

**PENTECOSTAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY**

**MY THEOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP**

**PRESENTED TO JACKIE DAVID JOHNS, PH.D.  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR CF 721/ML 727  
FORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

**BY  
REGIMON DANIEL**

**CLEVELAND, TENNESSEE  
14<sup>TH</sup> MAY 2015**

## MY THEOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP

### Introduction

My name is Regimon Daniel, and this is my introduction to my personal theology of leadership. I began my quest to answer God's call on my life at 15 years old during my high school study period. Here I am as a 47 year old man to study and complete M.Div course. My Wife and children are at Sharjah, United Arab Emirates. I have been working at Dubai and I reached to the United States in the year of 2014. I have a great burden for the perishing souls and per the commandment of our Savior and Lord Jesus Christ as we read in Matthew 28:19-20 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, [even] unto the end of the world. Amen." Matthew 9:37-38 The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers [are] few; Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth laborers into his harvest."

Through the breathtaking, spirit filled and emotional testimonies and Pentecostal background Ministry experiences of our beloved Professors of PT Seminary I am very much blessed and learned a lot. Hence, I experience that the faculty at the P T Seminary is most qualified to help me to attain my goals. I want to implement their good ministry experiences into my ministry also as they have shared with us during the class time. I see this as a wonderful step for me in attaining my ambitions and goals as a minister of GOD.

The way that I am going to approach this responsive essay is by first defining what I think theology of leadership means, and second by outlining some key terms and reflecting on two of the most effective and pivotal leaders in the New Testament: Jesus Christ and the Apostle Paul and their influence on those who the baton was passed on to, namely Peter and Timothy.

What is meant when we say theology of leadership?

The *Pocket Dictionary of Theological Terms* describes theology this way: "Theology commonly refers to the ordered, systematic study or interpretation of the Christian faith and experience of God based on God's divine self-revelation."<sup>1</sup>The Oxford Dictionary defines leadership as, "the dignity, office, or position of a leader; also, ability to lead."<sup>2</sup> Peter G. Northouse, in his scholarly work, views leadership as, "a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal." C. Gene Wilkes writes, "The essential lesson I learned from Jesus on leadership was that He taught and embodied leadership as service." Before we find the sum total, John Piper's definition of Christian leadership is as good as any I have read; he writes, "Spiritual leadership is knowing where God wants people to be and taking the initiative to get them there by God's means on reliance of God's power." Let us add it up to see what we have. The goal of theology is to get to know God's divine self coupled with leadership, that is to say, serving a group of people with the common goal, relying on God's power of knowing who God is. So, when I say that I'm going to respond with my own personal theology of leadership, then I am acknowledging rightly that any good

leadership that is theological in nature is ultimately going to set its aim on discovering the glory of God and the supreme importance that God places on His own glory and renown, which ultimately comes from the unpacking of His words, producing the discovery of what is there. In short, I believe that a right view of theological leadership is demonstrated best by the man who goes to the task of preaching with a high respect, a reverent fear, and a humble, malleable heart.

One may be inclined to think that I just jumped ship on the goal of expressing my own personal view of my theology of leadership. I will submit to you that, in my opinion, a theology of leading or leading theologically and proclaiming the truth of who God is as revealed in and through God's words are one in the same. While defining the act of preaching, Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones wrote,

What is preaching? Logic on fire! Eloquent reason! Are these contradictions? Of course they are not. Reason concerning this truth ought to be mightily eloquent, as you see it in the case of the Apostle Paul and others. It is theology on fire. And a theology that does not take fire, I maintain, is a defective theology; or at least the man's understanding of it is defective. Preaching is theology coming through a man on fire. A true understanding and experience of the truth must lead to this. I say again that a man who can speak about these things dispassionately has no right whatsoever to be in the pulpit; and should never be allowed to enter one.

I quote MLJ at length to point out why I think the two are connected at the hip. If theology that is coming through a man is preaching, and preaching defined is simply a proclamation of a right view of God, and leading is gathering a group of people around a common goal, and in our leadership we make proclamations, send messages, and communicate all the time, then our conscious awareness of what theological leadership is should be awakened to consider that we are, as leaders in Christian ministry, to be about the business of proclaiming rightly about God, thus raising a high view of His glory to all those around us in our wake.

*Is preaching the Bible really the way to lead today's church?*

W.E. Sangster, a little over fifty years ago wrote, "Preaching is in the shadows, the world does not believe in it." Here now it seems that we have come to a place where the church may not even believe in it. If this is true, then may God help us to restore a right view of the central place for the proclamation of His words in birthing, growing, and advancing our organized people groups called the church.

Mark Driscoll, while preaching to pastors, addresses those with the hermeneutical trajectory that preaching is outdated and past its prime of relevance and effectiveness by saying, "The church that was birthed through a sermon of a man who was yelling is to have men to keep yelling so that the church can keep doing what the church is to be doing."

**Theological Leadership Demonstrated in the Scriptures  
Paul and Timothy**

There is nowhere more clear in all scripture for the mandate and primacy for proclamation than that which Paul lays down before Timothy, found in his second letter to his young protégé'. "In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus, who will judge the living and the dead, and in view of his appearing and his kingdom, I give you this charge: Preach the Word; be prepared in season and out of season; correct, rebuke and encourage—with great patience and careful instruction," (2 Timothy 4:1-2, NIV).

What does a leader do? This may be an oversimplification, but leaders lead. Leaders lead through both calm and rough waters and every other kind of situation in between. The leader's most useful tool for the task at hand is the faculty of speech.

Timothy, appointed by Paul, who was under the authority of God as the pastor of the church in Ephesus, was no doubt facing some very turbulent times in the infancy stages of the organization of Christ-followers called the ekklesia or church. Alistair Begg commenting on the situation that young Timothy faced said as follows:

The church was facing a variety of threats which were coming to it both externally and internally. They were, from a human perspective, challenging and threatening the existence of the Christian community. Those who from a human perspective looked at the events of those days might have safely assumed, on the basis of their secular understanding, that the church would not make it into a subsequent generation. Bishop Handley Moule writing to an earlier generation of this says, "Christianity trembled, humanly speaking, on the verge of annihilation."<sup>1</sup> My goal in pointing this out is to understand what it was that Paul told Timothy to do in lieu of these events. In verse 1, he gives the fledgling pastor a tremendous view of who he is ultimately going to stand before: "In the presence of God and Christ Jesus, who will judge...I give you this charge," (2 Timothy 4:1, NIV). As pastor, leader, or CEO, nothing should drive us more than fulfilling the mandates of those to whom you are going to have to give an account to. This description that Paul gave had to have helped Timothy see the big picture, that the work must go on, for the One to whom Timothy would finally stand before would be nonetheless than the executive board of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. So, if Timothy had nothing else to go on, he would certainly have his ears pricked paying attention to the command given after such an introductory clause.

### *Preach*

What was Timothy to do? Certainly Paul, one of the most notable and honorable mentioned leaders in the history of the church, would have the cutting edge paradigm that would see the church into the next generation. We may be shocked to discover Paul's instructions for the young pastor to craft into his routine of church business. Then it comes: "Preach the word," (2 Timothy 4:2, NIV).

The word "preach" as it comes to us from the Greek, *kērussō* (G2784), is that same word as to speak of one who is a herald or one who distributes the news. The *kērux* (G2783), herald, is to get the news out by all means necessary. Of course, Timothy's news would be the truth of Jesus Christ and His birth, life, work on the cross, death, and resurrection. Timothy was simply

told to preach the word. Not a hray'mah (G4487; rhema'), or present continuous message, but rather a log'os (G3056)<sup>18</sup> message, one that is logical and basic, the underpinning foundation on which every other understanding and interpretation is to be built.

## **Jesus and Peter**

*Peter affirms his own testimony about who Jesus is*

After this many of his disciples turned back and no longer walked with him. So Jesus said to the Twelve, 'Do you want to go away as well?' Simon Peter answered him, 'Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life and we have believed and have come to know that you are the Holy One of God' (John 6:66-69, ESV). It was during this occasion of seemingly mass exodus from some followers of Christ that even Jesus' closest companions pondered the thought of skipping out on Him. From another setting, we see that Christ had the ability to perceive thoughts, "But Jesus knowing their thoughts said," (Matthew 9:4, ESV) and thus, in all probability, is why the question came, "Do you want to go away as well," (John 6:67, ESV)?

Jesus is a good leader in that He does have words for life, but He does not force His words on anyone. Peter's reply may have come off a little sarcastic, but it's nonetheless true, "You have the words of eternal life," (John 6:68, ESV) and this method of question and answer that Jesus used was effective in helping lead Peter to this revelation. Gangel writes of this, "If leaders develop and hand down a report of what they want to see changed, the change will be much more difficult to implement than if the people themselves have a voice in planning the change.

*Jesus, God the Son, confirms Peters testimony about Himself*

If the task of utmost supremacy is to preach, then what should be the content of the proclamation? Banks and Ledbetter reflecting on Costa's *Working Wisdom* write, "Failures in leadership frequently spring from a lack of practical intellectual firepower." In Matthew 16, Jesus asked His learners who or what others thought about Him. Peter's pivotal confession came, "You are the Christ, the Son of the Living God," (Matthew 16:16, ESV). Acknowledging Peter's right profession of who He was, Jesus declared Peter's confession as the chief cornerstone on which everything else was going to take shape. In order for the church to be established in the minds of others, this thought at the heart of "practical intellectual firepower," has to become both a clear profession and a readily transferrable declaration.

### ***Who can be a leader?***

In most places, at most times, most of the leaders have been male. Some, like David Pawson, argue that Christian leadership is only for men but, interestingly, even Elizabeth Elliott in the foreword to his book [Pawson, 1988, 6] acknowledges that the principle of male leadership is not one that you can arrive at by careful Biblical study: it is a question of revelation, a mystery that needs to be revealed. While I am persuaded by a different interpretation of the Biblical text, as given by Forster [1992, 1-21], indicating that leadership in the church is not necessarily a male role, I accept that this usually is the case. In order to avoid the repetitive and pedantic use of 'he or she', 's/he', '(s)he', or some similar construction, I intend to use the masculine form of words to refer to both men and women unless the context indicates otherwise.

### ***Why consider the theology of leadership?***

Leadership is vital: the history of any group is largely the story of the leaders, what they attempted, and whether they succeeded or failed. In the Christian context, God works through leaders. Leadership needs to be understood. Most people work with an implicit understanding of leadership that is never critically examined, and this can create problems for both the leaders and the led: the leaders may be attempting the do things the led do not want or need, and the led may be expecting things the leaders do not intend to deliver.

### ***Varieties of leadership***

Part of the difficulty we have in talking about leadership is the wide range of situations, and the wide range of activities it can cover. In normal language, the term 'leader' can mean a number of quite different things. A leader can be a revolutionary figure people will follow to the death; the point of contact for a cooperative group; the founder of a new organisation; the person at the top of (some part of) an organisational tree; the manager whose department is the most profitable; the person who is responsible for some activity; the individual who happens to be in front; or the one who is currently winning a race.

Some people consider leadership to be something rare: we see it in people like Moses, Napoleon and Churchill, but few people can aspire to such heights. Others, like myself, see those examples as occupying one end of a spectrum of leadership, with people such as Sunday School teachers at the other end: people exercising a minor and limited but real leadership role, which may not be recognised as such by anyone. Adair [2006] identifies three levels of organisational leadership (team, operational and strategic), but this still seems to miss the possibility that a teacher may be leading their class and not just teaching it.

### *Leadership is about vision*

The first essential characteristic of leaders is that they are going somewhere, in other words they are aiming at goals or objectives that lie in the future." [Marshall, 1991, 9]

Leaders are out front because they are going somewhere, they know where they are going - or, at least, have some idea how to get there - and they are sufficiently motivated to accept the cost and risk the hazards of the journey. The vision may be something great and historic, like bringing the children of Israel out of Egypt and into the Promised Land, or much more mundane, such as our Coffee Shop, staffed by volunteers, being open every day of the week. The role of the leader is more like a coach driver than a taxi driver: "this is where I am going, do you want to come with me?" rather than "I am the driver - where do you want to go?"

### *Leadership is about people*

Leadership is not just a solo activity. A leader is a leader because other people are following, undertaking the journey with you.

A scout goes ahead of the company, and they follow at a distance. But the scout is only responsible for himself and for doing his job: surveying the country, reporting on the dangers.

Similarly, in Christian circles, a prophet is not automatically a leader. The prophet may articulate a vision, and identify what God wants His people to do, where He wants them to go, but then the prophet's role is over: it is up to the people whether they respond, it is not up to the prophet to take them there.

The leader is responsible for getting the people to the end of the journey: keeping them together, keeping them motivated, keeping them safe, keeping them fed, enabling them to avoid the dangers but still stay on track, educating and motivating them to recognise the inevitable danger but still risk stepping out into the unknown.

In many situations, leadership rests with one person: Moses, David, Jesus - the list is endless. But in the pages of the New Testament, we can see the emergence of another leadership paradigm: the team of leaders. "The New Testament knows nothing of one-man ministry." [Beasley-Murray, 1990, 37] It can be argued that this reflects a Trinitarian view of leadership in which the different members of the team have different role, but all are valued equally.

Even when there is a single leader, leadership does not have to be exercised in an authoritarian way. The familiar 'balance of power continuum' diagram developed by Tannenbaum and Schmidt shows a range of possible approaches to leadership, in whatever form it is presented: [Adair, 1979, 13-15] and [Love, 1994, 40-42] give two such examples. The preferred style of leadership may vary from the facilitator on the one hand to the dictator on the other, but the leader has responsibility for the people and at times this will mean he has to take executive decisions on behalf of the people

A different approach to the role of the single leader is suggested by Belbin [1993, 98-101], in which he contrasts the 'Solo leader' with the 'Team leader' in the following table.

As with the 'balance of power continuum', these are not the right and wrong ways to do the job: in times of crisis and emergency, you need a leader who is prepared to direct and get involved wherever necessary, while in times of comparative peace and stability, you need a leader who develops the people and encourages diversity.

### ***Leadership is about commitment***

The final key aspect of leadership is that the leader has a personal commitment to achieving the goal. A manager can be working simply because he is paid to do the job: there may be a professional pride and motivation to do a good job, but if the senior management scraps the project, commitment to the project immediately disappears.

A leader, on the other hand, has to take personal responsibility for achieving the goal. A leader must be convinced of the value of the work, accept responsibility for the task and for the people, and be personally committed to achieving success.

Leadership is always personal. It is helpful for the leader to have some technical skill and knowledge, but the people will not follow unless they can recognise in the leader both character and commitment: this is someone I am prepared to follow; they are going somewhere I want to be; and they are committed to this journey, so I can risk making a commitment too.

### ***Leadership principles***

Some aspects of good leadership seem to fit somewhere between attributes and activities: they are principles that have to be valued internally and worked out in some way externally.

### ***Speak from experience***

In order to lead with integrity, the leader must know where they are going: they must have experienced, to some degree, the end goal; they must have already visited the place they are aiming to reach. This visit may have been a real experience, as for example happened with those who brought the Charismatic Movement into the mainstream churches from Pentecostalism, or it may have been a moment of inspiration together with the revelation of a roadmap that describes where to go. In either case, this 'having been there' is in part an activity, and in part a pre-requisite for leadership.

### ***Empower your followers***

The point of being a leader is that you empower your followers: they achieve things because of you. This is the case whether or not the people understand what is happening, as is recognised by the old Chinese proverb: "The bad leader is hated by the people; the good leader is loved by the people; of the great leader, they say, 'We did it ourselves'."

"Empowering Leadership" is one of the eight 'quality characteristics' of Natural Church Development [Schwarz, 1996, 22].

### ***Act with integrity***

There is a growing body of secular material supporting the idea that good leadership must operate within a clear ethical framework. A good example of this can be seen in the 'OPAL' principles derived from Geoff Hunt's work with the Surrey Police Service [Hunt, 2006].

This seems to be a comparatively recent development, and contrasts with the traditional view of the leader as one who only acts ethically when it is advantageous to do so. For example, in speaking of 'severities' being 'badly or properly used', Machiavelli says: "Those may be called properly used, if of evil it is possible to speak well, that are applied at one blow and are necessary to one's security, and that are not persisted in afterward..." [Machiavelli, 1513, Chapter VIII]

### ***Demonstrate what it means to follow***

People only follow a leader because the leader is himself following some higher purpose. In this, as in many areas, the leader must model the behaviour that is required of his followers.

### **Christian leadership**

What is Christian leadership? Is there anything distinctively Christian about it, or are we just talking about leadership as it is exercised in a Christian context?

It seems to me that the following factors are, or should be, distinctive to Christian leadership. The deliberate omission from this list is 'Servant Leadership', which is sometimes identified as a distinctively Christian trait, but which is an outworking of the principles outlined above, and is often identified (albeit not under this name) in the secular literature.

The cross is at the centre of the Christian faith, and must be at the centre of any Christian theology of leadership.

This is not the place for a meditation on the cross, tempting though that may be, but some basic principles should be readily apparent: the way of the cross involves self sacrifice, not glory; it involves the acceptance of apparent failure as a part of

God's wider plans; it requires personal weakness so that God's power can be evident. Very few models of leadership - secular or Christian - cater for this perspective.

### *Dependence*

Christian leadership must be exercised in dependence upon God. This seems to be a point that is rarely made in Christian training. All Christian ministry is a call to do the impossible: if we could do it without God, it could hardly be Christian. For example, the evangelist cannot convert anyone; the healer cannot heal anyone; the pastor cannot make Christians grow in their faith; even the preacher cannot enlighten or inspire the flock - without the Holy Spirit's activity, the best sermon is only empty words.

The goal cannot be achieved using our best efforts and investing all our resources, not without God's involvement and intervention. We undertake the task knowing it to be impossible, and certain that we will fail unless God works miraculously to make it possible.

This creates a fundamental tension in all Christian ministry, which we do not have the space to fully explore. Christian ministry is a partnership between God and man: I do my part, God does His part, and between us, the job gets done. But my part requires that I do what I can - everything that I can - while knowing that it will not be enough, and knowing that the result is all down to Him.

The tension is neatly captured in the old advice: we are to pray as if it all depends on God (it does!), and to work as if it all depends on me. At the human level, it is hard to avoid the question: why bother? The frequency with which I am asked this question suggests that this is an area where the Church is not providing its members with the theological answers they need.

Christian leaders are unlikely to find effective followers if they cannot explain why people should sweat blood in an attempt to achieve the impossible.

Christian leaders also need to face this tension when it comes to setting goals and agreeing strategies. Our aim may be spiritual, but our activity is inevitably rooted in the material world: we may aim to see people converted, but all we can measure is the number of 'decision cards' filled in. Our aim may be to seek the Kingdom of God come, but our progress is measured in the number of seats filled on a Sunday morning and the amount on the collection plate. A Christian leader must somehow create programs and strategies that will make a difference without also making God irrelevant.

### *Priorities*

In the church, the five main priorities of Christian leadership are well established as the work of the apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor and teacher. In the church, any Christian

leader must somehow hold these five priorities together. In any other Christian organisation, there will generally be a tension between the specific aims of the organisation - evangelism, third world aid, etc. - and the wider responsibilities of the staff to behave as Christians in a Christian organisation.

From the conversations I have had with people working for Christian organisations, the most common point of tension is when they are forbidden from talking about their faith. This is generally due to policies that have been established when the organisation started to receive secular funding. Such limitations are clearly a difficult subject, and Christian organisations adopt a range of positions between accepting all the Christian priorities and seeking to work them out in a specific context at one extreme, to rejecting all such priorities that are not explicitly a part of the organisation's mission, at the other.

### ***Anointed or appointed?***

Every organisation must manage its leaders and leadership function. In the church context, any systems and policies will inevitably create tension between the human system and Divine action: is someone a leader because they have been appointed through some appropriate process, or because they have been anointed by God?

This tension can be formally resolved through the belief that God has chosen to work through the organisational structures we have established. While it is clear that God does establish and work through human structures, it is also clear that at times He bypasses the structures: this is the source of much of the conflict in the Old Testament between the Kings, representing the established structure, and the Prophets standing outside the structure.

However the tension is resolved, it is clear that, in a Christian context, the leaders must be both appointed by some human system and also anointed by God for the task.

Whatever the difficulties of reconciling human structures with Divine appointments, this is a far easier task than the alternative: attempting to operate an organisation without any systems and policies is a recipe for disaster. Occasionally, Christian groups claim to be doing this, but what it generally means in practice is simply that the systems and policies have not been formally agreed and written down as such.

### ***Identification***

Every organisation, once it has passed the earliest stages of growth, will have a system by which new leaders are identified. There are three possibilities: they can be

identified from below, from within or from above, although in practice a combination of these is often used.

The first leaders in the Church were identified from above: chosen by Jesus; the second leaders were identified from below: elected by the Church members.

By way of contrast, almost every personal testimony I remember hearing from a Christian leader has ignored these two Biblical approaches, and instead focussed entirely on 'the Call' - a personal sense that God has called them to 'the Ministry'. Sometimes, this has resulted in them applying to several different denominations before they were accepted.

I have heard numerous people teach and preach about 'the Call', and the message has been consistent: it is the means by which God calls you to full time Christian ministry, and it is for life. I am intrigued by the origins of this belief, as I do not find it in the Bible, and the experience of Paul in moving between 'full time' Christian work and 'part time' Christian work while tent making seems to effectively contradict it.

In practice, most denominations operate within this model, and have elaborate screening and selection processes to determine which of those potential leaders presenting themselves as having 'the Call' are to be recognised as a leader.

## ***Training***

Academic training often forms a part of the selection process for many of the established denominations, and it is usually a pre-requisite before the selection process can begin in most other cases: few congregations are prepared to accept or elect a Minister who does not have a theological qualification.

"No theological college can 'make' a pastor. It is God who calls and God who gifts. But colleges can develop gifts God has given and thus enable students to become what God intended them to be." [Beasley-Murray, 1990, 27] This seems over-simplistic: just because training is needed, this does not mean that the sort of training currently being supplied meets that need; because colleges do some good, this does not mean that they couldn't do much better.

Academic qualifications have been a required part of much Christian leadership training over the years, with occasional reactions against this tradition when, because of the urgency of the perceived need, there was "neither time nor need for drawn-out preparation for missionary service." [Bosch, 1991, 333] On these occasions, it seems that the alternative to academic training is usually no training.

The Church seems to have a very poor record at implementing on-the-job training of the sort that Jesus and the Apostles used: only small organisations such as *Open Air Campaigners* make significant use of this approach. This would seem to be an important area for further study.

## ***Accountability***

The difficulty of implementing an effective accountability structure has defeated many organisations. For the leader to be free to lead, they cannot be tied down by a detailed rulebook and oppressive monitoring systems.

You don't want leaders to be able to exercise arbitrary discipline, but on the other hand, you don't want every upset follower to be able to challenge and overturn every decision they don't like.

Whatever accountability structures are in place, they work, when they work, because the personalities and priorities of the people involved make them work: if a leader does not wish to be accountable in practice, there is little that anyone can do about it.

## **Conclusion**

Returning to the overshadowing premise of this response, I will pose a question. Is leadership preaching or is proclamation leading? On the cover of Lloyd-Jones book *Preaching and Preachers* sits a line from within the work, "To me the work of preaching is the highest and greatest and the most glorious calling to which anyone can ever be called." "Sitting down, Jesus called the Twelve and said, 'If anyone wants to be first, he must be the very last, and the servant of all,'" (Mark 9:35, NIV). What could possibly be a greater ambition than to lead the minds of men and women to Christ for the hope of a life fulfilled, coupled with the companionship of the Creator for all eternity? This is what has led me to believe that preaching Christ is the ultimate compendium of all that theological leadership should be.

So I am eager to study the word of God in a systematic way with Pentecostal Theological Seminary (PTS), USA and would like to go back to UAE or India in order to join into any Christian Ministries. If we understand the gospel very well, then we will feel agony and be zealous in our missionary activity. May God help us to do so. Amen. I completely surrender myself to God's plan alone to be fulfilled in my life.

<https://jonathonww.wordpress.com/2010/02/04/my-personal-theology-of-leadership/>  
[http://www.hazelden.org.uk/pt05/art\\_pt203\\_theology\\_of\\_leadership.htm](http://www.hazelden.org.uk/pt05/art_pt203_theology_of_leadership.htm)