

cases settled for \$7 million, the experience forced Stockman to come face to face with the “debt monster” he created with his leveraged buyout (LBO). As the scales of his own moral blindness fell from his eyes, Stockman was finally able to see the US economy as a gigantic limited buy-out operated for financial elites. In this governmentally sanctioned LBO, a massive amount of putative future wealth gets monetized in the form of dramatically accelerated capital gains and fraudulent asset acquisition (4, 519). In short, this wealth transfer system reflects a distortion of market integrity.

If David Stockman is right, the great deformation is really an insidious war waged against true justice and the productive middle class. As such, this trampling of the good ought to be opposed with all the courage and stamina people can muster—much the same way Americans took action following the 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor. Unfortunately, the insidious nature of financial war makes it difficult to defend against. In majoritarian politics, people must be able to comprehend a legalized larceny before they can effectively repel it. Happily, this thought-provoking book promises much help in understanding market morality.

—Timothy J. Barnett (e-mail: tbarnett@jsu.edu)
Jacksonville State University, Alabama

Management and the Gospel: Luke’s Radical Message for the First and Twenty-First Centuries

Bruno Dyck

New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2013 (302 pages)

Readers of this journal will already be familiar with the impressive body of management literature devoted to discovering and articulating a broader, more balanced view of the purpose of business and the practice of management. It is a pursuit that began in earnest during the latter half of the twentieth century—spurred certainly by global competitive forces but ultimately by the recognition that the claim that the purpose of business can be reduced to the maximization of shareholder wealth is a flimsy platform for the future of an institution so essential to human flourishing. For most of the past twenty years, Bruno Dyck, professor of management at the I.H. Asper School of Business at the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, has been a major contributor in this movement in an effort to arrive at what Gary Hamel refers to as “Management 2.0,” a qualitatively different approach to the theory and practice of management. In fact, management scholars such as Hamel, C. K. Prahalad, Peter Senge, and others have called for a wholesale reconstruction of the philosophical foundations of management, even noting the importance of drawing lessons from the field of theology. With *Management and the Gospel*, Professor Dyck offers us a comprehensive, carefully researched, and arguably paradigmatic shift in our grasp of what this “radical vision” of management might entail.

Dyck describes the aim of this text as both simple and profound: first, to return to the gospel of Luke and interpret it through a first-century management lens and, second, to

offer a radical (in the sense of “relating to the root”) account of what amounts to basic and fundamental aspects of Jesus’ teachings on the way to order life in community. Dyck’s carefully researched and articulated analysis of several important passages in Luke’s gospel, considered within the socioeconomic context of the first century, leads us to some unexpected conclusions about what Jesus is saying to us now.

The lynchpin of Dyck’s interpretation of the gospel account is one critical element of hermeneutical insight: that the usual translation of the word *oikos* as “household” obscures the reality that it was the household that constituted the basic organizational unit of first-century community and economic life; it represents the primary goods-and-service-producing organization in first-century Palestine. Thus the *oikos* as *organization* becomes the hermeneutical lens through which he views the three basic dimensions of first-century management: managing relationships *within* organizations (*oikonomia*); managing money (*chrematistics*); and managing relationships *between* organizations (benefactor vs. patron/client relationships).

When seen through this new interpretive device, the meaning of several important and difficult passages in Luke’s gospel is illuminated and, over the course of the book, a scriptural basis for Jesus’s teachings on “management” begins to emerge. First, to follow Jesus would require a new grasp of the relationships involved in the management of *oikonomia*: to see that men and women are equally important in the *oikos*, that its shortcomings must be continually overcome and its structures perfected, and that the proper model for managers to follow is one of servant leadership. Second, it would require a dramatic shift in the understanding and use of money, that is, recognition of the natural justice that undergirds sustenance economics in contrast to acquisitive economics and the unnatural and immoral use of money as a means to merely accumulate riches. Finally, it would call those with material wealth to imitate Jesus and God by serving, not as patrons who create relationships of dependency with “clients,” but as benefactors who freely share their wealth with the community in the service of the common good.

Dyck goes on to provide an account of three more explicitly theological themes that have long been identified as characteristic of Luke’s gospel—the kingdom of God, salvation, and the Holy Spirit—arguing that each of these themes have profound significance for locating what Luke says about management within its more cosmic context. Management is not merely a utilitarian function; it points beyond its capacity to produce goods and services to questions of ultimate meaning, as do all human endeavors. The wish for salvation and the intervention of the Holy Spirit manifest themselves in the *oikos* just as much as anywhere else. It is here that we face arguably the most important fact about first-century management: that it took place within a community that would have found the attempt to separate management activities from one’s relationship to God, spirituality, and religion inconceivable. Although Dyck does not fully exploit this point, he does describe a world in which human living reflects an integration foreign to contemporary Western culture—the idea that the religious is to be relegated to a private realm would be seen as frankly impossible.

Dyck ultimately offers a management theory that reflects a belief that the kingdom of God is not merely an otherworldly notion but one in which all aspects of the life of a community are implicated. The text goes on to unearth the “four-phase process model” that is imbedded in Luke’s gospel, finally spelling out the implications of his analysis for twenty-first-century-management theory and practice.

Dyck invokes Max Weber’s classic text, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, stating that his own book is really an effort to complete the project Weber started: to reach beyond the secularized version of Protestant Christianity that Weber argues is the basis of modern organizational and management theory to provide “an understanding of management based on a rigorous analysis of the biblical narrative.” It does seem clear that Weber’s prediction that the ethic he describes would ultimately fail to sustain human prosperity is on the verge of coming true. Dyck’s text thus comes at a critical juncture in the movement toward a sustainable business model that permits the human person to prosper at both the material and spiritual levels.

—Deborah Savage (e-mail: pdsavage@stthomas.edu)
St. Paul Seminary School of Divinity, Minnesota

Religion and Human Security: A Global Perspective

James K. Wellman, Jr. and Clark B. Lombardi (Editors)

Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012 (332 pages)

In the dank domain of wonks and pundits, the return of religion onto the foreign policy docket has largely pivoted around security. It would be only a slight exaggeration to say that of the prodigious effort produced since 2001 on religion, the vast majority is security related, and of that the underlying theme generally runs about how to put religion back into the domestic bottle so we can return to the business of liberal-democratic state building. Further, you can largely scratch religion and paste in Islam.

What a treat, then, to read *Religion and Human Security: A Global Perspective*, swimming upstream to offer a substantial theoretical account of human security and religion as well as in-depth, practical case studies on their at-times rival accounts in specific cultural and political settings.

The value of this kind of careful work should not be understated when almost any passable thinking on religion and security is now grant-worthy. Taking two rather woolly and highly contested concepts, human security and religion, and putting them into conversation is not work for the faint of heart, but Wellman and Lombardi are up to it. Without overwhelming the reader in their introduction, they make clear the territory of contestation over both of these terms, while unapologetically marking out their own stake in the conversation.

They define human security in three parts: (1) a physical aspect that involves protection from threats to basic welfare; (2) a juridical piece that relates to protection from violations