YES, since (1) "pastoral" is a Christian-leadership term and (2) Christology requires that Jesus be the control model for Christian-leadership roles, one of which is pastoral counsding. That's the deductive answer, equally dry from linguistics and from theology. Not completely useless, but unmoving because devoid of psycho- and socio-factors; yet not naive unless one imagines that the PC role (a) was created by Jesus or (b) existed in his surround and he fulfilled it. [Our highly differentiated roles, such as professional "preacher" and professional "counselor," should not be read back into Christian origins.]

So where are we with our question? Let's try another angle, the psychosociohistorical-religious: was Jesus a "prophet" or a "guru"? The typical leader in emissary-type religions such as those of the West (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) is the prophet; of the exemplary-type religions, which includes most of the developed religions of the East (Hinduism, Buddhism, Sikhism, etc.), it's the guru. Clearly, Jesus was emissary, "the Sent One" who is at the same time "the Coming One" in the here/now:not-yet tension; just as clearly, he was example, in Luther's startling phrase "God with hair and skin." In him "the natural enemies" are reconciled in living doctrine ("Christology") that recapitulates the shaman of archaic religion and embraces the role-developments therefrom: the old priest (of the settled tribe, city, amphictyony, nation), the reminding prophet (who "predicts" scenarios as projections from both illud tempus [the purity of the origin-time) and alternative power-decisions in the corrupt present], and the guru (who "models" the promoted behavior/attitudes/consciousness and provides techniques for the self-introjection thereof, both analytic and synthetic -- and who therefore includes the new priest, the psychotherapist/sociotherapist, who now tends to absorb the other shamanic roles and their contexts-the church of the old priest, the sect of the prophet, and the cult of the guru).

This thinksheet is being written the morning after the close of NYTS' first "PC Integration Seminar," whose intention was to help Post-Graduate Center / NYTS STM students "integrate" their training in the two institutions. All agreed the effort was worthwhile and necessary, and most held that NYTS should do more to help the student integrate the internal old/new priests, who are "natural enemies" and can become—as we see supremely in Jesus—supernatural friends. One of my conclusions, this morning—after (15May75), is that even heavier use of Jesus should be made in the seminar. The diagram below is one way of seeing him as convergence—model in roles and therefore implicitly as integration—model for the PC student and, less modestly, for the New World.

GLOBAL CONTEXT: While "the Third [i.e., less Westernized, West-industrialized] World" continues humping for Westernization-as-industrialization, the already West-ernized worlds are Easterizing the psyche, shifting from "phophets" (sacred and secular messengers with missions) to "gurus" (whose attentioning is egocentric in

the broad sense, not heterocentric [e.g., not Gen.12 and the other "calls" in the West's religions]): the zeitgeist is more favorable to maharashis and psychotherapists than to pastors and theotherapists....to state it institutionally, more favorable to the Post-Graduate Center than to NYTS. R.J. Liston's "protean man," Orr and Nichelson's "expansive man" (contra the traditional "conscientious man"), the current thirst for self-validating experience and therefore for participatory modes of being-in-world, [in my terms] the drift from the cortical (upper-coil) to the visceral (lower-coil) and from dualism (including Creator/creation) to [impersonal] monism (converging Western "science" and Eastern Vedanta in many forms, especially "meditation"...)....

