
ARTICLES

HOW A CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW DEFINES STRATEGY

Dr. Leo Salgado
Geneva College

ABSTRACT

Strategic decision makers have a set of beliefs, a worldview, that frame what reality is for them. Using this framework, they set strategic goals which, in turn, form a set of primary actions that define the strategic options of the firm. Therefore, we should be able to recognize various schools of strategy as defined by distinctive sets of beliefs in theory and practice. The paper argues that this is the case and that we should then be able to define at least one possible Christian school of strategy, framed by a Christian set of beliefs. A Christian school of strategy should assist all strategists in achieving their purposes in ways that are life-enhancing for their organizations.

HOW A CHRISTIAN WORLDVIEW DEFINES STRATEGY

The goal to integrate Christian principles into an understanding of strategy can be done at different contextual levels. For example, Martinez (2003) proposed a Christian framework for analyzing business principles which began with an examination of leading textbooks available to Christian business teachers—his context is these textbooks. This paper acknowledges Martinez's framework and seeks integration for the same reason, but uses a different integrative contextual level—the worldview of the strategist.

This paper seeks to deepen understanding of strategic worldviews in order to frame at least one possible Christian school of strategy. Current textbooks state the issues of strategic management from a specific understanding of strategy. Is it possible to uncover another understanding of strategy that is based on a Christian worldview and is more life-enhancing to an organization?

A biblical integration that begins at the worldview contextual level is important for Christian business students to pursue. It is critical to understand worldviews in order to have consistent success in strategic decision-making. Said differ-

ently, what strategists know about a situation is critical when analyzing the complexities inherent in developing strategy. If the decision makers have insufficient, incorrect, inaccurate, or irrelevant information about the situation, they may come up with a solution but the probability is that it will be an insufficient solution or a solution to the wrong problem. This leads, eventually, to failure. Failure teaches “how human planning and decision-making processes can go awry if we do not pay enough attention to possible side effects and long-term repercussions, if we apply corrective measures too aggressively or too timidly, or if we ignore premises we should have considered” (Dorner, 1996, p.2).

How do strategists know what premises to consider when making decisions? The premises considered depend on the worldview of the decision maker (Bahnsen, 1998; Kuhn, 1962; Kuyper, 2006; Polanyi, 1974; Quine & Ullian, 1970; Rosenstock-Huessy, 1953). When it comes to strategic decision-making, premises are more important than in decision-making in general. Why is this so? When forming strategies, leaders deal in complex situations leading to multiple actions, always acknowledging they live in a world limited by scarcity (Salgado, 2007). Leaders make decisions on the type of action the organization must pursue to achieve a specific purpose; that purpose focuses on what is most important about their reality. Taking into consideration the variety of purposes strategists aim to achieve, I define strategy for the purpose of this paper as a type of action leaders must pursue to achieve a specific goal or purpose in situations limited by scarcity¹.

How do strategists select the type of action to pursue? It depends on the leaders’ presuppositions about nature, the world, and the way things work. In other words, it depends on the outworking of their worldview (Cook 2000). Even if strategists are unconscious about their presuppositions, they decide on what types of action to take based on a worldview defined by the culture in which they work (Kuyper, 2006; Rosenstock-Huessy, 1954). Different worldviews lead to dif-

ferent and distinct aims, goals, and purposes. Different worldviews lead to different strategies that frame the problem and the types of actions to solve the problem (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1954).

In fact, meta-studies of the strategy literature have uncovered at least ten distinctive schools of thought on strategy (Mintzberg, 1990; Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, & Lampel, 1998; French, 2009) differentiated by what strategists believe to be most important about reality; the purposes, goals or aims for strategy; and the different types of action to achieve the aims. These schools are distinctively different because each is based on a distinctive worldview. But none of these schools suggested by Mintzberg or others are based on a Christian worldview (See Table 1).

Should Christian leaders then frame the problem differently, defining a distinctive set of actions for strategy because of their Christian worldview? This is the central question of this paper. To answer this question, the paper argues that it is possible to frame at least one possible Christian school of strategy using the following propositions:

1. Schools of strategy differentiate based on a main idea about reality and the purpose for their strategy.
2. Each school of strategy prescribes a distinctive set of actions.
3. Christianity offers strategists a different set of beliefs about reality and a prescription for the strategic problem.
4. Therefore, Christian strategists, if consistent with their faith, will offer a distinctively different set of actions as strategy.

A Christian school of strategy can provide Christians with the right expectations about strategies and take into consideration a more correct understanding of God’s order. Christian strategic decision makers desperately need a framework from which to work realistically in God’s world.

Additionally, a Christian school of strategy puts the other schools into perspective and

Table 1—Summary of description of the ten schools of strategy according to Mintzberg, et al. (1998).

School of strategy	Most important about reality	Types of primary action:
The Design School Strategy formation as a process of conception.	Rationality; therefore, the (phenomenal) environment can always be known for now and well into the future. What's important is the future Organizations are pliable; our own creation. The thinker controls the actions	Establishing fit and policies to control fit Rational appraisals of the external and internal situations A step by step conscious process to creating strategies Commitment to ways of acting Finding one centrally articulated best explicit strategy for that organization to bring unique competitiveness Technique: SWOT
The Planning School: Strategy formation as a formal process.	A rational person can predict the course of its environment, to control it, or simply to assume its stability. Quality is in the process not in the person. We think first then act.	Create formal comprehensive and deliberate plans, procedures, training, analysis Hiring educated planners; use of lots of checklists Set objectives on the front end and the elaboration of budgets and up rating plans on the back end Quantify goals as a means to control Do an audit of the internal and external environment or build several scenarios Evaluate strategies using a variety of techniques (tools) Schedule the operationalization of plan
The Positioning School Strategy formation as an analytical process.	Economics and competition. Thinking and acting are two separate things We learn by rational deduction only There are only a few generic strategies (laws of strategy) There are only a few generic situations Strategy precedes structure The industry structure determines strategies, which determines organizational structure	Learn generic strategies Analyze industry structure Analyze internal and external market Apply generic strategies to generic situations Hire analysts.
The Entrepreneurial School Strategy formation as a visionary process.	The intuition, judgment, wisdom, experience, insight of the leader—the traits of the leader. The perspective or vision of the leader—a mental representation of strategy, created or at least expressed in the head of the leader. The organizational in the economic aspect, interpreted from the classical economic theory.	The active search for opportunities Acquiring a vision Taking controlled bold strokes Growing the organization Knowing deeply the situation Articulating the vision
The Cognitive School Strategy formation as a cognitive process.	The mind of the leader The leader's schema of reality The leader's difficulty in seeing or interpreting reality. Either the leader re-creates what they see and perceive, or they create or construct a new reality.	Becoming self aware of mental processes Becoming aware of individual schema Mapping the situation Creating concepts and context Getting insights into the situation Seeing the organizations in different frames Creatively constructing reality Engaging employees in central decisions

Table 1—Summary of description of the ten schools of strategy according to Mintzberg, et al. (1998).

School of strategy	Most important about reality	Types of primary action:
The Learning School Strategy formation as an emergent process.	The work of an organization is complex and unpredictable and knowledge is diffused There are many day to day decisions that affect over time organizations	Learning over time Allowing or recognizing patterns of behavior to follow Creating knowledge Solving problems at the margin with underlying logic creating a consensus for specific actions Allowing for managers at all levels to define strategic initiatives Giving impetus, championing or venturing these initiatives Determining structural context and imposing sense on past experience. Acting, reflecting, selecting what makes sense and facilitating learning
The Power School Strategy formation as a process of negotiation.	Power relations Organizational life is ambiguous; there are a lot of uncertainties, competing goals, varied perceptions, scarcity of resources and so on. The marketplace is made up of organizational, regulatory, and professional systems of considerable interdependence and complexity. Individual liberty or freedom to make their own decisions	Negotiating Influencing using power and politics Creating cooperative arrangements Bargaining and compromising Confronting
The Cultural School Strategy formation as a collective process.	Organizations are a cultural system in a social process Organizations are controlled by ideologies It's not products that compete in the marketplace but systems of production.	Interpreting through the lenses of the culture Understanding how the culture affects decisions Clarifying dominant values Collective reframing Creating unique processes
The Environmental School Strategy formation as a reactive process.	The environment as an ecological system Forces and demands of the external context Environmental ecological-type niches where organizations cluster; four dimension: stability, complexity, market diversity, hostility; Environment is a repository of economic and symbolic resources	Finding out what increases or decreases the changes of survival in an ecological sense Finding ways of acquiring economic resources and converting them into symbolic ones and vice versa Strategies like acquiesce, compromise, avoid, defy and manipulate.
The Configuration School Strategy formation as a process of transformation.	Time—each school at its own time, in its place Strategy is about continuity not change Organizational time periods Organic life cycles	Leaping from one state of being to another Finding ways to stabilize the organizational direction Defining the right state, model or ideal type for the organization Depending on the state of the organization and its place it can be plays, plans, patterns, positions or perspectives

guides us to integrate the life-giving attributes of the other schools. Because it correctly views reality, it takes into consideration all other means of making organizational decisions. Its inclusiveness will help Christian strategists work with everyone to help the organization succeed. The result of a wiser strategist will be wiser decisions.

Let us now turn to the argument based on the stated four propositions. In the following section, I will use Mintzberg's Ten Schools of Strategy to enlarge upon the first two propositions.

MINTZBERG'S TEN SCHOOLS OF STRATEGY

Henry Mintzberg developed ten schools of strategic formulation (Mintzberg, 1990; Mintzberg, Ahlstrand, and Lampel, 1998) that, I argue, are based on worldviews. I chose to use this scholar's work for several reasons. He holds high credibility in the field as a world-renowned theorist on strategy and management (Bernhut, 2000; Prusak and Davenport, 2003; Kennedy, 2004). More importantly, he has written prolifically about strategy, which allows us to understand the origins of his views. He has also written critically about the various schools of strategy. His writings, in total, give insight into what leads theorists to create distinctive theories. Using his work, we will examine Proposition 1 and 2.

Proposition 1: Schools of Strategy Differentiate Based on a Main Idea About Reality and the Purpose for Their Strategy.

It is not surprising that theorists and practitioners hold a variety of insights into what strategy entails. In fact, when Mintzberg and colleagues (1998) reviewed hundreds of books on strategy and categorized them, they found ten distinct schools of thought². They categorized these schools not so much as perspectives of one school of strategy but as distinctive core beliefs about the world and how things work, namely worldviews. Based on a serious study of the history of strategy, Cook (2000) also concludes that the concept of strategy is based on worldviews or

core beliefs about human nature, the world, and how things work.

Specifically, following the idea of worldviews, an overriding idea about reality sets each of the schools apart and supports the schools' theories. There are many aspects of reality, and theorists tend to latch onto one idea which becomes their starting point for defining the truth about reality (Dooyeweerd, 1997). Dooyeweerd calls it the Archimedean point, the standpoint that we use as a lever to lift up all other ideas about reality.

Philosophers and theorists take and absolutize this "Archimedean point," making it the only idea that can best describe or make proper sense of reality. "It appears again and again," concludes Dooyeweerd, "that this dogma impedes mutual understanding among philosophic schools that prove to be fundamentally opposed in their true (though hidden) starting-point" (Dooyeweerd, 1997, p. 36). "In a debate among these schools one receives the impression that they are reasoning at cross-purposes, because they are not able to find a way to penetrate to each other's starting point" (p.37). Philosophers debate at the highest levels of thought, and theorists of all kinds, including strategy theorists, continue these debates at all levels (Mintzberg, 1994).

From their Archimedean point, theorists form an interrelated set of beliefs that frame a situation, problem and possible solutions (Percy, 2004; Stevenson & Heberman, 2004). Cook (2000) and Mintzberg and colleagues (1998) conclude that each school of strategy begins by defining what is most important about reality (See Table 1). Strategy decision makers use their view of reality in the context of strategy to frame the strategic situation, which defines the aim or purpose of the strategy and how this purpose should be accomplished. It is not that strategists ignore the rest of reality, but that they believe that by paying attention to what is most important, they can achieve their organization's intended purpose; what they believe success is.

The overriding criterion, therefore, for the distinctiveness of each school is the one main

idea that the strategist selects about reality. Again, theorists absolutize this idea and dogmatically believe and teach that this idea of reality defines what is most important about organizational success (Mintzberg, et.al., 1998). Different ideas lead to different aims for the strategist and to a distinctive set of actions.

For example, those in the Planning School, who define strategy as a plan, believe that a rational person can “predict the course of its environment, and control it, or simply to assume its stability” (Mintzberg et al., 1998, p. 67); that quality is in the process, not in the person; and that we should think first, then act. The theorists and practitioners’ purpose in this school is to put quality in the process through control.

Although the Planning School’s main idea about reality share some beliefs with the first five schools, theorists and practitioners package it as a distinctive set of beliefs. These beliefs differ from those of the other schools; in fact, they are completely opposite from the beliefs of those espoused by the Configuration school. Those in the Configuration School believe that time is most important issue in reality and that not taking time into consideration destroys organizations. Time, defined by this school, is biological time in reference to the life cycle, not the term physicists’ define as an expanse in space (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1953). The strategists in this school assert that they must pay attention to the specific time for the organizational growth stages or configurations. Because of the importance of time, strategic management is only done when the organization is stable and decides to maintain the status quo.

As seen in Table 1, each school reveals a distinct goal for strategy because of the one main idea about reality that different strategists have before they begin to strategize. This main idea leads necessarily to a different set of primary actions.

Proposition 2: Each School of Strategy Prescribes as Strategy a Distinctive Set of Actions.

When strategists identify the most important aspect of reality, they select the premises they

need to interpret reality. With these premises, they necessarily frame the strategic problem to solve. From this frame, they draw inferences and conclusions about the problem that fits within the frame and follows their premises (Argyris, 1982). In other words, they interpret their environment and the organizational situations differently according to worldview presuppositions. Thus, they solve different issues. At the end, strategists in the different schools define strategy distinctively and recommend different actions.

Looking at Table 1, we recognize how each school develops distinctive sets of primary actions that those in each school call strategy. As can be observed, some of these sets of primary actions share common tasks, but as a whole they represent distinctive processes. For instance, for those in the Planning School, the plan is the strategy. The plan is designed to form comprehensive and deliberate plans, procedures, training, and analysis. In contrast, the Design School and Planning School share evaluating strategies using a variety of techniques like the SWOT analysis, and the step by step conscious process, but as a set of actions, it draws strategic options differently than the Planning School.

Strategy as a plan is intentionally designed to control all those in and around the organization so that they follow the processes. Since quality is in the process, control becomes a priority. As necessary for this type of planning, strategists in this school hire educated planners who know how to control effectively, create lots of checklists and techniques to ensure full control, set objectives on the front end, fully elaborate all budgets and operationalize plans on the back end. Before they set objectives, these planners audit the internal and external environment or build several possible future scenarios. After filling out the entire checklist, they decide on control techniques and create objectives. They then evaluate strategies and schedule the operationalization of the plan in great detail (Mintzberg, 1989).

In contrast, by looking at the bottom of Table 1, we see that those in the Configuration School

have a different set of primary actions. For them, strategy implies a time perspective. The purpose for these strategists is to consider the process of the lifespan of their organization. To consider this lifespan they need to understand what is happening to all the elements that make up an organization during its life time. According to Mintzberg (1989), the elements include the operating core, the techno-structure, the support staff, the strategic apex and the ideology. Depending on the type and life process of an organization, these elements configure the organization differently. Strategy for those in the Configuration School is a process of stabilizing the organization at every stage of its transformation. To form strategies, they need to understand when their organization is leaping from one state of being to another and when they need to find ways to stabilize the organizational direction.

Looking at Table 1, a question may be raised: why could strategy not include all the types of action found in all these schools? The answer is that strategists begin with a problem which they interpret through their packaged set of beliefs or worldview. They cannot easily leave this web of beliefs (Quine & Ullian, 1970). Solving the problem, they select only those actions that are either logically consistent or correspond with their own interpretation of what is most important about reality. Thinking in those terms therefore, we can ask what is most important about reality to the Christian strategist. In the next section we will explore this question.

WHY NOT A CHRISTIAN SCHOOL OF STRATEGY?

Proposition 3: Christianity Offers Strategists a Different Set of Beliefs About Reality and a Prescription for the Strategic Problem.

A Christian view of strategy must begin with the core question: what is most important about reality for the Christian strategist? There might be a variety of answers to this question, but whatever answer we choose, we know that it needs to be defined by God.

One possible core reality that I propose looks at how the truth in Christ defines the reality or order that God created. The order that God created was marred, disjointed, and broken by rebellion and then redeemed by Christ and made whole again through His death and resurrection (Colossians 1:15-23). Because we begin with God's reality, instead of excluding any of the various concerns from all the schools of strategy, we can unify the "sovereignty dictated order of life" (Kline, in Rushdoony, 1973, p.8; Deut. 4:5-8; Psalm 19; Col 1:15-23). This becomes what is most important about reality.

As in all the other schools briefly described in Table 1, if Christian strategists affirm a unified, complete, redeemed reality as most important thing, they can frame their problem as the process of unifying or completing reality in ways that will make an organization fruitful.

If as a strategist we assume that God created a unified, coherent reality, and all things "are put together under Christ" (Eph. 1:10), we need to deal with all the complex concerns about the outside and inside environment and the past and future to create a process that unifies reality. Instead of absolutizing each of the concerns of the 10 schools on Table 1, we are set free to understand and unify them. We can acknowledge that each school has a legitimate concern, but by itself excludes many other concerns that make up the whole of reality. Taking into consideration only premises that we can agree with and ignoring others, as do many strategists of each of these schools, can create trouble when making decisions (Dorner, 1996), especially strategic decisions.

Aim: unifying strategic concerns. Therefore, the aim or purpose for this possible Christian school of strategy is to determine how to unify all these strategic concerns. What does this mean? In the real-world, to unify concerns means to work at reconciling or synchronizing them through peace. It is a problem when those who write about or create strategy reject or discount all other concerns except their own. In es-

sence, they refuse to make peace with the other concerns.

Even if decision makers understand the need to unify all the concerns, they often fall short. For example, Mintzberg and his colleagues (1998) attempt to unify the ten schools of thought, but encounter limitations because of inconsistencies in worldviews³. Mintzberg concludes, "Like many other safaris, we cannot deliver quite as much as we may seem to promise" (p. 350). Why not? He continues, quoting Ornstein, "Without the development of an over-all perspective, we remain lost in our individual investigations." (p.350). According to Mintzberg, it takes a different mode of knowledge to unify or see the whole elephant that makes strategic management. He cannot show it to us; we have to find it ourselves.

Peace and a Christian school of strategy. We have suggested that peace makes it possible to unify the whole of reality. As we discuss this in more depth, we need to ask what makes the strategists' aim at peace distinctively Christian. Our purpose in asking this question is to move toward developing a school of strategy that will help any strategist, whether a Christian believer or not, to succeed.

To suggest that it is possible to frame a Christian school of strategy, I am going to rely on the sociological work of Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy.⁴ As a Christian scholar, his thesis is that peace is most important for the organization when it is strategizing. With peace the organization has the opportunity to be successful; without peace the organization dies. An organization's life and fruitfulness depend on peace, because peace unifies its reality. Therefore, the aim of the strategist is to work at maintaining peace (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970).

What is peace? In his study of Biblical peace, Bruggerman (2001) says that "the central vision of world history in the Bible is that all creation is one, every creature in community with every other, living in harmony and security toward the joy and well-being of every other creature (p.13)." Jesus is our peace (Ephesians 2:14), and He came

to give us peace (Matt. 28:16-20; John 12:32). "The vision of wholeness, which is the supreme will of the biblical God, is the outgrowth of a covenant of shalom (see Ezekiel 34:25), in which persons are bound not only to God but to one another in caring, sharing, rejoicing community with none to make them afraid" (Bruggermann, 2001, p. 15).

Four fronts of reality. Utilizing this definition of peace Rosenstock-Huessy's (1970) suggests that in order to unify all of reality and to work at peace, decision makers must understand four key fronts: inside and outside environments and past and future lifetimes. These issues are also found in the Mintzberg schools of strategy formation. The inside and outside environmental issues are especially important in the Design, and Planning Schools, and the past and future time issues especially important in the Entrepreneurial and Configuration Schools.

In the four fronts of reality, the strategist faces very different sets of concerns. Strategists must understand that "for living beings (and this applies to plants and animals as well as to men) [the environment] is a conflict of inner and outer processes. For human beings (and this also applies to plants and animals), time is a conflict between responsibilities toward the past and the future" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970, p. 62). Strategists must work out the means to resolve the conflicts of the environment and of time.

The Bible speaks often in terms of time, revealing life and death issues. It also speaks about what gives us health, life, and shalom (de Raadt 1997; Deut. 30:15-19; Psalm 16:11; Psalm 36:9; Prov. 4:20; John 10:10). In other words, the Bible directs us toward the future. Christ died in the past to redeem our future. In fact, He already has redeemed our future though we have yet to live it out (Rom. 8:25; 2 Cor. 6:10). In this sense, it is important for Christians to integrate the past with what Christ's redemption means as we move towards the future.

Besides this past and future orientation, the Bible helps us discern the environmental order.

Table 3 Possible Main Focus of Each School

Inside	Outside	Past	Future
Design School	Design School		
Planning School	Planning School		
	Positioning School		
			Entrepreneurial School
Cognitive School			
			Power School
		Learning School	
Cultural School			
	Environmental School		
		Configuration School	Configuration School
Peace School	Peace School	Peace School	Peace School

We can understand and study the inner/outer environment through reason and our senses. We can see, weight, compare, smell and touch things in the environment. However, because all of life belongs to God, He defines the presuppositions we hold as we encounter our study of both environments (Bahnsen, 1998; 2 Corinthians 10:5; Hebrews 4:12).

Biblical peace will unify all the interests of time and the environment. This makes Biblical peace an overriding Christian concern. As a result, Christian strategists should work hard to bring peace into their organization. It solves the problem of disunity that is often found at work and in the field of strategy. Both are splintered because of lack of peace. Without peace, those who are concerned with controlling the external environment and those concerned with the life of the organization are no longer on speaking terms with each other. Conflict, if not resolved, creates crisis. Organizational crisis can create so much negative energy that if allowed to spread it can work as a cancer to destroy the organization.

This issue becomes clearer when we understand the main actors in an organization. Rosentock-Huessy (2000) argues that there are four main actors in any business: the manager, the

salesperson or marketer, the technician—skilled or semi-skilled employee, and the engineer—the idea employee. Managers pay close attention to what is going on inside the organization. Their concerns are efficiency and effectiveness. The sales person's interests respond to the outside of the organization. He or she needs to understand the outside markets and customers in order to sell the goods and services to them. Both managers and salespersons have formal roles and their skills can be applied to any organization. These two actors in the organization, managers and salespeople, have concerns identified in the first five schools of strategy in Table 1. When these people are Christians, they may emphasize other concerns such as the importance of stewardship, truthful communication and showing love to their neighbor.

Technicians respect the past. Over the years, these actors have established means to accomplish work, and they work best by maintaining what they have learned to do well. Their skills tend to be specific to types of work that tie them to the past and that make them liable to changes in production method and techniques. In contrast, engineers concern themselves with the future. They create change. They work at creating

new products, new production methods and new techniques to cut costs. These two actors, technicians and engineers, add the time perspective to work and have concerns related to some of the schools in the bottom five of Table 1. When these people are Christians, they may add other concerns, such as the promises made in the past that organizations need to keep, and future possibilities opened to them because Christ redeemed the world.

When not well understood, the interests of the four actors may cause much trouble for the organization. Salespeople continually try to sell what their customers will buy, while the engineer's interest is to sell a product that actually works well and that they can support. Technicians understand that they are getting paid for their skilled or semi-skilled work, which has taken years to sharpen. Their interests are to maintain their skill levels so that they can continue to have work. On the other hand, since the engineers continually seek to respond to the salespersons' communication with the demand of the market, they are working hard at changing. But change threatens the technician's future work. These tensions can tear the organization apart in many different ways. Managers work at reconciling these tensions so that the job gets done cost effectively.

If not synchronized, these four very different interests cause conflict within an organization. Of course, the different interests are not the only reasons of conflict. Sin also causes conflict because it adds self interest or disobedience to the quality of reasoning, motives and timing of the issues raised. All this creates crisis. The more human beings disregard God's order, the more conflict and conflict results. When people suppress the truth of God's order (Romans 1:18), they naturally find themselves in conflict, and unable to resolve conflict, gravitate towards crisis. In a way, crisis is the natural state of mankind.

Conversely, peace is unnatural to us. We have to work hard at peace.⁵ Therefore, by making peace the aim or purpose of strategic thinking,

planning and doing, Christians can give their organization an opportunity to succeed.

Therefore, peace as one, or possibly the main distinctive strategic aim should be a pragmatic consideration for any organization. We know from the study of decision-making that making decisions, particularly strategic decisions, is difficult. First, decision-makers have to overcome their reasoning limitations and tendencies toward self-deception (Bazerman, 2006; Bahnsen, 1978). For instance, Mauldin (2004) identified at least 23 ways in which decision makers are bounded rationally. Also, because of the issues the four main actors' perspective raise, in many cases information is not shared or passed on to the person making decisions (McCall & Kaplan, 1990). When making decisions, strategists need to understand how easily they fail to consider all the premises (Dorner, 1996).

In the real-world, because of these failings and sin, strategists work with lack of information, misinformation or disinformation (de Raadt, 1991). However, if decisions are made in peace, they will have a greater opportunity to be optimal. Peace is especially crucial in strategic decisions that require substantial change. "Peace is the experience of change at the right time. The best change is a peaceful change. Peace is not a situation that obstructs change or history or reform. Peace is presupposing change and time processes. . . . Peace is that quality of change by which it is approved and supported by all people concerned" (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970, p. 43). For all these reasons, peace should be the primary aim of the strategist. Peace should define a Christian view of strategy.

Proposition 4: Christian Strategists Should Offer a Distinctive Set of Actions as Strategy

Can the concerns and purposes of a Christian school of strategy defined by peace, lead to distinctive set of primary actions? Does framing strategic thinking in terms of peace lead to distinctive ways of solving problems? What can we do strategically that will maintain peace in the organization?

According to Rosenstock-Huessy (1970), it is a rich communication process that enhances peace in an organization. Creating a peace-enhancing communication process requires that strategic managers pay attention to four elements of communication. As I describe the elements, this issue will become clearer. The four necessary elements of communication are as follows:

1. Freedom for all the actors in the organization to speak up passionately about their interests. Salespersons will thrive in this freedom as they are allowed to speak up for the interests and real needs of their customers.
2. Unanimity within the organization based on mutual goals. Managers will respond well to unanimity as they seek to unify, simplify and integrate all interests inside the organization.
3. A formal process that includes set procedures, operational processes, cultural rituals and keeping promises. Technicians and support staff will respond well to this formal process.
4. Conversely, forward-looking thinking that allows the organization to change, move to ensure a successful future, and allow for controlled plans. Engineers will respond well to this type of thinking as they seek to move the organization forward.

Concretely, employees create peace when they listen and are allowed to speak in earnest with each other. Creating peace requires that employees have the courage to name people and problems when necessary. It requires employees to risk opening up to commitment and asking others to commit to action. Creating peace also requires employees to listen, for listening is “the art of valuing someone else’s words, thoughts, ideas, worries, and concerns above your own” (Walker, 2008, p.188). When employees throughout the organization talk and listen to each other, they take action, willing to wrestle with the consequences and creating all the other means that make it possible for them to come together and unify their interests. The peace they create allows them to achieve much, even momentous things (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970).

Creating peace in the organization. How do we actually accomplish these elements of communication? Let me suggest five primary actions organizations can take to make peace possible. These suggestions come from various theorists and practitioners and are put together here as a set of actions.

1. Teach and practice double-loop learning. Argyris (1982) suggests that a lack of rich communication at the executive level causes the friction that slows and even stops all strategic decisions. Implementing

Table 2 A Suggested Christian School of Strategy

School of strategy	Most important about reality	Types of primary actions
The Peace School. Strategy formation as a process of peace	God’s unified reality, redeemed by Christ	Teaching and practicing freedom, creativity, fellowship and sacrifice. Implementing a rich communication process throughout the organization. Creating a habit of double-loop-learning Creating a habit for collaboration Creating a habit for peacemaking Creating a habit for creativity

double-loop learning will open up communications.

2. Teach and practice peacemaking (Sande, 2004) or conflict resolutions. Peacemaking will also allow rich communication.
3. Teach and practice collaborative team skills (Miller, 2005). Collaborative team skills will help employees understand and build their speaking and listening skills that cover all four fronts of life: inside/outside, past and future.
4. Teach and practice Koinonia (Walker, 2008), through which employees can participate in communion and community, practice compassion, and practice what is right.
5. Teach and practice creativity (de Bono, 1970). Creativity allows organizations to detect what is currently lacking so that it can move forward into the future.

What is common in all the suggestions is teaching. According to Rosenstock-Huessy (1970), teaching becomes necessary as we seek peace. Peace requires that strategists learn from experience what actually creates peace. In learning what creates peace, employees do not require formal instruction on the variety of theories available, but rather should be taught what theories have been already tried and how they worked or not worked. This type of teaching responds to the milieu of real and serious organizational life (Rosenstock-Huessy, 1954).⁶

What is Christian in this primary set of actions? The primary set of actions suggested above reflect the all-inclusiveness of the Christian worldview and the recognition of God's order as determiner of what is right, good and of virtuous character in organizations. Using these actions becomes a way to establish God's order and either Christians or non-Christians can do them.

However, the set of actions misses is what is crucial for real, complete peace. Our relationship with Christ is what will bring real, complete

peace to ourselves and our organizations. Those who belong to Christ and have peace in Him are free to work towards the redemption of all things. However, those who do not have Christ's peace can still work at creating a peaceful environment and have a measure of success. Just as we all enjoy the good things that God has created for us, we can all enjoy peace and its reward (Matt 5:45).

CONCLUSION

A Christian worldview should define at least one distinctive school of strategy. If we accept the work of Mintzberg, et al. (1998), we find there are schools of strategy that reflect distinctive understandings of what is important in the reality of an organization. With these understandings, each school frames the work of the strategists. In other words, an understanding about what is most important about reality necessarily leads to a distinctive set of actions; change this understanding, and the set of actions also change.

Since Christianity gives us a different understanding of what is important, it is possible to identify at least one distinctive Christian school of strategy. The Peace School of strategy's understanding about our reality can lead to a distinctive purpose and set of primary activities that define the strategic options. These options should contribute not only to Christians but to all strategists as they seek the best for their organization.

Since this paper only focused on defining one possible Christian School of strategy, we need further study on how the Peace School of strategy works out the various strategic implications. To do that, we need additional examination of space and time as defined in this article. For example, in what ways does this perspectives frame and resolve different strategic issues? We also need to study the importance of language-based communication, such as the personal and relational everyday talk between leaders, managers, followers and employees. It would be fruitful to consider the language or speech-acts work of Austin, Searle and Rosenstock-Huessy (Austin, 1962; Clifton, 1006; Schrag, 1997, Rosenstock-Huessy, 1970) and what

their work's implications on business and strategic communication (Clifton, J. 2006; van der Merwe, Chermack, et al, 2007) teach us about how we implement peaceful change.

Finally, no doubt we can find other Christian frameworks to define other Christian schools of strategy. Although the discussion in this paper should add to the general understanding of strategic thinking, planning and doing, the challenge for us is to make any of these frameworks workable. In this respect, Mintzberg (2004) teaches us that it takes many years of hard, detailed work to popularize a theory based on an unpopular philosophy. In our case, for practitioners to implement the Peace School of Strategy, we need extensive scholarly work on its implications in all areas of strategy.

ENDNOTES

¹Mintzberg, et al. (1998) defines each school differently based on the literature from each school (see Table 1). Each definition has this in common: it defines a set of actions that the leader must pursue to achieve a specific goal or purpose in situations limited by scarcity. Perhaps this definition can be understood better at the end of the paper; however, we have so many definitions that it was deemed better to include it at the beginning.

2. French (2009) categorized them into seven schools.

3. Unifying reality has been tried many times before: Plato, Aquinas, and Kant tried. But their attempts cannot hold because man cannot do it through reason (Rushdoony, 1971).

4. Why Rosenstock-Huessy? My intent has been to find Christian sociological work that we can use to work out our strategy theories. The problem is that there are not many Christians who have done the work required for their sociology to be distinctively Christian. Rosenstock-Huessy has done the work. He was born and raised Jewish in Germany at the beginning of the last century. After converting to Christianity, he moved to the United States where he taught at Harvard for a short time. Harvard, uncomfortable with his unapologetic Christianity and his desire to be

a Christian scholar, moved him to the religion department. Because he did not want to be in the religion department, he moved on from Harvard and spent most of his teaching career at Dartmouth. Dartmouth allowed him to teach social philosophy. His concerns for Christ and for life also led him to get involved in solving problems in industry. In Germany he worked for a Daimler-Benz factory, and in the United States he founded a camp to bring together the various people that make up industry so that they learn how to work together. His ideas about this camp, Camp William James, were later directly instrumental in the creation of the Peace Corps (Rosenstock-Huessy, 2001). In his many books and transcribed lectures, he has a lot to say about work and the organization as a social unit.

5. We probably share the same idea with some Jewish thinking. See for instance the work of Frans Rozenzweig.

6. Adams (1988) agrees that this type of learning helps people change. It is this type of change that helps us work at peace.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. E. (1986). *How to Help People Change*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Argyris, C. (1982). *Reasoning, Learning, and Action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things With Words*, J.O. Urmson & Marina Sbisa, (Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bahnsen, G. L. (1998). *Van Til's Apologetic: Readings & Analysis*. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing.
- Bahnsen, G. L. (1978). A Conditional Resolution of the Apparent Paradox of self-deception. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Bahnsen, G. L. (Speaker) (n.d.c) *The Problem of Religious Language*. (Cassette Recording No. ASP GB231). Covenant Media Foundation.
- Bazerman, M. H. (2006). *Judgment in Managerial Decision Making*, (Sixth Ed). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bernhut, S. (2000). In Conversation: Henry Mintzberg. *Ivey Business Journal*, 65 (1), 18-24.

- Brueggeman, W. (2001). *Peace*. Danver: Clearance Center.
- Clifton, J. (2006). A Conversation Analytical Approach to Business Communication. *Journal of Business Communication*, 43(3), 202-219.
- Cook, W. J. Jr. (2000). *Strategics: The Art and Science of Holistic Strategy*. Westport: Quorum Books.
- de Raadt, J. D. R. (1997). *A New Management of Life*. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- de Raadt, J. D. R. (1991). *Information and Managerial Wisdom*. Idaho: Paradigm Publications.
- de Bono, E. (1970). *Lateral Thinking: Creativity Step by Step*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dorner, D. (1996). *The Logic of Failure*. Translated by R. Kimber & R. Kimber. Reading: Perseus Books.
- Dooyeweerd, H. (1997). *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought, Vol. I*, (D. H. Freeman & H. De Jongste, Trans.). Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- French, S. (2009). Re-thinking the foundations of the Strategic Business Process. *Journal of Management Development*, 28 (1), 51—76.
- Kennedy, C. (September, 2004). Mintzberg's Moral Maze. *Director* 58 (2), p. 84.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (3rd Ed). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kuyper, A. (2006). *Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc.
- Martinez, R. J. (2003 Fall). Teaching Strategic Management from a Christian Perspective. *JBIB*, 69-98.
- Miller, S. (2006). *I-Skill Zone*. Evergreen: Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc.
- Mauldin, J. (2004). *Bull's eye investing*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McCall, M.W. Jr. & Kaplan, R. E. (1990). *Whatever It Takes: The Realities of managerial Decision Making* (2nd Ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mintzberg, H. (2005). *Managers Not MBAs*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Mintzberg, H. Ahlstrand B., & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy Safari: A guided Tour Through the Wilds of Strategic Management*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1990) Strategy Formation: Schools of Thought. J. Frederickson (ed.) *Perspectives on Strategic Management*, New York: Harper & Collins
- Mintzberg, H. (1989). *Mintzberg On Management: Inside Our Strange World of Organizations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Quine, W. V. & Ullian J. S. (1970). *The Web of Belief*. New York: Random House.
- Pearcy, N. (2004). *Total Truth: Liberating Christianity from Its Cultural Captivity*. Wheaton: Crossways Books.
- Polanyi, M. (1974). *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Prusak, L. & Davenport, T. H. . (2003). Who Are the Gurus' Guru? *Harvard Business Review*, 81:12, pp. 14-16.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, E. (2001). *I Am an Impure Thinker*. Norwich: Argo Books.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, E. (2000). *The Multiformity of Man*. Essex Vt: Argo Books.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, E. (1970). *Speech and Reality*. Norwich: Argo Books.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, E. (1954). *The Rosenstock-Huessy Lectures: The Circulation of Thought*, (Vol.9)—Lecture 2; Dartmouth College; February 12, 1954. Jericho Vt.: Argo Books.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, E. (1953). *The Rosenstock-Huessy Lectures: The Cross of Reality*, (Vol.5); Dartmouth College; October 7, 1953—January 22, 1953. Jericho Vt.: Argo Books.
- Rushdoony, R. R. (1973). *The Institutes of Biblical Law*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company.
- Rushdoony, R. J. (1971). *The One and the Many: Studies in the Philosophy of Order and Ultimacy*. Craig Press.
- Salgado, L. (2007). *The Mind of Christ in Strategy*. Unpublished manuscript.

Sande, K. (2004). *The Peacemaker: A Biblical Guide to Resolving Personal Conflict* (3rd. Ed.). Grand Rapids: Baker Books.

Schrag, F. (1997). Essay Review: Searle on the Construction of Social Reality. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29 (2), 223-240.

Stevenson, L. & Haberman, D. L. (2004). *Ten Theories of Human Nature*. New York: Oxford University Press.

The Holy Bible: New International Version. 1996, c1984 . Zondervan: Grand Rapids.

van der Merwe, L., Chermack, T. J. Kulikowich, J. and Yang, B. (2007). Strategic Conversation Quality and Engagement: Assessment of a New Measure. *International Journal of Training and Development* 11(3), 214-220.

Walker, J. P. (2008). *Dirty Word*. Nashville: Discipleship Resources.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Dr. Leonidas Salgado is adjunct professor in the Masters of Organizational Leadership Program at Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA. He received his Doctorate in Strategic Leadership from Regent University in 2007. His research interests include the sociology of the workplace because of Christianity. He is also the Director of Administration at Light of Life Rescue Mission in Pittsburgh, PA. Email: lsalgado@lightoflife.org