본 소고는 한국교회의 목회 리더십의 부정적 형태를 형식주의적 권위주의로 설명하면서, 신앙공동체 내부의 갈등과 무기력의 원인임과 동시에 영적 리더십의 본질을 회복해야 할 대상으로 보았다. 한국개신교의 가장 영향력있는 신학자인 칼빈의 교회론과 최신 리더십 이론가들의 일관되며 공통된 통찰력을 통해, 교회는 역설적 공동체로서 그 본질에 부합하는 공동체 리더십을 지향해야 함을 주장한다. 공동체 분별 사역을 교회 리더십 형성에 필요 한 영적 수련으로 소개하면서, 그 성경적 근거를 예루살렘의 공의회로 들고 있다 (행 15장). 이나시오 전통에서 중요한 세 문서를 역사적 근거로 제시하며, 공동체 분별이 신앙 공동체의 리더십 형성과 건강한 사역에 필수적 요소라는 사실을 증명한다. 이에 근거하여, 공동체 분별 과정과 절차를 구체적으로 소개하고, 이 영적 수련이 한국 목회 현장에서 적용될 때, 중요하게 인식되어야 할 세 가지 요소를 제시하고 있다. 첫째는 영적 초연, 둘째는 과정으로서의 영성분별에 대한 영적 이해, 마지막으로는 권위에 대한 균형 잡힌 이해이다.

주제어: 공동체 분별, 목회 리더십, 역설적 공동체로서의 교회, 이나시오 전통, 한국 개신교 영성, 영성 수련
I. Introduction

It is a well-known fact that Korean churches are characterized by rapid numerical growth and great spiritual fervor. A lesser known but equally true fact however is that Korean church life is also characterized by intense internal conflict and widespread institutional schism. Many Korean churches and their congregations have come into existence as splinter groups due to bitter fighting and unresolved interpersonal conflicts among church members, often revolving around the question of pastoral leadership. As a Korean minister, my first-hand experiences with parish leaders among Korean churches lead me to believe that the hierarchical and patriarchal style of leadership and decision making has consistently discouraged congregational life so as to lead members to leave their original Korean churches and establish new ones.\(^1\)

My argument in this paper will first explore the leadership style based on *formalistic authoritarianism* and claims its negative influence on Korean pastoral leadership as the main clue to the inner conflicts and splits among Korean churches.\(^2\) Then, the contemporary ideas of leadership theory for renewing the concept of authority and pas-

---

1) I have engaged with several Korean American churches mostly in California metropolitan areas for more than a decade (from the year of 2001 to 2015). My various ministerial experiences assist fairly the general assumption that the church conflicts have strongly related with the leadership style.

2) The detailed description and comprehensive survey on the leadership style in Korean churches is well examined in Jürgen Hendricks, 김성욱, “한국교회 성장을 위한 리더십 연구,” *신학지남* 73/3 (2006), 230-251.
Pastoral leadership will help develop the main argument. Lastly, I attempt to introduce the practice of communal discernment that originated in the Ignatian spiritual tradition as a legitimate decision-making process which has the potential to contribute in critical ways to transforming Korean pastoral leadership. In conclusion, I demonstrate that, to aid in the maturing of Korean church leadership whose authoritarianism has severely aggravated the crisis in Korean churches, reorientation of the theological foundations of the church along with a church leadership that embraces the paradoxical nature of the world must be established.

Then, I will argue that communal discernment should be adopted as pastoral leadership tactic in the church decision-making process. Communal discernment is a method of coming to decisions in an inclusive manner, based on the theological conviction that God’s will is paradoxically revealed among people. In this paper, I attempt to verify that the concept of communal discernment that includes congregation members, lay leaders, and ordained and non-ordained staff is useful in pastoral ministry in that it helps all pay more attention to ways to implicitly embrace interconnectedness and mutual interdependence in religious communities, in this case Korean protestant churches.
II. The Leadership Crisis in the Korean Church

My understanding of the formalistic authoritarianism in the Korean church, which is culturally grounded with hierarchical and patriarchic style of leadership, is characterized best as following the pyramid paradigm. The pyramid paradigm speaks of a “strong authority” and of the “power play” of the pastor in dealing with his or her church members. Euntae Jo elaborately puts, “power play means that a pastor can control his church members, who are accustomed to obeying their pastor.”\(^3\) Most critically, all decision-making belongs to the pastor alone. He is the only person to make decision for the whole church. This causes both the church and the pastor to be in a very vulnerable situation.

First, this top-down leadership in general could not discern and meet comprehensively the spiritual or religious needs of the congregation. Second, the absence of accepting the voice of the lay people in the decision-making process easily engenders exclusion of people and an atmosphere of disregard among church members. It usually leads to loss of membership in the church, including especially the new and young generation members of the congregation. Third, under the pyramid paradigm and formalistic authoritarianism all responsibility for a decision must be taken by one person, the senior pastor, which makes the leadership vulnerable in a conflict

\(^3\) Euntae Jo, *Korean-American and Church Growth* (Seoul, Korea: Cross-Culture Ministry Institute, 1994), 110.
situation. So, it is readily found in the Korean church that whenever conflict is detected, Koreans think that the pastor leaving the church is the best solution. The situation described above indicates that the authoritarian pastoral leadership style common in Korean churches is easily dismissed and even unacceptable to those who have become familiar with a more democratically oriented society. It is necessary to reconsider from a broad perspective the nature and concept of the leadership in religious institutions.4)

Recognition of the leadership crisis with the formalistic authoritarianism leads us to ask questions: what kind of the leadership formation will be healthy to Christian community in Korean context? In what ways will the Korean church be able to overcome existing maladies aroused from formalistic authoritarianism and establish fully fledged leadership? What is most appropriate way to integrate between what they believe in church leadership and what they actually practice it in Korean context? Drawing on old wisdom and new insights following will help cultivate and completely reshape the landscape of Korean pastoral leadership.

4) The writer however is beware of generalization of this assumption since many Christian pastors or ministers have endeavored to be conformed with the servant leadership of Jesus Christ,
III. Renewing the Pastoral Leadership by Embracing Paradox

1. Overcoming Authoritarianism with Authentic Authority

Leadership theorist Ronald Heifetz challenges the common perception that equates leadership with authority. “We routinely call leaders those who achieve high positions of authority, even though we readily acknowledge their frequent misuse of leadership.”5) This perception mainly fails to distinguish true leadership from authority. By equating leadership with authority, we fail to see the obstacles to leadership that come with authority itself.6) Heifetz defines authority as the conferral of power to perform a service, rather than as conferred power to dominate others.7) Moreover, he also suggests two changes in authority leadership: first, the awareness that authority is given and can be taken away; and second, the understanding that authority is conferred as part of an exchange which implies flexibility in obtaining and losing one’s authority.8)

Heifetz’s definition of authority deliberately eliminates the dominance-oriented leadership style. This helps us to take a creative new

---

6) I do not imply there is possibility of leadership without authority. Heifetz also explicates authentic understanding of authority fully enables leadership to be legitimate. Authority is the constitutive element for leadership formation in any place. The bottom line is that authentic leadership must come with the right notion of authority, the conferral of power to perform a service.
8) Ibid., 57.
direction in conceptualizing Korean pastoral leadership in several aspects. First, we need to have a new idea of the role of authority in leadership. Awareness of authority as conferred power to perform a service confronts the Korean formalistic authoritarianism that tends to result in leaders taking the power to dominate church members. And second, Heifetz encourages us to create flexible leadership by exchanging authority among members. This shift will play a significant role in preventing leadership not only from being addicted to or abusing their power and authority but also from the temptation to dominate community members with a top-down communication style. The third benefit from this kind of the authority is a type of leadership which is easily accessible to any member of the community so that the decision-making process will be more sensitive to and inclusive of various groups of people in the community. In the end, this form of leadership is likely to accomplish Calvin’s idea of the church, that of a mutually reciprocal and interdependent community. This new concept of authority and church readily enables us to create a new concept of pastoral leadership as leadership thriving within paradox.

2. Pastoral Leadership within Paradoxical Milieu

It is not totally unreasonable to say that living in the age of pluralism and postmodernism implies “embracing paradox and ambiguity,” Anderson and Miller-McLemore persuasively assert that ambiguity does not refer to contradictions; it is “inherent in human nature, in
human community, in the circumstances of life, and in our theology.”9) Most of all, they effectively remind us that human nature is also paradoxical itself, since humans have the ability to transcend their limitations with a symbolic thought even though at the same time they will eventually die.10) Employing a similar argument about paradox, Reformed theology states that the Christian is simultaneously righteous and sinful before God. These paradoxes are not regarded as untrue; rather, they address very deep truths. Any effort to choose either part of a paradox will not lead to truth, since paradox is “a self-contradictory statement or proposition that on further investigation may nonetheless be true.”11) Thus, the task of a religious leader living in the pluralistic world is to hold the paradox without choosing one side or the other.

Newton H. Malony comments that religious leadership is easily trapped in conflict because leaders fail to adopt the paradoxical mind-set.12) He correctly presupposes that any religious enterprise willingly sets its foundation in paradox: it is based on otherworldly concerns and yet must function in this world. So, it would be natural for the leadership to exist in this paradox. He maintains that religious leadership requires double vision. It asks leaders to move beyond “either/or” to “both/and.” To become a leader with double vision

10) Ibid., 18.
11) Ibid., 17.
means “to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function.” As applied in Christianity, both human and divine should be considered at the same time. To affirm either the human or the divine side of the paradox to the exclusion of the other would be to engage in denial and artificiality.

A classical view about the christian church has confirmed the paradoxical feature of the faith community. The Religious reformer, John Calvin has been regarded as the most influential theologians in the Korean Protestant context. His theology has shed tremendous light upon the theological creeds and confessions characterizing Korean Presbyterian churches, which includes more than 60% of Korean churches. Among the Reformers, Calvin was the one who gave the most attention to the doctrine of the church. He sees the church as the people whom in every age God has called out from the world to serve him, He believed the church was the elect people of God called out of this world to proclaim God’s Word.

Meanwhile, Calvin’s understanding of church is apparently paradoxical, since the high calling of the church goes hand-in-hand with the humility of the church. The church is a human institution at the same time that it is a holy communion. We have these treasures in earthen vessels, as the apostle Paul made so clear (2 Cor. 4:7). This

implies that the leaders of the church can and often do err. The church is a field of grain in which tares all too often have been sown, but this is no excuse to separate ourselves from the church, for it is God’s field.\(^{15}\) Beside that, we need each other. To none of us has God given all the spiritual gifts. It is through each other in the church where God has seen fit to bless us, In the wisdom of God, it is in this way that the Christian commonwealth is bound together, God’s blessings come through the hands of our brothers and sisters in Christ. We need each other, both in material things and in spiritual things.

A pastoral leader equipped with the paradoxical perspective is well aware that most decisions in a church are supposed to be made following prayers so that such decisions will be attuned with God’s will. However, leaders also realize that the decision-making process has to take into serious consideration congregational needs and expectations. Noting several occasions in which a pastoral leader might not have an all-embracing mind, Molony states that an exclusive decision-making process tarnishes the most important truth in Christianity: practicing loving one another.\(^{16}\) It results in the congregation’s withdrawal from the church since the limited communication, they believe, does not cherish people and, furthermore, their self-interest is neither satisfied nor considered. Therefore, Malony believes that sharing decision-making with a transparent process is a prerequisite to healthy and authentic leadership in the paradoxical

---

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 4, 1, 17-22, 1031-36.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 98-99.
milieu. In this way, we can ensure that the paradox between divine and human is taken into account in the church decision-making process.

The fruits of sharing decisions in religious organizations are as follows. First, church members feel profoundly accepted and understood when they participate in communications and decision-making. Second, church leaders do not treat congregation members as employers with growing awareness that the religious organization has to be sustained by members’ volunteers, yet at the same time they advocate acceptance, support, and good relationships among members and staff. Third, shared decision-making can prevent pastoral leaders from the vulnerable situation of having to take sole responsibility for every decision they make. The last benefit is derived from the first three - the faith community can participate in the authentic spiritual practice of loving each other. These results of shared decision-making demonstrate that an inclusive approach to making decisions is essential to church leadership in the paradoxical world and would be greatly beneficial to Korean pastoral leaders and congregations. After all, the fruits of sharing decision enable us to present the potentials to resolve the leadership crisis detected in the Korean churches unveiled as formalistic authoritarianism. It seems to be inevitable to accommodate the sharing decision-making process in Korean church since the process prompts feeling of acceptance, enhances security among the leadership, nurtures good sense of mutual accountability, and

17) Ibid., 99-100.
practices love, the ultimate value of the Christian community.

Now, we will discuss a specific method that facilitates both the authentic concept of authority and the sharing of decisions in the church setting. The method of communal discernment developed long ago by Ignatius of Loyola is invaluable for my argument for renewal and transformation within the Korean church.

**IV. Communal Discernment for Transforming Pastoral Leadership**

**1. Communal Discernment as Christian Heritage**

Decision making is inherent to human nature. We all face momentous decisions as we quite literally become who we are. The Christian tradition has long recognized the importance of decision making. As Elizabeth Liebert notes, “Because our identity is formed in part through our decision, the making of decision is actually a privileged moment for growing in discipleship.” Through our choices, we can become the person God is calling us to be, Because our decisions are so central to our identity as persons and as Christians, we

---


can look to the Christian tradition for help in the process of decision making. That help is called discernment. Liebert succinctly defines discernment as "the process of intentionally becoming aware of how God is present, and calling us as individuals and communities so that we can respond with increasingly greater faithfulness."\(^{20}\) In decision making, self-determination and group identity come manifestly together with God’s call.

Community discernment, based on Liebert’s work, can be defined as the group process of becoming aware of how God is present and of finding God’s will through recognizing the initiative movements of the Holy Spirit among the inner being of the community. The participants in communal discernment are entering into a mystery where, simultaneously, we wait on God to show us how we ought to proceed, while using our minds and hearts and the best strategies at our disposal to help us grow spiritually as a group, in order to make decisions together in a faith context.\(^{21}\)

The practice of communal discernment itself is not new in the Church; a careful reading of the acts of the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35) reveals all of its essential elements. The apostolic Council of Jerusalem was concerned with great religious issues involving the future of the whole church: were the Gentiles asking for baptism obliged to be circumcised as Jews were? In other words, does salvation come through the law and its practices, as the

\(^{20}\) Ibid.

party of the Pharisees contended, or does it come through the grace of the Lord Jesus alone, as Paul claimed? My focus in reading this passage is on the discerning process of the Church. The apostles gathered together with the elders and disciples. The core of the assembly was the small group which prayed together in the upper room when the Spirit of the Lord was poured out on them. No doubt as they met to deliberate, they were united in prayer again as only they could be.22) In our contemporary terms, they put themselves into the right disposition before God, or they made themselves “indifferent” or impartial. More correctly, they allowed God to dispose their hearts for the truth.23)

The biblical precedent gives us a broader horizon for considering communal discernment. We acknowledge that we are not joining a movement of dubious origins. We follow a route traced by the apostles.24) Such historical awareness helps us to realize that ever since the Council of Jerusalem, communal discernment has been practiced in the Church whenever men and women graced by God came together and set out to search for those high thoughts and ways of the Lord that no person can know through his or her own efforts alone.

22) For more details, see Luke Timothy Jonhson, Scripture and Discernment: Decision Making in the Church (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press, 1996),
2. Ignatian Communal Discernment as a Historical Model

Although communal discernment is ancient in the church, the historical precedent for the form to which I refer is the experience of St. Ignatius of Loyola and his first companions in their deliberations about the founding of the Jesuit order. As a group they worked through specific questions of community in the midst of the discerning process, a process well documented in the *Deliberation Primorum Patrum* (*Deliberation of the First Fathers*). The document includes the way in which the first fathers of the Society of Jesus reached a decision concerning two issues: the need for a vow of obedience and the procedures for sending their members out to do apostolic works.

Father Schemel and Sister Judith briefly and concisely delineate how the most characteristic of the procedures presented in *Deliberation of the First Fathers* is “the insistence on separating the pro and con sides of a question at issue, requiring that each person prayerfully consider and speak to both.” Despite the existence of contradictory opinions, the document shows precisely how the communal discerning process allowed for an unfolding of comprehensive perspectives on the issues without dominance by any one individual. More than that, it also shows how sincerely they engaged in the decision process with intentional devotional preparation. First, they devoted themselves to prayers, sacrifices, and meditations, making ev-

ery effort to find joy and peace in the Holy Spirit concerning obedience which dispositions humans to glorify God and praise His majesty. The second preparation of the soul was the communal agreement that no one would persuade another or incline them more in favor of obeying or of not obeying. They evaluated equally each autonomous idea that arose from individual prayer and meditation. Third, each participant was not supposed to promote their own opinions and judgments, but they were to freely propose their ideas. After months of prayer and discussion, these “pilgrim priests” decided to form a permanent union, and the Society of Jesus was born. Their authentic use of the communal discernment process has been demonstrated repeatedly over the centuries since.

The other two resources from the Ignatian tradition concerning communal discernment can be discovered within the *Spiritual Exercises*. The first is the practice of personal discernment, codified in the “Rules of the Discernment of Spirit,” which directs the re-

27) Andrew Hamilton, "Correct Weight for Communal Discernment," *The Way Supplement* 85 (Spring 1996), 19. “The ‘Spiritual Exercise’ blends not only Ignatius’s personal mysticism and spirituality but also his pastoral experience. The exercises can be called the school of prayer created for, and taught by, the Society of Jesus. Ignatius composed them as a manual for the person giving them, They are to be experienced, not read or studied, by the one making them,” Harvey D. Egan, S.J. "Ignatian Spirituality,” in *the New Dictionary of Catholic Spirituality*, ed, Michael Downey (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1993), 522.

28) In the *Spiritual Exercises*, Ignatius of Loyola outlines “Rules for the Discernment of Spirits,” which function critically as the exercitants attempts to respond to the influence of God directing her or his life. The rules unite all of the factors that previous traditions included: good and evil spirits, personal and preternatural influences, thoughts and imagination, and states of affectivity, consolation and desolation,
treatant to reflect on the significant movements of the heart. An individual seeks to recognize the kind of movements taking place within him or her and to grasp the meaning of the consolation and desolation so that he or she can follow the lead of the Spirit. The second source for communal discernment is derived from the *Election* in the *Spiritual Exercises*.29) Within the Exercises, a retreatant is directed towards choice and practical renewal within a context of prayer. Then, the process of decision-making culminates in the *Election* in that emphasis is placed on the movement of the heart. Even though these two resources were originally designed for use by individuals, both could serve also as resources for communal discernment, since individual discernment is the fundamental resource for group discernment.30) When an individual comes to a decision, this decision is considered tentative or provisional until confirmed objectively by the person’s community. Meanwhile, in communal discernment there often is a higher authority with whom the group has to be in dialogue for objective confirmation. And so this same principle for objective

29) The term *Election* in the Ignatian tradition indicates that each human being is created for a purpose, which is, ‘to praise, reverence and serve God our Lord and by so doing to save his or her soul’ (*Spiritual Exercises* 22). “Ignatius likewise held that, since human well-being and good order are rooted in consistency between that ultimate purpose and the choices which men and women make in particular circumstances, then if human beings are to flourish, those choices need to be consciously related to that purpose,” David Lonsdale, “Ignatian Election,” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Christian Spirituality*, ed. Philip Sheldrake (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 268; Joohyung Lee, “Centrality of Imagination in Election within Spiritual Exercises,” *Theology and Praxis* 50 (2016), 159-187.

confirmation applies. Therefore, the methods of the Spiritual Exercises which were designed for the individual could be extended to communal reflection and choice.31)

The Constitutions for the Society of Jesus should be taken into account since the constitution implicitly and explicitly is embedded in the key values for communal discernment.32) Firstly, Ignatius is primarily concerned that decisions among the Society should be made in spiritual freedom, the freedom in which people are as open as possible to Christ. To enable this sense of spiritual freedom, the gathering allows each member’s authentic participation with an invitation to anyone to speak regardless of their age or position. The second key value here is the group’s unity. Ignatius seems at least to envisage consensual resolutions. For him, God’s Spirit is not arbitrary. As a group of people are sharing life vocation and opening to God, the divine wisdom will be reflected in all decisions.

I have been exploring so far the Ignatian experience of communal discernment using a couple of historical resources. Even if those three documents represent different styles of discernment, any Ignatian approach to communal discernment will seem to cohere with these approaches,33) Their basic concerns consist of four aspects. The first concern is that a decision must be made based on an accu-

33) Ibid., 78-79.
rate account of all relevant information. Second, the decision should be taken in faith rather than in fear, out of a gospel understanding of the self rather than a constricting self-image. Third, general rules cannot impede people’s freedom to do what a situation requires. Fourth, realistic allowance must be made for human limitations. For additional help in coming to a good decision, Ignatius sets forth indifference as a prerequisite for good discernment.

What is the initial implication of Ignatian Communal Discernment for Korean pastoral leadership stuck firmly in formalistic authoritarianism? It is significant for Koreans that Communal Discernment seems to represent a form of participation which is an alternative to the authoritarianism prevalent among Roman Catholics before Vatican II. Communal discernment was rediscovered as a historical reaction against a rigid conception of obedience right after Vatican II. Before the Vatican Council, the old-style obedience and communal discernment was preoccupied with the question of who, in the end, has the power to make the decision. However, the historical transitions of catholic landscape by the Vatican Council caused reevaluation of its significance and the revival of Ignatian communal discernment since Vatican II shook the stubborn foundation of authoritarianism. Its legitimation by Roman Catholics demonstrated the probability and adaptability of “discerning together,” even though it was in a different context from Protestant Korean churches.34)

3. The Practical Procedure of Communal Discernment

Communal discernment is an instrument offering different agenda for developing true Christian community. It should be confessional not only in that the faith community has embodied the love of God and love is the primary motive in decision making. In addition, it is based on the premise that there can be individual discernment without a relationship to the total faith community, which means no communal discernment is possible without consideration of individual discernment. Its methods set out the presupposition that each individual has the capacity to discern God’s will but, even so, each individual’s discernment becomes finally authenticated through the process of communal discernment. Drawing on several resources which have reformulated the practical methods and processes of communal discernment for contemporary use, I will here present practical processes and guidelines for Korean communal discernment in the context of Korean pastoral leadership in the parish ministry.35)

Before beginning a group discernment process there should always be a period of ‘readying.’ This is the time of dispositional readiness, which is a matter of the heart. Among the signs of readiness are the following. First is the ability of the members to enter into serious conversation without prejudice and bias with each other. Second, the members are open to prayer, as an essential element for obtaining knowledge not so much by human effort as through God’s gracious gift; this knowledge is akin to the “intimate understanding and relish of the truth” which Ignatius speaks of in his Exercises #2. The third sign of readiness includes the capacity to trust the discerning process and the facilitator, even when the process is perceived to be out of tune with the group’s spirit or agenda. Fourth, the members of the group should have the capacity and the patience to stay with the process to the end.

The discernment process itself is composed of five phases. Phase one is called “experience,” in which a history or timeline of the church is presented to the members. This can be an instrument for inclusion of new members and of reconciliation and healing among existing relationships. It also can be the vehicle for discerning the presence of God through the historical events of the community. While tracing the historical events from the present back in time, the group eventually comes back to its beginning where the initiating vision took form. Then, the act of storytelling of history becomes a chance to articulate the vision of the group, and the shared vision evokes a sense
of commonality that permeates the community and gives coherence to diverse activities.

Once the history line has been recounted, the members are asked to reflect on their experience and to understand the movement of spirit in their interior lives (phase two). Helpful questions at this stage to ponder include: What is the significance of this event? What is it saying? Then, each person makes a personal assessment of meanings: Our history says to me that… After this, all are invited to state their interpretation of the events as follows: Because our history is what it is, there is a need to… This praying over the church’s history profoundly assists the group to interpret and view its history from the point of view of the main Christian narratives.

After each person has shared their reflections, each person is encouraged to speak about what they have heard (phase three). When everyone has spoken, the group returns to silence to reflect on what they have heard from each other. The articulation of each one’s experience in prayer places the individual in the communal context and helps the group to become more objective in its understanding of the experience. It also enables trust to grow in the group by sharing some in-depth experiences, which is a way to learn how to be aware of God’s work among them. In the fourth phase, everyone is involved in an interpreting activity in which people realize the significance of the interior movements of spirits. This action of interpretation is often begun by the simple question, What does this experience of ours mean? It is here that the insights about the spiritual discernment process found
in Ignatius of Loyola’s writings can be very helpful. Interpreting the movement of the heart, group direction, interior moods, feelings or affections, and tendencies have to be seriously and inclusively considered. There are times when the moods or judgments of members of a group can cause discouragement and communal desolation. However, it is at these times that it is important for the group to pause and ask, *What is happening to us? Where did this discouragement originate?* When a group is able to monitor itself in this way, a great deal of growth in spiritual maturity can be expected.

When confidence in the process, and spiritual maturity, and a consensus about the right timing have all been reached among members, the practical **decision-making** process begins as the fifth phase. The first four steps of this phase consist of “initially walking around the issue, gathering all relevant data and posting it on flipchart paper for all to see; second, checking assumptions and determining criteria for choice; third, brainstorming, prioritizing, examining the advantages and disadvantages, making a composite of the groups’ list of advantages and disadvantages and taking the matter to prayer, seeking God’s help in coming to a provisional decision; lastly seeking confirmation for the decision reached.”36) Diligent monitoring of participants’ inner dynamics including mostly affectivity will be the decisive indicator whether the decision making process takes right track. The assured process then prompts all to accept the decision.

In concluding the discernment process, seeking consensus and confirmation is so vital since it means something more than the simple words imply. Consensus brings about unity, and it may even lead to an experience of a special sense of wholeness. Finally, the experience of wholeness through the consensus prompts each member to recognize that he or she has been involved in a mystery which has touched the life of each person present; it is God who has worked this change in them.

4. The Communal Discernment as Pastoral Leadership in Korean Church

Attempt to foster communal discernment into the Korean churches and its leadership formation is one of the inevitable endeavors to envision the aim of the practical theology in Korean context through integrating between what churches believe in and how they live out. My hope is that a focus on communal discernment will provoke at least three transformations in the Korean church leadership. The first

37) One of the legitimate challenges on this research topic would be related with the interreligious approach asking the way in which the catholic traditional methods could effectively applicable in protestant church contexts. As forementioned, it is therefore important to acknowledge the historical or contextual understanding of Ignatian spirituality for authentic procedure or desirable outcomes. However, it is also meaningful to facilitate important spiritual heritage within christian spiritual traditions if it would accommodate the enhancement and nourishment for our contemporary faith community.

38) Don Browning’s methodology and understanding of practical theology and Christian church as of living out their faith offer the milestone of this argument, Don Browning, A Fundamental Practical Theology: Descriptive and Strategic Proposals (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 9-10.
relates to indifference, the intrinsic prerequisite of discernment. Indifference (or detachment) is generally defined as a willingness to give up any worldly value for the sake of a higher spiritual good, such as seeking, following and decision-making to God’s will.\textsuperscript{39)} Specifically, Ignatius of Loyola states in his legacy work, \textit{Spiritual Exercises} that indifference is preparatory to a choice to live a life that wants what God wants \textit{[Spiritual Exercises, 23]}.\textsuperscript{40)} Anyone authentically seeking to discern God’s will is supposed to practice indifference in order to ready mind and soul to make a choice conformity with God’s will along the way, we are to abandon preoccupation with worldly value systems. The features of the formalistic authoritarianism as cultural consciousness do not originate from the Christian value system but attached with the worldly value system. The aim of indifference is to liberate community members from mundane or physical desires which distort participant’s intention or attention to the decision-making process, I believe indifference also liberates the members from the culturally embedded consciousness, which is the initiative benefit and contribution of the communal discernment in Korean church.

Second gift from practicing communal discernment in Korean church stems from realization that discernment itself is not static, but


process; any decision made is not permanent but tentative. Authentic discernment challenges assumptions of evidence and certainty by admitting human incapability to discern decisive God’s will because it is in part hidden and remains a mystery to human being. To discern the partly mysterious but partly revealed will of God leads us inescapably to embrace of uncertainty and ambiguity.41) Since the will of God is perceived as hidden and simultaneously revealed, the discernment itself is still process in-between. The will of God is already discerned but not yet totally—paradoxical. It helps us clearly to conceive the identity of the church, the discerning subject, inevitably as paradoxical—a human institution as well as Holy Communion. In the end, practicing communal discernment is confessional by itself, in that the church is paradoxical community to the extent that its discerning process will be paradoxical. The Communal discernment hence emphasizes upon awakening all that the will of God is not exclusively known by one person in a church such as a senior pastor, but by the whole community. The will of God is revealed to ordinary people and to taste the next advantage of the communal discernment.

Lastly, facilitating communal discernment will constructively shifts the concept of authority from being tarnished, deformed, and distorted by the formalistic authoritarianism to being flexibly shared among the constitutive members; from as conferred power to dominate group members to as the conferral of power to perform a

41) Herbert Anderson and Bonnie Miller-McLemore, Faith’s Wisdom for Daily Living (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2008), 16.
service. The primary challenge for the Korean church leadership under the authoritarianism is to embrace lay people as partners to discern the will of God unveiled indiscriminately in the mundane human nature. As above noted, however, communal discernment takes transparency for granted in the communication process and it considers all discerners as divine vehicles to perceive the will of God regardless of their ages, social class, gender, position, etc. The radical methods of the communal discernment establish that authority is given to the community, any attempt to dominate others with top-down leadership excludes lay people and distorts the intention for the church.

I eagerly vindicates, I believe that the communal discernment is a genuine spiritual practice that will overcome the leadership crisis of Korean churches that are trapped by formalistic authoritarianism. Adopting the communal discernment is well renew leadership formation since it negatively prevents Korean churches from being split or conflicted through accepting the voice of the lay people in the decision-making process. It also keeps church members actively from becoming vulnerable sacrifices by scapegoat-like by inner conflicts.

Most of all, what makes the communal discernment the most legitimate spiritual practice in Korean church leadership is that the communal decision-making process embodies practice of ultimate will of God, loving each other. The discerning process described above deepens the intimate understanding each other through listening, accepting, and understanding among the members. In communal discernment process tremendously does surly enhance awareness of
God’s loving presence and does definitely foster confessional affirmation of the communal discernment as ‘the shared divine wisdom,’” where the will of God is revealed among the community.

The endeavors to vindicate necessity of communal discernment in Korean church and to apply it for Korean context leave at least three tasks for future research. First, the way in which Korean Presbyterian churches comprehend community as paradoxical should explicitly be delineated. There is plausible suspicion whether Calvin’s understanding of church as paradoxical is authentically accepted to Korean church or not. Second remaining task will relate with the practical concerns that the model of the communal discernment presented herein stems from the catholic tradition: Ignatian tradition. Even if we examined discernment as Christian spiritual practice by noting the biblical foundation, it is mostly predictable to have reluctance or resistance from Korean protestant church due to its catholic roots. The question, then, arise, “how can the communal discernment be introduced to the Korean protestant churches that have prejudice or bias of the catholic churches and its spiritual tradition?” Lastly, the communal discernment is presupposed with personal discernment, since the individual discerning process becomes the most significant resources for the communal discernment, Thus, introducing and internalizing the personal discernment should be concurrent with the way in which both methods can be integrated in discerning and seeking the will of God,
V. Conclusion

This paper has taken an experimental journey to explain the legitimacy of communal discernment as spiritual practice and its implications in the Korean pastoral context. First, Korean pastoral leadership is restricted by its cultural inheritance of formalistic authoritarianism, a leadership style that undermines the fundamental ground of the church’s unity and minimizes the congregational spiritual and religious needs, leading to increasing vulnerability of the leadership in conflict situations. Second, Calvin’s theology of the church, points out the paradoxical identity of the church, and Heifetz’s elaboration of flexibility in the relation between authority and leadership expands the landscape of the church leadership by showing its potential adaptability in the milieu of ambiguity and paradox. We can acknowledge with Malony’s support that pastoral leadership that serves truth must resonate primarily with paradox. And thirdly, the practice of communal discernment stemming from the Ignatian spiritual tradition has been re-discovered and re-introduced as a legitimate decision-making process in pastoral leadership which could critically contribute to transform Korean pastoral leadership in the context of the paradoxical world.
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The Communal Discernment for Pastoral Leadership in Korean Church

Joohyung LEE (Chaplain & Assistant Professor, Soongsil University)

The pastoral leadership style in Korean churches, which is characterized as formalistic authoritarianism, is claimed as the main reason to trigger inner conflict or discouragement as well as to lead into restoring the essence of the leadership formation. The illuminating insights of Calvin’s understanding of church and the contemporary ideas of leadership theory is playing a pivotal role in presenting the paradoxical nature of the faith community and leadership formation. The communal discernment is introduced within its biblical resources from the apostolic council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35). The historical document about the communal discernment stemming from Ignatian tradition is explored as the historical heritage for complementary and transformative tool for pastoral leadership in Korean churches. At next, it deliberately articulates the details of the procedures and guides in practicing the communal discernment as spiritual practice in faith community context. At last, as practical implication in Korean pastoral context, it delineates the way in which the communal discernment could effectively be embodied as equipped with the authentic understanding of the spiritual indifference, its dynamic of process, and authority.
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