Essays for CL610

Please Read the following two essays and note in a response when you have read them - this will allow me to see who has read them and by when. No further response is needed other than a "complete", "done" or any other indication that you have actually read the essays. These essays and appropriate engagement with their content are to be included in your first half reading log.

Cathy Price essay on Servant Leadership

A Perspective on Servant Leadership:

Growing God's People for God's Purposes

Cathy Price 26 January 2005

Biblical and Theological Foundations of Servant Leadership:

As both a Christian author and a leadership scholar, John Stott uses his book titled *Basic Christian Leadership* to highlight the biblical and theological foundations for a ministry designed to 'grow the people'. He uses the first four chapters of Paul's first letter to the church of Corinth as a basis of outlining his claims. By doing so, he presents a style of leadership that drastically differs from the traditional, more secular models – he presents a model that would be later called 'servant leadership' (110). Stott's use of I Corinthians 1:27 best illustrates the premise of this seemingly contradictory term: "God chose the foolish things of the world to shame the wise; God chose the weak things of the world to shame the strong" (NIV). Here, Stott uses Paul's words to the Corinthian church to remind Christian leaders that "cultural leadership models are incompatible with the servant imagery taught in Scripture" (113). Thus, he charges Christian leaders to be "humble" in everything they do: "… the common denominator in all models of servant leadership is humility – humility before Christ, whose subordinates we are; humility before Scripture, of which we are stewards; humility before the world, whose opposition we are bound to encounter; and humility before the congregation, whose membership we are to love and serve" (114). Therefore, as a servant leader I lead paradoxically: I lead through serving; I lead through weakness; I lead by acknowledging that I am called *first* to be a follower of Christ and *then* to be a leader of people. This is the essence of servant leadership that Stott develops in his book.

Respected businessman and leadership expert Robert Greenleaf agrees with Stott's notion of servant leadership. In fact, in many leadership circles, he is credited with coining the term that Stott's book explores. Thus, his 1977 book, *Servant Leadership*, is more than an innovative approach for leading and managing within the secular business context. It is a book rooted in principles that are foundationally biblical. In fact, even though Greenleaf's inspiration for the idea of servant as leader came out of reading Herman Hesse's *Journey to the East*, the characteristic he accredits to Leo are the same embodied throughout scripture by Jesus. It is important to note, however, Greenleaf does not explicitly make this connection. Regardless, he highlights ten principles that help to define the art of servant leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of the people, and commitment to the growth of the community (Greenleaf 21-61). Each of these principles is imperative for the leader who is dedicated to serve.

In short, Stott's analysis of Paul from a Christian perspective and Greenleaf's analysis of Leo from a business perspective confirms that the primary role/responsibility of a servant leader is 'growing the people'. However, neither author gives sufficient attention to Jesus, the ultimate example of a servant leader; for Jesus, more than Paul or Leo, embodies the essential characteristics of a servant leader:

humility, obedience, submission, and willful-suffering (CL610 Notes). Critically acclaimed Christian author Henri J. M. Nouwen agrees. Thus, he dedicates his book, *In the Name of Jesus: Reflections of Christian Leadership*, to exploring Jesus' words and actions in two gospel stories: the story of Jesus' temptation in the desert (Matt. 4:1-11) and the story of Peter's call to be a 'shepherd' (John 21:12-19). Nouwen's analysis challenges Christian leaders to follow the Kingdom-minded model of leadership that Jesus modeled – a leadership style in which leaders willfully resign their desire to be powerful and, thus, embrace authority based on prayer and forgiveness (91-93). This is the model Jesus set for his followers. Furthermore, it is the model Paul charges all Christ-followers to mimic in Philippians 2:6-7: Jesus, "who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, but made himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant…." (NIV). Jesus' willingness to do this is the mysterious beauty behind the Christian faith. Furthermore, it is the mysterious beauty behind servant leadership.

Application of my Understanding of Servant Leadership:

Such Biblical foundations have particular implications for my ministry context – Young Life. First, I must make sure that each ministry goal/objective is consistent with God's (Blackaby 56-86). In short, I must strive to identify areas where God is already at work and aim to provide an environment where lay people can partner with Him. Thus, I must earnestly seek and obediently submit to God's plan (Blackaby 56-86). Secondly, I must consciously seek ways to empower others to utilize their gifts and talents (Blackaby 31-55). This, too, is done in full submission to God's promptings via the Holy Spirit. By using Godly discernment, I can distinguish which individuals are best suited to lead, manage, minister, or pray – four essential roles in a ministry intended to grow the people (Blackaby 119-146).

My Passion for Growing the People:

Currently, Young Life acts as the ministry context that through which I am executing my call to 'grow the people'. As a para-church organization, Young Life applies the incarnational ministry method Jesus demonstrated in the New Testament. In short, Young Life trains Christians (primarily college students) to go into middle schools and high schools as a means of building relationships with adolescents and thus earning the right to tell them the gospel message. My particular role in the Young Life ministry is a "leader trainer". In short, I disciple college students in the same way they will disciple adolescents. Clearly, as a leader of Christian leaders, I am most passionate about effectively modeling the principles of servant leadership. As the team leader, the platform through which I can best model such principles is in our weekly team meetings. Thus, much like Jesus, I strive to model "kenosis" – I choose to lay aside the power granted to me by my title/position and lead my team by serving my team.

It is important to note, however, that in order to effectively model these servant leader characteristics within my professional life, I must first implement them into my personal life. This means I must pay special attention to developing the personal and spiritual disciplines necessary for becoming a servant leader.

Personal and Spiritual Formation Lifestyle Necessary for becoming a Servant Leader:

There appears to be at least two characteristics that mark the lives of all the great saints – fellowship *with* God and service *for* God – and my recent study of John Wesley's life and ministry has confirmed both their presence and importance. Steve Harper's book, *Devotional Life in the Wesleyan Tradition*, outlines the major features of Wesley's personal devotional life and illustrates how they can be applied to my own devotional time. More than presenting an objective analysis of Wesley's daily devotional times, however, Harper highlights how Wesley lived in continual fellowship with God and thus dedicated his every breath to bringing Him Glory. In this regard, Harper reveals the deep intimacy of

Wesley's relationship with God.

Studying Wesley's approach has challenged me to adopt the same approach to my personal spiritual development. For, like Wesley, I believe I must adopt a *lifestyle* of personal and spiritual formation in order to effectively lead.

The first lifestyle characteristic I seek to implement is fellowship with God. In other words, much like Wesley, I yearn to live out of a deep and abiding intimacy with my Creator (note: This is a concept Henry and Richard Blackaby highlight in their book *Spiritual Leadership* as well.) Above all, I want my life to be seized by His great affection for me; so that, at the very core of my being, I can rest in the quiet, steady assurance that I am both accepted and loved. Wesley reminds me that such affection is not something I can earn. Rather it is a gift that has already been given. Therefore, I seek to view my devotional life as Wesley did – as a "means of grace" (Harper 8). My leadership style must flow out of this understanding. After all, the only way I can develop an "environment of grace" for others is rest in the truth that God enables me to function out of that same environment (CL610 notes – character and capacity ladder).

The second lifestyle characteristic I seek to adopt is service for God. I seek to mark my life by reaching out, caring, and giving. I want to follow Jesus' example of laying down my life for my friends (John 15:13). Thus, I want to genuinely and unconditionally care for/about others. Hopefully such an attitude will enable others to be who God intended them to be and to live the "full life" God intended them to live (John 10:10).

I realize the only way I can successfully implement such lifestyle characteristics is by continuing to surrender to the Holy Spirit (Blackaby 56-85). After all, my life can overflow with intimacy and service only if I see it in relation to God purposes, instead of God in relation to my own purposes. As the Psalmist said, "Know this: Yahweh is God, and God, Yahweh. He made us, we didn't make Him. We're His people," (Psalm 100:3). This psalm challenges me to recognize that every aspect of my life is an opportunity to experience God's presence and to offer Him service.

Perhaps one of the most often ignored areas of preparation for ministry in Young Life is in this area of soul preparation. Many of the folks I have known who were successful in their ministry were wearing themselves out because of what was missing inside. On his deathbed, Jim Rayburn, the founder of Young Life, pleaded with one of his dear and trusted friends: "Don't ever let them stop telling kids about Jesus." (Miller 25-26). Perhaps the greater fear in Young Life these days should be that we, as leaders, would stop talking *with* Jesus, rather than we would stop telling kids *about* Him.

Clearly, this is a pitfall that I must actively seek to avoid. For there is no doubt that the privilege and responsibility of being a Young Life leader is great. That means, however, that there are no shortcuts to spiritual growth. Thus, as a leader of Young Life leaders, I must be diligent and determined in my personal commitment to live a life of fellowship *with* God and service *for* God. For, sustaining effective and satisfying ministry requires an intentional effort to stay in touch with the "rivers of living water" that refresh, renew, and sustain (John 7:38). This means that maintaining an intimate relationship with Christ is essential. It was essential for the first disciples and is just as important for us (Blackaby 57). Arguably, however, since we are modern Christians living in the modern "already/not yet" context, facilitating such as relationship can be somewhat difficult. Thus, it requires discipline. More specifically, it requires discipline of one's character. Critically acclaimed Christian author Richard Foster agrees.

Foster's book, appropriately titled *Celebration of Discipline*, highlights the need for Christians to practice the various spiritual disciplines. He maintains that they are essential in developing an intimate relationship with God. Foster's book highlights thirteen disciplines and groups them into three

categories: inward disciplines, outward disciplines, and corporate disciplines. As I read Foster's description of each discipline, I was repeatedly challenged. More specifically, I was challenged in the areas of prayer, scriptural study, and solitude.

Prior to this year, my prayer and devotional times are sporadic at best. At times, I felt as though I did more talking than listening – I did more talking *to* God rather than hearing *from* Him. Similarly, at times I felt as though I was studying books written about God but not spending time studying His Book (i.e. Scripture). Thus, Foster's commentary and the insights presented in class lecture/discussion challenged me to revamp my current spiritual practices. More specifically, they challenged me to develop a personal prayer and devotional time that was separate from my seminary studies and prayer group meetings (33-46; 62-76). Also, they challenged me to implement a weekly accountability regarding those disciplines (143-157). Therefore, I currently exchange weekly accountability reports with Caroline, a trusted spiritual friend and mentor. In addition to reporting our spiritual development, Caroline and I also report on other areas of our life: physically, mentally, and socially. We do this because we believe in a wholistic (i.e. 'holistic') approach to personal well-being.

The other aspect of my personal spiritual development that Foster's book challenged was the area of solitude (96-109). As an extreme extrovert, I love being with people. Thus, I am rarely alone. That means that the corporate spiritual disciplines of service, worship, and celebration are ones I consistently practice, but the more inward disciplines were ones needed development. Therefore, in addition to implementing weekly accountability regarding daily prayer and study, I also wanted to be intentional about setting aside longer periods of time where I could rest in God's presence and hear His voice. One catalyst for this desire was Foster's chapter on solitude (96-109). As a result of his insights, I decided to schedule times for personal reflection. Friday, November 19th marked my first official 'reflection retreat'. I spent the day at the Abby of Gethsemane located in Nazareth, Kentucky. I was blessed by my time and am looking forward to my second retreat scheduled for February 3rd. Ironically, my time alone has enriched my time with people. Thus, my experience validates the claims Henry and Richard Blackaby and Richard Foster make in their books: by drawing closer to God, I am more effective in my ministry efforts to grow the people of God.

Importance of Living and Growing in Community:

While I must take responsibility for my personal spiritual development, the role of community is an equally important aspect of my spiritual maturation. Catholic Priest John D. Zizioulas agrees. In fact, his book, *Being as Communion*, explores how community and communion impact the Christian identity (Introduction). More specifically, Zizioulas suggests that communion is more than a sacrament, it a way of life (17). Thus, in the same way the Eucharist celebrates Christ, the Body of Christ (i.e. the Church) does as well. In other words, where communion commemorates the initiation of a right-relationship with God through Christ, the Body/Christian Community celebrates the perfecting/constituting/transforming work of the Holy Spirit making Christians more like Christ (Zizioulas 101-114). In short, Zizioulas claims responsibility of Christian community is character development – Christians partner with the Holy Spirit so as to accurately reflect Christ/become more Christ-like (101-114). The end result is the Body of Christ becoming the image of Christ to the world (123). In this regard, Zizioulas reminds me that living and growing in community is essential to living and growing in Christ.

Where Zizioulas highlights the importance of living in community, John Wesley provides practical insights regarding how to do it (i.e. Societies). After all, Wesley's techniques for nurturing and training Christian disciples brought about personal transformation in the lives of countless individuals and a moral reformation for the entire nation as well, so his insights deserve serious consideration (Davies 3). At the heart of Wesley's revolutionary system was the notion of 'the Methodist society' (Davies 5).

In the same way community was essential to the global expansion of Methodism, it also functions as a crucial aspect of Young Life's Leadership Training Program – the program through which I grow the people. Much like Wesley, I emphasize the personal spiritual growth of all team members and hold them accountable for such growth. By doing this, I place emphasis on *who they are rather in Christ* rather than on *what they do for Christ*. I believe the sequence is important. I think Wesley would agree.

Who am I as a Servant Leader: My Unique Ministry Gifts and Graces

One key role a community plays in the process of discerning God's call is in the area of personal gifts. Os Guinness devotes an entire chapter of his book, *The Call*, to relating giftedness to calling (Chapter 6). The chapter's title "Do What You Are" appropriately communicates the principles related to giftedness. More specifically, this chapter encourages people "to do" what God has uniquely gifted them "to be" (Guiness 45).

Thus, I am a teacher. Thus, I thoroughly enjoyed my teaching experience at Lexington Catholic High School (1999-2003). In fact, my experiences both in and out of the classroom taught me invaluable lessons about the American culture in general and the American teenage culture in particular. Most significantly, I've learned that above all adolescents seek a sense of individuality and identity. While I was able to use literature as a medium where they could develop in these areas, I believe that a foundation in Christ's teachings instead of the world's teachings would make the process more meaningful; I believe that instead of forming an identity that is a product of fleeting advertising, teenagers need to formulate an identity that is grounded in Christ's eternal teachings. It is because of this realization that I followed God's call out of the classroom. I still consider myself as a teacher. The only significant change is the content I teach. Instead of teaching literary classics from the American canon, I teach the principles found in God's Holy Word. In this regard, I try use my teaching skills to teach something more significant than comma placement; I try to teach people how to know themselves and their function in the body of Christ. In this regard, I seek to use my spiritual gifts of teaching, wisdom, discernment, and encouragement as the means of advancing God's Kingdom.

Marcus Buckingham and Donald O. Clifton use their book *Now, Discover Your Strengths* as a platform to encourage individuals to focus on improving their strengths rather than troubleshooting their weaknesses. As means of identifying such strengths, they partnered with the Gallup International Research and Education Center and created a revolutionary program – StrengthsFinder Profile. In short, the profile is designed to help individuals "identify their talents, build them into strengths, and enjoy consistent, near-perfection performance" (67). This program introduces thirty-four dominant "themes" with thousands of possible combinations and reveals how they can best be translated into success (76-116). After taking the StengthsFinder Profile test and analyzing the results, my unique gift and graces were evident.

The first theme the StengthsFinder Profile identified was "communication", meaning I like to "explain, describe, host, speak in public, and write" (90). As a former English teacher, this theme is consistent with my life and ministry experiences. The second theme, "significance" indicates my desire to for others to see me as "important". Truly, I like to be recognized/known. Above all, however, I seek to make Christ known. "Connectedness" was the third theme the StrengthsFinder Profile identified. This theme speaks to my "faith in the links between all things" (92). In other words, it highlights my belief that there are few coincidences in life (92). This tendency to link meaning with circumstances is particularly helpful in my ministry context. Arguably, however, the fourth and fifth themes are the most beneficial: "Relator" and "Woo". As a strong Relator, I "enjoy close relationships with others," and "find deep satisfaction in working hard with friends to achieve goals" (110). The "Woo" theme suggests that I embrace the "challenge of meeting new people and winning them over" (116). Also, I "derive satisfaction from … making a meaningful connection with another person" (116). Arguably, each of these strengths themes could be categorized under my spiritual gifts of teaching, wisdom, and

exhortation.

Former church pastors Albert L. Winesman and Curt Liesveld partnered with Donald O. Clifton to write a follow-up book to *Now, Discover Your Strengths* called *Living in your Strengths*. Much like the title suggests, this book encourages individuals to *live* according to the strengths they have now discovered. Their further explanation of the difference between a strength, talent, and skill enabled me to critically assess my current ministry responsibilities and encouraged me to seek assistance in certain areas. Thus, I can focus on optimizing my strengths rather than minimizing my weaknesses.

As a Young Life leader serving in the Leadership Training Program, I try to follow their advice. I work with a group of leaders who regularly meet with college students so as to facilitate their personal spiritual formation and leadership development. The individual strengths of people in our training group complement each other nicely. Thus, we are each able to live and serve according to our personal strengths.

As a trainer of leaders and facilitator of spiritual growth, I still consider myself as a teacher. The only difference is the content I teach. I no longer teach people the copious rules of proper comma placement or appropriate semi-colon usage. Instead, I help them to be Christ-centered people who are passionate about building relationships with teenagers who don't yet know the God they serve. It is a subject matter about which I am most passionate.

My Anticipated Areas of Ministry Assistance: The "Shadow-Sides"

The StrengthsFinder Profile identified "communication" as one of strengths theme. By definition, "communication" is "the ability to express ideas, concepts, strategies, visions, and solutions in a way that's clear and easy to understand by others" (32). It's also "the ability to express these same things in a compelling fashion that inspires others to buy into them" (32). Until recently, I would've considered the ability to effectively communicate as the most essential characteristic for leaders. Today, however, I am continually reminded of the importance of listening. Leaders must be able to provide the experience of being heard and understood to their people. Without it, most will be reluctant to buy into, and thus emotionally invest themselves in, the leader's proposed path. When people experience validation of their thoughts and feelings, and know their input is given serious consideration, they become more receptive to coaching, direction, and ideas that differ from their own. Clearly, the ability to listen is essential for an equipping ministry. Consequently, it is an area in which I anticipate needed assistance and development. For it is not a natural strength.

In addition to identifying the practical areas of potential weaknesses, I must also identify potential spiritual pitfalls or "shadow sides" – to use Parker J. Palmer's term – that could compromise or even destroy ministry efforts. Palmer purports that in order to avoid such pitfalls, an individual must first recognize that he/she *is* the problem. In other words, "leaders need not only the technical skills to manage the external world but also the spiritual skills to journey inward toward the source of both shadow and light" (Palmer 79). Once again, this 'journey' cannot be completed alone, so I must be intentional about living and growing in Christian community. This is the primary way I seek to ensure to remain under God's authority and avoid the pitfalls my shadow side leads me to when it goes unchecked.

Works Cited

Barker, Kenneth, ed. *The NIV Study Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1995.

Blackaby, Henry and Richard Blackaby. *Spiritual Leadership*: Moving People on to God's Agenda. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 2001.

Buckingham, Marcus and Donald O. Clifton. *Now, Discover Your Strengths*. New York: The Free Press, 2001.

CL610 Notes. *Theology of Servant Leadership*. Asbury Theological Seminary. Dr. Tom Tumblim. January 2005.

Davies, Rupert E. Ed. *The Works of John Wesley*. Nashville: Abingdon Press. vol. 9., 1989.

Foster, Richard J. *Celebration of Discipline: The Path to Spiritual Growth*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1998.

Greenleaf, Robert. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. 25th edition. New York: Paulist Press, 2002.

Guinness, Os. *The Call: Finding and Fulfilling the Central Purpose of Your Life*. Nashville: W Publishing Group, 1998.

Harper, Steve. *Devotional Life in the Wesleyan Tradition*. Nashville: UpperRoom Books, 2002.

Miller, John. *Back to the Basics of Young Life*. Revised Edition. USA: 1991.

Nouwen, Henri J.M. *In the Name of Jesus: Reflections on Christian Leadership*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1989.

Palmer, Parker, J. *Let Your Life Speak: Listening for the Voice of Vocation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

Stott. John. *Basic Christian Leadership*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002.

Winseman, Albert L, Donald O. Clifton, and Curt Liesveld. *Living Your Strengths*. Washington D.C.: The Gallup Organization, 2003.

Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. New York: St. Vladimir's Semi

Les Comee essay on Servant Leadership

A PERSPECTIVE ON SERVANT LEADERSHIP by Les Comee

One of the descriptions of Jesus I have most appreciated is "the Man for others." That seems to me to be at the heart of servant leadership. Some wonderful books have been written about

servant leadership. I want to discuss some of the simple implications for people who want to ask God to lead them in this way.

I. LEADERSHIP FROM WITHIN

Each year , for the past several years, I have encouraged our staff to listen to God for a special scripture then ponder that scripture and let it shape their vision, their prayer, their speaking. Jesus did this with Isaiah 61. He used it when He preached His inaugural sermon in Luke 4. It undergirded His ministry. It focused His prayer life. When the disciples wrote the Gospels they remembered that Jesus' vision was not His own — it was given to Him. He listened first. If we are going to be servant leaders, we begin with a listening posture, to our Lord in scripture, to the leadership God has given us, to the people we are called to serve.

It is an important question we need to ask — how am I doing at listening? How clear am I on what I am being called to do? Am I being faithful to that vision in the midst of whatever struggles I face? All leadership begins from "within." There are a lot of different ways to talk about this. For the leader, the real issue is always an internal one. This is a hard lesson for me to learn. I want to change or blame everything but myself. "My supervisor expects too much. Not enough leaders are committed. We do not have enough money." All this may be true. The issue for a leader is to begin to understand what is blocking him or her from hearing God's Spirit. What are we to do that will allow us to be open to God's grace? What in me needs to be transformed? This is another way of saying the servant leader has to be open to change, to listen, to hear the voice of God. So the leader has to live with the paradox of being clear about a sense of call and vision, plus open to God and others. This is one of the many tensions with which a servant leader lives and works.

Texts that have influenced Part I

Leighton Ford's *T ransforming Leadership* is a solid biblical/practical study of Jesus' style, especially chapter 8 on Jesus as a servant leader.

A.B. Bruce's *The T raining of the Twelve* is a classic used by Robert Coleman in *The Master Plan of Evangelism* .

Robert Greenlief 's *Servant Leadership* talks about leadership in an institutional setting.

R. Foster in *Celebration of Discipline* .

Gordon Cosby in *Handbook for Mission Groups* .

H. Nouwen in *In the Name of Jesus* . C. Swindoll in *Improving Y our Serve* .

II. SERVANT LEADERSHIP AND COST

John Stott, in *Imitating the Incarnation* , said, "Evangelical theology is essentially a theology of the cross." There is no other way to understand Christian leadership than leadership that is self-giving and costly. Four times in John 10 Jesus talks about laying down His life for the sheep. It is something He does by His own free will. It is not something pushed on Him by a "program" of any sort. A good deal of my ministry has been spent trying to understand the meaning and implication of these ideas. How do you lead and serve in this way? Being honest/vulnerable with the people we serve is one thing that we see in Jesus' ministry. It was misunderstood then, and we can expect the same response now. In America, we are taught to expect to move from victory to victory. Our lives and ministry grow and grow from one mountaintop to the next. I have never heard a ministry leader take scripture and teach his or her leaders how to deal with lack of response (or failure). Jesus took the time to warn the disciples in Mark 6 as He sent them out in mission by twos. Everyone will not "buy" the Gospel (Mark 6:10-11), and He gave them a sign to allow them to "let go" when people did not respond. He helped them deal with one of the outward stresses of ministry. He told them the truth. People do not always respond. They had not responded to Jesus in Mark 6:1-6. Do we ever talk with our leaders like that? But soon after the sending of the disciples, Jesus begins to prepare them for the inner cost of leadership. He begins in Chapter 8 of Mark and continues in chapters 9 and 10. Like me, the disciples are not interested in hearing about this. They want things to go smoothly, painlessly. In fact, in Chapter 10 they want glory and honor. Jesus then gives His most clear teaching about servant leadership. It has to do with suffering. It is the way God has chosen to transform us. In fact the primary paradigm for the Christian life is death (deny self/let go/ give up) and resurrection (new life/gift/ renewal). Jesus modeled it and the disciples misunderstood it.

It seems to me there are numerous ways we may be called to suffer. We may be called to walk with

brothers and sisters through their pain, suffering and darkness. The disciples did not want to do this with Jesus. Then there is the more subtle call to death that comes with facing our own need to let go of power and control. It may be the call to face our own places of sin and darkness and surrender them to Jesus and our fellowship. How do we lead when we are tired, in pain or not "together?" Leadership can confer this gift if leaders serve by honestly sharing them suffering they face — suffering due to ministry or our personal lives. When teaching the disciples about the cost of being a servant in Mark 10:45 or in Luke's more expanded account in Chapter 22, Jesus never says that being a servant means giving up leadership. He redefines what leadership means, but He expects them to be "the greater" or "the one who rules" (in Luke). He just does not want them to rule by "lording over" people like the Gentiles. Their calling was to lead — Jesus' purpose was to reframe the meaning of leadership. How have you worked in your own life with the inner cost of leadership? There is no other way to understand Christian leadership than leadership that is self-giving and costly.

III. ANGER AND HOSTILITY/ SHOOTING STRAIGHT

I do not know why , but I am always surprised by the amount of hostility that leaders face. In time, I have come to believe that the ability to face hostility (to work with it and through it) was an important task of a person who wanted to serve. I have always wanted to believe that if I am "nice" enough people will not get upset with me. That is the opposite of what I am talking about. I am called to be open about my struggles and encourage the same in others.All of us bring our own pains and wounds into ministry. The context a leader creates either encourages us to cover up all of our "stuff," or allows us to be who we really are. There is a cost to allowing that kind of openness. Some will be especially upset if the leader is vulnerable. We are not meeting their expectations.

There are many other reasons a leader faces hostility; but the issue is do we dodge it or allow it to surface and grow through it? We are faced with the decision to get on with the task/vision or work with a person. Often hostility is a clue to an important step in a person's spiritual journey. The leader who is willing to serve by facing hostility knows that grace and transformation come at a high price to God and to the people of God. I have missed too many opportunities in my ministry to help people grow by not shooting straight with them. I have not given them honest feedback about parts of their lives that need to change. One of my former ministry supervisors used to say "Confrontation + Tribulation = Transformation." Are we willing to take the time, energy and work that is necessary, (the "tribulation"), to help people grow? Along with this question, it seems to me we are called to accept people where they are. It is one of the principles we teach early in ministry. How do you live with the tension of accepting people where they are and honestly giving them feedback about their growth?

A View of Leadership
Leadership is influence. Though popularized by John
Maxwell in seminars across the United States, I first
came across this phrase in J. Oswald Sander's Spiritual
Leadership years ago. I am sure, however, that it
predates him as well. What the phrase implies is that for
intentional, planned change to occur will take the
extraordinary influence of a leader. And intentional,
planned change is in order for the church to capitalize
upon this moment in history where the cultural
constructs are in flux as postmodernism continues making
its way onto the cultural stage.
Present trends in defining and shaping leadership in
the North American church are heavily influenced by the

corporate business culture. Russell Chandler in Christianity Today wrote an article on the annual church conference, "The Church in the 21st-Century Church", and self-evidently titled it, "Pastors Turning to Corporate America for Help" (Chandler 47). In support of this prevalent trend are the wealth of books written in this regard, complete with a "business-speak" language that gives such leadership models a sense of relevance and credibility rooted in the culturally prestigious business world. Further, the temptation to mimic business theory in the pursuit of success is to fall prey to moral pragmatism.

Such trends are visible in the church. Bill Hybels of Willow Creek Church recently wrote an article on leadership styles for the Leadership Journal (Winter 1998) in which he lists ten styles of leadership for church leaders, eight of which are cast in the common language of corporate business culture: ". . . a bridgebuilding leader; a re-engineering leader; an entrepreneurial leader; a team-building leader; a managing leader; a motivational leader; a strategic leader; a directional leader" (Hybels 85-89). This may make church leadership seem more accessible to those new to church culture or lend the church culture a sense of relevance, but one wonders who and how the content of such terms is being defined.

The use of such terms, though not exclusive to the domain of the business world, simply underscores the trend noted above. Not only is church leadership buying into the business community motif, it is promoting the concept. Wholesale or indiscriminate adoption of corporate business leadership styles to acquire their attendant cultural credibility, relevance, or success is to take a long step away from biblical origins and risk importing cultural leadership values that are not in sync with biblical leadership values. Without critical discernment through a biblical lens, the leadership style outcomes could be far from scriptural. Cultural leadership patterns are not to be rejected outright, but to be weighed and considered in the light of scripture. To ensure scriptural validity of local church leadership, the church is better served to begin with biblical models of leadership.

The Bible offers a wide range of leadership models of equitable validity. However, since leadership is never exercised in a vacuum, it is necessary to understand the context in which leadership is to be given in order that the model of leadership chosen will best serve the interests of that moment. The postmodern context that governs the leadership model required for this moment has been widely discussed above.

In order to contextualize the leadership that best corresponds to this postmodern ethos, I move now to discuss four leadership models that Scripture presents and critique them for their suitability for the postmodern context.

The first model is the anointed leadership model which for the purposes of this study is related to the kings of Israel in the Old Testament. Although not exclusively used of kings, (both persons and things were anointed as a sign of separation unto God; pillars in Genesis 28:18; the tabernacle and its furnishings in Exodus 30:20ff; priests in Exodus 28:41; prophets in 1 Kings 19:16) anointed serves as an accurate label for that model of leadership that assumes being set apart with divine authority in a sacrosanct manner to give leadership.

The account of David and Saul illustrates the distinctiveness of this anointed leadership model. Saul had been anointed by the prophet Samuel to be king in Israel (cf. 1 Samuel 9,10) but had fallen out of favor with God owing to his disobedience. In his place, Samuel anoints David as king in 1 Samuel 16 while Saul is still on the throne. In the ensuing conflict between the two precipitated by Saul's jealousy, David flees and although Saul is caught in vulnerable circumstances where David could kill him on at least two occasions, David refuses to do so (1 Samuel 24,26). David views Saul, the king, as having both authority and sacrosanct status because Saul had been anointed king by the Lord Himself through the prophet Samuel. Thus in 1 Samuel 26:11a, David says, "But the Lord forbid that I should lay a hand on the Lord's anointed."

This anointed leadership model is commonly seen in the current church context as the independent church founded by a leader with a charismatic personality who rules in effect, as a benevolent dictator. Where that benevolence is focused on the best welfare of the community of faith such models can flourish.

However, abuses of such leadership abound. Whenever questioned or called into accountability or when attempts to curb their authority arise, the anointed leader points to his anointing by God to start the church and assumes that such a response answers the question satisfactorily. They view their leadership to be sacrosanct and vested with authority from God that is above accountability. After all, one should never touch the Lord's anointed.

(In the Bible a) sharp warning is sounded for pastors. A great deal of leadership authority is handed to them, but because they are human beings this can be, and all too often is, abused . . . Sociologically, churches

are voluntary associations. Spiritually, churches are the family of God. Neither allows for a coercive type of leadership authority . . . The dangers of lordship, rather than Christian leadership, are clear. (Wagner, Leading 116)

The anointed leadership model is hierarchical in nature and antithetical to the postmodern realities of community based determinations of truth and participatory decision making. In addition, this model functions on the premise of absolutes which is an untenable consideration to the postmodern mind. For these considerations, it is apparent that the anointed leadership model is not conducive to leading the church in a postmodern context.

A second leadership model common to Scripture is what I term the prophetic leadership model. Moses becomes the classic example of this leadership type. Moses is the one who has come down from the mountain with the will of God etched on tablets of stone (Exodus 19-35). In this model, Moses has exclusive access to God that others do not and he alone can determine the will of God as expressed in propositional absolutes. Moses meets with God face to face, dwells in God's glorious presence, and then informs the people he leads of what God has said they should be and do.

In the contemporary church context, we see this paralleled in the authoritarian leadership models of some church movements. In such contexts, the pastor/leader has strong control over his or her followership sheltered under the covering of the seemingly unarguable status of prophet. "He (the prophetic leader) will be subject to the dangers of extremism . . . and his temptation will be to speak on his own and claim to be speaking for God" (Snyder, Community 91). Such temptations to selfserving ends are a clear distortion of the biblical picture of prophetic leadership. Herbert W. Armstrong serves as an example of this type of leadership model at its distorted extreme.

In contrast, John McCarthur may well serve as a positive example of this model, closer to the shepherd model espoused by Thomas Oden where authority for leading is not coercive, " . . . not an external, manipulative, alien power that distances itself from those ''under' it, but rather a legitimized and happily received influence that wishes only good for its recipient" (Oden, Pastoral 53).

Ideally cast, the prophetic leader functions as Moses did as a benevolent dictator, using that term in a non-pejorative sense. Across the wide spectrum of the church subculture, this prophetic leadership model finds wide and effective use in numerous denominational

contexts.

Such an authoritarian model of leadership is sharply rejected by the postmodern mind. Although authoritarian models of leadership hold the appeal for a segment of the church population seeking definitive answers and black and white solutions, this model can only diminish in effectiveness as postmodernism takes greater hold on culture. Exclusive access to God by a select few denies the need in the postmodern soul for a direct spirituality of immediate personal construction. The prophetic leadership model has its place in the Kingdom but is not the appropriate model for reaching this emergent generation.

A third model of leadership the Scripture espouses is apostolic. This model is rooted in the New Testament pattern of sent ones (from the Greek, apostello) who held special status and authority within the early church structure. The term implies a sense of commission or purpose in the selection of the twelve by Jesus as in Mark 3:14ff where the appointed tasks include preaching, authority for healing, and casting out demons. This personal commissioning by Christ becomes the authoritative entry point into apostleship along with having been with Him (Acts 1:21) and having witnessed a post resurrection appearance of Christ (John 20-21). Since the Holy Spirit is uniquely tied to the ministry of the apostles after the death and resurrection of Christ (cf. John 14-17, for guidance, leading into all truth, bearing witness to their ministry) the authority of the apostolic office is even more deeply rooted in the divine. "For this reason the apostles are the norm of doctrine and fellowship in the New Testament church. (cf. Acts 2:42; 1 John 2:19)" (N.B.D. 60).

The Apostle Paul represents a unique exception to the precedent criteria of apostolic office. His claim comes from the resurrection appearance of Christ to him on the road to Damascus (Acts 9; cf. 1 Corinthians 15:8). Throughout his writing, he insists upon his place as an apostle, appealing to it for authority where necessary in order to gain compliance in the churches he dealt with (Romans 1:1; 1 Corinthians 1:1; Galatians 1:1 cf. Galatians 2:8; 5:2).

In appealing to apostolic authority, he is part and parcel with the institutionalizing of the New Testament church, where authority now comes to rest in distinct offices of the church. In this manner his apostolic writing finds its place in the New Testament canon along with Peter, James, and John who had firsthand interaction with Jesus. Included in this writing is the further institutionalizing of the church in his pastoral epistles (Timothy and Titus) and sections of his other

epistles where offices and roles are described (Ephesians 4; 1 Corinthians 14).

As the original apostolic group passed from the scene, a secondary, derivative apostleship is evidenced in the post-apostolic era. Snyder writes, "It cannot be successfully maintained that the apostolic ministry passed away with the death of the original Twelve. Nor is there Biblical evidence, conversely, that the apostolic ministry was transmitted formally and hierarchically down through the history of the church. Rather, Scripture teaches that the Spirit continually and charismatically gives to the Church the function of apostle." (Snyder, Community 88)

Snyder notwithstanding, although there were no apostles of the classic, original sense, the office of apostle continued as a recognized office within the institutional church as it firmed in its structure. Ultimately within Catholicism, this led to a direct claim of apostolic succession in the papal line back to the Apostle Peter.

Of importance to this study is the vesting of authority in hierarchical, ecclesiastic office which consequently tended to define the church institutionally rather than charismatically. I use the term charismatically as a comparative with institutionally, understanding it to mean the function of spiritual giftedness, not human personality.

Although these two descriptors of church polity are intended to function in consort, church history betrays the common tendency to weight church function in one direction or the other. The regrettable result can be the institutional ecclesiastic office being occupied by persons without the spiritually charismatic giftedness for the ministry that office requires.

In my use of the term apostolic leadership I am referencing this tendency in the church's historical development where reliance upon the office or the title to secure leadership influence supplants the spiritual giftedness that ought to secure such leadership.

The apostolic leadership model carries little weight in a postmodern context that is suspicious of reliance upon institutional leadership models. The decline of mainline churches across North America supports this contention. Titles and degrees are eschewed for the pragmatism of having your needs met in a competent manner. Authority to lead comes from a relationship of trust and confidence and demonstrated competence. "Too often would-be leaders fail because they do not understand this principal. They think that a college degree . . . and a title on the door will give them that authority to lead. But it is not that easy" (Anderson,

Dying 191).

The hierarchical architecture of presbyterian governance models is an imposing road block to a generation in tune with communal decision making. Insistent reliance upon ecclesiastical office to secure influence in a postmodern culture is a vacant hope. The postmodern person is looking for authenticity in leadership. Even when such is found in the appointed offices of the church, the structure itself becomes an impediment.

Despite how the above models do not suit the current cultural context it does not invalidate them as workable, scriptural models. In addition, there are other scriptural models of leadership not discussed here that have merit and validity in certain contexts and may serve as sub-species of other biblical models (for example, an activist leadership model within a prophetic leadership model as seen in Nehemiah; a contemplative leadership model within a prophetic leadership model as seen in Ezra).

The leadership trap, however, is to try to force the constituency you lead to respond to a self-styled preference to one of these types of leadership under the spiritual covering of being biblical or counter-cultural. To stubbornly cling to an ineffective leadership model is to miss the opportunity to reach this generation and overlook the other fully biblical models of leadership that exist.

One such biblical leadership model is the servanthood leadership model as seen in Jesus Christ. Of the models discussed, this readily commends itself as the most tenable in a postmodern context. For a scriptural overview of this model we look to the Upper Room Discourse of John 13-16 (with particular attention given to chapter 13) as well as Jesus declaration in Mark 10:42-45:

"You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to be first must be the slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many." (Italics mine)

In the incarnation Jesus presented to humankind the enfleshment of God. Incarnational leadership then would be understood as being how God would lead if He took upon Himself human form. Paul writes that in so doing, ". . . (Jesus) made Himself nothing, taking the very nature of a servant, . . ." (Phil. 2:7). Such is what we see in the teaching on leadership and the pattern of leadership that the incarnate Son of God portrays in this

section of John's gospel.

The principal qualities of servanthood leadership are taken from the exegetical cues of the text and define the model for the purposes of this study. In each instance I will relate the quality illustrated or taught with its value in addressing the needs of the emergent postmodern culture.

The principal ethic of servanthood leadership also serves as its context: it is love. "Having loved his own who were in the world, he now showed them the full extent of his love" (John 13:2). In using the strongest word available to him for love (agapao), John is underscoring the measure of Jesus' love.

In addition, John underlines that this love is not simply professed but was demonstrated in the unseemly task of foot washing where the Master took upon himself the role of a slave. In a postmodern world, the tangibility of demonstrated love appeals to the pragmatic character of the culture and affirms the self-worth of the individual loved.

The second great quality of servanthood leadership is modeling. "I have set you an example that you should do as I have done for you" (John 13:15). Modeling in leadership not only demonstrates the nature of leading but reduces the distance between the leadership and the followership. In a postmodern ethos, this represents a winsome, non-hierarchical model.

The authoritative power to lead in servanthood leadership is secured in the actual serving. As Jesus serves in John 13 the disciples are powerfully motivated to follow his example and do the same. The authority is moral in nature, not the amoral authority of that which is simply vested in offices or titles.

"Modern leadership theory sees authority flowing upward from followers to leaders. Authority must be conferred. Christian leaders should adopt the leadership style of Jesus, who washed the disciple's feet. Interestingly, the 'old style' of Jesus is as up-to-date as modern leadership theory (Anderson, Dying 191-192).

In a postmodern culture of moral pragmatism, there is great moral authority to lead to be secured in the practice of incarnational servanthood. Jesus did not say to give up leading or ruling, but said in Luke 22:26 that " . . . the one who rules (is to be) like the one who serves." The call to lead " . . . needs to be exercised in the spirit of serving" (Ford, Transforming 153).

The servanthood leadership of Jesus is charismatic in two senses, personal and spiritual. In the personal sense, Jesus calls focus upon himself in this text (cf. John 13:12-15; 15:1-16:16) to the effect that he challenges his disciples of every age (cf. John 17:20) to

take up the mantle of servanthood. This puts within the reach of the ordinary postmodern person the significance they long for. The significance found by Jesus' disciples in winning and reshaping the world is a significance that can be found and contributed to by any disciple of Christ. But in a second sense, this is spiritually charismatic because it is not tied to institutional realities but spiritual ones. For the spiritually hungry postmodern heart, practical servanthood becomes a truly spiritual function, empowered by the promised Holy Spirit (cf. John 16:7-11).

Servanthood leadership is highly relational, a core value in a postmodern ethos. "No longer do I call you servants . . . Instead, I have called you friends, for everything that I learned from my Father I have made known to you" (John 15:15). In such declarations by Jesus we find no elitism, no special classes of disciples, and no overt distinctions within the community of faith. "The New Testament doctrine of ministry rests therefore not on clergy-laity distinction but on the twin and complementary pillars of the priesthood of all believers and the gifts of the Spirit" (Snyder, Community 95). This intensifies the intimacy of relationships and flattens perceived or real hierarchies at the same time. This makes servanthood leadership life affirming, value adding, and inclusive.

Servanthood leadership is also visionary. In this whole discourse, Jesus walks his disciples into a future that he will not physically be a part of in order to prepare them for it (cf. John 13:33,34; 14:1-4; 15:9-15; 16:5-16). He alleviates their fears, comforts and assures them, and then promises the Holy Spirit as the new source of all he will lead them to become and accomplish. The future as he paints it is to be preferred to what they presently enjoy, which is having him physically present.

In the midst of their grief at his imminent departure (cf. John 16:6) Jesus casts a vision of a preferred future that takes them beyond their immediate grief to the possibilities of tomorrow. There is hope in this text when read through the eyes of a despair that could only see Jesus' imminent departure. In a bleak and pessimistic postmodern culture, this message of hope assures and strengthens. Visionary servanthood leadership that picks up that cadence of hope and casts a scriptural vision of a preferred future with its message will find a ready listener in this culture of despair and abandonment.

Sensitivity that an only be called pastoral in character also marks servanthood leadership. On the night he is being betrayed unto death, the principal

concern of Jesus is the welfare of his disciples and how they will fare in his physical absence (cf. John 16:5-16). Such pastoral sensitivity is a value-added component of servanthood leadership that humanizes relationships, affirms the worth of people, and places relationships in the forefront of any apologetic engagement with the postmodern cultural context.

Summary

The shift is underway. Modernism with all of its empirical constructs is giving way to postmodernism, a pastiche of styles as Snyder says, where ambiguity and contradiction rule at the expense of logic and reason. In the chaos of this transition which is colored by despair and pessimism, the need for community and the relationships it could provide is pervasive.

Historic cultural institutions that have been the principal providers of community such as family and church are cynically disparaged. The wider culture offers only the artificial community defined as geography (residential communities) or the commercially exploitive community of pop culture trends in music, entertainment, and fashion. The cultural vacuum of community is conspicuous.

Into this vacuum the church has an historic window of opportunity to offer authentic Christian community in answer to the cultural need for belonging, trust, relationships, identity, and spirituality as noted above. Sheltered in these needs are the multiple components of such postmodern points of angst as anti-institutionalism, distaste for hierarchies, despair and pessimism, a culturally pervasive low self-esteem, and the thirst for significance.

The church as caricatured, stereotyped, and experienced by the wider culture cannot hope to meet such needs from such a platform nor does it have the credibility to speak into them as they are known and experienced within the emergent culture. But the answer is not for the church to prostitute itself to the culture or "dumb down" the essence of the gospel but to contextually re-invent itself in tune with the biblical norms of community and leadership.

On the leadership side of the equation, it is incumbent upon pastors and lay leadership teams to position the church to seize this moment. Without rejecting everything that cultural leadership patterns espouse, to effectively capture this moment with leadership that has scriptural integrity will take a biblical model of servanthood leadership, as modeled by Jesus and rooted in John 13-16. Here love is demonstrated, trust is engendered, relationships are primary, belonging is invited, identity is secured, spirituality is clearly in

view, and hope is birthed in a new vision of reality
sheltered within the Kingdom community. The intention
of this project is to do that, which in turn invites critical
evaluation on such terms and grounds.
For the present, the wider church bobs like an apple
in the water of the wider culture. While in the midst of
the culture and affected deeply by its waves and
currents, the church still seems impotent to bring
change. At many points, it seems to prefer to remain a
closed, subcultural entity. However, with the correct
kind of leadership the church can be positioned to reach
this culture during this transition without compromising
its message or character. And its greatest apologetic
asset can be authentic Christian community. Steve Elliott