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ABSTRACT

The study of a case of charismatic leadership at the Hope of Bangkok Church, Thailand in the light and scope of Max Weber's theory of charismatic authority. The study concluded that Hope of Bangkok Church was established through charisma leadership. However, due to internal economic and political crisis charisma failed to help the church survive.

The Hope of Bangkok Church, founded in 1981 under the leadership of Dr. Kriengsak Chareonwongsak, was a Christian church registered according to Thai Law as a non-political, voluntary, non-profit organization known as the “Hope of Thai People Foundation”. The church disintegrated in 2008 and split up into factions with continuous segregation into other churches. The research indicated that Kriengsak and his leadership team were truly charismatic, as their nature and features comply with Weber’s and other’s experts description of charismatic authority. Moreover, the fact that upon Kriengsak emergence the number of Protestant believers, which were historically low in Thailand, increased dramatically within the country and then overseas. Charismatic leaders are often dissatisfied with the status quo, and we see this in the case of Kriengsak in relation to the church. His ability to administer
alternate ways of functioning is a trait of charismatic authority and consistent with the characteristics stipulated by Weber and other authorities on the subject. These characteristics include both positive and negative aspects. As a positive, his personal commitment resulted in great success as defined by the number of dedicated and obedient followers. However, the negative characteristics of the charismatic nature often manifest, and in Kriengsak's case it was self-promotion over the institutional mission and the instability cause by changing goals.

Secondly, the research reflects the hypotheses for the disintegration of the church and analyzes these hypotheses in light of Weber's thought (and that of other scholars who have contributed to the field of organizational behavior and leadership) with references to popular cases of charismatic leaders or institutions. The researcher considered five hypotheses as reasons for the disintegration and by analysis found that all of these hypotheses have contributed in different degrees to the disintegration of the church. These five hypotheses are: (1) lack of accountability in charismatic leadership, including the succeeding administration, (2) the change in creed and mission of the church, (3) psychological makeup and behavior of followers, (4) self-promotional goals of the leader and his personal responsibility, and (5) failure of proper routinization.

The analysis of the above hypothesis showed that the researcher is justified in the position that Hope of Bangkok Church was established based on charisma. However, due to internal economic and political crisis, charisma ultimately failed to help the church survive. The research showed that Hope of Bangkok church was established based on the charisma of its founding leader, and on the charismatic authority in accordance with Weber's, and other scholars, understanding of the phenomena. The hypothesis also shows a fundamental connection to two main
factors, namely political and economics. And, as such how the leader’s use (or misuse) of the church for political ends created factions on matters related to financial transparency, management, aspect of creed, essential objectives, and the message and nature of the church.
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CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

1.1. Background and the Significance of the Study

The research proposed is to study the charismatic leadership of Hope of Bangkok Church and is conducted in the light and scope of Max Weber's theory of charismatic authority. In brief, the research is primarily related to the issue of the role of charisma and charismatic leadership in the establishment of the church, with a brief examination of the biblical view of charisma. In addition, the researcher will explore the economic and political crisis that, in spite of the charismatic leadership, eventually led its disintegration.

In the year 1981, Dr. Kriengsak Chareonwongsak, along with some supporters, founded Hope of Bangkok Church, which grew over a few years into the largest Protestant Charismatic church in Thailand. The Hope of Bangkok Church was a Thai Christian Church, registered according to Thai Law as a non-political, voluntary, non-profit organization called the "Hope of Thai People Foundation". Kriengsak envisioned, founded, and developed the church through particular use of his charismatic leadership abilities. The church grew within the borders of Thailand and in time spread overseas with churches in various countries. However, in the year 2008, the organization suffered a management crisis, which created a divide in the church community and its administration. This resulted in not one church with a large united community, but numerous churches with various communities. The researcher, a former member of this community for sixteen years, is one of the many affected and concerned. The researcher assumes that the church disintegrated because of the failure of the routinization of the charismatic authority. The reasons for the failure as presented indicate the negative
aspects of charismatic leadership, of routinizing, and in the (unsuccesful) transition to other types of sustainable organizational leadership.

The breakdown of the church leadership and its split resulted in a considerable loss to the community in spiritual, social, and emotional ways. Therefore, the researcher believes it will be academically and applicably significant to conduct a study of this case with respect to the analysis and criticisms of Max Weber's theory of charismatic authority. The researcher expects the study will culminate in genuine findings and recommendations that may be of some help to charismatic leadership style institutions, particularly churches. Therefore, the findings of this research and the lessons learned may offer significant assistance to religious institutions in the area of leadership and organizational behavior.

The study is based on Weber's thought on charismatic authority and the case study of Hope of Bangkok Church. For this reason, the literature review of the proposed study constitutes a brief, descriptive exposition of Weber's model of charismatic leadership and the history of Protestantism, particularly Pentecostals and charismatics in Thailand. The proposal summarizes details regarding the case study of Hope of Bangkok Church and affirms the thesis statement, research methodology, questions, outline, objectives, and expectations of the study.

1.2. Literature Review

Max Weber (1864 - 1920), German sociologist, was the most influential and in many respects the most profound of twentieth-century social scientists. Max Weber made original contributions to the study of modern social structure, to the analysis of the economy and the law, to the comparative analysis of civilizations and to the methodology
of the social sciences. Weber's major works deal with rationalization in sociology of
religion, government, organizational theory, and behavior. In addition, Weber's various
works show that he had a wide-ranging set of interests. He has contributed to politics,
history, language, religion, law, economics, and administration. Weber's most influential
works are *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904–5) and *Economy and

Weber’s contribution is remarkable in the field of organization theories and
institution building. He treats discourses on domination, power, legitimacy, and types of
authorities. Weber middles the question of legitimacy of authorities. He suggests a
tripartite classification of authority consisting of: charismatic authority, traditional
authority, and rational-legal authority. Weber distinguishes the various attributes between
these different styles of authority. Traditional authority is the type of authority "resting on
an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the
status of those exercising authority under them" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). Legal
or rational authority is authority "resting on a belief in the 'legality' of patterns of
normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue
commands" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). Weber defines charismatic authority as
"resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary
character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or
ordained by him" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). Weber’s discourse on charismatic
authority is scattered in his major works, which are explored with an exceptional focus
upon the charismatic authority by probing its various features. The most important of
these features are meaning, definition, recognition, cessation, and routinization of
charismatic authority. The scope of Weber's theory is significant in its areas of application and because of this, analysis, criticism, and interpretations of his theory have evolved through scholarship and have subsequently become imperative in understanding its all-encompassing applicatory stance.

Before explaining the charismatic authority, Weber explains the term charisma as follows:

The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader. In primitive circumstances this peculiar kind of deference is paid to prophets, to people with a reputation for therapeutic or legal wisdom, to leaders in the hunt, and heroes in war. It is very often thought of as resting on magical powers. How the quality in question would be ultimately judged from any ethical, aesthetic, or other such point of view is naturally entirely indifferent for purposes of definition (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 48).

Weber defines charismatic authority as "resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). From the definition, it appears that charisma is an extraordinary quality of a person. The reorganization of the quality depends mainly on followers who consider the person to be gifted with supernatural, superhuman, or exceptional powers or qualities. The element of having belief on the part of followers in such a quality is very important, the followers should believe in the existence of such quality. Weber states, "What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority, by his 'followers' or 'disciples'" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 48). Charisma thus denotes a relationship between a charismatic leader and his followers rather than an individual
personality attribute. Therefore, charismatic authority is power legitimized. The leader's exceptional personal qualities or the demonstration of extraordinary insight and accomplishment inspires loyalty and obedience from followers. Weber notes, “This basis lies rather in the conception that it is the duty of those who have been called to a charismatic mission to recognize its quality and to act accordingly. Psychologically this 'recognition' is a matter of complete personal devotion to the possessor of the quality, arising out of enthusiasm, or of despair and hope” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.49).

Therefore, “The only basis of legitimacy for it is personal charisma, so long as it is proved; that is, as long as it receives recognition and is able to satisfy the followers or disciples. But this lasts only so long as the belief in its charismatic inspiration remains” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 52).

The requisite elements of charismatic leadership are the existence of a leader, the extraordinary qualities he possesses and the belief of followers in such qualities. As such, it rests almost entirely on the leader. The absence of the leader, for any reason can lead to the dissolution of the authority's power. The legitimacy of charismatic authority is also prone to cessation and instability. Weber puts it as follows:

If proof of his charismatic qualification fails him for long, the leader endowed with charisma tends to think his god or his magical or heroic powers have deserted him. If he is for long unsuccessful, above all if his leadership fails to benefit his followers, it is likely that his charismatic authority will disappear. This is the genuine charismatic meaning of the 'gift of grace' (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 50).

The instable disposition of charismatic authority demands its routinization. Routinization is the process by which charismatic authority is successful by either a traditionalized or rationalized authority, or a combination of both (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 54). This is a very important theme; it is important to institutions and
organizations because charisma can be very effective in the lifetime of the charismatic leader or in short run, however it has shortcomings as being a long-term source of authority. Therefore, there is a need of routinizing charismatic authority and transforming it into other workable forms of authority; and that is not an easy task. Weber considers the transition of the charismatic administrative staff to a bureaucratic and rational administration as the biggest challenge. Weber gives the reason for such difficulty, which is because “Charismatic authority is radically opposed to both rational and particularly bureaucratic authority” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 51). Therefore, if the gains of charismatic authority are to be safeguarded and continued, it has to be transformed into a traditional or legal form of authority or a combination of both. The routinization part of Weber’s theory is very elaborate which includes an excellent treatment of issues related to charismatic leaders, succession, and different aspects related to the followers, their interests, and behavior. This major part will be explored extensively in the research and will be chiefly used in the analysis and criticism of the case study of the research, namely Hope of Bangkok Church.

Weber’s above-summarized theory is for the purpose of studying and analyzing the case study of this research, which is Hope of Bangkok Church. It is important to note that the church is Protestant charismatic. For this reason, before explaining the case of Hope of Bangkok Church, it is imperative to investigate the charismatic movement and its arrival in Thailand.

The term Charismatic comes from the Greek word Charis; it means a grace or a gift, a term used in the Bible that will be explored in some detail in chapter two. Charismatic is an umbrella term used to describe those Christians who believe that the
manifestations of the Holy Spirit seen in the first century Christian Church, such as healing, miracles and glossolalia, are available to contemporary Christians and ought to be experienced and practiced today (Charismata, Catholic Encyclopedia, 2009). The Charismatic church and movement are interrelated; they take their reason for existence from the earlier history of Christianity. However, the emergence of the movement and its development is historically a modern occurrence. The charismatic movement emerged within the historic church in the 1950s. In Protestantism, the modern Charismatic movement emerged from Pentecostalism, sometimes termed as neo-Pentecostal. The charismatic movement, despite its classical parentage of Pentecostalism, exists almost totally outside official Pentecostal denominations. However, Pentecostalism and charismatic are often used interchangeably.

In a narrow sense, the charismatic movement refers to the appearance of charismatic practices in Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in the United States during the 1960s. For Protestants the decisive year was 1960. That was when an Episcopal priest in Van Nuys, California, Dennis Bennett (1917–91), informed people that he had experienced the gift of glossolalia, speaking in tongues. In the 20th century, Pentecostalism grew more rapidly than any other Christian movement (Ellwood, 1998/2007, p. 80). While the movement in Western societies may have been in decline for some time, its international appeal continues unabated, with the total number of charismatics and Pentecostals globally being in the region of three billion. Its emotional appeal, alongside a flexible theology, has ensured its formidable growth as the largest and fastest spreading expression of Christianity (Clarke, 2008).

The arrival of Pentecostals and Charismatics in Thailand has a long history, which
goes back to 1828. However, the presence of Christians in Thailand has been since 1511. The history shows that the first Pentecostal missionaries were from Finland, who they arrived in Bangkok in 1946. They established the first church associated with the Full Gospel Church of Thailand in Thonburi (Hosack, 2001, p.111). Starting in 1951, various Pentecostal missionaries from a number of Scandinavian countries began arriving in the country. They formed churches called the Foundation of the Full Gospel Churches in Thailand. In 1956, T. L. Osborn, a healing evangelist from America, had a profound effect on the growth of Pentecostal churches within Thailand (Hosack, 2001, p.113). Similarly, another missionary Don Price traveled to Huay Sawing to participate in church building. While teaching in an afternoon service, many in the congregation suddenly began speaking in tongues, dancing in the Spirit and some started rolling around on the floor. This is generally looked upon as one of the first truly powerful Pentecostal services to take place in Thailand (Hosack, 2001, p.114). The coming of many new mission organizations in the 1960s and early 1970s led to development of a completely new array of Pentecostal ministries in Thailand. The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada sent their first missionary couple to Thailand in 1961. The churches that developed in association with them are called the Full Gospel Fellowship Church of Thailand. In 1962, Boonmak Kittisan, established a Thai branch of the United Pentecostal Church. In 1967 Charles Austin, an American G.I. stationed in Udorn Thani, began the first Church of God work in Thailand. Churches affiliated with the Church of God are called "Plukjit" (in Thai). In 1968, Ervin Shaffer, the first American Assemblies of God missionary to Thailand, arrived to work with American G.I.'s who were stationed in Southeast Asia. In that same year, other missionaries started working alongside Kowae in establishing the Thailand
Assemblies of God. In 1977, the Church of God of Prophecy sent their first missionary to Thailand. The first Pentecostal publishing venture, called Gospel Press, began in 1965 when Don Price moved to Thailand bringing a printing press with him. The first Christian radio programming was begun in Chiang Mai in 1967 and later moved to Bangkok to begin a popular program known later as the "Way of Life" Broadcast (Hosack, 2001, pp.115-116).

In short, the influence of the Charismatic movement started to affect the Christians in Thailand starting from the 1970s and continuing to the present time. Many of the early Charismatic works initiated by missionaries came in the form of training programs. During the same period, a number of independent church movements started. In 1979, Wan Petchsongkhram separated from the Southern Baptists and began establishing churches throughout the country; these churches are known as Rom Klaw (Hosack, 2001, p.116). The largest charismatic church in Thailand came to be known as The Hope of Bangkok Church. The church is the case study of this research and therefore will be dealt with separately in the following section.

1.3. Case Study

The largest Protestant charismatic church in Thailand called "The Hope of Bangkok" was founded in 1981 through Kriengsak Chareonwongsak and the association of seventeen members. The further or subsequently established churches that developed under his leadership, both in Thailand and abroad are called "Hope" churches. The essential parts of the case study consist of Kriengsak Chareonwongsak's biographic sketch, his charismatic leadership, and the historical timeline of the church and its disintegration.
Before explicating the case of the church, it is crucial to mention some biographic details of Kriengsak Charoenwongsak. This is indispensable as he founded the church and became its charismatic leader. Kriengsak grew up in a Buddhist home that also practiced Chinese ancestor worship. At the age of 16, in 1972, he was offered a scholarship to study for a year in an American high school in Wisconsin, USA. In November 1973, he studied economics and political science at Monash University, Australia. During this time, he converted to Christianity, became disciplined in Bible study as well as church activities. He became involved in a conservative evangelical church and in the Asian Fellowship on campus. Later, he had an experience of being baptized by the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues. Soon after, he began to attend the charismatic Waverley Christian Fellowship in Melbourne. In this church, as well as in the Asian Fellowship, Kriengsak quickly became a leader who demanded total commitment from his followers in conducting the mission activities (Linder, 2009, p.4).

In 1976, Kriengsak received a vision to plant a church in every district of Thailand. However, he was invited to study for his PhD in Australia for another three years. During this time, he was also able to complete his studies in New Testament while carrying out his other responsibilities in the church (Linder, 2009, p.4). Later in 1981, Kriengsak returned to Thailand, being disappointed with the working style of Thai Churches, he began a new church service in the lecture room on the ninth floor of the Bangkok Christian hospital. The first church service was conducted on 6 September 1981, with 17 people, many of whom were foreign missionaries. To increase the number of attendees and to make the church more effective, Kriengsak appointed leaders who belonged to the church and had received training from him. As a result, after seven years
of growth, 93% of church members were those converted at Hope of Bangkok, the remaining 7% were transplants from other churches. During this time, a cell group program was promoted to attract people (Linder, 2009, pp.5-6).

In November 1983, the Hope of Bangkok church moved to the Sheraton hotel. Later, the Hope of Bangkok church obtained the Oscar Theatre in Petchburi Road, and was able to commence services there with about 400 people. In May 1985, the Hope of Bangkok church had about 700 members and was able to pay off the money that Kriengsak owed for his bond in studying overseas. As a result, he was released for full-time ministry and established the Thailand Bible Seminary, which offered various educational programs. In the same year, the Hope of Phayao church was established and in the next few years, other churches were established in Chiang Mai, Suratthani, and Nakhon Sri Thammarat (Linder, 2009, pp.6-7). Hope churches were also established in other countries such as Malaysia, Sydney, Seattle, and Singapore and were connected through an international network of relationships (Linder, 2009, p.12).

Kriengsak's leadership style in the early years manifested itself concretely in church building and in increasing the number of its members. He was completely committed to the church. There are many stories, which show his personal commitment to the church affairs. One of these stories concerns the absence during the birth of his son, because he was at that time preaching to a drug addict. Another regards his habit of conducting meetings as early as five in the morning (Linder, 2009, p.6). As a preacher, he was able to feed his congregation through expository preaching. He was a very effective preacher and was able to move those who listened to him through his passion and his commitment. Kriengsak also suited the Pentecostal style of church in his leadership style
where the pastor is normally given a lot of authority and scope for ministry. Being a man of enormous capability and intellect, he was able to command the respect of those who followed him. As a result, the church became an expression of his personality and ministry where he became the key to making things work. Nobody within the congregation would think of refusing him anything that he asked for. Kriengsak had the status, the charisma, and the influence over his followers. Since he himself was the man who led by example of total commitment to the work of the church over and above other priorities, he was able to demand no less from those who followed him. By mobilizing his church members to be involved in work he was able to multiply the ministry and the effectiveness in reaching outsiders to come into the Hope of Bangkok church (Linder, 2009, pp.15-16).

On the contrary to the above history of the church and the positive leadership of its founder, since 1980 a different side of leadership began to unfold which had negative effects on the reputation of the founder and the management of the church. During the time of growth in the 1980s, the structure and organization of the Hope of Bangkok became increasingly autocratic; though, the Hope of Bangkok church was successful, in 1989, to obtain the present premises at Khlong Toey. The church membership also grew to six thousand by 1991 (Linder, 2009, p.7). In October 1990, there was a dispute in the leadership team of the Hope of Bangkok church and Kriengsak expelled one of his senior leaders. In time, four additional members were also excommunicated and by the end of the following week, four more leaders who had defiantly questioned the decision were dismissed. The leaders expelled were accused of rebellion in an attempt to take control of the church. It seemed Kriengsak had become untouchable and no one was able to call
him to account. This became more obvious when in December 1991, a delegation sent from the Waverley Christian chapel in Melbourne confronted Kriengsak on many of the unresolved issues that were affecting his reputation. Kriengsak was not open to being questioned and denied any wrongdoing (Linder, 2009, p.10).

The leadership role of Kriengsak and its analysis shall be investigated in more detail further along in this research. However, in summary there is no doubt that the key to the initial and explosive growth of the Hope of Bangkok church was the result of his leadership. In year 1995, Kriengsak left the church and he had his brother-in-law, Phitsanunart Srithawong, who is the husband of his sister Sunee Srithawong, replace him as the pastor of the church. Phitsanunart Srithawong was referred to as the directing pastor and Kriengsak as an honorary pastor. After Kriengsak left the church he ceased giving sermons and did not join in the worship service at the church (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008). Furthermore, he has currently no publicly known connection to the Hope of Bangkok church.

Though Kriengsak had left the Church, his influence remained, and this influence seemingly brought about the split in the church. Kriengsak turned to politics after leaving the church, which resulted in a new crisis. He joined the Democrat Party. He asked his sister and brother-in-law to encourage church members to enroll in the party so he could be on the party list for a term. Gaining a seat in the committee, he prepared himself for the election for the representative on behalf of the Democrat Party. However, because of other reasons, he resigned from the party (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008). This was his first time implementing the power of church authorities to help his political carrier, when in fact the church is a non-political institution as its objectives of establishment are
The case of Hope of Bangkok Church and its leadership as mentioned above is the area of research, which deserves a careful treatment. The main area of the investigation is concerned with the role Kriengsak as a charismatic leader, who founded the church by his charismatic gift, managed it, and ultimately by his own role, and that of his successors, split of the church into six major opposing sects.

1.4. Research Question

The research question concerns the Hope of Bangkok Church and its founder. The questions, which arise, are: (1) Charismatic character of its founder, did his charisma cease during his tenure at the church? (2) What reasons were behind not allowing church leadership to make a smooth transition to other types of leadership? (3) What are the psychological effects of the charismatic leader on his followers? (4) What could have been the best course in this case to bring the situation under control and to avoid the community split? (5) What were the problems in routinizing the charisma, and to what extent is the charismatic leader himself responsible for its failure?

The above-mentioned questions will be sought through the proposed research. The hypotheses will be also tested by applying the qualitative methods of research by analyzing, interpreting, and criticizing the available details in the light of Weber's theory, and its merits and demerits. In addition, other critical works will also be implemented which build on Weber's treatment of the subject. The criticisms, thus made, will lead to diagnosis of the case and justification of the thesis statement; in addition, it will accordingly lead to the formulation of the feasible recommendations for church leadership in Thai context.
1.5. Thesis Statement

Hope of Bangkok Church was established based on charisma. However, due to internal economic and political crisis, charisma fails to help the church survive.

1.6. Methodology

The applied methodology in this research is qualitative and based on two main sub-methodological approaches: theoretical analysis and case analysis. The theoretical analysis will take into consideration the study and analysis of Weber’s works on charismatic leadership, the history of charismatic church, and its development in Thailand. The case study will take into consideration the investigative study of Hope of Bangkok Church, its establishment, and the documents related to its history and split. The methodology in part will be anthropological and qualitative. The study is based on literature and written documents.

1.7. Limitation of the Research

This research is focused on Weber's charismatic authority and leadership of Hope of Bangkok Church. Therefore, the research is limited to Weber's' main works, documents and evidence related to history and current affairs of Hope of Bangkok Church.

1.8. Objectives

The major objectives are as follows:

8.1. To understand Weber's charismatic leadership model and its main features.

8.2. To analyze the role of charisma in the development of Hope of Bangkok church.

8.3. To investigate the fall of Hope of Bangkok Church and failure of its
charismatic leadership.

8.4. To study Weber’s theory of charisma in relation to the development of church in Thailand and see its validity and shortcomings.

8.5. To put forward some suggestions and recommendations on the basis of the findings of this research which may be helpful for the institutions based on charismatic leadership.

1.9. Expectations

9.1. Making a clear case of the issues in an academic manner in accordance to research methods employed in social sciences and humanities.

9.2. Making educated recommendations and suggestions based on the findings of the research.
CHAPTER TWO
Max Weber on Charismatic Authority

2.1. Introduction

The contents of this chapter have been planned to provide a comprehensive exposure of Weber’s ideas on charisma and charismatic authority and its role in institution building. In the beginning, an overview of Weber’s general thought in relevance to the topic is briefly described, while the succeeding portions investigate his various types of authority. The most important area concerning the subject matter of the research is his ideas on charismatic authority; therefore, initially, the researcher explains the various meanings and definitions of charisma and charismatic authority. In order to have a comprehensive understanding, we must take a brief but important departure and examine the biblical perspective of charisma. Returning to Weber, the following components explicate the various aspects of the theory, and focus on the routinization of charismatic authority and its pertinent aspects.

2.2. Weber’s Thought: Relevance to Religion, Sociology and Authority

Max Weber (1864 - 1920), German sociologist, was the most influential, and in many respects, the most profound of twentieth-century social scientists. Max Weber made original contributions to the study of modern social structure, to the analysis of the economy and the law, to the comparative analysis of civilizations, and to the methodology of the social sciences. Weber's writings and theories helped in the firm establishment of foundations of modern sociology. Weber's major works deal with rationalization in sociology of religion, government, and organizational theory and
behavior. He had a wide-ranging set of interests: politics, history, language, religion, law, economics, and administration, in addition to sociology. Weber’s most influential works are *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904–5) and *Economy and Society* (Max Weber, 1922, p. 733).

On the subject of religions and their study, especially sociological, Weber studied the universal historical relationship of religion and society. He dealt with prophets and priests in ancient Judaism, with the alternation and fusion of world rejection and world affirmation in Buddhism and Hinduism, with Mandarin rationality and Taoist pantheism in China, and with much else as well. He contrasted the religions of virtue with those of popular strata and explored the world religions’ very different consequences for communal life, economic system, and the ways in which these elements affected political structure. He examined their origins and the psychological responses to social conflict. He also considered their compromises within social constraints, and showed how religions generated entire systems of belief and value, indeed, how they gave institutional structure and cultural content to civilizations (Weber, 1987, pp. 9710–9713).

Max Weber is famous for introducing charisma in social and political theory. “In fact, Max Weber was the first to introduce the term "charisma" into sociology, the first to attempt to analyze the inner content of the charismatic's character, the first to argue that charisma implies a relationship between the great man and the followers, and the first to place the charismatic within a social context” (Lindholm, 1990, p.28). Weber takes up the concept of charisma in his later and indeed most important years which range from 1910 to 1920. He does so in several writings and analyses the role of charisma in two different spheres: religion and politics. Hence, charisma has a cardinal position in his collected
writings published as “Economy and Society”, and in the collections on the World Religions, published in English as “The Comparative Study of the World Religions”. He worked on these two major twin-projects until his death in 1920. Weber refers to charismatic leadership in his important essays such as “Politics as Vocation”. Thus, charisma forms a key component in his political sociology, as it is well known, but it is equally central to his analysis of the World Religions. Max Weber On Charisma and Institution Building, an anthology edited by S. N. Eisenstadt are an exhaustive collection of Weber’s scattered writings on charisma which are dispersed in his major works and minor writings.

Weber’s development of charisma into a theory with its significance in developing leadership and institutionalizing organizations is thoroughly explained in the following sections of the chapter.

2.3. Weber on Power, Domination, Legitimation, and Authority

Weber’s ideas on power, domination, legitimation, and authority are a substantial contribution to politics and sociology. They are significantly associated with leadership, which is very important for any organization, be that political or religious. In addition, Weber’s discussions on these concepts are connected to institution building and organizational behavior.

Weber defined power as the chance that an individual in a social relationship can achieve by his or her own will, even against the resistance of others. Weber describes power: "power" (Macht) is 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 (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.15). In order to make this
definition more useful in the study of history and society, Weber suggests domination as an alternative, or more carefully defined concept. Weber defines domination "as the probability that certain specific commands (or all commands) will be obeyed by a given group of persons" (Weber, 1968, p. 212). Features associated with domination are obedience, interest, belief, and regularity. Weber notes, "Every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance, that is, an interest (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience" (Weber, 1968 p. 212). According to Weber, when dominance continues for a considerable period, it becomes a structured phenomenon, and the forms of dominance become the social structures of society. However, domination can be both legitimate and illegitimate, and the kind of domination could be classified, as legitimate domination is what Weber explains in his discussion on the "authority". Weber claims the legitimacy of the authority as an element of belief, which the authority can instill in the social order, he states, "Action, especially social action which involves social relationships, may be oriented by the actors to a belief (Vorstellung) in the existence of a "legitimate order". The probability that action will actually empirically be so oriented, will be called the "validity" (Geltung) of the order in question" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.11).

Weber describes a few types of authority as legitimate forms of domination: forms of domination, which followers or subordinates consider legitimate. Legitimate does not necessarily imply any sense of rationality, right, or natural justice. Rather, domination is legitimate when the subordinate accept, obey, and consider domination to be desirable, or at least bearable and not worth challenging. It is not so much the actions of the dominant that create this, but rather the willingness of those who subordinate to
believe in the legitimacy of the claims of the dominant. Weber discusses the legitimacy of an order and states that legitimacy may be ascribed to an order by those subject to it in various ways, which seem to be four. The first is by tradition, which is a belief in the legitimacy of what has always existed. The second is through the virtue of effectual attitudes, which legitimizes any newly revealed model for imitation. The third is by virtue of a rational belief in its absolute value and the fourth is a legitimacy that becomes established in a manner that is recognized to be legal (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.12).

Weber outlines three major types of legitimate domination: traditional, charismatic, and legal or rational. These three forms do not constitute the totality of types of domination, but they show how it is possible for some people to exercise power over others. Authority extends and maintains power and a study of its origins can show how people come to accept this domination as a regular and structured phenomenon. In addition, it is noteworthy that these are ideal types, with any actual use of power being likely to have aspects of more than one type of authority, and perhaps even other forms of power such as the use of force or coercion.

2.4. Weber's Legitimate Types of Authorities

As mentioned above, Weber's contribution is noteworthy in the field of organization theories and institution building; he discusses power, legitimacy, and types of authorities. Weber focuses on the question of legitimacy of authorities. From Weber's thought, it appears that legitimacy of authority is connected to the obedience of the followers. There are no other criteria to judge the legitimacy of authority, as long as people believe in some authority, the authority on Weber's formulations remains legitimate (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 62). Weber proposes a tripartite classification of
authority: charismatic authority, traditional authority, and rational-legal authority. Weber’s purpose is only to show the legitimate types of authorities. Furthermore, these types of authorities are ideal types. Therefore, the types are not necessarily pure and in fact can contain elements from other types of authority types. The ideal type, also known as pure type, is a typological term closely associated with Weber. According to Weber, an ideal type is formed from characteristics and elements of the given phenomena, but it is not meant to correspond to all of the characteristics of any one particular case. It is not meant to refer to perfect things, moral ideals nor to statistical averages but rather to stress certain elements common to most cases of the given phenomena. Weber states: “An ideal type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct...” (Weber, 1994, p. 90). These “pure types” exist only in some societies and are usually found in combination with other “pure types”. For example, familial charisma (important in kingship and the Indian caste system) is a combination of charismatic and traditional elements, while institutional charisma (existing in all church organizations, but absent from priesthood fails to develop such an organization), is a mixture of charismatic and legal elements. The fact that none of these three ideal types, the elucidation of which will occupy the following pages, is usually found in historical cases of 'pure' form, it is not a valid objection to attempt their conceptual formulation in the sharpest possible form (Weber, 1947, p. 329).

The types of domination change over time, such as when rulers fail to live up to the expectations of the ruled. For example, after the death of a charismatic leader the
followers, if they lack the charisma of their predecessor, will try to institute a system based on tradition or law. On the other hand, these systems can be challenged by the appearance of a new charismatic leader, especially during economic or military crises.

Regarding charismatic authority, his thought shows only how it could be routinized or in other words institutionalized. He does not go into details, concerning what are the right and wrong ways of institutionalization, nor does he go into the causes of failure of such institutions. However, later scholars, the subject matter of which will be discussed in the critical chapter of the research, address these themes. In short, there are three pure types of legitimate authority. The validity of their claims to legitimacy may be based on:

1. Rational grounds, which rests on the belief in the 'legality' of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority).

2. Traditional grounds, which rests on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them (traditional authority).

3. Charismatic grounds, which relies on the devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him (charismatic authority). (Weber, 1947, p. 328)

2.4.1. Traditional Authority

Traditional authority is the type of authority “resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising
authority under them” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). From the definition, it is obvious that traditional authority is legitimated by the sanctity of tradition. The ability and right to rule is passed down, often through heredity. It does not change overtime, does not facilitate social change, tends to be irrational and inconsistent, and perpetuates the status quo. In fact, Weber states: “The creation of new law opposite traditional norms is deemed impossible in principle”. Traditional authority is typically embodied in feudalism or patrimonialism. In a purely patriarchal structure, “the servants are completely and personally dependent upon the lord”, while in an estate system (i.e. feudalism), “the servants are not personal servants of the lord but independent men” (Weber, 1958, p. 4). Nevertheless, in both cases the system of authority does not change or evolve. In the case of traditional authority, obedience is owed to the person or chief who occupies the traditionally sanctioned position of authority and who is (within its sphere), bound by tradition. In this manner, the obligation of obedience is not based on the impersonal order, but is a matter of personal loyalty within the area of accustomed obligations (Weber, 1947, p. 328).

2.4.2. Legal or Rational Authority

Legal or rational authority is authority “resting on a belief in the 'legality' of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). Legal-rational authority is empowered by a formalistic belief in the content of the law or natural law. Obedience is not given to a specific individual leader - whether traditional or charismatic - but a set of uniform principles. Weber thought the best example of legal-rational authority was a bureaucracy, be it political or economic. This form of authority is frequently found in
modern state, city governments, private and public corporations, and various voluntary associations. In fact, Weber stated that the “development of the modern state is identical indeed with that of modern officialdom and bureaucratic organizations, just as the development of modern capitalism is identical with the increasing bureaucratization of economic enterprise” (Weber, 1958, p. 3). In the case of legal authority, obedience is owed to the legally established impersonal order. It extends to the persons exercising the authority of office under it only by virtue of the formal legality of their commands and only within the scope of authority of the office (Weber, 1947, p. 328).

2.4.3. Charismatic Authority

Weber defines charismatic authority as “resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). However, Weber did not fully set out a model of charisma, combining concept and theory. At times, he was even contradictory. Thus in one place he argues that ‘as a rule, charisma is a highly individual quality’, whereas in another he states that ‘what is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority’ (Weber, 1968, p.242 and p.1113). In the case of charismatic authority, it is the charismatically qualified leader as such who is obeyed by virtue of personal trust in him. His revelation, his heroism or his exemplary qualities fall within the important scope of the individual's belief in his charisma (Weber, 1947, p. 328).

Weber makes a special focus on the charismatic authority by exploring its various features. The most important features are meaning, definition, recognition, cessation, and routinization of charismatic authority. The scope of Weber’s theory is significant in its
application; because of which, the analysis, criticism, and interpretations of his theory developed by many scholars became important in understanding the extensive applicative stance of charismatic authority. The following comparative table shows the different characteristics of Weber’s tripartite classification of authority types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Charismatic</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Legal-Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of ruler</td>
<td>Charismatic leader</td>
<td>Dominant personality</td>
<td>Functional superiors or bureaucratic officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position determined by:</td>
<td>Having a dynamic personality</td>
<td>Established tradition or routine</td>
<td>Legally established authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruled using:</td>
<td>Extraordinary qualities and exceptional powers</td>
<td>Acquired or inherited (hereditary) qualities</td>
<td>Virtue of rationally established norms, decrees, and other rules and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimized:</td>
<td>Victories and success to community</td>
<td>Established tradition or routine</td>
<td>General belief in the formal correctness of these rules and those who enact them are considered a legitimized authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty:</td>
<td>Interpersonal fidelity allegiance and devotion</td>
<td>Based on traditional allegiances</td>
<td>To authority / rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesion:</td>
<td>Emotionally unstable and volatile</td>
<td>Feeling of common purpose</td>
<td>Abiding by rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership:</td>
<td>Rulers and followers (disciples)</td>
<td>Established forms of social conduct</td>
<td>Rules, not rulers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.3.1. Definition and Meaning of Charismatic Authority

Weber explains the term charisma before explaining the charismatic authority as follows:

The term 'charisma' will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader. In primitive circumstances this peculiar kind of deference is paid to prophets, to people with a reputation for therapeutic or legal wisdom, to leaders in the hunt, and heroes in war. It is very often thought of as resting on magical powers. How the quality in question would be ultimately judged from any ethical, aesthetic, or other such point of view is naturally entirely indifferent for purposes of definition (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 48).

Weber treats charisma as a value free concept and gives it a significant or revolutionary force. The term "charisma" in this context must be applied in a completely value-free sense (Weber, 1968, p.1112). In this purely empirical and value-free sense charisma is indeed a specific creative as well as revolutionary force in history (Weber, 1968, p. 1117). Sociological analysis, which must abstain from value judgments, will treat all these on the same level as the men who, according to conventional judgments, are the 'greatest' heroes, prophets, and saviors (Weber, 1947, p. 329).

2.4.3.2. Characteristics and Features of Charismatic Leadership

Weber defines charismatic authority as "resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 46). From the definition, it appears that charisma is an extraordinary quality of a person. The quality, which depends mainly on followers who consider the person endowed with
supernatural, superhuman, or exceptional powers or qualities. The element of belief is very important, as the followers should believe in the existence of such qualities. "What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority, by his 'followers' or 'disciples" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 48). Thus, charisma denotes a relationship between a leader and his followers rather than an individual or personal attribute. Charismatic authority is power legitimized through a leader's exceptional personal qualities or the demonstration of extraordinary insight and accomplishment, which inspire loyalty and obedience from followers. Charisma has been a revolutionary power of history because the bearers of charisma, the oracles of prophets, or the edicts of charismatic warlords alone could create a new order within the world (Weber, 1946, p. 297). The genuine prophet, like the genuine military leader and every true leader in this sense, preaches, creates, or demands new obligations, typically, by virtue of revelation, oracle, inspiration, or of his own will, which is then recognized by the members of the religious, military, or party group because they originate from such a source. Recognition is a duty (Weber, 1968, p.243-244). Weber notes, “This basis lies rather in the conception that it is the duty of those who have been called to a charismatic mission to recognize its quality and to act accordingly. Psychologically this 'recognition' is a matter of complete personal devotion to the possessor of the quality, arising out of enthusiasm, or of despair and hope” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.49). Therefore, “The only basis of legitimacy for it is personal charisma, so long as it is proved; that is, as long as it receives recognition and is able to satisfy the followers or disciples. But this lasts only so long as the belief in its charismatic inspiration remains” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 52).
Weber further discusses the relationship between the charismatic leader and his followers and the nature of the duty as follows:

It is recognition on the part of those subject to authority that is decisive for the validity of charisma. This is freely given and guaranteed by what is held to be a 'sign' or proof, originally always a miracle, and consists in devotion to the corresponding revelation, hero worship, or absolute trust in the leader. But where charisma is genuine, it is not this which is the basis of the claim to legitimacy. This basis lies rather in the conception that it is the duty of those who have been called to a charismatic mission to recognize its quality and to act accordingly. Psychologically this 'recognition' is a matter of complete personal devotion to the possessor of the quality, arising out of enthusiasm, or of despair and hope. No prophet has ever regarded his quality as dependent on the attitudes of the masses toward him. No elective king or military leader has ever treated those who have resisted him or tried to ignore him otherwise than as delinquent in duty. Failure to take part in a military expedition under such leader, even though recruitment is formally voluntary, has universally been met with disdain (Weber, 1947, pp. 358-9).

The importance of Weber's charismatic authority is that it is a kind or category of authority, which signals change, and at the same time becomes a base for establishing new systems. It can be understood from Weber's explanation of authority types that charismatic authority, which is revolutionary in its nature, sets itself apart from the previously existing authority types, be they traditional or rational. As the charismatic authority emerges, it gives a new beginning to burgeoning organizational systems, which, due to the routinization experience longevity. Weber holds that bureaucratic and patriarchal structures have a common peculiarity, which is permanence. Weber treats them as everyday routines. Opposite to that, the one that goes beyond the daily routine has a charismatic foundation. This means that the "natural leaders, in times of psychic, physical, economic, ethical, religious, political distress, have been neither officeholders nor incumbents of an "occupation" in the present sense of the word, that is, men who have acquired expert knowledge and who serve for remuneration. The natural leaders in
distress have been holders of specific gifts of the body and spirit. These gifts are believed to be supernatural, therefore not accessible to everyone. The concept of "charisma" in this context is completely "value-neutral" (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, pp.18-19).

The organizational nature of charismatic leadership is what Weber elaborately refers to as, the corporate group, which is subject to the charismatic authority and based on an emotional form of communal relationship. The administrative staff of a charismatic leader does not consist of 'officials and the members are not technically trained. Official responsibility is not chosen based on social privilege nor from the point of view of domestic or personal dependency, but in terms of the charismatic qualities of its members. The prophet has his disciples, the war lord his selected henchmen and the leader, has his followers. In this system, there are no 'appointments' or 'dismissals. It is not in this sense a career or vehicle for promotion. There is only the 'call' at the whim of the leader, on the basis of the charismatic qualifications of those he summons. This results in a system without a defined hierarchy. The leader merely intervenes in general or in individual cases when he considers the members of his staff inadequate to a task with which they have been entrusted. There is no such thing as a definite sphere of authority or competence, and no appropriation of official powers on the basis of social privileges. There may however, be territorial or functional limits to charismatic powers and to the individual's 'mission.' Salaries or benefits are not part of this system as disciples or followers tend to live primarily in a communistic relationship with their leader through the means provided by voluntary gifts. There are no established administrative organs. In their place are agents who have been provided with charismatic authority by their chief or who possess charisma of their own. There is no system of
formal rules, of abstract legal principles, and hence no process of judicial decision oriented to them. Equally, there is no legal wisdom oriented to judicial precedent. Formally, concrete judgments are newly created and addressed from case to case and are originally regarded as divine judgments and revelations. From a substantive point of view, every charismatic authority would have to subscribe to the proposition, 'It is written. . . . but I say unto you . . .' The genuine prophet, like the genuine military leader and every true leader in this sense, preaches, creates, or demands new obligations. In the pure type of charisma, these are imposed on the authority of revolution by oracles, or of the leader's own will, and are recognized by the members of the religious, military, or party group, because they come from such a source. Recognition is a duty. When such an authority comes into conflict with the competing authority of another who also claims charismatic sanction, the only recourse is through contest, magical means or even an actual physical battle of the leaders. In principle, only one side can be in the right in such a conflict. The vanquished must therefore, be guilty of a wrong, which has to be expiated (Weber, 1947, pp. 360-361).

Charismatic authority is thus specifically outside the realm of everyday routine and the profane sphere. In this respect, it is in sharp opposition to both rational and particularly bureaucratic authority, and to traditional authority, whether in its patriarchal, patrimonial, or any other form. Both rational and traditional authority is specifically forms of everyday routines of controlled action, while the charismatic type is the direct antithesis of this. Bureaucratic authority is specifically rational in the sense of being bound intellectually to analyzable rules. On the other hand, the charismatic authority is specifically irrational in the sense of being foreign to all rules. Traditional authority is
bound to the precedents handed down from the past and to this extent is oriented to rules. Within the sphere of its claims, charismatic authority repudiates the past, and is in this sense a specific revolutionary force. It recognizes no appropriation of positions of power by virtue of the possession of property, either on the part of a chief or of socially privileged groups. The only basis of legitimacy for it is personal charisma, so long as it is proved, that is, as long as it receives recognition and is able to satisfy the followers or disciples. This recognition lasts only as long as the belief in its charismatic inspiration remains secure. The above is scarcely in need of further discussion. What has been said applies to the position of authority of such elected monarchs as Napoleon, with his use of the plebiscite. It applies to the 'rule of genius,' which has elevated people of humble origin to thrones and high military commands, just as much as it applies to religious prophets or war heroes (Weber, 1947, pp. 361-362).

2.4.3.3. Bible Views: Bible View on Charisma

The purpose of this part is to examine the scriptures, locate where the specific term charisma is used, make an analysis of those the various passages, and draw a logical conclusion as to what the bible says and means regarding charisma.

The problem that people face today in using the term charisma is that it is immediately associated with, and perhaps most appropriately thought of as, a cult of personality. However, this is certainly not the only definition, and in terms of a biblical perspective perhaps misleading. That is not to suggest that the qualities, which an individual possesses, especially those that may have great appeal to others, is unbiblical. It does, however, become important to understand the origin of those qualities and the appropriate use thereof as it relates to the Holy Scriptures.
This part is necessarily limited to a general understanding of charisma from its specific use in the bible. The researcher is not attempting to make a detailed analysis of each particular charismata, or charism, as that would go far beyond the scope of this work. Nor can the researcher take a select prototype, even the more well know "gifts", and let an examination of one or two suffice. This would become an elucidation of the charism itself and not the canonical concept. The research will show via biblical exegesis is the answer to the hermeneutical question of what the bible say about “special gifts” does. Therefore, the more wide ranging implication and even perhaps an expansion of the idea that is more aligned with the common understanding will become apparent.

In terms of methodology, the researcher has suggested a reliance on the scriptures as the primary source - it is axiomatic that any examination of a biblical perspective would require such. Furthermore, it should be noted that unless otherwise specified the text is best interpreted synchronically. As stated, the bible is the single and self-supporting document relied upon for the purpose of this explication; however, the research will not dismiss the insights of other biblical and secular scholars.

The question of charisma as it pertains to the bible interesting in that the scriptures are almost silent on the subject, since the word is only used a total of 17 times, 16 of which are by the same person - Paul. In examination of the Pauline epistles, most notably Romans and I Corinthians the Greek word χάρις is used to describe the "gifts of grace". The primary concern is to learn what was meant by the word at the time of writing, however, perhaps further understanding would be possible by using a modern definition assuming at least for the for the moment that time has not distorted appreciably
the essential nature or meaning of the word. The Oxford dictionary definition for charisma is “a divinely conferred power or talent”.

However, other definitions may prove useful such as those in the New Testament Lexicon based on Thayer’s and Smith’s Bible Dictionary:

1) A favor with which one receives without any merit of his own
2) The gift of divine grace
3) The gift of faith, knowledge, holiness, virtue
4) The economy of divine grace, by which the pardon of sin and eternal salvation is appointed to sinners in consideration of the merits of Christ laid hold of by faith
5) Grace or gifts denoting extraordinary powers, distinguishing certain Christians and enabling them to serve the church of Christ, the reception of which is due to the power of divine grace operating on their souls by the Holy Spirit

Using the New American Standard version of the Bible, the following breakdown of the 17 uses of the original Greek and the number of times each appears in the various book of the new Testament - favor, 1; free gift, 3; gift, 5; gifts, 7; spiritual gift, 1. The following list the books of the Bible and the number of times the word charisma is used in each.

Romans 6 times, 1 Corinthians 7 times, 2 Corinthians 1 time, 1 Timothy 1 time, 2 Timothy 1 time, 1 Peter 1 time.

The following passages give each occurrence of the word charisma. However, because a single verse may not be sufficient in terms of understanding the meaning, therefore included for the sake of context are the appropriate surrounding verses.

Romans 1:8-15

8 First, I thank my God through Jesus Christ for you all, because your faith is being proclaimed throughout the whole world. 9 For God, whom I serve in my spirit in the preaching of the gospel of His Son, is my witness as to how unceasingly I make mention of you, 10 always in my prayers making request, if perhaps now at last by the will of God I may succeed in coming to you. 11 For I long to see you so that I may impart some spiritual gift to you, that you may be
established; 12 that is, that I may be encouraged together with you while among you, each of us by the other's faith, both yours and mine. 13 I do not want you to be unaware, brethren, that often I have planned to come to you (and have been prevented so far) so that I may obtain some fruit among you also, even as among the rest of the Gentiles. 14 I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish. 15 So, for my part, I am eager to preach the gospel to you also who are in Rome.

Here Paul wants to give spiritual gifts to the Romans for strengthening them.

This is not the same special gifts that Paul lists elsewhere but instead a knowledge of Godly truths that would make them better Christians. Here is simply by looking at verse 12 and recognize that any attempt to think that he is referring to "miraculous" gifts is a clearly out of contexts.

Romans 5:15, 16

6 For while we were still helpless, at the right time Christ died for the ungodly. 7 For one will hardly die for a righteous man; though perhaps for the good man someone would dare even to die. 8 But God demonstrates His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. 9 Much more then, having now been justified by His blood, we shall be saved from the wrath of God through Him. 10 For if while we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son, much more, having been reconciled, we shall be saved by His life. 11 And not only this, but we also exult in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation. 12 Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned -- 13 for until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come. 15 But the free gift is not like the transgression. For if by the transgression of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many. 16 The gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned; for on the one hand the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification. 17 For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ. 18 So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men. 19 For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the One the many will
be made righteous. 20 The Law came in so that the transgression would increase; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, 21 so that, as sin reigned in death, even so grace would reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Here Paul is using the same word but in a radically different context. The "gifts" of verse 15 and 16 refer to the grace of God, or more specifically righteousness via the person of Jesus Christ. Furthermore it is worth noting that the gift is afforded to all men, since "all have sinned".

Romans 6:1-23

1 What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin so that grace may increase? 2 May it never be! How shall we who died to sin still live in it? 3 Or do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death? 4 Therefore we have been buried with Him through baptism into death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life. 5 For if we have become united with Him in the likeness of His death, certainly we shall also be in the likeness of His resurrection, 6 knowing this, that our old self was crucified with Him, in order that our body of sin might be done away with, so that we would no longer be slaves to sin; 7 for he who has died is freed from sin. 8 Now if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him, 9 knowing that Christ, having been raised from the dead, is never to die again; death no longer is master over Him. 10 For the death that He died, He died to sin once for all; but the life that He lives, He lives to God. 11 Even so consider yourselves to be dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus. 12 Therefore do not let sin reign in your mortal body so that you obey its lusts, 13 and do not go on presenting the members of your body to sin as instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves to God as those alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness to God. 14 For sin shall not be master over you, for you are not under law but under grace. 15 What then? Shall we sin because we are not under law but under grace? May it never be! 16 Do you not know that when you present yourselves to someone as slaves for obedience, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin resulting in death, or of obedience resulting in righteousness? 17 But thanks be to God that though you were slaves of sin, you became obedient from the heart to that form of teaching to which you were committed, 18 and having been freed from sin, you became slaves of righteousness. 19 I am speaking in human terms because of the weakness of your flesh. For just as you presented your members as slaves to impurity and to lawlessness, resulting in further lawlessness, so now present your members as slaves to righteousness, resulting in sanctification. 20 For when you were slaves of sin, you were free in regard to righteousness. 21
Therefore what benefit were you then deriving from the things of which you are now ashamed? For the outcome of those things is death. 22 But now having been freed from sin and enslaved to God, you derive your benefit, resulting in sanctification, and the outcome, eternal life. 23 For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Paul is stating that because of God’s graciousness there is the opportunity for deliverance from sin, therefore a transformation of the sinners’ entire life.

Romans 11:1-32

1. I say then, God has not rejected His people, has He? May it never be! For I too am an Israelite, a descendant of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. 2 God has not rejected His people whom He foreknew. Or do you not know what the Scripture says in the passage about Elijah, how he pleads with God against Israel? 3 "Lord, THEY HAVE KILLED YOUR PROPHETS, THEY HAVE TORN DOWN YOUR ALTARS, AND I ALONE AM LEFT, AND THEY ARE SEEKING MY LIFE." 4 But what is the divine response to him? "I HAVE KEPT for Myself SEVEN THOUSAND MEN WHO HAVE NOT BOWED THE KNEE TO BAAL." 5 In the same way then, there has also come to be at the present time a remnant according to God’s gracious choice. 6 But if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works, otherwise grace is no longer grace. 7 What then? What Israel is seeking, it has not obtained, but those who were chosen obtained it, and the rest were hardened; 8 just as it is written, "GOD GAVE THEM A SPIRIT OF STUPOR, EYES TO SEE NOT AND EARS TO HEAR NOT, DOWN TO THIS VERY DAY." 9 And David says, "LET THEIR TABLE BECOME A SNARE AND A TRAP, AND A STUMBLING BLOCK AND A RETRIBUTION TO THEM. 10 "LET THEIR EYES BE DARKENED TO SEE NOT, AND BEND THEIR BACKS FOREVER." 11 I say then, they did not stumble so as to fall, did they? May it never be! But by their transgression salvation has come to the Gentiles, to make them jealous. 12 Now if their transgression is riches for the world and their failure is riches for the Gentiles, how much more will their fulfillment be! 13 But I am speaking to you who are Gentiles. Inasmuch then as I am an apostle of Gentiles, I magnify my ministry, 14 if somehow I might move to jealousy my fellow countrymen and save some of them. 15 For if their rejection is the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance be but life from the dead? 16 If the first piece of dough is holy, the lump is also; and if the root is holy, the branches are too. 17 But if some of the branches were broken off, and you, being a wild olive, were grafted in among them and became partaker with them of the rich root of the olive tree, 18 do not be arrogant toward the branches; but if you are arrogant, remember that it is not you who supports the root, but the root supports you. 19 You will say then, "Branches were broken off so that I might be grafted in." 20 Quite right, they were broken off for their unbelief, but you stand by your faith. Do not be conceited, but fear; 21 for if God did not spare the natural branches, He will not spare you, either. 22 Behold then the kindness
and severity of God; to those who fell, severity, but to you, God's kindness, if you continue in His kindness; otherwise you also will be cut off. 23 And they also, if they do not continue in their unbelief, will be grafted in, for God is able to graft them in again. 24 For if you were cut off from what is by nature a wild olive tree, and were grafted contrary to nature into a cultivated olive tree, how much more will these who are the natural * branches be grafted into their own olive tree? 25 For I do not want you, brethren, to be uninformed of this mystery so that you will not be wise in your own estimation --that a partial hardening has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in; 26 and so all Israel will be saved; just as it is written, "THE DELIVERER WILL COME FROM ZION, HE WILL REMOVE UNGODLINESS FROM JACOB." 27 "THIS IS MY COVENANT WITH THEM, WHEN I TAKE AWAY THEIR SINS." 28 From the standpoint of the gospel they are enemies for your sake, but from the standpoint of God's choice they are beloved for the sake of the fathers; 29 for the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable. 30 For just as you once were disobedient to God, but now have been shown mercy because of their disobedience, 31 so these also now have been disobedient, that because of the mercy shown to you they also may now be shown mercy. 32 For God has shut up all in disobedience so that He may show mercy to all.

Paul is speaking about the favors or benefits, which God bestows on men as a matter of favor, not reward.

Romans 12:1-21

1 Therefore I urge you, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living and holy sacrifice, acceptable to God, which is your spiritual service of worship. 2 And do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, so that you may prove what the will of God is, that which is good and acceptable and perfect. 3 For through the grace given to me I say to everyone among you not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think; but to think so as to have sound judgment, as God has allotted to each a measure of faith. 4 For just as we have many members in one body and all the members do not have the same function, 5 so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and individually * members one of another. 6 Since we have gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, each of us is to exercise them accordingly: if prophecy, according to the proportion of his faith; 7 if service, in his serving; or he who teaches, in his teaching; 8 or he who exhorts, in his exhortation; he who gives, with liberality; he who leads, with diligence; he who shows mercy, with cheerfulnes. 9 Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor what is evil; cling to what is good. 10 Be devoted to one another in brotherly love; give preference to one another in honor; 11 not lagging behind in diligence, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord; 12 rejoicing in hope, persevering in tribulation, devoted to prayer, 13 contributing to the needs of the saints, practicing hospitality. 14 Bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse. 15 Rejoice with those who rejoice, and
weep with those who weep. 16 Be of the same mind toward one another; do not be haughty in mind, but associate with the lowly. Do not be wise in your own estimation. 17 Never pay back evil for evil to anyone. Respect what is right in the sight of all men. 18 If possible, so far as it depends on you, be at peace with all men. 19 Never take your own revenge, beloved, but leave room for the wrath of God, for it is written, "VENGEANCE IS MINE, I WILL REPAY," says the Lord. 20 "BUT IF YOUR ENEMY IS HUNGRY, FEED HIM, AND IF HE IS THIRSTY, GIVE HIM A DRINK; FOR IN SO DOING YOU WILL HEAP BURNING COALS ON HIS HEAD." 21 Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

This example of the word charisma speaks of the various gifts that God bestows on individual believers and how they are to be used. In other words, how each person may be given a special talent for a particular activity.

1 Corinthians 1:1-9

1 Paul, called as an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, 2 To the church of God which is at Corinth, to those who have been sanctified in Christ Jesus, saints by calling, with all who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, their Lord and ours: 3 Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. 4 I thank my God always concerning you for the grace of God which was given you in Christ Jesus, 5 that in everything you were enriched in Him, in all speech and all knowledge, 6 even as the testimony concerning Christ was confirmed in you, 7 so that you are not lacking in any gift, awaiting eagerly the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, 8 who will also confirm you to the end, blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. 9 God is faithful, through whom you were called into fellowship with His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.

It is generally recognized that here Paul is referring specifically to spiritual gifts.

1 Corinthians 7:1-7

1 Now concerning the things about which you wrote, it is good for a man not to touch a woman. 2 But because of immoralities, each man is to have his own wife, and each woman is to have her own husband. 3 The husband must fulfill his duty to his wife, and likewise also the wife to her husband. 4 The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; and likewise also the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does. 5 Stop depriving one another, except by agreement for a time, so that you may devote yourselves to prayer, and come together again so that Satan will not tempt you because of your lack of self-control. 6 But this I say by way of concession, not of command. 7 Yet I wish that all men were even as I myself am. However, each man has his
own gift from God, one in this manner, and another in that. 8 But I say to the unmarried and to widows that it is good for them if they remain even as I. 9 But if they do not have self-control let them marry; for it is better to marry than to burn with passion.

Here Paul is using charisma in reference to marriage, or celibacy for that matter, as representative examples of a gift from God.

1 Corinthians 12:1-11

1 Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I do not want you to be unaware. 2 You know that when you were pagans, you were led astray to the mute idols, however you were led. 3 Therefore I make known to you that no one speaking by the Spirit of God says, "Jesus is accursed"; and no one can say, "Jesus is Lord," except by the Holy Spirit. 4 Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit. 5 And there are varieties of ministries, and the same Lord. 6 There are varieties of effects, but the same God who works all things in all persons. 7 But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. 8 For to one is given the word of wisdom through the Spirit, and to another the word of knowledge according to the same Spirit; 9 to another faith by the same Spirit, and to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit, 10 and to another the effecting of miracles, and to another prophecy, and to another the distinguishing of spirits, to another various kinds of tongues, and to another the interpretation of tongues. 11 But one and the same Spirit works all these things, distributing to each one individually just as He wills.

The verses Paul is again talking about the grace-gift, or more technically speaking spiritual gifts.

1 Corinthians 12:27-31

27 Now you are Christ's body, and individually members of it. 28 And God has appointed in the church, first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, administrations, various kinds of tongues. 29 All are not apostles, are they? All are not prophets, are they? All are not teachers, are they? All are not workers of miracles, are they? 30 All do not have gifts of healings, do they? All do not speak with tongues, do they? All do not interpret, do they? 31 But earnestly desire the greater gifts. And I show you a still more excellent way.
In this passage, the variety of gifts and that some are miraculous in nature such as healing, or the speaking in tongues, others or more mundane such as helping, or ministerial administration.

2 Corinthians 1:7-11

7 and our hope for you is firmly grounded, knowing that as you are sharers of our sufferings, so also you are sharers of our comfort. 8 For we do not want you to be unaware, brethren, of our affliction which came to us in Asia, that we were burdened excessively, beyond our strength, so that we despaired even of life; 9 indeed, we had the sentence of death within ourselves so that we would not trust in ourselves, but in God who raises the dead; 10 who delivered us from so great a peril of death, and will deliver us, He on whom we have set our hope. And He will yet deliver us, 11 you also joining in helping us through your prayers, so that thanks may be given by many persons on our behalf for the favor bestowed on us through the prayers of many.

This favor is not only a matter of a miraculous gifts, or administrative abilities, but of whatever needs are meet via God's grace.

1 timothy 4:6-16

6. In pointing out these things to the brethren, you will be a good servant of Christ Jesus, constantly nourished on the words of the faith and of the sound doctrine which you have been following. 7 But have nothing to do with worldly fables fit only for old women. On the other hand, discipline yourself for the purpose of godliness; 8 for bodily discipline is only of little profit, but godliness is profitable for all things, since it holds promise for the present life and also for the life to come. 9 It is a trustworthy statement deserving full acceptance. 10 For it is for this we labor and strive, because we have fixed our hope on the living God, who is the Savior of all men, especially of believers. 11 Prescribe and teach these things. 12 Let no one look down on your youthfulness, but rather in speech, conduct, love, faith and purity, show yourself an example of those who believe. 13 Until I come, give attention to the public reading of Scripture, to exhortation and teaching. 14 Do not neglect the spiritual gift within you, which was bestowed on you through prophetic utterance with the laying on of hands by the presbytery. 15 Take pains with these things; be absorbed in them, so that your progress will be evident to all. 16 Pay close attention to yourself and to your teaching; persevere in these things, for as you do this you will ensure salvation both for yourself and for those who hear you.
This seems to indicate those specific abilities that God has granted Timothy at ordination.

2 Timothy 1:6-14

6 For this reason I remind you to kindle afresh the gift of God which is in you through the laying on of my hands. 7 For God has not given us a spirit of timidity, but of power and love and discipline. 8 Therefore do not be ashamed of the testimony of our Lord or of me His prisoner, but join with me in suffering for the gospel according to the power of God, 9 who has saved us and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was granted us in Christ Jesus from all eternity, 10 but now has been revealed by the appearing of our Savior Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel, 11 for which I was appointed a preacher and an apostle and a teacher. 12 For this reason I also suffer these things, but I am not ashamed; for I know whom I have believed and I am convinced that He is able to guard what I have entrusted to Him until that day. 13 Retain the standard of sound words which you have heard from me, in the faith and love which are in Christ Jesus. 14 Guard, through the Holy Spirit who dwells in us, the treasure which has been entrusted to you.

This is again a reference to some personal spiritual endowment.

1 Peter 4:7-11

7 The end of all things is near; therefore, be of sound judgment and sober spirit for the purpose of prayer. 8 Above all, keep fervent in your love for one another, because love covers a multitude of sins. 9 Be hospitable to one another without complaint. 10 As each one has received a special gift, employ it in serving one another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God. 11 Whoever * speaks, is to do so as one who is speaking the utterances of God; whoever serves is to do so as one who is serving by the strength which God supplies; so that in all things God may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom belongs the glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen.

This is the first and only time that the word charisma used by someone other than the Apostle Paul. Here, Peter is stating that the special gift, while good for the possessor is really meant to share it the purpose of benefiting others.
The term charisma seems quite limited not only in its occurrence, but even in its meaning, however, is it that really the case? Is it as Philip Reiff puts it in his work Charisma; The Gift of Grace:

"that the key to understanding charisma is not in its general meaning equivalent to grace but in the particular charisms themselves"? Stated in a somewhat different manner, "that charisma is the practice of belief directly received".

This is certainly true but it does seem to suggest a limited application and while that must necessarily be the case in view of any particular gift, it may not be the case when considering the concept.

1 Corinthians 13 indicates that charisma is not only the dramatic demonstration of spirit but also the mundane, therefore any service performed in the body of Christ such as leadership, teaching and even service roles are charismata by definition.

Max Turner points out that charisma is somewhere between:

"activities of the spirit and the latent possibilities and hidden talents".

Furthermore, Turner points out:

"Charisma also has a corresponding wider denotation than is often assumed. While Paul enumerates 9 gifts in 1 Corinthians 12:8-10, he widens the class considerably in 1 Corinthians 12:38, Romans 12:6-8, and Ephesians 4:11. The list...suggests that (for Paul) virtually anything that can be viewed as God's enabling man for upbuilding the church could and would be designated as charisma...".

Turner is further quoted:

"for Paul, God is sovereign in the world and that means that all he enables are his gifts".

While Paul does not speak directly to the subject of natural abilities is would be almost strange to think that he would not consider them as a gift from God and therefore charisma.
Turner concludes:

"Certainly we are unwise to limit the scope of the term charismata more narrowly than Paul does, and that will include a wide spectrum indeed - including those abilities usually artificially cut off from discussion because Paul chances to use a different metaphor and to call them fruits of the spirit".

A broad view of the term seems consistent with the nature of God as is revealed in his word. Thus, if it is true as some scholars suggest that Christ himself is charisma incarnate and that Christ is God's gift to the world as stated in John 3:16, then the biblical view of charisma is, in a sense, the central theme of the entirety of scripture.

2.5. The Problems of Charismatic Authority

The essentials of charismatic leadership are bound through the presence of a leader's extraordinary qualities, and the firm belief of followers. As such, it rests almost entirely on the leader and the absence of that leader for any reason can lead to the authority's power dissolving.

The legitimacy of charismatic authority is also prone to cessation and instability. Weber puts it as follows:

If proof of his charismatic qualification fails him for long, the leader endowed with charisma tends to think his god or his magical or heroic powers have deserted him. If he is for long unsuccessful, above all if his leadership fails to benefit his followers, it is likely that his charismatic authority will disappear. This is the genuine charismatic meaning of the 'gift of grace.' (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 50).

Charisma is genuinely an anti-traditional and anti-rational force. At its heights, charismatic followers of the prophet are subject to anti-economic force of charisma. Yet as soon as their work or duties are fulfilled, the original charisma is replaced by the rules of everyday life. Here the process of routinization of charisma has set in. "When the tide
that lifted a charismatically led group out of everyday life flows back into the channels of workaday routines, at least the pure form of charismatic domination will wane and turn into an institution" (Weber, 1978, p. 1121). Since charisma in the pure type is the very opposite of a continuous institution of everyday life, those who have a share in charisma must inevitably turn away from the routine and order of the world (Weber, 1978, pp. 1113-1114). However, charisma does not last. "In every case charisma is henceforth exposed to the conditions of everyday life and to the powers dominating it, especially to the economic interests" (Weber, 1978, pp. 1121-1122).

The instability of charismatic authority requires that it should be routinized. Indeed, in its pure form, charismatic authority may be said to exist only in *statu nascendi*. It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized, rationalized, or a combination of both (Weber, 1968, p.246). By its very nature, the existence of charismatic authority is specifically unstable. The charismatic holder is deserted by his followers only when the personal strength of the leader disappears. The charismatic leader gains and maintains authority solely by proving his strength in life (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.22). All routinization of charisma have the same cause: the desire to transform charisma from a unique gift of extraordinary time and person into a permanent possession of everyday life (Weber, 1978, p. 1121). Routinization is the process by which charismatic authority is succeeded by either traditionalized or rationalized authority, or a combination of both (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 54).

Charisma can be very effective in the lifetime of the charismatic leader or in short run, however it has shortcomings as a long-term source of authority. Therefore, there is a need of routinizing charismatic authority and transforming it into other form of authority,
which is not an easy task. Weber considers it the biggest challenge for the charismatic administrative staff to transition to a bureaucratic and rational administration. Weber gives the reason for such difficulty because “Charismatic authority is radically opposed to both rational and particularly bureaucratic authority” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 51). Therefore, if the gains of charismatic authority are to be secured and continued, it must be transformed into a traditional or legal form of authority. The routinization part of Weber's theory is very elaborate which includes excellent treatment of issues related to charismatic leaders, succession, and different aspects related to the followers, their interests and behavior.

That is to say, the interests of concerned people modify the nature of religious charisma into the acquisition goods. Their economic concerns, transforms and creates the employees, teachers and other occupations in the religious enterprise. The lay people, in turn, become dues-paying members of a religious enterprise. For the desire to transform charisma into a lasting good, the first basic problem is to find a successor to the charismatic prophet. This problem inescapably channels charisma into the direction of traditionalism or rationalism (Weber, 1978, p. 1123). The designation of a successor or a representative has been a typical means of assuring the continuity of a religious enterprise (Weber, 1978, p. 1124). "Charisma cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination for both" (Weber, 1978, p. 246).

2.6. Process of Routinization

Weber states that pure form of charismatic authority exists only in the process of origination. In contrast to any bureaucratic organization of office, the charismatic structure knows nothing of form or of an ordered procedure of appointment or dismissal.
It knows no regulated "career", "advancement", "salary", or regulated methods of training of the holder of charisma or of his aids. It knows no agency of control or appeal, any local bailiwicks or exclusive functional jurisdictions; nor does it embrace permanent institutions like our bureaucratic "departments", which are independent of persons and of purely personal charisma. Charisma knows only inner determination and inner restraint.

The holder of charisma seizes the task that is adequate for him and demands obedience and a following by virtue of his mission (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, pp. 19-20). Therefore, it cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination of both. Weber gives the two main motives, which lead to this transformation: (a) The ideal and the material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community. (b) The still stronger ideal and also stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff, the disciples or other followers of the charismatic leader in continuing their relationship (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.54). In its pure form, charismatic authority has a character specifically foreign to everyday routine structures. The social relationships directly involved are strictly personal, based on the validity and practice of charismatic personal qualities. If this is not to remain a purely transitory phenomenon, but one with longevity, based on the vitality of a stable community, party or any such organization, it is necessary for the character of charismatic authority to become radically changed. Indeed, in its pure form, charismatic authority may be said to exist only in the original process of its very establishment (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.54). It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination of both (Weber, 1947, pp.363-364) & (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.54). The longevity or long-term sustenance
of the charismatic is therefore possible through routine in the form, which is either traditionalized or rationalized or, a mixture of both. Concomitant with the routinization of charisma with a view to insuring adequate succession, are the interests in its routinization on the part of the administrative staff. It is only in the initial stages and so long as the charismatic leader acts in a way which is completely outside everyday social organization, that it is possible for his followers to live communistically in a community of faith and enthusiasm, on gifts, of 'booty,' or sporadic acquisition of goods. Only the members of the small group of enthusiastic disciples and followers are prepared to devote their lives purely idealistically to their call. The great majority of disciples and followers will in the long run 'make their living' out of their 'calling' in a material sense as well. Indeed, this must be the case for the movement to avoid disintegration (Weber, 1968, p.249). Weber also refers to the economical factor if charisma is to be transformed into a permanent routine structure, charisma in such a case must be adapted to some form of fiscal organization for the economical needs of the group. When a charismatic movement is routinized, the 'laity' becomes differentiated from the 'clergy'; therefore, the officials are differentiated from the 'tax payer (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.60).

Weber also refers to the conflicts, which may hinder the process of routinization. The process of routinization is thus not by any means confined to the problem of succession which does not cease once a solution has been realized. On the contrary, the most fundamental problem is that of making a transition from a charismatic administrative staff, and the corresponding principles of administration, to one, which is adapted to everyday conditions. The problem of succession, however, is crucial because the structure of routinization can be realized through the process focusing and solving
problems. In this way, the character of the leader himself and of his claim to legitimacy is altered (Weber, 1968, p.253). Weber states, “As a rule the process of routinization is not free of conflict. In the early stages personal claims on the charisma of the chief are not easily forgotten and the conflict between the charisma of office or of hereditary status with personal charisma is a typical process in many historical situations” (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.61). Weber states “Revolutions under a charismatic leader, directed against hereditary charismatic powers or the powers of office, are to be found in all types of corporate groups, from states to trade unions” (Weber, 196, p. 370).

One of the decisive motives underlying all cases of the routinization of charisma is naturally the striving for security. This means legitimization, on the one hand, of positions of authority and social prestige, and on the other hand, of the economic advantages enjoyed by the followers and sympathizers of the leader. Another important motive, however, lies in the objective necessity of adaptation of the patterns of order and of the organization of the administrative staff to the normal, everyday needs and conditions of an administration (Weber, 1968, p. 370). The following are the principal motives underlying this transformation: (a) The ideal and material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community, (b) the still stronger ideal and stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff, the disciples or other followers of the charismatic leader in continuing their relationship. In addition, they have an interest in continuing it in such a way, from both an ideal and a material point of view, with regard to securing their everyday status. This means, above all, to participate in normal family relationships or at least to enjoy a secure social
position in place of a kind of discipleship, which is cut off from ordinary worldly connections, notably in the family and in economic relationships (Weber, 1947, p. 364).

Weber states that these interests generally become conspicuously evident with the disappearance of the personal charismatic leader and with the problem of succession, which inevitably arises. For charismatic leadership, to transform into a perennial institution, the first basic element or problem is that of finding a successor to the prophet, hero, teacher or party leader. This problem inescapably channels charisma into the direction of legal regulation and tradition (Weber, 1968, p. 1123).

Then Weber gives some solutions to this problem of succession. The following are the principal possible types of solution:

(a) The search for a new charismatic leader based on criteria of the qualities, which fit him for the position of authority. Weber illustrates this by the example of searching for new Dalai Lama (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 55).

(b) By revelation manifested in oracles, lots, divine judgments, or other techniques of selection. Weber illustrates this by the example of Saul who was chosen by the old war oracle (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 55).

(c) By the designation on the part of the original charismatic leader of his own successor and his recognition on the part of the followers, Weber says that it is very common form and illustrates it with the Roman magistracies, which were filled entirely in this way (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 55).

(d) Designation of a successor by the charismatically qualified administrative staff and his recognition by the community. Weber states that this was the original meaning of the
coronation of bishops and kings in the Western World by the clergy or the nobility with the 'consent' of the community (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 55).

(e) By the conception that charisma is a quality transmitted by heredity; thus that it is participated in by the kinsmen of its bearer, particularly by his closest relatives. This is the case of hereditary charisma. Weber states that hereditary monarchy is a conspicuous illustration (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 55).

(f) The concept that charisma may be transmitted by ritual means from one bearer to another or may be created in a new person. The concept was originally magical. It involves a dissociation of charisma from a particular individual, making it an objective, transferrable entity. The most important example is the transmission of priestly charisma by anointing, consecration, or the laying on of hands; and of royal authority, by anointing and by coronation (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p. 55).

The process of routinization is thus not by any means confined to the problem of succession and does not stop when this has been solved. On the contrary, the most fundamental problem is transitioning from a charismatic administrative staff, and the corresponding principles of administration, to one, which is adapted to everyday conditions. The problem of succession, however, is crucial because through succession occurs the routinization of the charismatic focus on the structure. In this manner, the character of the leader himself and of his claim to legitimacy is altered (Weber, 1947, p. 371).

2.7. Three Ways of Routinization

Weber suggests that routinization of charisma also takes the form of the appropriation of powers of control and of economic advantages by the followers or
disciples, and of regulations concerning recruitment of these groups. This process of traditionalization or of legalization, according to whether rational legislation is involved or not, may take any number of typical forms.

The routinization of charisma is a process, which views and creates charisma as a quality, which is transferable, personally attainable or suitable to be attached to any official or institutional structure. By the routinization, charisma becomes a component of everyday life and fulfills its social function on behalf of its extraordinary qualities that overshadow the charismatic lay people (Weber, 1978, p. 1135). Comcomitant with the routinization of charisma with a view to insuring adequate succession, go the interests in its routinization on the part of the administrative staff. It is only in the initial stages and so long as the charismatic leader acts in a way which is completely outside everyday social organization, that it is possible for his followers to live communistically in a community of faith and enthusiasm, on gifts, of 'booty,' or sporadic acquisition of goods. Only the members of the small group of enthusiastic disciples and followers are prepared to devote their lives purely idealistically to their call. The great majority of disciples and followers will in the long run 'make their living' out of their 'calling' in a material sense as well. Indeed, this must be the case if the movement is not to disintegrate. Hence, the routinization of charisma also takes the form of the appropriation of powers of control, economic advantages by the followers or disciples, and of regulations of the recruitment for new members.

The process of traditionalization, or of legalization according to whether rational legislation is involved or not, may take any number of typical forms (Weber, 1947, p. 367). Thus, the process of routinization according to Weber happens in three ways:
hereditary, virtuous, and office. The descriptions are as follows.

Firstly, Charisma can be transferred through natural heredity and charisma becomes traditionalized and sanctified in this way. Although charisma and tradition are fundamentally different in the type of authority, both rest on a similar basis of their religious aura, that is, a sense of loyalty and obligation. Both depend upon the spirit, which predominates the community, though not directly visible. In other words, both depend upon the basis of the leader's claim to legitimacy: authority sanctified by tradition, or faith in the person of the prophet (Weber, 1978, p. 1122). Weber states as follows:

It is easy for charismatic norms to be transformed into those defining a traditional social status on a hereditary charismatic basis. If the leader is chosen on a hereditary basis, it is very easy for hereditary charisma to govern the selection of the administrative staff and even, perhaps, those followers without any position of authority. (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.58).

The process of routinization is thus not by any means confined to the problem of succession and does not cease when this has been solved. On the contrary, the most fundamental problem is that of making a transition from a charismatic administrative staff, and the corresponding principles of administration, to one, which is adapted to everyday conditions. The problem of succession, however, is crucial because through succession occurs the routinization of the charismatic focus on the structure. In this manner, the character of the leader himself and of his claim to legitimacy is altered (Weber, 1947, p. 371).

This process involves peculiar and characteristic conceptions. They are understandable only in this context and do not apply to the problem of transitioning to traditional or legal patterns of order or types of administrative organizations. The most
important of the modes of meeting the problems associated with succession are the charismatic designation of a successor and hereditary charisma.

Secondly, charisma can be personally acquired. It is transformed from a state that only a few individuals can achieve through genuine endowment, into a goal that many can reach through unidentifiable means (Weber, 1978, p. 1169). In this context, the Charismatic qualities, such as the ecstatic and visionary capacities of shamans, sorcerers, prophets and various ascetics could not be attained equally or by everyone. Charisma becomes the faculty of the virtuoso, that is to say, virtuoso charisma. In accordance with the differences in charismatic qualifications, the virtuosos distinguish themselves from the lay people, those who are religiously unmusical yet in need of charismatic dispensation (Weber, 1946, p. 287). Charisma is a quality, which cannot be acquired by everyone but by those who are gifted. It cannot be taught, it can be only tested, and therefore only few can attain it. Weber states as follows:

The original basis of recruitment is personal charisma. With routinization, the followers or disciples may set up norms for recruitment, in particular involving training or tests of eligibility. Charisma can only be 'awakened' and 'tested'; it cannot be 'learned' or 'taught.' All types of magical asceticism, as practiced by magicians and heroes, and all novitiates, belong in this category (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.58).

Thirdly, charisma can be attached to the incumbent of an office or to an institutional structure. The charisma of office is “the belief in the specific state of grace of a social institution” (Weber, 1978, p. 1140). This linkage of charismatic quality with the institutional office, in turn, is based on the belief that charismatic quality can be transferred though artificial, magical means such as ordination and sacrament. The transformation into the office of charisma completes the depersonalization of charisma, that is, the separation of the quality of a person and functions of office. Then, the belief in
the charismatic functionality of office replaces the belief in the revelation and heroism of charismatic personalities (Weber, 1978, p. 1139). Here charisma becomes part of an established social "institution", which Weber defines as a permanent structure with established tradition. Institutions of the church consist of, (1) an established system of hierarchal office with specific rights and duties, (2) rationalized dogma with the sacred canon, and (3) sophisticated sacraments and corporate grace (Weber, 1978, p. 1164).

Office charisma is a combination of traditionalism and rationalism. Charisma is traditionalized for example, in the sanctity of the permanent seat of the See of Rome, in the efficacy of the sacrament and ordainment. It is also rationalized within the hierarchy of office, the dogma of the teaching, and the codified order and church regulations. Therefore, routinization of charisma has three directions: traditionalization (hereditary charisma), rationalization (virtuoso charisma), and the combination of both (office charisma).

2.8. Important Consequences of Routinization

As explained in the above sections, routinization is the only way to transform the instable nature of charismatic leaderships into a stable pattern of leadership, a leadership, which has the ability to grow institutionally and organizationally in the long term. Routinization of the charisma apart from the many consequences in regards to the organizational behavior, relationships, and followers; there are some further significant implications of considerable importance.

For charisma to transform into a permanent routine structure, it is necessary that its anti-economic character be altered. It must be adapted to some form of fiscal organization to provide for the needs of the group and hence, the economic conditions

With the process of routinization, the charismatic group tends to develop into one of the forms of everyday authority, particularly the patrimonial form in its decentralized variant or the bureaucratic. Its original peculiarities are apt to be retained in the charismatic standards of honor that are attendant in the social status acquired by heredity or the holding of office (Weber, 1947, pp. 369).

As a rule, the process of routinization is not free of conflict. In the early stages, personal claims on the charisma of the chief are not easily forgotten and the conflict between the charisma of office or of hereditary status with personal charisma is a typical process in many historical situations (Weber, 1947, p. 370).

One of the decisive motives underlying all cases of the routinization of charisma is our natural strive for security. This concerns aspects of legitimation, positions of authority and social prestige on one hand and on the other, the economic advantages enjoyed by the followers and sympathizers of the leader (Weber, 1947, p. 370).

Another important motive, however, lies in the objective necessity of adaptation of the patterns of order and of the organization of administrative staff to the normal, everyday needs and conditions of an administration. In this connection, in particular, there are frequently points in which traditions of administrative practice and of judicial decision can take hold, since these are needed both by the normal administrative staff and by those subject to its authority. It is further necessary that some model of definite order be introduced into the organization of the administrative staff itself (Weber, 1947, pp. 370-371).
Finally, as will be discussed in detail below, it is necessary for the administrative staff and all its administrative practices to be adapted to everyday economic conditions. It is not possible for the costs of permanent, routine administration to be met by 'booty,' contributions, gifts, and hospitality, as is typical of the pure type of military and prophetic charisma (Weber, 1947, p. 371).

2.9. Conclusion

The chapter analyzed and described Weber’s thoughts on the charismatic authority, and a brief, potentially contrasting, view of charisma as found in the Bible. Weber takes up fundamental concepts of power, domination, legitimation, and authority. These concepts are related to leadership, when he finally arrives at the formulation of legitimate types of authority. The legitimate types of authority are traditional, charismatic, and legal. These three types are actually ideal types which means not anyone of them may be exclusively so, but in fact may contain elements of other types as well. Among these types, charismatic authority is of importance, which breaks away with the existing structure and as result gives birth to new leadership in a successful routinization. Weber defines charisma as a personal gift, which rests on the recognition of the followers. Therefore, charismatic authority rests on the devotion and recognition of the followers. Weber elucidates the problems which a charismatic authority may face are cessation and instability of such authority. Weber suggests that if charismatic authority is preserved, it requires a successful routinization. Weber states that such routinization will as a result render it traditionalized, rationalized or a combination of both. Weber states that there are many ways of routinization. One of such way is searching for a new charismatic leader based on qualities, by divine judgment, or by succession by the
charismatic leader, the administrative staff or heredity.
CHAPTER THREE

The Role of Charisma in the Formation of Hope of Bangkok Church

3.1. Introduction

This chapter is primarily concerned with the role of charisma in the formation of "Hope of Bangkok Church". The church was founded on charisma. The church is not only charismatic with an alliance to the movement itself, but was in fact founded by a charismatic leader. Therefore, the mixture of factors, being founded on charisma and belonging to the charismatic church movement renders this case unique. Moreover, if the institution belongs to the movement, which bears the same name, then the meaning and significance becomes even more profound.

There are churches built and established in an ordinary manner and belonging to a charismatic model by name only, however, when a church is in fact truly brought into existence by and through charisma and adheres to the movement of the charismatic church, it can defined as special as it has gone through a true charismatic experience since inception. This is exactly what the researcher aims to support in the coming details regarding how charisma contributed to the foundation and establishment of the Hope of Bangkok Church.

In the presence of the above facts, it is indispensible to tackle the details of the chapter by arranging them in a connected manner. Therefore, the chapter will look into the historical study of charismatic movements within the church, and seeks to define charisma as a significant factor with regard to the administration of such a church.

The charisma and charismatic authority gives a different sense of church in terms
of its administration, vision, mission, and leadership. For example, in charismatic churches, a high value is given to charismatic acts such as speaking in different tongues, healing, and acts of grace, which appears as something magical. In a similar manner, the church leader or pastor reserves greater authority than in other types of churches.

In addition, the arrival of the charismatic movement in Thailand is also included in this section of research. The main issue concerns the development of Hope of Bangkok church. The chapter then shall concern the history of the church, its establishment, founders, and leadership. The model of leadership and its crisis will be documented in detail.

3.2. Origin of Charismatic Movement and Church

The charismatic church and movement has a religious connotation, which originates in the meaning and definition of charisma. The term Charismatic comes from the Greek word Charis; it means a grace or a gift, a term used in the Bible to describe a wide range of supernatural experiences.

Charismatic is an umbrella term used to describe those Christians who believe the manifestations of the Holy Spirit, seen in the first century Christian Church, such as healing, miracles, and glossolalia are available to modern day Christians and ought to be experienced and practiced today (Charismata, Catholic Encyclopedia, 2009).

In a similar way, Philip Rieff explores the emergence and evolution of this mysterious and compelling concept of charisma within Judeo-Christian culture. He suggests that its first expression was in the idea of the covenant between God and the Israelites: Charisma—religious grace and authority was transferred through divine inspiration to the Old Testament prophets. It was embodied by Jesus of Nazareth, the first
true charismatic hero. Rieff shows how St. Paul transformed charisma into a form of social organization, how it was reworked by Martin Luther and by nineteenth-century Protestant theologians, and, finally, how Max Weber redefined charisma as a secular political concept. By emptying charisma of its religious meaning, Weber opened the door to the modern perception of this concept by viewing it as more than a form of celebrity, stripped of moral considerations (Rieff, 2007).

It can be said that charisma is a gift of God evident in the history of Judaism and Christianity and as seen in the Old and New Testaments. The story of Moses in Judaism and the life of Jesus are full of charismatic characteristics. The Old Testament reveals how the charismatic character was retained by the famous figures in the Old Testament. The history of Christianity also shows how the charismatic characteristics were present and retained by the disciples of Jesus and later saints of Christianity. The emergence of such churches and movements is historically a modern occurrence. Therefore, it is of relevance to the subject to investigate how charisma fits into the modern-day charismatic movements, in terms of significance in administration, and the levels of authority given to the church leaders.

From the historical viewpoint, the Charismatic church and movement are interrelated. They took their reason for existence from the early history of Christianity.

The charismatic movement emerged within in the 1950 in both catholic and protestant churches. In Protestantism, the modern Charismatic movement emerged from Pentecostalism. For this reason, it is sometimes referred to as neo-Pentecostal, also known as "charismatic renewal" or "neo-Pentecostalism" (Balmer, & Winner, 2002, p.78). The charismatic movement, despite its classical parentage of Pentecostalism, exists
almost totally outside official Pentecostal denominations. However, Pentecostalism and charismatic are often used interchangeably. Whereas the Pentecostal Movement was for the most part a separate movement outside the mainline denominations, the Second Wave or Charismatic Movement was very much a mainstreaming of Pentecostal theology. Beginning in 1951, Demos Shakarian, a Southern California millionaire businessperson, launched the Full Gospel Businessmen’s Fellowship International, whose stated purpose was to spread the Pentecostal message of tongues and healing, via nonsectarian luncheons and conferences (Moriarty, 1992, p.66).

In a narrow sense, the charismatic movement refers to the appearance of charismatic practices in Protestant and Roman Catholic churches in the United States during the 1960s. For Protestants 1960 was a decisive year. That was when an Episcopal priest in Van Nuys, California, Dennis Bennett (1917–91), informed his congregation that he had experienced the gift of glossolalia or speaking in tongues. In the 20th century, Pentecostalism grew more rapidly than any other Christian movement (Ellwood, 1998/2007, p. 80). While the movement in Western societies may have been in decline for some time, its international appeal continues unabated, with the total number of Charismatics and Pentecostals globally in the region of three billion. Its emotional appeal, alongside a flexible theology, has ensured its formidable growth as the largest and fastest spreading expression of Christianity (Clarke, 2008).

3.3. History of Charismatic Movement in Thailand

The arrival of Pentecostals and Charismatics in Thailand has a long history, which goes back to 1828 (Fahlbusch, & Bromiley, 1999, p.347). However, the presence of
Christians in Thailand has existed since 1511. The history shows that the first Pentecostal missionaries were from Finland. These missionaries arrived in Bangkok in 1946 and established the first church associated with the Full Gospel Church of Thailand in Thonburi (Hosack, 2001, p.111). Beginning in 1951, various Pentecostal missionaries from a number of Scandinavian countries also began to arrive. They formed churches called the Foundation of the Full Gospel Churches in Thailand. In 1956, T. L. Osborn, a healing evangelist from America, had a profound effect on the growth of Pentecostal churches within Thailand (Hosack, 2001, p.113). Similarly, another missionary, Don Price traveled to Huay Sawing to participate in church building. While teaching in an afternoon service, many in the congregation suddenly began speaking in tongues, dancing in the Spirit and some started rolling around on the floor. This is generally looked upon as one of the first truly powerful Pentecostal services to take place in Thailand (Hosack, 2001, p.114). The coming of many new mission organizations in the 1960s and early 1970s led to development of a completely new array of Pentecostal ministries in Thailand. The Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada sent their first missionary couple to Thailand in 1961. The churches that developed in association with them are known as the Full Gospel Fellowship Church of Thailand. In 1962, Boonmak Kittisan, established a Thai branch of the United Pentecostal Church. In 1967 Charles Austin, an American G.I. stationed in Udorn Thani, began the first Church of God work in Thailand. Churches affiliated with the Church of God are called "Plukjit" (In Thai). In 1968, Ervin Shaffer, the first American Assemblies of God missionary to Thailand, arrived to work with American G.I.'s stationed in Southeast Asia. In that same year, other missionaries started working alongside Kowae in establishing the Thailand Assemblies of God. In 1977, the
Church of God of Prophecy sent their first missionary to Thailand. The first Pentecostal publishing venture, called Gospel Press, began in 1965 when Don Price moved to Thailand bringing a printing press with him. The first Christian radio programming was begun in Chiang Mai in 1967 and later moved to Bangkok to begin a popular program known later as the "Way of Life" Broadcast (Hosack, 2001, pp.115-116).

In short, the influence of the Charismatic movement started to affect the Christians in Thailand starting from the 1970s and continuing to the present time. Many of the early Charismatic works initiated by missionaries came in the form of training programs. During the same period, a number of independent church movements started. In 1979, Wan Petchsongkhram separated from the Southern Baptists and began establishing churches throughout the country. These churches are now known as Rom Klaw in Thai (Hosack, 2001, p.116). The largest charismatic church in Thailand came to be known as The Hope of Bangkok Church. It is "the largest Pentecostal and Charismatic church in the country and the only significant church founded by a Thai" (Anderson, 2004, p. 129). Before elaborating on the Hope of Bangkok Church, it seems adequate to give a brief but relevant biography. The charismatic leadership and its crucial role in establishing the church will be dealt with in the subsequent portion of research.

3.4. Charismatic Leader of Hope of Bangkok Church

Kriengsak Chareonwongsak (born September 9, 1955), is currently Executive Director of the Institute of Future Studies for Development (IFD) in Bangkok (Prof. Dr. Kriengsak Chareonwongsak, 2009). His current profiles posted on websites of various organizations do not indicate his past religious life or indicate any current involvement
with the development of the Hope of Bangkok church. Before his break up with the Church, he was mentioned as an economist and international leader in the charismatic movement (Schlossberg & Sider, 1994, p.9).

Kriengsak grew up in a Buddhist home that also practiced Chinese ancestor worship. At the age of 16, in 1972, he was offered a scholarship to study for a year in an American high school in Wisconsin, USA. In November 1973, he studied economics and political science at Monash University, Australia. During this time, he converted to Christianity and became disciplined in Bible study and involved in church activities. He also became involved in a conservative evangelical church and in Asian Fellowship circles operating on campus. Later, he had an experience of being baptized by the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues. Soon after, he began to attend the charismatic Waverley Christian Fellowship in Melbourne. In this church, as well as in the Asian Fellowship, Kriengsak quickly became a leader who demanded total commitment from his followers in conducting the mission activities (Linder, 2009, p.4).

In 1976, Kriengsak received a vision to plant a church in every district of Thailand. However, he was also invited to study for his PhD in Australia for another three years. During this time, he was also able to complete studies in the New Testament while carrying out his other responsibilities of the church (Linder, 2009, p.4). The Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, where Kriengsak was a Visiting Fellow from June 2007 to June 2008, briefs his achievements of that time as follows:

Professor Kriengsak obtained first class honors and a PhD in Economics from Monash University, Australia, 1981 and a Masters of Public Administration from Harvard University. He is a Research Professor at Regent University, USA and an Adjunct Professor at many universities both in Thailand and overseas. Prior to Thailand's recent parliamentary dissolution, Professor Kriengsak was an elected Member of Parliament. Currently he is on the Executive Board of the Democrat
Party, Thailand, having also held fifty positions as an active participant in various organizations and committees at national level. He was a member of Thailand's National Committee for International Economic Policy. He was also Chairman of the Education, Religion, Arts, and Culture Commission, Vice Chairman of the Economic, Commerce, and Industry Commission of the National Economic and Social Advisory Council, and Advisor to the Senate Foreign Affairs Commission and Privatization Commission (Professor Kriengsak Chareonwongsak (b) 2009).

Later in 1981, Kriengsak returned to Thailand, and finding himself dissatisfied with the working style of Thai Churches, he began a new church service in the lecture room on the ninth floor of the Bangkok Christian hospital. This church grew into what later came to be known as Hope of Bangkok Church. Kriengsak's role in developing the church was very fundamental. This role will be discussed in the subsequent chapters. In short, in the year 1995, Kriengsak left the church, appointing his brother-in-law, Phitsanunart Srithawong Sunee Srithawong, to replace him as the pastor of the church. Phitsanunart Srithawong was titled the directing pastor and Kriengsak was referred to as honorary pastor. Since his departure from the church, Kriengsak refrained from preaching or joining the worship service at the church (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008). As mentioned above, Kriengsak's former relationship with the church is not mentioned in his current profiles or biographies. The same lack of information can be found in his personally written profile that describes his many achievements and current engagements, but has no mention of his contributions to the church or the dynamic Christian life he once led. The current professional engagements of Kriengsak are very clearly cited on his own website as follows:

Professor Dr Kriengsak is President of the Institute of Future Studies for Development (IFD), which focuses on interdisciplinary future studies contributing to economic, human resource, and national development. He is the Eminent Member of the Education Council on Standard and Quality Assurance of the Office of the Education Council. He is also on the Social Science Committee of the National Committee for Education, Science and Culture for UNESCO.
Professor Dr Kriengsak is currently Honorary Chairman of the Social Science Association of Thailand, the Advisory Chairman of the Masters of Business Administration (M.B.A) Program of the Rajabhat Suan Sunandha University, and also the Chairman of the Masters of Business Administration (M.B.A) Program of Far Eastern University. As an academic, he lectures to graduate students at several universities. He is also chairman of a number of foundations and holds positions on the governing/advisory boards of various Asian and international organizations and educational institutions.

As a businessman, he is Chairman of the Success Group of Companies, a conglomerate of businesses, diversified into such fields of media technology, as broadcasting, publishing, educational multimedia production and distribution, internet web site and domain development, web hosting, web-based applications, systems integration and retail outlets, internet service provision (ISP), hotel booking online, e-commerce, and web portals. Other areas under the Success umbrella include biotechnology, finance and securities, investment, trading, animal health products, hotel, travel industry, and management consultancy.

In addition to the aforementioned, he is a newspaper and magazine columnist, having written over 3,000 articles containing academic analysis and proposals on various issues, especially on public policy and development issues. He is the author of 150 books and has presented over 200 academic papers at international conferences. He has hosted several television talk show series and is heard frequently on radio. His perspectives are often highlighted in interviews carried by a wide variety of media sources in Thailand and overseas. He has presented his viewpoints to government and non-government organizations, academic institutions and community groups in over 2,200 lectures in fifty countries (Professor Dr Kriengsak Chareonwongsa, ©, 2009).

From the above details, it is at least clear that Kriengsak is a well educated and an intellectual. It points out his capacities and involvement in many areas, which shows that he is a person of great potential. However, in a similar way he lived a dynamic Christian life with missionary zeal and proved charismatic in his leadership by establishing a charismatic church, which gained worldwide fame and spread in many countries. This charismatic role has many details, which can only be understood in their full significance and effectiveness when discussed in connection with the development the Hope of Bangkok Church.

The following portion of the chapter explicates Kriengsak’s charismatic role in
developing the church. The aim of the investigation is concerned with the role of Kriengsak as a charismatic leader, who founded the church by his charismatic gift, managed it, and ultimately through him and his successors, ultimately split the church into five opposing sects.

3.5. Hope of Bangkok Church: The Largest Thai Charismatic Church

In the year 1981, Dr. Kriengsak Chareonwongsak founded Hope of Bangkok Church, which grew over a few years into the largest Charismatic church in Thailand, it had by 1997 developed more than 800 churches in a country, traditionally resistant to Christian missionary efforts (Hocken, 2009, p.30). The Hope of Bangkok Church is a Thai Christian Church, registered according to Thai Law as a non-political, voluntary, non-profit organization called the "Hope of Thai People Foundation". Kriengsak envisioned, founded, and developed the church by particularly use of his charismatic leadership.

"The Hope of Bangkok", initially founded in 1981, was established mainly through the efforts of Kriengsak Chareonwongsak and with the association of seventeen members. Further churches that have developed under his leadership, both in Thailand and abroad, are known as "Hope" churches. The essential parts outlined in this section consist of Kriengsak Chareonwongsak’s charismatic leadership and the historical timeline of the church.

As mentioned, Kriengsak received his education in Australia. While in Australia he converted to Christianity, became disciplined in Bible study, and had an active role in church activities. He also became involved in a conservative evangelical church and in
the Asian Fellowship on campus. Later, he had an experience of being baptized by the Holy Spirit and speaking in tongues. Soon after, he began to attend the charismatic Waverley Christian Fellowship in Melbourne. In this church, as well as in the Asian Fellowship, Kriengsak quickly became a leader who demanded total commitment from his followers in conducting the mission activities (Linder, 2009, p.4).

Kriengsak had a strong foundation in biblical studies and was well disciplined in his missionary spirit. He returned to Thailand equipped with the necessary training and enthusiasm. Kriengsak was well aware that though Protestants had entered Thailand long ago in 1816, but with little growth or significant progress. He reports:

Consider further the fact that Protestant missionaries first entered Thailand in 1816, and by 1978, 162 years later (according to Alex Smith's doctoral dissertation in missiology with Fuller Theological Seminary), there were only 58,953 Protestant Christians in Thailand (Barrett 1982:664). Today, an estimate of the Protestant population is probably around 80,000 at the most, an insignificant number compared to the bulging population of fifty-six million (Kriengsak, 1990, pp.25).

In 1976, Kriengsak received a vision to plant a church in every district of Thailand. However, he was also invited to study for his PhD in Australia for another three years. During this time, he was also able to complete studies in the New Testament while carrying out his other responsibilities for the church (Linder, 2009, p.4). Later in 1981, Kriengsak returned to Thailand, and being disappointed with the working style of Thai Churches, began a new church service in the lecture room on the ninth floor of the Bangkok Christian hospital. The first church service was conducted on 6 September 1981, with 17 people, many of whom were foreign missionaries (Linder, 2009, pp.5-6). However, Kriengsak states that the church was started in September 1981 with five members, and in December 1988 had over 4,500 members in Bangkok alone (Kriengsak,
Besides other branches and members, by 1995 the church boasted more than ten thousand members in its central congregation alone (Conn, & Ortiz, 2001, p.243).

The church origins and significance are described by Kriengsak as follows:

Being a Thai indigenous church and not a branch of any foreign denomination, the Hope of Bangkok seeks to be a biblically and culturally relevant, contextualized Thai church. In so doing, it has challenged many traditional Thai concepts. One of these is that Christianity is Western-owned. The walls of prejudice are slowly breaking down, and people have become more open to the gospel (Kriengsak, 1990, p.26).

In addition to the above uniqueness, Kriengsak states that church programs and activities catering to the needs and spiritual development of the members were carefully designed to be culturally sensitive right from the start. This enabled members to grow spiritually and to equip them selves for ministry work in the unique Thai cultural setting, efforts, that at times, have been misunderstood by conventional Christian onlookers (Kriengsak, 1990, p.26).

Kriengsak’s missionary zeal in spreading Christianity can be well understood by the vision he put forward for the church. He clearly develops this vision as follows:

In all church activities, the Hope of Bangkok Church has carefully defined goals and utilizes strategic, administrative planning to monitor them. The God-given vision for the church is to plant a church in every district of Thailand (approximately 685). Even before the church began, our vision has been to saturate this country with churches by the year 2000. The history of missions in Thailand makes it clear that without God’s help, this is an impossible task (Kriengsak, 1990, p.26).

The beginning of the church was from September 1981 and about six months later, the space became too small and the meeting was then moved to the hospital’s chapel. In November 1983, the Hope of Bangkok church moved to the Sheraton hotel. Later, the Hope of Bangkok church obtained the Oscar Theatre in Petchburi Road, and
was able to commence a service there with about 400 people. In May 1985, the Hope of Bangkok church had about 700 members and was able to pay off the money that Kriengsak owed for his bond in studying overseas. As a result, he was released for full-time ministry and established the Thailand Bible Seminary, which offered various educational programs. In the same year, the Hope of Phayao church was established and in the succeeding few years, other churches were established in Chiang Mai, Suratthani, and Nakhon Sri Thammarat (Linder, 2009, pp.6-7). In December 1988, the membership reached to 4,500 members (Kriengsak, 1990, p.27).

To increase the number of attendees and to increase the effectiveness of the church, Kriengsak appointed leaders who belonged to the church and had received training from him. As a result, after seven years of growth, 93% of church members were those converted at Hope of Bangkok, the remaining 7% were transplants from other churches. During this time, a cell group program was implemented and heavily promoted to attract people (Linder, 2009, pp.5-6).

Kriengsak states the reason behind the rapid growth in the memberships as follows:

One principle that has been important in the growth of our church has been our emphasis on local church-centered evangelism. This approach enabled us to enfold new converts into church life. As a local church, we can integrate evangelism, follow-up, and nurturing with sensitivity to personal and community needs (Kriengsak, 1990, p.27).

Kriengsak had a special strategy in increasing the membership of the church. He focused on urban church planting, which he believed would serve as bridges to the rural areas. Because cities are the centers of complex social interaction, they are home to the nation's social, commercial, political, military, artistic, entertainment, educational, and
mass media life. To evangelize a whole nation requires us to use these resources and concentrate on the cities first (Kriengsak, 1990, p.27). Connected to this urban church idea, Kriengsak retained a special mindset of the Thai people in his mind. He once stated, “Thais by nature enjoy big, exciting, festival events. They call this sanuk, which means "fun". In this culture, a church must be perceived as being big enough to warrant their interest. A big urban church is necessary to work in Bangkok successfully. We need to make the church visible so that it can attract people's interest and confidence” (Kriengsak, 1990, p.27).

Kriengsak also emphasized mass Evangelism and devised a strategy for evangelizing through the spectacle of special church events. According to him, special occasions or events draw people best, therefore, the church often held mass meetings on Valentine's Day, Father's Day, Mother's Day, and Christmas. One such event, thematically referred to as Miracle Christmas '88, illustrated this method of celebratory promotion.

Miracle Christmas was a time of great excitement for the members. The atmosphere of festivity, together with the spiritual eagerness in preparing for new believers to join the church, created a refreshing spirit in outreach. As a result of "Miracle Christmas '88," the Hope of Bangkok Church was able to present a gift of over 500 new believers to our Lord Jesus Christ on Christmas Day, and the spirit of evangelism was once again rejuvenated. (Kriengsak, 1990, p.29).

To make such events, as mentioned above popular and successful Kriengsak put forward a special plan. In this plan, he, apart from the commitment of the members, took full advantage of the modern means of sharing and spreading information and effective advertising. He succinctly stated:

Prior to the event, all members are asked to list at least four people whom they
would invite to the program, and to pray specifically for God to prepare their hearts. Attractive posters announcing the event and highlighting special programs are posted by the members on city buses, in public places, universities, office complexes, etc. Membership involvement at this grass roots level encourages their interest in inviting people to attend these programs. Full scale advertisements draw the involvement of businesses and celebrities to participate in the event, which attracts further interest from the public (Kriengsak, 1990, p.28).

Kriengsak also emphasized the importance of witnessing. According to him, if the sermon or message of the church was taught, emphasized, and modeled in a clear way it would encourage members to be continually equipped and mobile in order to witness with confidence. Emphasis was also placed on reaching out to possible members via webs of friends and relatives who have proven to be most open and responsive. He further stated that members of the Hope of Bangkok Church have been trained to look for both small and large units of responsive people to evangelize.

Therefore, Kriengsak put a greater emphasis on conversion. He stated that an incredibly high proportion, (ninety-five percent) of the growth of the church has been due to these conversions. He did so by emphasizing the members to utilize every available opportunity for reaching out. According to him, this includes the printing of personal testimonies as tracts and distributing them at engagement ceremonies, birthdays, funerals, weddings, etc (Kriengsak, 1990, p.29)

The other important factor, which Kriengsak employed in keeping the converts on track, is what he calls follow-up. He clarifies the effective mechanism for this purpose as follows:

Having new believers join the church will not lead to church growth if proper follow-up strategy is not well executed. Data collection for statistical analysis plays a vital role as a diagnostic tool for leaders by revealing follow-up problems as well as enhancing systematic follow-up. Hope of Bangkok keeps precise records of all visitors and new believers. Correct names, addresses, important dates, maps and convenient places of
contact are filled out when these people first enter the church (Kriengsak, 1990, p.29).

These forms were computerized and a copy of the printout was given to the pastoral leader overseeing the given demographic. Follow-up within twenty-four hours of the conversion decision was also emphasized. This was to ensure that all doubts could be dealt with accordingly and the proper spiritual nurturing and encouragement could be provided from the start of their newfound faith. Thereafter, the convert was visited once or twice a week in order to lay a proper biblical foundation for their faith in Christ (Kriengsak, 1990, p.29).

Among the many strategies Kriengsak employed, one in particular, was the cell group structure. This cell group structure and its effectiveness is one of the famous cell structures (Astin, 1998, p.115). Kriengsak elaborates on the cell structure and its mechanism as follows:

A key thrust of the Hope of Bangkok Church is its cell group structure. In December 1988 there were approximately 700 cell groups in Bangkok, serving as bridges into the community in every sub-district of the city. Cell groups offer a non-threatening setting where open sharing of needs, blessings, experiences, and the Word of God takes place in an atmosphere of love and concern. Because of their small size, they are an excellent forum for personal teaching and pastoral care.

Since Bangkok is a city made up of many subcultures, the Hope of Bangkok has organized its pastoral care structure around homogeneous cell groups. We have allowed the members to fellowship at the intimate level with their ethnic and cultural peers, yet the church is a heterogeneous church. In order to maintain a good balance between homogeneity and diversity, we teach, expect, and provide fellowship between people of different backgrounds as well (Kriengsak, 1990, p.30).

Another one of the many strategies Kriengsak had in mind was a congregation of mixed membership, with target groups including members of different classes, such as elites and poor alike. He elaborated on the nature of mixed membership of the church as
follows:

Membership of the Hope of Bangkok Church includes people from virtually all backgrounds, including household members of one of the billionaires in Thailand, high-ranking government officers from the immediate family of a past Prime Minister, as well as slum dwellers and ex-heroin addicts. Some homogeneous groups in the church are business executives, professionals, students, farmers, and laborers (Kriengsak, 1990, p.30).

To foster closer links between the members and to be more effective, Kriengsak introduced mini-cell groups. Each mini-cell consists of two or three people from the larger cell, who learn to grow and serve together, especially through evangelism, visiting new believers, and joining regular prayer and Bible study.

Kriengsak also included leadership-training programs with a corporate vigor as well as conducting educational programs. Thailand Bible Seminary was established by the Hope of Bangkok Church in June 1985 to offer four levels of training: School of Christian Life, School of Ministry, Bachelor of Theology, and Master of Divinity. All these courses combined high-level academic and biblical teaching with an emphasis as well upon character development and practical training in discipleship. They also provided on the job ministerial training through the church's example and their model of effective growth and planning. Leaders and potential leaders were trained with the sole aim of pioneering and leading strong, growing churches. Over 400 leaders have completed this training. Most are either serving as leaders in sister churches or have continued their studies in advanced training at church seminary (Kriengsak, 1990, pp.32-33).

According to founding church documents, Kriengsak implemented an attitude of non-distinction with regard to the clergy and the laity. All believers were called to
minister with their God-given gifts. In the past, the Christian church has put forth very little effort to utilize the potential of the laity in such a way. Kriengsak’s rationale held that clergy and laity distinctions must be scrapped, not only in our theological formulation but also in actuality. He has put it as follow:

In fact, I see no room for allowing the people to simply attend church and watch the performance of the "full time" chosen ones! All gifts must be employed for the advancement of God's Kingdom. This is clearly one definite concrete way to demonstrate the priesthood of all believers. There is no place for professional ministries in the church. All clergy must be laity and all laity must be clergy! God does not and never has called anyone to the "full time" ministry. There is none! To bring people together he applies all the means much formal and informal biblical and practical training is given to the laity. To name just a few, interest clubs such as Artists, Evangelism, Radio Programs, Guitar, Drum and Drama draw people of the same interests together, to train and equip them to serve God (Kriengsak, 1990, p.33).

Another important aspect rests on the financial and fiscal organization of the church. On this point there seemed to exist a strong motivation and strategy through contributions and sacrifice of the members. An example of this sacrificial spirit came when they were raising money for evangelistic and evangelical needs. As a young church, made up of mostly students, financial backing appeared almost impossible.

The burden was then passed on to the different levels of leadership and membership. At the end of three months, 10 million Baht (approximately U.S. $400,000) had been raised. This was in 1986, when membership was around 1,000 and the annual average income per person in Thailand was U.S. $750 (Kriengsak, 1990, p.34). To fulfill the task of winning the nation to Christ, the leadership sacrificially started by selling their cars, houses, and valuable jewelry. Members shared in this spirit. Life savings and valuable items were pooled together in the exciting, God-honoring venture. God blessed the church as a whole through this sacrificial act (Kriengsak, 1990, p.34).
The above vision, mission, and strategies devised by Kriengsak, worked well because of the wisdom and rigor, which seemed to thrive with an ever-present vitality. These elements of success, along with Kriengsak’s own commitment, dedication and leadership turned the Hope of Bangkok Church into a highly successful venture, not only locally but also internationally.

Thailand’s Hope of Bangkok Church turned to the flagship paradigm a decade after its beginning in 1981 and since then has planted over three hundred churches throughout Thailand and overseas (Conn, & Ortiz, 2001, p.251). The Hope of Bangkok began with a very clear vision of planting a church in every one of the 685 districts in Thailand by the year 2000. This vision supported the growth for the first few years as the church sought to plant new churches outside Bangkok, beginning in Phayao province, Chiang Mai province before spreading to other major provincial towns throughout the Kingdom. Hope churches were also established in other countries such as Malaysia, Sydney, Washington, and Singapore and were connected through an international network of relationships (Linder, 2009, p.12).

3.6. Kriengsak’s Charismatic Leadership: Realizing the Dream

The dream to establish Hope of Bangkok Church originated from Kriengsak. He drafted the vision, mission, and strategies for its growth and establishment. In the above details it is clear that the church was drawn to success in its operational mode like that of a corporation. The effects of Kriengsak’s educational expertise on the organization are clear. One of the analyses of Weber’s charismatic formulation is that of innovation and possessing a proactive attitude. That is to say that having a beautiful dream is not always
enough. The successful realization of the church, from a mere thought to one of reality comes from Kriengsak’s own charismatic personality. His innovation and originality has placed him among such famous personalities as Billy Graham and Desmond Tutu (Ider, 1993, p.194). Many aspects of his leadership show that he began the church from scratch but in a very short time made tremendous progress. His charismatic role can be well understood in two ways: proper planning and effective leadership. His charismatic character shows in both of these aspects. His charismatic character in planning the church and carefully setting its goals, exhibits his effectiveness as a proactive and charismatic leader.

Weber’s formulation of charismatic leadership is the sort of leadership born against tradition and in times of need. These elements are present in Kriengsak’s emergence. He appears in a particular time when the Protestant presence was limited in Thailand in spite of their long history inside the country. Secondly, he approached and transformed the traditional, organizational, and operational systems of the Protestants. His charismatic gift, based on Weber’s formula, also indicates that he was original in his thinking and with regard to the change he sought. His followers who readily obeyed and made the necessary sacrifices to further his mission held him high esteem. These characteristics are to a greater degree understood in the explication of his charismatic leadership as follows.

Weber’s analysis on charismatic leadership is clearly congruent to Kriengsak’s leadership. We can see this in the early manifestation of church building and the efforts to increase church membership. Even with their limited means, in the early days of the church, the main attraction was the style of Kriengsak’s preaching and his vision of
growth. He was also a young man who was well educated, intelligent, and seemed to possess a great deal of personal integrity and commitment. This commitment and his leadership ability had a substantial effect on the early members. These early members also read one book every week. Some Thai members expressed their commitment even to the point of selling their homes and moving into rented housing in order to contribute to the expenses of the church (Linder, 2009, p.5).

Another element of Weber’s aspect on Charismatic leadership style is that of commitment. Kriengsak was completely committed to the church and there are many stories, which show his personal commitment to the church affairs. One of these stories regards his absence from the birth of his son, because he was at that moment, busy preaching to a drug addict. Another instance of his unwavering commitment was his church meetings, which were held as early as five a.m. (Linder, 2009, p.-6). Few Thai Christian leaders have the status, the charisma and the influence that Dr Kriengsak had over his followers. Since he himself was the man who led by example of living with a total commitment to the work of the church, over and above other priorities, he was able to demand no less from those who followed him. As the church continued to grow and build momentum so did the expectations that Dr Kriengsak was able to put on those who followed him. This stands in stark contrast to the general demands of the Buddhist religion and the demands of most mainstream churches in Bangkok, where most church activities are purely voluntary and without any pressure applied to a member’s choice of involvement. As a result, Dr Kriengsak was able to break through the deadlock that most churches experienced in not being able to mobilize their members to a high level of commitment. By mobilizing his church members to become involved, he was able to
multiply the ministry and the effectiveness in reaching outsiders to join Hope of Bangkok church. Although some people were turned off by the methods used, it has obviously brought results in terms of numerical growth and is continuing to do so (Linder, 2009, pp.15-16).

The Pentecostal style of running a service is attractive to young people because it is lively and upbeat with big bands, expressive worship, and emotional sermons. The emphasis on miracles and healing is also a magnet for many people who are impressed by such an emphasis. It is also appealing for those who are looking to be healed of their physical illnesses. As the Hope of Bangkok church was being established in the early eighties, this was a time when Pentecostal-style churches were enjoying a growth all over the world. The Hope of Bangkok led the way in providing exciting worship in a contemporary format and in adopting new music from overseas as well as providing the church with music composed by its own members. Apart from the contemporary elements of worship, Dr Kriengsak was also able to feed his congregation through expository preaching, which is not typical of most charismatic churches. In this way, he was able to bring together the most appealing aspects of both charismatic style churches and the more conservative evangelical churches. He was able to disciple people not just by preaching the Bible, but also by enabling people to put into practice what they learn. Dr. Kriengsak knew very well that people learn best by putting into action the things that they hear, and he did this to an extent that many mainline churches would not consider (Linder, 2009, p.14).

The critical aspect regarding Weber's religious charismatic leader, rings true to that of Kriengsak. His expository preaching was a very effective style, which moved
those who listened and who were struck by his passion his commitment. Kriengsak also suited the Pentecostal style of church in his leadership, where pastors are normally given liberal authority and working scope for their ministries. Being a man of enormous capability and intellect, he was able to command the respect of those who followed him. As a result, the church became an expression of his personality and ministry, where he became the key to making things work. No one within the congregation would think of refusing him anything that he asked for. Kriengsak possessed status, charisma, and influence over his followers. Since he himself was the man who led by the example of total commitment to the church, over and above other priorities, he was able to demand no less from his followers. By mobilizing his church members to become involved, he was able to multiply the ministry and its effectiveness by reaching out to outsiders to become members (Linder, 2009, pp.15-16).

There is no doubt that the key to the initial and explosive growth of the Hope of Bangkok church was the result of Dr Kriengsak's leadership. He was a man who had experienced a powerful experience of conversion and possessed the qualities necessary to become a powerful leader in the Christian church. People respected and listened to him and through his vision; he was able to lead a large number of people in a common and unified direction. He was very influential, not only among Thai people, but also with many foreigners who were impressed with his character and his leadership. Because of his charisma, he was able to break through the complacency that many Thai Christians show towards their faith and lead them into a very higher level of commitment and activity. He was an exceptional individual who displayed qualities that are very rare in the Thai Christian church. Although his strong leadership style created friction and
conflicts with other churches, he was nonetheless able to grow his church very quickly. This is especially true in the early days of its formation, when his membership respected and vigorously supported his leadership (Linder, 2009, p.17).

Contrary to the above history of the church and the positive leadership of its founder, since 1980, a different side of leadership began to unfold, which had negative effects on the reputation of the founder and the management of the church. During the time of growth in the 1980s, the structure and organization of the Hope of Bangkok became increasingly autocratic; though, the Hope of Bangkok church was successful, in 1989, to obtain the present premises at Khlong Toey.

The church membership also grew to six thousand by 1991 (Linder, 2009, p.7). In October 1990, there was a dispute in the leadership team of the Hope of Bangkok church and Kriengsak expelled one of his senior leaders. In time, four additional members were also excommunicated and by the end of the following week, four more leaders, who had defiantly questioned the decision, were dismissed. The leaders expelled were accused of rebellion in an attempt to take control of the church. It seemed Kriengsak had become untouchable and no one was able to call him to account.

This became more obvious when in December 1991, a delegation was sent from the Waverley Christian chapel in Melbourne to confront Kriengsak on many of the unresolved issues that were affecting his reputation, including a charge of adultery. Kriengsak was not open to being questioned and denied any wrongdoing (Linder, 2009, p.10).

According to Weber’s theory on Charismatic leader, it is clear that Kriengsak’s leadership style and bureaucratic organization, while being positive in terms of
recruitment, was also suffering from its own system of finance, which became mysterious and suspect in the minds of lower members. It seemed that the leaders demanded obedience without the benefits of transparency in terms of financial accountability, the personal lives of the leaders and involving members in major decisions affecting the future direction of the church. Edwin Zhener refers to Dr Kriengsak’s style as the “functional equivalent of the traditional Chinese patriarch atop the family business” and compares the bureaucracy of the church to that of “a large-scale Chinese organization where financial matters are handled through a staff function where the details can be kept privately among a few individuals” (Zhener, 1987).

In year 1995, Kriengsak left the church and he let his brother-in-law, Pissanunart Srithawong who is the husband of his sister, Sunee Srithawong, to replace his role as the pastor of the church. Pissanunart Srithawong is to be called directing pastor and Kriengsak is to be called honorary pastor. Kriengsak, since he left the church never preached or joined the worship service at the church (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008). Furthermore, he has currently no publicly known connection to the Hope of Bangkok church.

Though Kriengsak had left the Church, his influence remained and this influence, which took a managerial position behind the scenes, was what ultimately brought about the eventual split in the church. Kriengsak turned to politics after leaving the church, which only created a new crisis. He joined the Democrat Party. He asked his sister and brother-in-law to encourage church members to enroll in the party so he could be on the party list for a term. After gaining a seat in the committee, he prepared himself for the election as a representative on behalf of Democrat Party. However, because of other reasons, he resigned from the party (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008). According to Rubina Suwannapong claim, this was his first misuse of church authorities to help his political career, when in fact the church is a non-political institution. In 2008, Kriengsak turned to
politics at the local level as a candidate running for the Bangkok governorship. This event brought the issue in its full gloom on 21 October 2008, Mrs. Rubina Suwannapong, Chairman of the Hope of Thai People Foundation, issued a detailed statement to Members of Hope Bangkok, Staff of Hope of Thai People Foundation, and other concerned people. Her statement included the main allegations with details against Kriengsak and his followers. Briefly, the allegations include four major areas: (a) misuse of church resources for the election campaign of the founder, (b) misrepresentation of church doctrine, (c) lack of financial transparency and misuse of church funds, and (d) unaccountability of the founder to the elders of the church (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008).

3.7. Disintegration of the Hope of Bangkok Church

In the year 2008, the organization and management crisis of the church created a split in the church community and its working management. Instead of one church with a large united community, there were now, five churches with small, divided communities. The church community had affectively split into six major factions. Mrs. Rubina Suwannapong Foundation church, Nimit Panich church (UCC), Phitsanunart-Sunee church (Indra church), Piyaweij church, HGI International Hope church, and Nexus church.

Rubina Suwannapong is controlling the current location of the church, known as Foundation church. Nimit Panich is running UCC church or, The United Church of Commandment, which conducts services at Thai CC Tower, Sathron. Phitsanunart-Sunee Srithawong’s church is conducting services at Indra Regent Hotel, Pratunam. Tanon and his team are running Nexus church at Samyan. Piyaweij church resides at Piyaweij hospital with leadership from Central Group’s CEO Kobchai Chirathiwat. HGI
International Hope churches were formerly called Inter church, and were predominately located outside of Thailand. This organization still has newly opened branches in Thailand, and is known as HGI Group, under the leadership of Simon Eng.

3.8. Conclusion

The researcher has indicated how charisma, as demonstrated in the leadership of Bangkok Hope Church, has contributed to the formation and development of this church as the fastest growing in Thailand, along with its many overseas establishments. The history of the church represents a breakthrough of Protestant success in Thailand as it bears its development from the vision, novel methods, and innovative concepts of Kriengsak.

Kriengsak’s personal life shows how he developed into a vibrant missionary and set up the church. He exhibited his charismatic character in two effective ways. One was that he employed a very well managed strategy in developing the church by setting goals and overseeing the overall process. Secondly, his personal commitment and demand for equal commitment from his followers.

The leadership role Kriengsak reveled in indicates a charismatic nature. The overall effects of his leadership indicate his charismatic ability to go against the traditional methods of establishing and running a church. It was through the faith and commitment of his followers that the main objectives of his mission became realized. These objectives and model of leadership were also successful in subsequent churches that spread around the nation and overseas.
Some of controversial events and incidents during Kriengsak’s leadership are somehow moralized or treated negatively by critics; however, they are not actually an essential part of this research. Even, supposing they are true and without judgments, such behavior could be ascribed to charismatic leaders based on Weber’s formulas. Some examples are his avoidance in response to questions or to be held accountable. These elements are actually congruent and consistent with charismatic leadership.

However, as shown above, he left the church and remained virtually away from its operations, therefore, in the aftermath the results could only be linked to the issue of the routinization of charisma. This routinization, which seems a failure, will be elaborated upon in the subsequent chapter.
Chapter Four

Charisma, Crisis and Disintegration of Hope of Bangkok Church:

A Critical Analysis

4.1. Introduction

The chapter is mainly focused on the evaluation and criticisms of the reasons which led to the disintegration of the church. Closely related to the subject is an analytical study of the charismatic characteristics of Dr. Kriengsak’s leadership in the formation of Bangkok Hope Church. The status of the church makes it obviously that the church has fragmented, disintegrated, and is continuously splitting into a further number of churches. The church community has divided itself into numerous sects. Many churches in existence have sprung from the origins of the Hope of Bangkok Church. The chapter, therefore, will look at this division, which is fundamentally connected with the failure of the routinization of charisma and various other reasons related to the overall management of the church. The chapter will discuss in detail the reasons behind the disintegration of the church. In addition, the chapter will discuss the main components in order. First, the chapter will discuss the status of the church in regards to its disintegration and the subsequent establishment of divided branches. Secondly, it would look at the reasons that led up to the disintegration. The discussion will remain in the realms of Max Weber's charismatic authority and its criticism, and analysis, of various charismatic movements or institutions. As the backdrop of the charismatic authority, Weber’s thoughts remain a
foundation for understanding; however, the latter works and various applicative researches have contributed to the deciphering of many facets and aspects of the charismatic authority. Therefore, while basing the main theme on Weber's thoughts, additional research and sources are worth citing for a comprehensive understanding of the issue.

4.2. Organizational Breakdown of Hope of Bangkok Church

The Hope of Bangkok Church, as discussed in the preceding chapters, started in 1981 with a small number of memberships and it developed in very short time into a large network of churches within and outside Thailand. This exemplary progress and development of the church seems to have been accomplished because of the leadership of Dr. Kriengsak who, in fact, had envisioned the church and had provided his personal efforts, dedication, and leadership skills in bringing the development and progress of the church in the realm of reality. In brief, during the time of Kriengsak from 1981-1995, as the caretaker of the management and leadership of the church, it seems that the organization of the church faced few challenging negative events as mentioned earlier. The presence of Kriengsak and his tackling of the issues were successful in bringing the situation under control and at least the church did not split up during his time in office. This then answer the first research question – did the leader's charisma cease during his tenure at the church? Obviously, it did not. This indicates the power and control a charismatic leader is supposed to possess, based on Weber's formulations of a charismatic leader.

However, in 1995, the routinization of the charismatic leadership took place; Kriengsak ended his own active leadership at the church by succession, he appointed his
brother in law, Pissanunart Srithawong, to replace his role as the pastor of the church. However, he named himself as honorary pastor though he never preached or joined the worship service at the church again, something that is a critical aspect of being a good Christian, especially a religious charismatic leader. (Rubina Suwannapong, 2008). This succession of the leadership shows two ways of influence which Kriengsak may have had on the church leadership. The first is the factor of family relationships between the newly selected leader of the church. The second factor is the self-imparting of the honorary title. This also creates a buffer against the interventions and motives of those who may question or wish to raise objections. The aftermath of succession shows that the relationship between the church and Kriengsak remained intact even as church resources continued to be utilized for his election campaign. However, the positive possibilities suggest that Kriengsak's role could have in fact rescued the church from disintegration, most especially had Kriengsak directly intervened in the conflicts and mediated between the departing communities.

Kriengsak, while retaining himself as an honorary pastor, secured a direct influence on the directing pastor Pissanunart Srithaowng. This is to say that the influence of the honorary pastor on the directing pastor can be assumed natural when in fact; no committee had approved such succession. There are two main factors, which seem to have played a role regarding the honorary pastor's influence upon church management; one is that the appointed pastor was a relative of Kriengsak, and secondly, though the succession had taken place, Kriengsak had retained power as an honorary pastor, thereby securing his influence.
After exploring the events that ultimately caused the disintegration of the church, we have seen that some of these are certainly related to the diverting of church resources and political ambitions. However, the main reasons for the split are principally linked to the charismatic leader himself and that of his devotees.

In light of the above issues and many other relevant aspects of the case, the church community initially split into five major factions and has been subsequently dividing into various forms.

The above description indicates why and how the church disintegrated and continues to split into many sects. The reasons, which are briefly mentioned above, are on one hand responsible for the disintegration of the church, and at the same time they indicate the emergence of many new churches after the disintegration. This suggests that crucial issues still abound among the disciples of the leader.

Through the succeeding sections the hypotheses will be tested by applying qualitative methods of research by analyzing, interpreting, and criticizing the available details in the light of Weber's theory and its criticism. In addition, other critical works will be also used which build on Weber's theory. The merits and demerits of Weber's theory will be dealt with accordingly. The criticism, thus made, will lead to a diagnosis of the case and the justification of the thesis statement. In addition, it will accordingly lead to the formulation of feasible recommendations for church leadership in the context of Thai culture.
4.3. Kriengsak, the Charismatic Leader

The first question sought to answer whether Kriengsak was truly a charismatic. This question was outlined in the preceding chapter, however, the analysis of such leadership within Weberian thought remains to be answered in essential length.

The emergence of charismatic leaders is mostly treated as a consequence of circumstances. This thinking is present in Weber; Weber (1924/1947) noted that charismatic leaders are likely to emerge during times of instability, crisis, and turmoil. Such times increase the feelings among people of helplessness, agitation, anxiety, and frustration. Upon analyses of Weber’s text, this definition does not completely fit Kriengsak’s position. There were protestant churches and institutions running in Thailand even before 1981, when Hope of Bangkok Church was established. There was no instability, crisis, or such turmoil as Weber describes. However, from a different perspective there appears some logic in applying Weber’s definition to the emergence of Kriengsak as a charismatic leader. There are two plausible reasons to support that there was, in fact, conditions that could lead to the emergence of a charismatic leader. The first reason is that even though Protestants had long ago entered Thailand their numbers were limited and their churches few. From this point it can said that the conditions of Thai Protestantism deserved, or was in need of, someone who represented progress - someone perhaps that could lead the church in a more dynamic and progressive manner. The other reason is the way in which Kriengsak broke away from other protestant churches and vigorously began anew. His novel approach and rapid progress could be interpreted that he and his followers may have understood their needs for such vitality.
Kreingsak understood that the performance of the churches and winning new converts was a slow process, and the same could be said for those who supported Kriengsak in the realization of his goal. However, there is a possibility that the aforementioned reasons may not be satisfactory to many who might believe that the Protestant situation was not so hopeless as to require the emergence of a charismatic leader. This is in consideration to the overall situation of Thai Protestantism. However, there is research which suggest that charismatic leaderships does occur in the absence of crisis or distress (Conger and Kanungo, 1998 cited in Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 64). Personally seeking to shake up the status quo, charismatic leaders, particularly the pseudo transformational personalized ones, identify and exaggerate existing shortcomings in a situation and the grievances of followers. They create dissatisfaction with the status quo so that followers are motivated to accept the radical solutions that the charismatic leaders advocate in order to eliminate the distressful problems (Conger and Kanungo, 1988 cited in Bass & Riggio, 2006, p. 64). The above reasons, which cause and create the emergence of a charismatic leader in various ways, are helpful in understanding the emergence of Kreingsak as a charismatic leader. These interpretations are congruent with the establishment and subsequent disintegration of Hope of Bangkok church. In 1981, Kriengsak returned to Thailand. Feeling dissatisfied and disappointed with the working style of Thai Churches, Kriengsak began a new church service in the lecture room on the ninth floor of the Bangkok Christian hospital. The first church service was conducted on 6 September 1981, with 17 people, many of whom were foreign missionaries (Linder, 2009, pp.5-6). This indicates clearly that Kriengsak was disappointed with the status quo of the present churches.
In light of these two views, it seems that emergence of Kriengsak was the same as any other charismatic leader. This second view derives ample support from the historical fact that Kriengsak, after returning from Australia and having joined some Thai Churches was deeply dissatisfied with the ways those churches were conducting their affairs. In any case, it seems that emergence of Kriengsak is of the charismatic type.

In the preceding chapter, the researcher has shown that Kriengsak was deeply committed to his work. During his tenure, he developed strategies and managerial ways of instilling the same spirit of commitment among his followers. The record shows that his followers, due to his leadership, had accomplished concrete goals in a very short time, furthermore, when can view the financial, personal and committed sacrifice of his followers as congruent with Weber’s characteristics of a charismatic leader. As a preacher, Kriengsak was able to nourish his congregation spiritually through expository preaching. He was a very effective preacher and was able to move those who listened to him through his passion and his commitment. Kriengsak also suited the Pentecostal style of church in his leadership style where the pastor is usually given liberal authority and scope in is leadership. Being a man of enormous capability and intellect, Kriengsak was able to command the respect of those who followed him. As a result, the church became an expression of his personality, where he became the key to making things work. No one within the congregation would think of refusing him anything that he asked for. Kriengsak had status, charisma, and the influence over his followers. Since he himself was the man who led by example of total commitment to the work of the church, over and above other priorities, he was able to demand no less from those who followed him. By mobilizing his church members into action, he was able to multiply the ministry and
the effectiveness of gathering new members (Linder, 2009, pp.15-16). This is indicated in
the description of charismatic leadership by Kenneth E. Clark and Miriam B. Clark as
follows:

"Charismatic leaders increase the intrinsic value of effort and thus make work
more appealing. As a can-do attitude becomes associated with increased
performance, the intrinsic value of goals increase as well. The leader who
emphasizes faith in a better future thus diminishes the role of personal and
material rewards. The follower's commitment increases. The leader continues to
provide a model of the behavior expected from all. The ceremony, symbols,
ritualistic procedures, and tradition sustain and emotional commitment of the
group to higher goals" (Clark & Clark, 1996, p.47).

From the above analysis, it seems adequate to claim that Kriengsak was a
charismatic leader in establishing the Hope of Bangkok Church and leading its members.
On Weber's analysis of charismatic leader, there are other characteristics, which are
associated with a charismatic leader. For example, a charismatic leader resists
accountability. A charismatic leader can demand compliance without offering reasons
and may not be open for personal or financial auditing. These characteristics are, as
mentioned in the preceding chapter, present in Kriengsak's leadership style while in
office. Here, it is important to mention that being charismatic does not mean to have only
positive characteristics or generating positive results. Charismatic leaders can have
negative characteristics and just as naturally, generate negative results. Moreover, some
of the negative characteristics may not appear in the beginning of the charismatic carrier,
but may show up in the latter stages as well.

After, indicating through the above analysis and relevant details contained in the
preceding chapters, it seems clear that Kriengsak was a charismatic leader and it is his
charismatic leadership, which, in fact, contributed to the development of the church.
There is no other model of leadership which can adequately describe Kriengsak's style.
In the above details, the researcher discussed the charisma and episode of disintegration. However, the analysis of the crisis is more important. The crisis, which finally caused disintegration, is in fact a group of incidents and issues. In the following portions of this research, the researcher will show how these issues are in many ways consequences of negative aspects of a charismatic leadership. It will also be indicated to what extent they affected the consequences of the failure of routinization and the behavioral and psychological aspects of the disciples of the charismatic leader.

4.4. Analysis and Criticism of Hypotheses

The preceding chapter has shown that the development of the church was because of charisma, which its leader exhibited in establishing the church and running its administration. The chapter also illustrated how the leader of the church was truly charismatic insofar as Weber's theory of charismatic authority is concerned. The same theme is explored in the above-mentioned parts of this chapter to reinforce the theory that Kriengsak was in fact a charismatic leader. Kriengsak's leadership was tested and treated with Weber's understanding of charismatic authority in mind, as well as various other scholars who have built upon Weber's thought.

This chapter is mainly concerned with the failure of routinization of charismatic authority. The current situation of the church clearly shows that the disintegration of the church has in fact emerged from the problems inherent in the transition of authority. The case of Hope of Bangkok Church is slightly different from other charismatic institutions because in the case of Hope of Bangkok Church the charismatic leader was still living during the transition of authority, as well as the disintegration. An overlap of events also existed post transition as Kriengsak managed to maintain a tacit, but significant, control
and influence on church management.

In discussing the disintegration of the church, it is important to return to the events that caused the disintegration. These events are of two types. The first type of events to occur took place when the charismatic leader was in office. The second type took place after the charismatic leader had left office or, post succession, and it is possible that Kriengsak may have been involved in these various events through the power of office or his influence. Therefore, the chapter analyzes the first type of event as an element of charismatic leadership, with characteristics that indicate and support the charismatic character of Kriengsak’s leadership. The second category of events is related to the routinization of the charismatic authority and their relation to the disintegration of the church.

As described in chapter three of this research and again in the above-mentioned parts of this chapter, the main issues that were seminal, and in a developed form that caused complications, in the end brought about the final stages of disintegration. From the above analysis the inherent reasons for the disintegration become visible, however, the main hypotheses as stipulated in the first chapter of this research needs to be further analyzed in order to gain a fuller understanding of the case of Hope of Bangkok Church.

4.4.1. The Case of Unaccountability in Charismatic Leader and in the Succeeding Administration

One of the main issues, which are responsible for the disintegration, is contained in the problem of unaccountability. The problem of unaccountability first appears during the charismatic leader’s time in office. This notion of un-touchability also seems to have
been transferred to the succeeding authority of the church. Concerning accountability, in terms of Weber’s formulations, the absence thereof is one characteristic of charismatic leadership that leads to adverse consequences.

It is abundantly clear that the lack of accountability is a definite trait of a charismatic leader. For example, Eileen Barker holds that Charismatic leaders are unpredictable for they are not bound by tradition or rules and they may be accorded by their followers. Barker warns that in these cases, the leader may lack any accountability, require unquestioning obedience, and encourage a dependency upon the movement for material, spiritual, and social resources (Barker, 1990). This unaccountability is evident in the charismatic leader’s time in office; however, his refusal to submit became even more evident when in December 1991 a delegation sent from the Waverley Christian chapel in Melbourne to confront him on many of the unresolved issues that were affecting his reputation, including a charge of adultery. Kriengsak was not open to questioning and denied any wrongdoing (Linder, 2009, p.10).

This unaccountability also reflects upon the financial information of the church, which was mysterious and suspect in the minds of lower members. It seemed that the leaders demanded obedience without the benefits of transparency in terms of financial accountability, their personal lives, and in major decisions affecting the future direction of the church. The unaccountability and demand for blind and silent compliance are evidence of the absolute characteristics of a charismatic leader.

Charismatic leadership seems sharply antithetical to that of a bureaucratic authority, as it strives on its role of being above the everyday administrative routine. At
the same time, however, Weber noted that a 'routinization of charisma' is indispensable, giving birth to new traditions and new institutions endowed with 'charisma of office', if it is to prevail over time (Weber 1968: 61). However, in making the charismatic authority meaningful and lasting those temporary traits of a charismatic leader need to be replaced by the proper ways of leadership, which can show transparency and maintain trust and confidence in a continuous manner. The charisma of office by succession continues the sacredness into succeeding agents such as priests, but the organizational matters are rationalized in terms of accountability. If the transition and succession of charismatic leadership retains the same traits of the charismatic leadership, such as unaccountability, then the organization may face radical changes. As shown in the above illustrations, the outcome of Hope of Bangkok has not been different from any other organization in this respect. The unaccountability in Bangkok Hope Church goes back to its founder who was not receptive to change and consequently this trait continued into his successors as the research clearly indicates.

The problem of accountability in charismatic leadership is a theme taken by several scholars. By definition, charismatic leaders are not tied to institutional means that define and structure their accountability (Bird, 1993). Furthermore, if the accountability is not structured while routinizing the charisma, there are more possibilities of corruption. The absence of routinized structures of accountability fosters corruption in charismatically led "cults" (Balch, 1988). This becomes more visible in the case of Hope of Bangkok Church where claims of corruption and misuse of funds were alleged after the succession had taken place. Among these claims is that church funds or finance was
diverted to the election campaign of the founding charismatic leader who had already ceased his once active role in the church.

Though the allegations of corruption prompted some to break away from the church, a number of followers continued their involvement even after succession by a new leader. In the presence of allegations of corruption, financial mismanagement, distorting the faith of the church, and many other grievances, a number of followers remained loyal by rationalizing the charismatic leader's behavior. For example, the charismatic leader's involvement into political activities is rationalized as a step that could have helped the church mission to grow to attract more support from the public. This kind of tendency is not new. The research related to charismatic authority indicates that a charismatic leader's whimsical behavior is sometimes rationalized by his followers. The tendency for believers to rationalize the whimsical behavior of revered leaders and the lack of institutional restraints can also facilitate other forms of deviant or extreme behavior, including violence. Wallis and Bruce see charismatic leadership as the enabling context for the sexual deviance and/or violence that appeared in movements such as the Peoples Temple, Synanon, and the Children of God (now "The Family"). The dynamics of charismatic leadership can thus "provide opportunities for charismatic leaders to indulge the darker forces of their subconscious" (Wallis & Bruce, 1986, p.117).

One of the episodes of unaccountability in the history of Hope of Bangkok Church regards the excommunication of the few members of the church who had raised questions against the charismatic authority. A delegation was sent from the Waverley Christian chapel in Melbourne to confront Kriengsak on many of the unresolved issues
This kind of behavior is also found in other charismatic leaders. The firing of some staff members is also attested by some scholars. Charismatic leaders must continually be on the alert for threats to their authority from outsiders, dissidents, and rivals within the movement, as well as from their administrative staff. The latter is generally oriented toward expanding the scope of its authority and rationalizing administrative procedures to the detriment of the leader's freedom of action. As noted by Johnson (1992), leaders may opt to ignore this conflict, support institutionalization and the consequent shrinkage of their role, or act to resist staff encroachments. The latter strategy tends to maximize volatility, as the leader may engage in persistent "crisis-mongering" to keep the movement in constant turmoil such that stable institutional structures cannot be consolidated; hence, the leader's indispensability is underlined (Swatos & Kivisto, 1998, p. 79).

However, the presence of unaccountability during the active time in office time of a charismatic leader may create problems but not necessarily break up the institution. However, if the routinization of such charisma continues to exhibit the same patterns without adapting to bureaucratic systems, the breakdown of such institution is possible. If the routinization of charisma is not effectively implemented, the factions may rise up. Thus, failure to effectively institutionalize the charisma of the founding prophet led to intensifying factionalism and ultimately to lethal violence such as in the case of the Hare Krishna movement (Rochford 1985; Huber and Gruson 1987).

Through the above analysis, it can be said that the factor of unaccountability, which was present in the charismatic leader, did create problems during his active role at the church, but such problems were easily controlled because of the charismatic leader's
great influence. However, there seems a warning and lesson for such charismatic leaders. During the process of routinization such negative features of the church system should have been rectified before the transference of his authority to successors. However, it seems that the system was left untouched and unaccountability reigned freely in the functioning of the church. In the absence of charismatic leadership and the presence of successors that operate within a failed system it becomes easy to see the answer to our question of why there was not a smooth transition into other types of leadership – there simply is no opportunity. Thus, the church members split into factions and the disintegration of the church was predicated on the failure of routinization and the failure to adapt to a rationalized legal and bureaucratic system.

4.4.2. The Faith and Disintegration of the Church

Relevant to the problem of unaccountability is the problem related to the basic elements of faith. It has been claimed that the basic faith of the church was distorted during the gatherings to encourage the support and political ambitions of the founder. The political campaigning for governorship of Bangkok was conducted at the expense of the faith of the congregation and was in contradiction to the sacredly held principles of the church. It was reported that the persons working on the political campaign had delivered lectures in which they expressly justified idol worship, non-Christian religious activities, and had participated in funeral rituals, which apparently stand in offence to the sacredly held church ideals. This misrepresentation was necessary in achieving the political aspirations of the founder.
From the Weberian point of view, the matter of charisma is a matter of faith. The relationship that exists between the charismatic leader and his followers is actually based on the faith, which is in turn reserved for the charismatic leader. It is important here to make a distinction between types of charismatic authority. The charismatic leader who is the subject of this research is a person who lives with a tradition. He is charismatic in many ways as far as the birth of the movement is concerned. Conversely, he is living within a tradition, which is based on Christianity. There is a difference between the pure personal charisma of prophets, sages and priests, and other representatives of institutionalized charisma. In one aspect, or type, the authority they wield is not controlled by fixed codes and customs and there is a tendency to resist institutional influences. In this case, "Charisma, then, represents the extraordinary, the non-routine aspects of life and reality" (Hamilton, 1995, p.142). Moreover, "personal charismatic leaders such as sages and prophets communicate normative messages for which they are the primary authors" (Bird, 1993, p.76). Whereas, priests and other representatives of institutionalized charisma are generally associated with orthodox spiritual and normative ideas derived from existing traditions.

The above analysis shows that there are two types of charismatic leaders. One type may appear revolutionary in terms of their mission and view, for example: prophets and sages such as Jesus. The other type of charismatic authority are those who live within a tradition and are charismatic by succession, or are originally charismatic but in matters of faith are linked to a defined tradition. This can be seen in the life of pastors and early disciples of Jesus. This can also be seen in the tradition of Popes in Catholicism. The disciples of Jesus were charismatic but in terms of faith, they adhered to the tenets of
their faith. They were all Christians sharing a system of belief. The authenticity of Jesus’ disciples was based not on the ability to perform miracles or the wonderment of His divine spirituality, but also on the connected and intimate relationship that they shared. A leader that possesses only the miraculous without the substance of faith would not be accepted within the Christian tradition as charismatic, but most probably as a heretic. We can see this clearly in the catholic tradition where a saint is declared in terms of not only possessing a divine gift but also having an accepted Christian faith.

In the light of the above, the case of the Bangkok Hope Church became the type which was founded by a charismatic leader and run by a charismatic authority and bound by the traditions of Christianity. The events in Hope of Bangkok Church, which are related to matters of belief and faith, alienated followers and contributed to the disintegration of the church. It seems apparent that the church leaders had deviated from their main message. This kind of change in terms of an institution is not entirely new. Such is the case example of the Seventh-day Adventist Church (SDA). In this case a very well established organization remained committed to an apocalyptic prophecy while simultaneously becoming more accommodative in its practical stance to the larger society. Internal adjustments to doctrine can create a climate were schisms may develop whereby aspiring charismatic leaders develop their own movements based upon revisions of the original prophecy. These are often linked to their claim of a prophetic or messianic calling. Such groups are also prone to schisms and conflicts between rival prophets (Swatos & Kivisto, 1998, p.79). The notorious David Koresh (née Vernon Howell) rose to the leadership of the Branch Davidians, which was an offshoot of an earlier Davidian schism of the SDA Church (Bromley and Silver 1995, Pitts 1995). Koresh “identified
himself as the Lord's anointed and saw the standoff at Waco as the literal fulfillment of an intensifying campaign by demonic earthly rulers to destroy the righteous remnant” (Boyer, 1993, p. 30). In the same manner, the Hope of Bangkok Church disintegrated because of the change in their mission and message, which created a schism among the followers. Ultimately, the followers divided into many groups and established their own churches.

Bangkok Hope Churches’ deviation from the original message thus contributed to the disintegration of the church. Secondly, this change of message and the accommodation of those changes were not for the benefit of the church but for the leader’s personal political aspirations. In light of the above analysis it can be said that distortion of the faith contributed to the disintegration of the church.

4.4.3. Psychological Makeup and Behavior of Followers

The charismatic leadership requires routinization also with regard to the immediate followers. These needs include their economical well being and psychological satisfaction. The main purpose of routinization of charisma is, according to Weber’s thought, to stabilize and satisfy the psychological and material needs of the followers. Weber gives the two main motives which lead to this transformation: (a) The ideal and also the material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community (b) The stronger ideal and material interests of the members of the administrative staff, including the disciples or other followers of the charismatic leader (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.54). Weber also refers to the importance of economical factors if charisma is to be transformed into a permanent routine structure.
Charisma in such a case must be adapted to some form of fiscal organization for the economical needs of the group. When a charismatic movement is routinized, the 'laity' becomes differentiated from the 'clergy'; therefore, the officials are differentiated from the 'tax payers' (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, p.60). As discussed by many researchers, including Weber, Charismatic Leadership features one major negative aspect, which is that there is usually no plan for a successor. Even in cases when a successor is nominated, a split in the organization sometimes ensues leaving the discipleship confused in the ensuing chaos. This is not a minor problem. Charismatic leaders spend a great amount of time and energy changing a culture. Many times the culture reverses after the leader departs, often destroying any progress that may have been accomplished. Laura Desfor Edles and Scott Appelrouth, while interpreting Weber stated that after the routinization, "Only the members of the small group of enthusiastic disciples and followers are prepared to devote their lives purely idealistically to their call. The great majority of disciples and followers will in the long run "make their living" out of their 'calling" in a material sense as well. Indeed, this must be the case if the movement is not to disintegrate (Edles & Appelrouth, 2005, p. 209).

In light of the above lines of thought, the disintegration of Hope of Bangkok Church paints a picture of dissatisfied followers. The splitting of the church shows that the routinization process failed to provide the proper psychological and economical support to the followers. It is possible that only the selected persons were given the administrative duties and other influential members were not considered. Some of these have now opened their own churches. An additional consequence to the lack of institutional support for charismatic leadership involves the absence of regulated
procedures for the transfer of authority, that is, the problem of *succession*. Thus, failure to effectively institutionalize the charisma of the founding prophet led to intensifying factionalism and ultimately to lethal violence as was the case concerning the Hare Krishna movement (Rochford, 1985; Huber and Gruson, 1987).

In the light of the above analysis, it seems adequate to conclude that we have answered another key question, that of the psychological effects of the charismatic leader on his followers. There is no doubt that the follows felt disaffected and disenfranchised, thus the routinization of charismatic authority of Hope of Bangkok Church lacked the means to retain the influential members of the administrative staff, and therefore the church disintegrated.

4.4.4. Political Goals of the Leader, Self Promotion: Leader’s Responsibility

The case of Hope of Bangkok Church shows that after Kriengsak departed his role as leader, and naming his brother in law the active pastor of the church, he then set his sights on politics. There are accusations that his political ambitions took advantage of the church finances and resources. Mrs. Rubina Suwannapong in the beginning of her report gives the following statements and supports it with many details in the rest of the document:

There are rumors that destroy the reputation of Hope Church and Hope of Thai People Foundation. Thing started when some top leaders in church used their authority to command church members to support the election or Mr. Kriangsak Chareonwongsak in the unrighteous way, which are:

1. Ask the amount of CT leaders in church to represent KC by giving the wreaths at the temples at 50 districts around BKK even though they don’t know anyone there. Also, they were asked to light the joss stick and worship idols in those funerals. This is to prevent outsiders to know that they are CT and also to gain votes for KC. They make CT do wrong against God.
2. Ask the staff of the foundation to secretly withdraw money (offering for church building) to use for KC's election campaign.

3. Try to force the Chairman of the foundation to do illegal actions e.g. money laundering, using money for other purposes (not what people give for) which will make the foundation be shut down.

4. Set targets for each RL (Regional Leaders) to get money from their members whether rich or poor by different methods e.g. arranging the dinner talk and selling tickets to get money to fund KC's political activities.

5. Set targets for members which mostly are females, students, and ordinary people to distribute his campaign paper; 1,000 copies (2 reams) / person/ day. They have to go to every streets and soi around 50 districts for the period of 9 months and without any financial support.

6. Use their authority as the top leaders in Hope to demote lower level leaders as a threat to get money from those leaders in daughter churches (Thailand) or ask them to get money from their members to fund the election campaign. 
7. Use their authority in commanding members to transfer their names in the house registration in the provinces into the election district in BKK.

For the same purpose of helping his election campaign, the allegation was also made that the followers compromised their faith and belief system by participating in activities that were not Christian. These could be easily treated as acts of self-promotion.

Understanding the aforementioned, the research on charismatic leadership differentiates between positive and negative charismatic authority consistent with research that suggests a charismatic leader can have both positive and negative attributes. Jay Alden Conger, Rabindra Nath Kanungo, state this difference as follows:

"As Musser (1987) has suggested, we might even classify charismatic leaders as positive or negative by their orientation toward satisfying their own needs versus those of their followers. For example, negative charismatics presumably emphasize a devotion to themselves over their mission...Positive charismatic leaders, on the other hand, are more likely to emphasize the mission rather than themselves and to seek internalization over personal identification" (Conger & Kanungo, 1998, p. 212).
They also argue, “Charismatic leaders can be prone to extreme narcissism that leads them to promote highly self-serving and grandiose aims. As a result, the leader’s behavior’s can become exaggerated, lose touch with reality, or become vehicles for pure personal gain” (Conger & Kanungo, 1998, p.211). They further conclude by referring to Howell and House (1993: House and Howell, 1992) have termed negative charismatic leaders as personalized leaders that exhibit characteristics which promote leadership and behavior that is largely self-serving. Such leaders govern in a totalitarian manner; discourage questioning of their decisions, advocate goals that largely benefit themselves, with a disregard for legitimate institutional channels. There also exists a climate of punishment and rewards, which is designed to motivate the members. They prefer to foster dependence and unquestioned obedience from their followers over independent thinking (Conger & Kanungo, 1998, p.212).

Therefore, in light of the above analysis, the charismatic leader of Bangkok Hope Church should be held to account and share in the of responsibility for the disintegration. The church in fact experienced it’s the actual disintegration after the leader had officially left the church. The infighting and conflicts of various factions, which developed during his tenure in the church, did not catch his immediate attention. The charismatic leader openly severed his ties with the institution and seemed to, in effect; cleanse his life of the connection. Indeed, his personal profiles and biographic notes contain no traces of his former links with the church - it seems that he has disappeared from the scene.

Therefore, it seems plausible that the best answer to our question of how to bring the situation under control and avoid the spit is to conclude that the charismatic
leader would have to give up his personal promotional ambitions and stay vested within the church. Supposedly, if he had made more of an effort to keep the church intact the unsettled matters would have been solved. Since the church is a religious institution, and in the religious creed, matters could have been rectified in the spirit of forgiveness and grace.

4.4.5. Failure of proper routinization

On Weber's understanding, the characteristics of a charismatic authority are of some value in relation its role in producing change. In Weber's formulation, Charismatic authority is itself limited to very short span of time. Weber states that 'Indeed, in its pure form charismatic authority may be said to exist only in the process of originating. It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination of both' (Weber, 1968, p. 54). The volatility of charismatic authority and of groups manifesting charismatic leadership has been a persistent theme (Johnson, 1979, Robbins and Anthony, 1995, Wallis 1984, Wallis and Bruce, 1986). In essence, charismatic leadership is unstable because it lacks both institutional restraints and institutional supports (Robbins and Anthony, 1995).

Weber claims that routinization itself would not solve the problem; he states:

"The process of routinization is thus not by any means confined to the problem of succession and does not stop when this has been solved. On the contrary, the most fundamental problem is that of making a transition from a charismatic administrative staff, and the corresponding principles of administration, to one which is adapted to everyday condition (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, 371).

Weber further states that the biggest challenge is for the charismatic administrative staff to transition to a bureaucratic and rational administration (Weber & Eisenstadt, 1968, pp. 370-371).
In the case of Hope of Bangkok Church, it seems that though the succession had taken place, the routinization had in fact failed. This can be seen throughout the report, which was issued by Mrs. Rubina Suwannapong. For example, regarding the financial system of the church, the following passages depict how the system failed to comply with rational and bureaucratic ways:

I, as the chairman of the foundation, has investigated all above mentioned facts and think that according to the Bible, every leader in the church is only the steward of God not the owner of the money or property. Therefore (s) he must be faithful in the duty and fear the Lord. Money or whatever must be used in the right way and can be investigated for the sake of God and His kingdom. However, some leaders in Hope, whom their names are mentioned above, acted as they are the owner of that money or property. They use the resources the ways they want, cover or hide something, being dishonest, not being transparent only for the benefit and fame of KC. Their behaviors can be considered as deceit to the church members who give their money to the church. They are liars and deceitful as they brought church money to support KC in his political activities, knowing that KC does not live a CT life anymore, does not work for God and live in unrighteousness and dishonesty. In this investigation, the chairman found that the financial system that has been followed since the beginning has a leak that allows some church leaders to keep or take offering money for their own use or to give to others and it could not be found by the financial officers. Though the receipt of money was recorded and no fault could be found on the documents, still the money leaks out with no one could know.

The above passages from the report indicates that though routinization had taken place, the administration was still struggling with the charismatic leader's ideas. Therefore, this difficulty contributed significantly in the disintegration of the church. As such, in answer to our final research question as to the problems of routinization, we see an administrative failure to transit to a bureaucratic and rational system. How much is the leader accountable? It can be argued that he is entirely responsible as only a person in his position, and with his qualities, could, when used for the express purpose of such a transition, indeed make that endeavor successful.
4.5. Conclusion

The chapter took an analytical and critical study of the charismatic authority of Bangkok Hope Church and analyzed the hypotheses of its disintegration. The chapter first examined the present status of the church, which clearly indicated that the church disintegrated after Dr. Kriengsak, terminated his role and appointed his brother in law as the active pastor. The disintegration continuously segregated the church into increasing number of sects. The main parts of the chapter discussed the hypotheses for the disintegration in the light of Weber’s thought and its critical studies on charismatic authorities and institutions.

First, it was established that Kriengsak and his leadership were indeed truly charismatic, as their nature and features comply with Weber’s description of charismatic authority. There are reasons to support Kriengsak’s emergence as charismatic due in part to the stagnation of Protestantism in the Kingdom. Although Protestants have enjoyed a history in the country, their numbers and spiritual reach remained somewhat limited. On the contrary, with the emergence of Kriengsak, Hope of Bangkok Church had managed to multiply the number of adherents and churches, not only in Thailand but overseas as well. Kriengsak’s charismatic leadership also becomes justified on Conger and Kanungo’s understanding of charismatic leadership who hold the view that charismatic leaders emerge as a response to dissatisfaction of the status quo and the working systems of institutions. Kriengsak’s leadership style also complies with various other characteristics of charismatic authority as stipulated by Weber and others. These characteristics include both positive and negative aspects. His personal commitment, success, obedience and dedication from his followers are positive charismatic qualities. His unaccountability
during his time in office is also a charismatic quality, because according to Weber and others, unaccountability is one of the main characteristics of charismatic leadership because charismatic authority differs from bureaucratic and legal and rational authorities. However, the negative characteristics such as self-promotion over institutional mission and clarity of church goals were also found, which are of a charismatic nature as well.

Secondly, the chapter studied the hypotheses, and the closely related research questions, in light of Weber’s thought and that of other scholars who have contributed to the field of organizational behavior and leadership with references to popular cases of charismatic leaders or institutions. The researcher considered five hypotheses as reasons for the disintegration and by analysis found that all of the hypotheses that have contributed in different degrees to the disintegration of the church. These five hypotheses are: (1) unaccountability in the charismatic leader and in the succeeding administration, (2) change in creed and mission of the church, (3) psychological makeup and behavior of followers, (4) self promotion and goals of the leader and his personal responsibility, and (5) failure of proper routinization.

The first hypothesis maintained that unaccountability in a charismatic leader and in the succeeding administration contributed enormously to the disintegration of the church. In the case of Hope of Bangkok Church, the problem of unaccountability appears during the time in office of the charismatic leader and was then effectively transferred to the succeeding authority of the church. These aspects contributed to the disintegration of the church.

The second hypothesis, which contributed to the disintegration of the church, was because of the change in creed and mission of the church. One of the reasons, which
alienated some of the church members, was because the basic faith of the church being distorted during the gatherings in order to encourage support for the election of the founder as the candidate for the governorship of Bangkok. The Hope of Bangkok Church disintegrated because the change in the main message and view created a schism among the followers and ultimately the followers divided into many groups and established their own churches.

The third hypothesis is that psychological makeup and behavior of followers contributed to the disintegration of the church. The splitting of the church shows that the routinization process failed to provide the proper psychological and economical support to the followers. It is possible that only the selected persons were given the administrative duties and other influential members were not considered. Some of these members have now opened their own churches. In the light of the above analysis, it seems adequate to conclude that routinization of charismatic authority of Bangkok Hope Church failed to control or utilize the influential members of the administrative staff and therefore the church disintegrated.

The fourth hypothesis concerns the self-promotion and personal goals of the charismatic leader, which also bears responsibility in terms of his contribution to the disintegration of the church. In terms of Kriengsak’s political ambitions, he allegedly abused the human and financial resources of the church for his own personal gain. Allegations also claimed that the followers compromise their faith and belief systems by participating into activities not based on their Christian faith. These acts could be easily seen as acts of self-promotion. Therefore, it seems plausible to conclude that the
charismatic leader’s personal ambitions, contributed enormously in the disintegration of the church.

The fifth hypothesis concerns the failure of proper routinization. In the case of Hope of Bangkok Church, it seems that though the succession had taken place, the routinization had in fact failed. This was a staff failure to transit to a bureaucratic and rational administration. The lack of accountability in terms of church administration and financial matters shows that the church administration lacked the proper means of control. The result was a division into two groups: one that was alienated and disappointed and one that was blindly faithful to the charismatic leader and accepting of his irrational and self-promotional goals. Therefore, the inability to avoid the segregation of the church community and its subsequent factions clearly show that the failure of routinization contributed heavily in the disintegration of the church.
CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

The research has accomplished its stages of description, analysis, and criticism based on study of the charismatic leadership of Hope of Bangkok Church, in the light and scope of Max Weber's theory of charismatic authority. Therefore, this final and concluding chapter will summarize the overall findings of the research and the researcher's main findings, which support the thesis statement. The thesis statement states that Hope of Bangkok Church was established based on charisma. However, due to internal economic and political crisis, charisma fails to help the church survive. In addition, the need for further research and recommendations is documented in the end of the chapter.

The Hope of Bangkok Church was initially found in 1981, its founder and leader was Dr. Kriengsak Chareonwongsak. It was a Thai Christian Church, registered according to Thai Law as a non-political, voluntary, non-profit organization called the "Hope of Thai People Foundation". In short, the church disintegrated in 2008 and split up into factions with continuous segregation into other parts. The researcher, as mentioned in the first chapter, has been one of the community members of the church and is where the inspiration lies for conducting this research. The researcher assumed in the beginning of the research that the disintegration of the church came about because of the various interconnected factors, such as the negative side of the charismatic leadership and the failure of routinization. The preceding research was spread into four chapters. The researcher will summarize the main elements of the first three chapters with fewer details.
The researcher will then summarize the fourth chapter with brief and important details, which are essential in supporting the thesis statement and the supporting hypothesis of the thesis statement.

The first chapter, which is introductory, outlined the essential information and important aspects of the research that followed. In brief, it singled out the subject of the research concerning the charismatic leadership of Hope of Bangkok Church in the light and scope of Max Weber's theory of charismatic authority. Therefore, in brief, the subject of the research signifies that the main contents of the research concern the history of the Hope of Bangkok Church from its initiation to its disintegration. The leadership role of the founder of the church and the framework of charismatic leadership as based upon Weber's thought. The analysis and the criticism of the hypothesis is in accordance with Weber's thought and other researches who have built up on Weber's ideas. These components of the research were laid out clearly in the following chapters, therefore to summarize the first chapter; the researcher deems it necessary to reiterate the thesis statement, hypothesis, and the main objectives of the research.

The thesis statement states that Hope of Bangkok Church was established based on charisma. However, due to internal economic and political crisis, charisma fails to help the church survive. To be exact, the thesis statement in essence maintains that the church was in fact resultant of charismatic leadership, and its disintegration is linked to the negative aspects of that leadership, including the failure in routinization, and the compromised through political aspects and various financial matters. However, there are other minor contributing factors as well. The research of the subject needed to be limited with certain questions, which were delineated in the beginning. The research question
focused on the Hope of Bangkok Church and its founder. The questions that arose were:

(1) Charismatic character of its founder, did his charisma cease during his tenure at the church? (2) What reasons were behind not allowing church leadership to make a smooth transition to other types of leadership? (3) What are the psychological effects of the charismatic leader on his followers? (4) What could have been the best course in this case to bring the situation under control and to avoid the community split? (5) What were the problems in routinizing the charisma, and to what extent is the charismatic leader himself responsible for its failure?

The second chapter of the research took the essential view of Max Weber’s thought on the charismatic authority. Max Weber’s thought includes his special interest in organizational behavior, leadership theories, and three types of legitimate authority. Weber outlines three major types of legitimate domination: traditional, charismatic, and legal or rational. Weber is acclaimed for introducing charisma in social and political theory and gives considerable details regarding such charismatic authority in his many works. Weber describes traditional authority as resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them. He describes legal or rational authority as resting on a belief in the 'legality' of patterns of normative rules and rights of those elevated to authority under such rules, whereas, he defines charismatic authority as an authority resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity. It also rests upon elements of heroism, exemplary character, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him. Weber describes the relevant details of the charismatic authority. The most important
features related to charismatic authority are meaning, definition, recognition, cessation, and routinization of charismatic authority.

Weber defines the term charisma as a characteristic of an individual, which is applicable to certain extraordinary qualities considered as divine or exemplary which makes the possessor of that quality a leader. This divine view is explored further in this chapter as a brief, but important, departure from Weber is conducted by researching the biblical use of the term charisma. Returning then to Weber’s account of the charismatic quality of an individual as a matter of character in addition to the extent that the person is perceived and regarded. The legitimacy of charisma depends on the presence of personal charisma and recognition of such quality by the followers. Weber discusses the problems related to charismatic authority, which he sees as prone to cessation and instability - if the charismatic authority remains unsuccessful and fails to benefit the followers the authority will disappear. Weber also states that Charisma is genuinely anti-traditional and anti-rational force. In its height, charismatic followers of the prophet are subject to anti-economic forces of charisma. Yet as soon as their work is complete, the original charisma is replaced by the rule of everyday life. Here the process of routinization of charisma has set in.

Routinization of charisma essentially has one cause: the desire to transform charisma from a unique gift of extraordinary time and personality into a permanent possession of everyday life. Routinization occurs when charisma is institutionalized. Weber considers the greatest obstacle for a charismatic administrative staff is to transform to a bureaucratic and rational administration. For the desire to transform charisma into a lasting good, the first basic problem is to find a successor to the
charismatic prophet. Weber states that charisma cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized or a combination of both and gives the two main motives that lead to this transformation: (a) The ideal and the material interests of the followers in the continuation and the continual reactivation of the community and (b) the strong ideals and stronger material interests of the members of the administrative staff, and the disciples in continuing their relationship. Weber also refers to the conflicts, which may hinder the process of routinization. In short, Weber states that revolutions under a charismatic leader, directed against hereditary charismatic powers or the powers of office, are to be found in all types of corporate groups, from states to trade unions. Weber generally offers three ways for successful routinization. First, Charisma can be transferred by succession such as through heredity. In this context it becomes traditionalized. Secondly, charisma can be personally acquired - transformed from a state that only few individuals can achieve through their genuine endowment into a goal that many can reach through unidentifiable means. Thirdly, charisma can be attached to the incumbent of an office or to an institutional structure. Here charisma becomes part of an established social "institution", which Weber defines as permanent structures with established tradition. Institutions of church consist of (1) established system of hierarchal office with specific duties and rights, (2) rationalized dogma with the sacred canon, and (3) sophisticated sacraments and corporate grace. Therefore, routinization of charisma has three directions: traditionalization (hereditary charisma), rationalization (virtuoso charisma), and the combination of both (office charisma).

Chapter three investigated the role of charisma in the formation of the church. The chapter explored the historical study of charismatic movement in the church and the
significance of the movement with regard to its administration. In addition, the arrival of the charismatic movement in Thailand is also included. The main issue is development of Hope of Bangkok church as well as the history, establishment, founders, leadership model, and its crisis.

The history of Hope of Bangkok Church is related to the history of Christianity in Thailand. The arrival of Pentecostals and charismatics in Thailand has a long history, dating back to 1828. In short, the influence of the Charismatic movement began affecting Christians in Thailand beginning from the 1970s and continuing to the present time. The largest charismatic church in Thailand came to be known as The Hope of Bangkok Church. It is the largest Pentecostal and Charismatic church in the country and the only significant church founded by a Thai.

Kriengsak Chareonwongsak (born September 9, 1955), was a convert who studied overseas and participated in many church activities. He is regarded as the founder and charismatic leader of Hope of Bangkok Church. After his return from overseas in 1981 Kriengsak began the gradual process of establishing what came to be known as Hope of Bangkok Church. Church history indicates that the church was required to continually re­locate in response to increasing numbers of membership, by 2001, the church had successfully established over three hundred churches in Thailand and overseas.

The most crucial and important aspect related to the development of Hope of Bangkok Church was the leadership role mandated by its founder. Kriengsak was a visionary and extraordinary leader and many aspects of his leaderships indicate that he started from scratch and in a very short time made tremendous progress. His charismatic character is evident in both of these aspects. On Weber’s formulation, a charismatic
leadership is born against tradition and in needy times. These elements are present in Kriengsak, as he appears at time when Protestant presence was limited in Thailand in spite of their long history in the kingdom. Secondly, he approached and operated in a very different manner to the standard traditional organizational and operational systems of the Protestant churches in Thailand. His charismatic gift, on Weber’s formulations, also shows that he was original in his thinking and ambitious to the changes he sought. His followers, for his commitment and sacrifice for the mission of the church, held him in high esteem. The key to the initial and explosive growth of the Hope of Bangkok church was the result of Dr Kriengsak's leadership. He was a man who had a powerful and converting spiritual experience and possessed the necessary qualities of an effective leader. Because of the deep respect he commanded he was able to muster large numbers of people and direct them in a unified way toward his vision. He was very influential not only with Thai people but also with many foreigners who were impressed with his character and his leadership. He was an exceptional individual who displayed qualities that are very rare in the Thai Christian church. Although his strong leadership style caused friction and conflicts with other churches, he was able to expand his church very quickly. The other side of Kriengsak's leadership indicates that along with the positive elements of his personality, there were also negative elements, which took its eventual toll on the entire institution. The problems were of moral, managerial, political and financial in nature. The issue of accountability or the lack thereof and the leader’s political involvement were the most detrimental. This became abundantly clearer after he had departed his role as the charismatic leader.
In the year 2008, the organizational and managerial crisis of the church created a split in the church community and its working management. Instead of single church with a large united community, there were now five churches with small divided communities. The church community itself split into six major factions. They are as follows, Mrs. Rubina Suwannapong Foundation church, Nimit Panich church (UCC), Phitsanunart-Sunee church (Indra church), Piyaweij church, HGI International Hope church, and Nexus church.

Rubina Suwannapong is controlling the current location of the church known as Foundation church. Nimit Panich is running UCC church or The United Church of Commandment, conducting services at Thai CC Tower, Sathron. Phitsanunart-Sunee Srithawong’s church conducts services at Indra Regent Hotel, Pratunam. Tanon and his team are running Nexus church at Samyan. Piyaweij church resides at Piyaweij hospital with leadership from Central Group’s CEO Kobchai Chirathiwat. HGI International Hope churches, formerly Inter church are predominately located outside of Thailand. This organization still has newly opened branches in Thailand and is known as the HGI Group, under the leadership of Simon Eng.

The fourth chapter was an analytical and critical study of the charismatic authority of Bangkok Hope Church and analysis of hypotheses for its disintegration. The chapter first examined the present status of the church. The present status indicated the church disintegrated after Dr. Kriengsak had terminated his once active role and appointed his brother in law as pastor. From that point, the disintegration continuously segregated the church into an increasing number of divided sects. The main parts of the chapter discussed the hypotheses for the disintegration in the light of Weber’s thought and its
critical studies, which were conducted through the careful study of many charismatic authorities and institutions.

First, it was shown that Kriengsak and his leadership were truly charismatic, as their nature and features comply with Weber’s description of charismatic authority and other supporting research of the same nature. According to Weber, charismatic leaders are likely to emerge during times of instability, crisis, and turmoil. Such events increase the feeling among people of helplessness, agitation, anxiety, and frustration. Though this might not fit Kriengsak’s charismatic leadership, there are reasons to support Kriengsak’s emergence as charismatic as due in part to the stagnation of Protestantism in the Kingdom. Although Protestants has enjoyed a history in the country, their numbers and spiritual reach remained somewhat limited. On the contrary, with the emergence of Kriengsak, Hope of Bangkok Church had managed to multiply the number of adherents and churches, not only in Thailand but overseas as well. Kriengsak’s charismatic leadership also becomes justified on Conger and Kanungo’s understanding of charismatic leadership who hold the view that charismatic leaders emerge as a response to dissatisfaction of the status quo and the working systems of institutions. Kriengsak’s leadership style also complies with various other characteristics of charismatic authority as stipulated by Weber and others. These characteristics include both positive and negative aspects. His personal commitment, success, obedience and dedication from his followers, are positive charismatic qualities. His unaccountability during his time in office is also a charismatic quality, because according to Weber and others, unaccountability is one of the main characteristics of charismatic leadership because charismatic authority which differs from bureaucratic and legal and rational authorities.
However, the negative characteristics such as self-promotion over institutional mission, lack of clarity in church goals, political ambitions, and compromising church creed were also found. Comprehensively speaking, the leadership style of Kriengsak as a charismatic leader is abundantly justified

Secondly, the chapter studied the hypotheses and analyzed the hypotheses in light of Weber’s thought and that of other scholars who have contributed to the field of organizational behavior and leadership with references to popular cases of charismatic leaders or institutions. The researcher considered five hypotheses as reasons for the disintegration and by analysis found that all of these hypotheses have contributed in different degrees to the disintegration of the church. These five hypotheses are: (1) unaccountability in the charismatic leader and in the succeeding administration, (2) changes in creed and mission of the church, (3) psychological makeup and behavior of followers, (4) self-promotional goals of the leader and his personal responsibility, and (5) failure of proper routinization. The researcher analyzed these hypotheses in the order that follows.

The first hypothesis supported that unaccountability in the charismatic leader and in the succeeding administration, which contributed enormously to the disintegration of the church. In the case of Hope of Bangkok Church, the issues of unaccountability appeared during the charismatic leader’s time in office. These same issues were then transferred to the succeeding authority of the church. Unaccountability, on Weber’s formulation is seen as one of the chief characteristics of a charismatic leader because a charismatic leader is not controlled by any institutional means. Eileen Barker and other
scholars have also shown such characteristics as integral elements of a charismatic authority. This unaccountability appears in Kriengsak’s leadership style based on his reluctance to respond to or answer questions relating to his leadership and church activities. Furthermore, his willingness to excommunicate, as well as the mysterious financial workings of the church also supports this hypothesis. Weber’s understanding of Charismatic leadership seems sharply antithetical to bureaucratic authority, as it strives to operate above the everyday administrative routines. Weber has stated, a 'routinization of charisma is indispensable in giving birth to new traditions and new institutions endowed with 'charisma of office', if it is to prevail over time. Unaccountability, which directly contributed to the disintegration of the church, is that of an administrative staff who were in charge after the succession and routinization. It appears that the staff could not adapt to the bureaucratic and rational legal administrative style. As Balc stated, if accountability is not structured while routinizing the charisma there is an increase in the possibilities of corruption. The absence of routinized structures of accountability fosters corruption in charismatically led "cults". This becomes more visible in the case of Hope of Bangkok Church where many allegations of corruption and misuse of funds were made after the succession had taken place. Among these claims are that church funds and resources were diverted to serve the political ambitions of the charismatic leader. Therefore, the unaccountability of the post succession staff contributed to the disintegration and factionalism. The same had occurred according to Rochfor, Huber, and Gruson in the Hare Krishna movement, wherein the failure to effectively institutionalize the charisma of the founding prophet led to intensifying factionalism and ultimately to lethal violence. In the above analysis, it can be said that the factor of unaccountability, which was present
in the charismatic leader, did create real problems during his active role at the church, but such problems were easily controlled because the charismatic leader had greater influence. However, there seems a warning and a lesson for such charismatic leaders. During routinization, the negative features of the system could have easily been rectified during the transference of power to the successors. However, it seems that the system was left untouched and subsequently unaccountability continued to reign over the functioning of the church. With the absence of a charismatic leader and the presence of successors without a proper system, this created a climate for members to split into factions. Therefore, the disintegration of the church was because of failure of the routinization and failure to adapt to a rationalized legal and bureaucratic system.

The second hypothesis, which contributed to the disintegration of the church was due to the change in creed and the mission of the church. One reason in particular, which alienated members, was the distortion of the basic tenants of faith. This distortion was seen as a deliberate attempt to garner political support for founder’s campaign for the governorship of Bangkok. The political campaigning was conducted at the expense of the faith of the congregation and in contradiction to the sacredly held principles of the church. From the Weberian point of view, Charisma in essence, is a matter of faith. The relationship that exists between the charismatic leader and his followers is actually based on faith. However, there is a difference between the pure personal charisma of prophets and sages and priests and other representatives of institutionalized charisma. For the first type, their authority is not controlled by fixed codes and customs and they resist institutional influences. Moreover, as Bird has stated, personal charismatic leaders, such as sages and prophets, communicate normative messages for which they are the primary
authors. Whereas, the second type such as priests and other representatives of institutionalized charisma are generally associated with received spiritual and normative ideas derived from existing traditions. In the light of the above, the case of the Hope of Bangkok Church can be categorized as the second type. The events surrounding Hope of Bangkok Church, which is of course related to matters of belief and faith, alienated followers and contributed to the disintegration of the church. It seems that the church leaders had deviated from its main message. This change in views and adverse affects upon an administration is not necessarily new. This can be witnessed in other case studies of charismatic leadership, such as the Seventh-day Adventist Church (SDA). The SDA remains committed to apocalyptic prophecy while simultaneously becoming more accommodative in its practical stance to the larger society. As such, schisms may develop whereby aspiring charismatic leaders develop their own movements based upon revisions of the original prophecy and linked to their claimed prophetic or messianic role. Such groups are also prone to schisms and conflicts between rival prophets. In the same manner, the Hope of Bangkok Church disintegrated because of the change in the main message or mission, which created a schism and ultimately created the division and subsequent establishment of other churches.

The third hypothesis concerns the psychological makeup and behavior of followers as a contributing factor leading to the disintegration. The charismatic leadership requires routinization administratively but also with regard to the immediate followers. These needs include their economical well being and psychological satisfaction. The main purpose of routinization of charisma is, according to Weber's thought, to stabilize and satisfy the psychological and material needs of the followers. Weber also refers to the
economical factor if charisma is to be transformed into a permanent routine structure. Charisma in such a case must be adapted to some form of fiscal organization for the economical needs of the group. However, researches show that charismatic leaders spend a great amount of time and energy changing or shaping a culture. Many times the culture reverses itself after the leader leaves, which can destroy any previous growth or progress. Laura Desfor Edles and Scott Appelrouth, in their interpretation of Weber, stated that after the routinization only the members of the small group of enthusiastic disciples and followers are prepared to devote their lives purely idealistically to their call. The great majority of disciples and followers will in the long run "make their living" out of their 'calling" in a material sense as well. Indeed, this must be the case if the movement is not to disintegrate. In light of the above lines of thought, it seems that the disintegration of Hope of Bangkok Church paints a picture of dissatisfaction among followers. The splitting of the church shows that the routinization process failed to provide the proper psychological and economical support to the followers. It is possible that only the selected persons were given the administrative duties and other influential members were not considered. In response, some of these members went on to create their own churches. In the light of the above analysis, it seems adequate to conclude that routinization of charismatic authority of Bangkok Hope Church lacked the means to retain influential staff members and therefore the church disintegrated.

The fourth hypothesis is that the self-promotional goals of the charismatic leader and his personal share of responsibility also contributed to the disintegration of the church. The case of Hope of Bangkok Church shows that after Kriengsak had left the church, and after naming his brother in law the active pastor of the church, he turned his
ambitions towards politics. This introduced yet another series of issues that rocked the establishment. It was alleged that the leader took advantage of human and financial resources for personal and political gain. In addition, and for the same purpose of supporting his election campaign, the allegation was made that followers compromised their faith by participating in activities that were seen as non-Christian. These acts could be easily treated as acts of self-promotion. The research indicates that a charismatic leader can be positive, negative and both. Musser has suggested we might even classify charismatic leaders as positive or negative by their orientation toward satisfying their own needs versus those of their followers. For example, negative charismatics presumably emphasize a devotion to themselves over their mission. Positive charismatic leaders, on the other hand, are more likely to emphasize the mission rather than themselves and seek internalization over personal identification. The research also shows that charismatic leaders can be prone to extreme narcissism that can lead to self-serving and grandiose aims. As a result, the leader's behavior can become exaggerated, out of touch with reality, or become simply a vehicle for personal gain. Howell and House have termed negative charismatic leaders as personalized leaders who exhibit characteristics that promote leadership behavior that is largely self-serving. Therefore, in light of the above analysis, the charismatic leader of Hope of Bangkok Church has a definite share in the responsibility for its disintegration. The church in fact experienced the disintegration after the leader had officially left the church. The conflicting factions and the rift, which grew, did not attract his immediate attention. Since the disintegration, Kriengsak has publicly severed his ties with the institution. His personal profiles and biographic notes remain void of any trace or his previous longstanding relationship with the church.
seems that he has disappeared completely from the scene. It is assumed by some that if he had made efforts to keep the church intact, the eventual disintegration would have been avoided. As is a religious institution, matters could have been rectified and the church put back on the correct course through the power of Christian forgiveness and grace. Therefore, in light of the above analysis, it seems plausible to conclude that the charismatic leader's personal and promotional ambitions contributed enormously to the disintegration of the church.

The fifth hypothesis concerns the failure of proper routinization. The failure of routinization contributed to the disintegration of the church. Weber states that indeed, in its pure form, charismatic authority may exist in the process of origination. It cannot remain stable, but becomes either traditionalized or rationalized, or a combination of both. Weber also states that the process of routinization is thus not by any means confined to the problem of succession and does not stop when this has been solved. On the contrary, the most fundamental problem is that of making a transition from a charismatic administrative staff, and the corresponding principles of administration, to one that is adapted to everyday conditions. Furthermore, he concludes that the greatest obstacle for charismatic administrative staff is the transition to a bureaucratic and rational administration. In the case of Hope of Bangkok Church, it seems that though the succession had taken place, the routinization had in fact failed. This failure is because the staff had failed to transition to a bureaucratic and rational administration. The staff and administration of Hope of Bangkok church were not transferred into a bureaucratic system. The issue of accountability, in terms of church administration and financial matters, indicates the administration lacked proper means of control. Because of this loss
of control the administration divided into two groups, basically one which was alienated and disappointed and the other was blindly faithful to the charismatic leader to the point of rationalizing his goals and accepting his distortion of church mission. Therefore, the inability to prevent the segregation of church community indicates very clearly that the failure of routinization was significant contributing factor in the disintegration.

The analysis of the abovementioned hypothesis demonstrates convincingly that the researcher is justified in the position that Hope of Bangkok Church was established based on charisma. However, due to internal economic and political crisis, charisma ultimately failed to maintain the longevity of the church. As the research indicated, the Hope of Bangkok church was established based on charisma and its founding leader proves to be a charismatic authority in accordance with Weber's understanding of a charismatic authority and of those various scholars who have contributed to the field. The hypothesis also strongly indicated that the failure was fundamentally connected to two main factors, political and economical. The abuse of church resources for personal and political ends created factions within the church. In addition, the subsequent issues related to the lack of financial transparency, management, spiritual matters of creed, and the essential objectives of the church mission. All of these elements played a consequential and deciding role in the eventual demise of the Hope of Bangkok Church.

Further Research and Recommendation

Further research in the field of charismatic leadership related to religious institutions is needed to discover ways of ensuring such leaderships remain effective and avoids the negative aspects of charismatic leadership. There is need of developing
mechanisms in charismatic institutions that can enable the institutions to avoid disintegration. Public awareness regarding charismatic authorities and the education of followers of such institutions is also required in order to encourage charismatic institutions to develop successful models of administration, which may reflect proper routinization.
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