospel. Philadelphia: United Church, 1973.

Tinder, Glenn E. The Political Meaning of Christianity: An Interpretation. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1989.

Toland, Eugene, Thomas Fenton, and Lawrence McCulloch. "World Justice and Peace: A Radical Analysis for American Christians." The Other Side, 12 (January-February 1976), 50-58.

Trist, Eric. A Concept of Organizational Ecology. Philadelphia: Management and Behavioral Science Center, 1976.

Turner, James. Without God, Without Creed: The Origins of Unbelief in America. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1985.

Turner, Jonathan H. The Structure of Sociological Theory. 3rd rev. ed. Ed. Robin M. Williams, Jr. The Dorsey Series in Sociology. Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 1982.

Turner, Victor. Drama, Fields and Metaphors. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1974.

_____. The Forest of Symbols. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, 1967.

Ureña, Enrique M. Capitalism or Socialism? An Economic Critique for Christians. Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1988.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, series P-60, no. 175, and earlier reports.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1981. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

Vladislav, Jan, ed. Václav Havel or Living the Truth. Boston: Faber & Faber, 1987.

Vogel, David. Lobbying the Corporation: Citizen Challenges to Business Authority. New York: Basic, 1978.

Völkl, R. Christus und Welt nach dem Neuen Testament. Würzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1961.

Waetjen, Herman C. Review of Engaging the Powers, by Walter Wink. The Christian Century, 110, no. 21 (July 14-21, 1993), 721-722.

Wallace, Ruth A., and Alison Wolf. Contemporary Sociological Theory. 2nd rev. ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Wallis, Jim. Agenda for Biblical People. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Walzer, Michael. Spheres of Justice: A Defense of Pluralism and Equality. New York: Basic, 1983.

Weronka, Bill. "By Jailing Runaways, State Still Violates Federal Law." The Courier-Journal, Sunday, July 15, 1990, sec. B, pp. 1, 4.

Whyte, William F. Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1943.

Williams, Claude J. "Walter Rauschenbusch: A Prophet of Social Righteousness." Th.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1952.

Wink, Walter. Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination. Vol. 3 of The Powers. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

_____. Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament. Vol. 1 of The Powers. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

_____. "Neither Passivity nor Violence: Jesus' Third Way." Forum, 7 (1991), 5-28.

_____. Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence. Vol. 2 of The Powers. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Winn, Albert Curry. A Sense of Mission. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981.

Winter, Gibson. Liberating Creation: Foundations of Religious Social Ethics. New York: Crossroad, 1981.

_____. The New Creation as Metropolis. New York: Macmillan, 1963.

Wogaman, J. Philip. The Great Economic Debate: An Ethical Analysis. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.

Yin, Robert K. Case Study Research. 2nd rev. ed. Ed. Leonard Bickman. Applied Social Research Methods Series, vol. 5. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989.

Yoder, John Howard. The Politics of Jesus. Grand Rapids:

William B. Eerdmans, 1972.

Zingaro, John, and Philip Harnden. "Since Steel Went
Down." The Other Side, 21 (April-May 1985), 30-36.