

**TEACHING NOTE**

**CASE: “A MEGA-CHURCH TAKES ON URBAN PROBLEMS:  
FELLOWSHIP BIBLE COMES TO SOUTH MIDTOWN”**

**Brent Coffin**

Copyright © 2006 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College

## **Teaching Objectives of the Case**

1. Understand the resources, capacities, and challenges presented by an externally-focused mega-church;
2. Assess a church-based public initiative to address urban poverty from the perspectives of multiple stakeholders; and
3. Analyze the challenges and possibilities of religious and public leaders collaborating effectively.

## **Teaching Use**

For use with Kennedy School of Government Teaching Case 1780.0: “A Mega-Church Takes on Urban Problems: Fellowship Bible Comes to South Midtown” (Author: Howard Husock, 2005).

## **Introduction**

Robert Lewis is the visionary leader of a successful mega-church. The Fellowship Bible Church (FBC) is one of some 1,200 mega-churches, most of which belong to the Evangelical Protestant wing of American Christianity.<sup>1</sup> Fellowship is nationally recognized as a “cutting-edge” church within the mega-church movement. Under Lewis’s leadership, the congregation has undertaken a series of bold organizational development strategies toward becoming an “externally focused” church, one which mobilizes its members to improve its civic community. This case considers the question of whether a church with a strongly evangelical religious identity and outwardly directed mission can work with the city manager to renew a 130-block section of Little Rock.

This case can be used in classes on public management, cross-sector collaboration, leadership, or negotiation. Depending on the instructor’s objectives for the class, the case can be taught from the standpoint of Robert Lewis, Bruce Moore, or both. This teaching note follows the third option in order to examine the convergences and conflicts between Lewis’s and Moore’s interests, and, therefore, the prospects of their working together.

Two features of the case present teaching opportunities for instructors who are working with diverse groups of leaders: (1) race; and (2) religious identity. In contrast to the other cases in this curriculum module, this case features a *white* congregation strategically positioned in the growing, affluent suburb west of Little Rock. This contrast enables the instructor to raise questions or to note insights concerning the influence of race on public religion in America. For example, Rev. Cheryl Sanders, who is featured in another case in the Hauser Center Public Religious Leadership online, and Robert Lewis would both describe their faith as “evangelical.” Yet how do their respective views of

---

<sup>1</sup> See Lyman Kellstedt et al., “Evangelicalism”. In William H. Swatos, Jr., editor, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Society*: <http://hirr.hartsem.edu/ency/evan.htm> . Also Christian Smith, *Christian America? What Evangelicals Really Want*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

race impact their commonality as evangelical Christian leaders acting in the public square? How does their faith enable them to bridge the racial divide, how does it permit them to ignore the influences of race, and how might their religious practices accentuate problems associated with race?<sup>2</sup>

Perhaps the most important contribution this case can make on the issue of race is for the instructor to use it as a way to challenge assumptions regarding the monolithic character of religion—“Evangelicals and Fundamentalists,” “The Religious Right,” etc. If unexamined, these assumptions can encourage attitudes and approaches to cross-sector collaboration that may be empirically and analytically unfounded. In several other cases of the module, for example, key actors posit strategic operational assumptions concerning replication, scale, and capacity of programs featuring Black religious leaders and institutions.<sup>3</sup> When we take into account the influence of race (and class) on what are too easily generalized as “faith-based organizations,” we are in a better position to determine if these assumptions are valid or not.

White-evangelical religious identity also presents challenges and opportunities. The FBC case is likely to evoke a range of strong emotional responses among class participants. These can help the instructor to develop a more candid, self-engaged, and probing discussion of the case; they also can generate tension and conflict that shuts down the reflective learning process. In either case, religious and cultural diversity *inside the classroom* provides an experiential laboratory for individuals to learn better how to address diversity *outside the classroom*. In the words of Kennedy School Professor Bill Apgar, “Talking about religion today is like talking about race in the 1960s—it’s hard for us to avoid it, but we don’t yet know how to do it.”

### **Discussion Questions**

1. What is your view of Lewis’s vision to transform South Midtown?
2. Do you agree with Bruce Moore in his view that there is a “good fit” between FBC and the city on the South Midtown Project?
3. What are the organizations’ respective motivations for potentially working together on this project?
4. What is the FBC strategy regarding the South Midtown Project?
5. Is it desirable for Lewis and Moore to work together; and, if yes, then how?

---

<sup>2</sup> See Michael O. Emerson and Christian Smith, *Divided by Faith: Evangelical Religion and the Problem of Race in America*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

<sup>3</sup> See “The Reverend Jeffrey Brown,” “Starting Amachi,” and “Building Shreveport” cases in this online module.

These questions are intended to develop a discussion along these lines:

- *Question 1* allows the instructor to elicit and validate a range of personal and professional reactions to the case;
- *Question 2* challenges the class to identify the assets and capacity of a successful religious nonprofit organization;
- *Question 3* asks the class to explore the incentives for cross-sector collaboration;
- *Question 4* analyzes FBC’s strategy for change; and
- *Question 5* requires participants to decide how they would act in Bruce Moore’s position.

### **Discussion and Analysis**

#### **1. What is your view of Lewis’s vision to transform South Midtown?**

The opening question is intended to elicit a range of opinions on FBC in particular and the public presence of religion in general. The instructor should encourage class members to speak with their own voices on these questions and to feel free to disagree with one another. It is important to validate the full range of views expressed in the class.<sup>4</sup>

It also may be important to validate the difficulties experienced by many public leaders when it comes to having a frank discussion of religion in the context of their professional roles. Four quite valid reasons help to account for this: (i) democratic principles of religious liberty and tolerance; (ii) separating the “private expression” of religion in a church or family setting from the “public expression” of religion in other settings; (iii) professional training and socialization, which often depend on specialized languages and expertise; and (iv) the challenge of managing religious and cultural pluralism—not only in the public arena, but around the “family dinner table” and within ourselves as complex individuals.

Given these complexities and challenges, instructors may want to invite individuals to indicate their religious affiliations (or lack thereof), and share something of their personal narratives which, as opposed to argued positions, can invite openness among others instead of criticism.

#### **2. Do you agree with Bruce Moore in his view there is a “good fit” between FBC and the City on the South Midtown Project?**

---

<sup>4</sup> It may be useful to open and close this session by polling participants on the question: “If you were in Bruce Moore’s shoes, would you work with Fellowship Bible Church on the South Midtown Project?” (See final page of this teaching note.)

## *Robert Lewis's Church*

Fellowship Bible Church is typical in many respects of the more than 1,200 “mega-churches” (congregations of 2,000 or more attending weekly services) in the United States. This number is up from 350 in 1990 and 600 in 2000. Nearly 50% of mega-churches are in the South; and, like FBC, most are demographically positioned in rapidly growing suburban areas. These churches—over two-thirds of which are evangelical, charismatic, or Pentecostal, while just 2% are fundamentalist—typically grow into their large size rapidly, often within a decade. They do so under the leadership of a charismatic senior pastor, nearly all of whom are male, who oversees an organization providing a wide range of social, recreational, and educational ministries. To manage these operations, mega-churches have multi-million dollar annual budgets, most of which go to support an average staff of 20 full-time ministers and 22 full-time program staff persons.<sup>5</sup>

However, FBC is atypical in certain respects. With weekly worship attendance over 5000, it ranks among the largest 16% of mega-churches in the U.S. Beyond its size, Fellowship has become nationally recognized as a cutting-edge model for “externally focused” mega-churches—“churches that have not only built capacity but are releasing their capacity through the ministry and service of every member.”<sup>6</sup>

The key ingredient in FBC’s success as an innovator is the leadership of its senior minister Robert Lewis. As the “directional leader,”<sup>7</sup> Lewis combines spiritual visions of divine leading with keen organizational savvy to identify new models. Lewis found the key elements for the FBC model in his college experiences of “community, relevance, engagement of the broader community, and entrepreneurial business methods.”<sup>8</sup>

After building Fellowship from its original 59 members in 1977 to around 2,000 members by 1990, Lewis began to address a serious problem that characterizes large churches—new members experience spiritual satisfaction the first five years and find their satisfaction declines thereafter. To address this problem, Lewis led his congregation through an extensive process of reorganization focused on the model of “common cause” community groups. Rather than being member-serving or “church-focused” groups, which characterize the vast majority of mega-churches, common cause groups were public-serving or “externally focused” cadres working with inner-city children, developing local nonprofits, or building low-income housing.<sup>9</sup> Still dissatisfied and

---

<sup>5</sup> Hartford Institute for Religion Research, “Megachurch Definition,” <http://hrr.hartsem.edu/org/megachurchesdefinition.html> For a profile of megachurches, see the Hartford Institute for Religion Research study, *Megachurches Today 2005*, [http://hrr.hartsem.edu/org/megastoday2005\\_summaryreport.html](http://hrr.hartsem.edu/org/megastoday2005_summaryreport.html) .

<sup>6</sup> Leadership Network conference, “Externally Focused Church Leadership Community,” Irvine, CA, 4-6 November 2003: <http://churchoftheservant.com/images/ChurchesMoving1.pdf> .

<sup>7</sup> Husock, H. “A mega-church takes on urban problems: Fellowship Bible Comes to South Midtown.” Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 2005. Case 1780.0. Page 3.

<sup>8</sup> Husock H case (2005). Page 1.

<sup>9</sup> “Fellowship Bible Church’s ‘Common Cause’ Groups: Mobilizing for Spiritual Service,” Kennedy School of Government Case Program, 1998 (C15-99-1492.0), p.1, p. 4. See also, “Fellowship Bible

seeking to sustain a tradition of ongoing change, Lewis wants FBC to be not only *externally* focused, but now to become externally *focused* on transforming the lives of the low-income, minority residents of South Midtown.<sup>10</sup>

*Bruce Moore, City Manager*

As the city manager, Bruce Moore has a positive view of FBC. Whatever their personal views of religion may be, class participants will need to recognize why, for Moore, FBC may be “the only game in town” if he wants to generate change in the South Midtown area of his city.

Moore is African American. (This is not mentioned in the case.) He is well aware of the enduring influence of race and class on the urban-suburban demographic and the power structure of Little Rock. At the same time, Moore is similar to D.C.’s mayor Anthony Williams: he brings to role as city manager the professional competence and pragmatism required to help build the new Little Rock.

Moore, however, has limited power resources at his disposal for generating revitalization in the South Midtown section. Despite its being a prime area for redevelopment, by virtue of its proximity to major public institutions and to the downtown, South Midtown is caught in the mutually reinforcing structures of “the truly disadvantaged.”<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, participants should not assume that this area has well organized grassroots organizations.<sup>12</sup> Of the eight churches in the area, six are very small, several are storefronts. The largest church is Highland Park Methodist, a congregation retaining its strong civil rights heritage by drawing middle-class blacks back into the neighborhood.

In South Midtown, there is just one CDC, the Black Community Developers, which has built a dozen new houses. Rev. Robinson’s Hoover United Methodist Church spawned Black Community Developers and an affiliated social services center for the area’s 4,468 households, thirty percent of which are below the official poverty line. Rev. Robinson’s programs receive some of the city’s \$3 million annual allocation of funds to the Prevention Intervention and Treatment program (PIT). It is worth recalling that this amount is matched each year by FBC’s charitable giving; and Mike Robinson, FBC’s savvy community strategist, was instrumental in developing Rev. Robinson’s community center and social service programs.

---

Church’s ‘Common Cause’ Groups—Epilogue: Implementing the ‘Common Cause’ System,” KSG Case Program, 1998 (C15-99-1492.1), and Husock H case (2005), p. 6.

<sup>10</sup> Husock H case (2005), p. 10.

<sup>11</sup> See William Julius Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

<sup>12</sup> When thinking about mobilizing civic capacity to influence the political process, it is necessary to do an empirical inventory of the faith-based and civic organizations in the particular social context under discussion. As a resource for this purpose, see the asset inventory tool: *Mapping Your Community’s Faith-Based Assets*.

Thus, Bruce Moore has good reason to see FBC as a high-capacity organization. When it comes to making significant change happen in this area, this mega-church is arguably the only game in South Midtown. What, then, are FBC’s organizational resources and capacities as a public agent?

One way for the instructor to organize this part of the class discussion is to use the analytical framework on the public roles of religion.<sup>13</sup> As organizational resources and capacities are identified, they can be listed on the board under six headings that correspond to the roles of the analytical framework. The instructor then can invite the class to reflect on these more analytically. From Bruce Moore’s perspective, what are the most important resources and capacities FBC can offer the city to improve South Midtown? What are the resources and capacities Moore might view with caution, or perhaps even consider liabilities?

The following are examples:

<i>Moore</i>	<i>Expression</i>	<i>Values Formation</i>	<i>Community Building</i>	<i>Moral Discourse</i>	<i>Civic-Political Engagement</i>	<i>Social Services</i>
<i>Possible Assets</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lewis has strong vision--charismatic leader who builds;</li> <li>- Connects vision to operational outcomes</li> <li>- structure;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FBC motivates civic involvement;</li> <li>- cares about the physical <i>and</i> moral quality of life in South Midtown (SM);</li> <li>- relational approach (mentoring) helps kids, builds social capital;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrated record</li> <li>- Motivated volunteers;</li> <li>- Generates non-profits;</li> <li>- Wants to “go to scale” by creating a model of hope for others to replicate;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Important role for churches in character development</li> <li>- Evangelical faith permeates public culture;</li> <li>- Links faith and citizenship;</li> <li>- Leaders (Mike Robinson ) have “multi-lingual” ability to work with different groups;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Affluent and influential members well placed in the power structure;</li> <li>- wants to improve elementary education;</li> <li>- wants to generate large scale housing redevelopment;</li> <li>- leadership knows how to get things done;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gives \$3 million annually;</li> <li>- Helped to build community social service center;</li> <li>- Started and runs a number of social service programs;</li> </ul>
<i>Possible Liabilities</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FBC vision driven &gt; authority of directional leader;</li> <li>- What are FBC’s driving motivations?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will FBC promote character and civic values, or will it proselytize?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What impact is FBC having on other stakeholders in SM and the wider city?</li> <li>- Is there danger of worsening race relations?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where to draw the line between religious and moral values?</li> <li>- Can Moore adopt FBC’s view of single-parent families;</li> <li>- Do moral values take into account structures of poverty?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could this worsen racial tensions between powerful white church and black community?</li> <li>- will this further the city’s ceding development to private actors without retaining oversight?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do volunteer-based programs have “staying power”?</li> <li>- What impact are these programs having on the city’s capacity to deliver needed services?</li> </ul>

### 3. What are the organizations’ respective motivations for potentially working together on this project?

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of these roles, see Mary Jo Bane et al., *Taking Faith Seriously* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2005: 1-17).

Despite FBC's considerable resources and capacity, it is not clear that Moore should actively collaborate with the mega-church on its South Midtown Project. What are FBC's driving motivation and objectives?

These questions require class participants to address the difference between vision and mission. Unlike for-profit organizations, which translate their mission statements into specific "bottom-line" objectives of profitability, nonprofit organizations regard income generation as a means to furthering social and moral objectives that are more difficult to measure.<sup>14</sup>

Moreover, religious organizations, which also have to pay attention to their social contributions and bottom lines, have as their *raison d'être* the faithful articulation--through words, symbols, and actions—of a particular religious and ethical view of reality. Thus, a particular challenge facing public religious leaders is to know how to clarify and to translate their theological vision and organizational mission into clear motivations and aims that allow for building constructive partnership and avoiding others.

### *FBC's Motivations*

Throughout the case, Lewis and others articulate a number of reasons. Which of the reasons (below) do participants think are organizational motivations behind FBC's South Midtown Program?

- Lewis's entrepreneurial spirit to sustain a "tradition of ongoing change" by creating models that "infect everybody else to change their little part" of the world;<sup>15</sup>
- Lewis's concern that members become disconnected from the church;<sup>16</sup>
- Lewis's obedience to divine authority as it's revealed on his annual retreat;<sup>17</sup>
- Challenging a successful church to live its values by becoming outwardly focused;
- A desire to improve the lives of disadvantaged people by creating an "island of health";<sup>18</sup>
- Improving the educational outcomes of children in an urban school;<sup>19</sup>
- Building partnerships with African-American families and churches;<sup>20</sup>
- Building strong, two-parent families in an impoverished area;
- Promoting its religious vision of a healthy church and society; and
- Other motivations.

### *Bruce Moore and the City's Motivations*

---

<sup>14</sup> See Mark H. Moore, "The Public Value Scorecard" (Cambridge: Harvard University, The Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations; Working Paper #18, May 2003).

<sup>15</sup> Husock H case (2005), p. 10.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2, p. 9.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

The instructor should ask students to identify what Moore would be likely to consider the city's motivations for working with FBC. After identifying these, participants need to identify which of these they view as most important. The city's interests include the following:

- Delivering on housing as one of the city's four priorities by taking advantage of a high-capacity organization that knows how to deliver on its commitments?
- Leverage the city's power to stimulate private-market development in an area of disinvestment?
- Create a mixed-income neighborhood that will improve Little Rock?
- Combine "bricks-and-mortar" with moral reform?
- Cooperate with a powerful constituency to avoid political problems?
- Others?

*Other Stakeholders: Black churches and the African-American community*

Moore needs to take into account other possible stakeholders' incentives and reactions to the South Midtown Project. The instructor should ask the class to identify the other main stakeholders. How will these actors view the SMP? Can Moore accommodate their interests, or is he likely to face problems?

In particular the class should consider the interests and possible reactions of the Black churches and African-American community. Even though the latter is not strongly represented institutionally in South Midtown, Little Rock's wider minority community could view this initiative as encouraging or threatening. What appear to be Rev. Robinson's interests; and can these be accommodated?

As a way of thinking about this question, the instructor might ask the class to respond to the question Cheryl Sanders raises: "Who is speaking for the poor in this case?"<sup>21</sup>

#### **4. What is the FBC strategy in its South Midtown Project?**

Before focusing on the central strategic question of partnership, the class may want to review the strategy of Fellowship's South Midtown project. It could do so at two levels: strategic analysis at the operational level; and normative analysis at the level of the respective social visions guiding FBC and the city.

#### **Strategic Analysis<sup>22</sup>**

##### *Mission*

The program has two interrelated objectives—moral and physical regeneration. FBC's strategy of moral regeneration is recruiting a larger number of church volunteers

---

<sup>21</sup> This is a central concern of Cheryl Sanders in the case, "Models of Collaboration: Churches, City Hall and Community Change."

<sup>22</sup> This section draws on concepts in Mark H. Moore's *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

to mentor to children attending Franklin Elementary School. Lewis explains the logic model behind this strategy: "...mentoring children might lead both to direct contact with their mothers and to indirect influence on neighborhood ministers, who might take up the message of abstinence until marriage and male responsibility."<sup>23</sup> The second strategy, physical regeneration, consists of using the power and competence of FBC's head of "Community Strategies,"<sup>24</sup> Mike Robinson, to generate private investment in large-scale new housing development, half of which would be affordable for current residents. While Bruce Moore might want to separate these two tracks, it is hard to imagine Lewis would be willing to do so.

### *Capacity*

FBC's capacity for achieving these objectives has already been introduced into the conversation. FBC is a highly successful nonprofit organization run by sophisticated and specialized management. This level of operational infrastructure is necessary to sustain the weekly programs drawing attendance by some 7,000 individuals, and for sustaining their voluntary programs of civic engagement in the wider Little Rock community.

However, what are the limitations of this operational capacity for cross-sector collaboration with other institutions and actors? What are the challenges FBC must address in recruiting and sustaining a large number of mentors to work with children and win the trust of their parents? Are there other barriers limiting the power of a megachurch that seeks to develop partnerships with other religious organizations?<sup>25</sup>

### *Resources*

What are the resources—i.e., money and legitimacy—the city needs to provide? Moore is not being asked to contribute public funds. What, on the other hand, are the kinds of legitimacy it is being asked to provide? These include the power of eminent domain, the political authority of the city manager to have the City Council appoint a Land Bank Authority, and the city's "umbrella of legitimacy" for FBC, which will be well represented on the Land Bank Authority as a lead actor in the project. Another form of legitimacy is the city's power to exercise oversight and accountability for achieving its public goals. Can Moore exercise this function, or is it likely to be circumvented?

### *Social Visions for the Regeneration of Single-Parent Families*

Beyond strategic analysis, the instructor may ask class participants to consider whether FBC's vision of social change is compatible with that of Bruce Moore as a public official. FBC's social vision centers on *family values*—i.e., the sanctity of the two-parent family as the foundation for all of society, as well as the Fellowship church

---

<sup>23</sup> Husock H case (2005), p. 16.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> The class might want to take note of the contrast between the capacity of Lewis's church and those of Brown and Sanders. These three cases provide different angles for thinking about the possibilities and difficulties of partnership between quite different "faith-based organizations."

community. The *moral values* of sexual abstinence and marriage are, to Lewis and his members, not religious sectarian values; they are universal values for all members of society.

For the FBC community, then, it is not possible to separate the track of “physical regeneration” from the track of “moral regeneration” without succumbing to the “subtle heresy” of the social gospel or liberal wing of American Christianity. Is this an arcane discussion for theologians, or does it have practical implications for a possible partnership between FBC and the city?

Single-parent families make up 61% of the households in South Midtown. While there continues to be significant disagreement over the reasons that account for the high level of single-parent families, poverty scholars generally agree that, all things being equal, two-parent families stand a much greater chance of escaping poverty than do single-parent families.<sup>26</sup> We can assume, therefore, Lewis and Moore agree on the importance of encouraging more two-parent families in South Central.

The question is how to go about it. Lewis’s strategy is for his church volunteers to mentor children in the Franklin Elementary School. Mentoring will provide volunteers the opportunity to get to know the children’s mothers, and to provide them with “life skills”<sup>27</sup> on sexual abstinence and marriage. Single mothers, in turn, will put pressure on their ministers in the Black churches to take up this crucial cause of reform. According to FBC’s key partner among the Black Churches, Rev. Robinson, the values of purity and marriage are promoted in all the area Black churches; the problem is the message doesn’t carry across the gap between the pews and the streets.<sup>28</sup>

The problem to resolve between Lewis and Moore is whether single-parent families will be permitted to move into the new housing. Lewis sees “the construction of new, relatively inexpensive-to-buy (‘affordable’) housing in the neighborhood, such that *upwardly-mobile-two-parent-families* would have a place to go and a reason to stay.”<sup>29</sup> If new housing were made available to single-parent families, who make up 61% of the area residents, the project would become just another futile attempt at physical regeneration of a community without moral regeneration of its residents.

For his part, Moore has reason to be concerned. Lewis’s approach would disqualify 60% of the current residents and require their massive displacement out of the area. That would certainly incur the wrath of the Black church leaders like Rev. Robinson. It could even inflame racial tensions and set back the slow, steady process of change FBC’s Scott Worthington hopes for in his weekly tutoring. Moore, himself an African American, has reason to believe that Lewis’s logic model is a bit naïve. Lewis extols the ability of “big

---

<sup>26</sup> See Sara McLanahan and Gary Sandefur, *Growing Up with a Single Parent* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); and Jason DeParle, *American Dream: Three Women, Ten Kids, and a Nation’s Drive to End Welfare* (New York: Viking Press, 2004).

<sup>27</sup> Husock H case (2005). Page 15.

<sup>28</sup> See Omar M. McRoberts, *Streets of Glory: Church and Community in a Black Urban Neighborhood* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).

<sup>29</sup> Husock H case (2005). Page 15.

churches” to learn from one another, and is frustrated by what he sees as a “small church” complex among pastors unwilling to learn from their more successful colleagues in the suburbs.<sup>30</sup> Finally, a church-state issue awaits Moore. Doing a full-scale housing redevelopment in South Central that excluded single-parent households would almost certainly be challenged in the courts as discriminatory, and rightly so. Can transformation of South Central be done at the expense of discriminating against and dislocating its most disadvantaged households? Is that what Christian love is about?

##### **5. Is it desirable for Lewis and Moore to work together; and, if so, how should they?**

The final question challenges class participants to draw the discussion together by stating their positions on what Bruce Moore should do. To set a context, the instructor may find it helpful to take a second informal poll by posing the same question: “If you were in Bruce Moore’s shoes, would you work with FBC on its South Midtown Project?” This will facilitate a balanced exchange among conflicting viewpoints.

Another possibility is to ask who has changed his or her mind over the course of this session. If individuals have moved in opposite directions, the instructor can ask several to explain why they changed their minds. What were the key factors? Would they approach the possible collaboration differently?

As individuals explain their positions, they should draw on the main points raised in the discussion to clarify both the “why” and the “how” of their views. Among the range of places where individuals will come out, one option should be challenged as unrealistic. Moore cannot simply avoid the dilemma by claiming a position of neutrality based on separation of church and state. The “wall of separation” in this case has a number of openings that allow for two-way traffic. Fellowship Bible Church *is* a public actor in Little Rock, one that is too powerful for the mayor’s office to ignore. Whether he decides to collaborate or not, Moore needs to think through his strategy carefully.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.