

4-2007

The Kingdom of God: An Ancient/Future Ontology of Leadership for the Twenty First Century Church

Stephen A. Campbell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/dmin>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY

THE KINGDOM OF GOD:
AN ANCIENT/FUTURE ONTOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP
FOR THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY CHURCH

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF GEORGE FOX EVANGELICAL SEMINARY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF MINISTRY
IN LEADERSHIP IN THE EMERGING CULTURE

BY

STEPHEN A. CAMPBELL

PORTLAND, OREGON

APRIL, 2007

PORTLAND CENTER LIBRARY
GEORGE FOX UNIVERSITY
PORTLAND, OR. 97223

Copyright © 2007 by Stephen Campbell

All rights reserved

DISSERTATION ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

STEPHEN A. CAMPBELL

DATE: MARCH 6, 2007

TITLE:

**THE KINGDOM OF GOD:
AN ANCIENT/FUTURE ONTOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP
FOR THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY CHURCH**

**WE THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT WE HAVE READ
THIS PROJECT AND APPROVE IT AS ADEQUATE IN
SCOPE AND QUALITY TO COMPLETE THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DOCTOR OF MINISTRY IN
LEADERSHIP IN THE EMERGING CULTURE DEGREE**

SIGNATURE

DATE

SIGNATURE

DATE



**GEORGE FOX
EVANGELICAL SEMINARY**

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Narrative	
Problem	
Thesis	
Definitions	
Overview	
2. ANALYSIS OF JESUS' TEACHING ON THE KINGDOM OF GOD.	13
Changing Times, Unchanging Book	
Jesus and the Kingdom	
Not Structures, But Spirituality	
Not Power, but Faith	
Not Separation, but Inclusion	
Not People, but God	
Implications – Worth everything	
3. AN ANALYSIS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE'S CITY OF GOD	36
Bibliographical Information	
Defining the Cities	
The City of God/The Kingdom of God	
Final Analysis	

Chapter

4.	THE MODERN CHURCH IN A MODERN WORLD	65
	Age of Enlightenment	
	The Industrial Revolution	
	Modern Outcomes	
	Leadership Implications for the Modern Church	
	The Effective Modern Church	
5.	THE WORLD OF POSTMODERNITY	83
	A World of Change	
	Re-Embracing Spirituality	
	Re-Embracing Faith	
	Re-Embracing Inclusion	
	Re-Embracing Mystery	
	Leadership Implications for the Postmodern Church	
6.	A POST-MODERN ONTOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP.	97
	Spirituality is Exegeticality	
	Faith is the Leader-As-Parent	
	Inclusion is Grafting	
	Theo-Centricity is the Kingdom of God	
7.	CONCLUSIONS.	126
	Appendix 1 – Definitions of Leadership.	128
	Appendix 2 – 10 Wizardly Characteristics of High Modern Leadership.	129
	Reference List.	131

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is impossible to complete a project of this magnitude without the help and assistance of many people. That has certainly been true of this dissertation and the DMin program.

Let me begin by thanking George Fox and the staff at the seminary. In particular I appreciate the tremendous patience and help Loren Kerns has been with the technical portions of this program. I am also grateful to Dr. Leonard Sweet for his support, encouragement, and friendship throughout this process and with the completion of this “big paper!” And I am extremely grateful to Dr. Clifford Berger for his tireless effort in helping me walk through these past three years. Your words of encouragement and affirmation were always right on time!

The completion of this degree would also not have been possible without the love and support of my local congregation, Redding First Church of the Nazarene. To the pastoral staff, church board, youth ministry team, and Door leadership group, I can’t thank you enough for allowing me the privilege of participating in this program and picking up the slack around me in so many ways. Your understanding and encouragement along the way has been a source of great joy in my life, and I look forward to the days ahead as we use this degree together!

Rev. Lane Zachary, you deserve special mention for your willingness to risk with me in support of this undertaking. I hope to be as willing to support the upcoming generations of leadership when I am in the autumn of my career as you have been of me! Thank you for your faithfulness to the Kingdom.

Two people in particular have been invaluable to me in the writing and editing of this document. Lois Zachary and Nathan Oates, I can't thank you enough for your willingness to serve as readers and editors. You should feel as proud of this dissertation as I do, because you had as much to do with getting it done as I did. Thank you so much!

A great big thanks also goes out to my family for persevering with me through this process. Mom & Dad, Bob & Bernice, I never once doubted that you were in my corner with your love and prayers. Shaw and Seth, you guys have been awesome through this process. Thanks for your sacrifice of love and commitment to your dad. I'm back! Jo, it's difficult for me to express in words what you mean to me. Sometimes I am amazed at how much you believe in me and that I could actually do something like this. You made all the difference, and I love you.

Finally, I want to thank my Lord for calling me to this task. You asked me to enter into this process so I would be ready for what You wanted to do with me, and through me on the other side of it. There were some moments along the way I wasn't sure whether we would get to that other side, but once again You were faithful. I don't know what is ahead of us, but I am so thankful to know that we will continue to travel this incredible road together with You as my guide.

ABSTRACT

The Church is facing a crisis of leadership. For the past several hundred years the Church has embraced an ontology, or basic understanding of the nature of leadership, based on a modern interpretation of the world. With the emergence of the postmodern world, Church leaders need to embrace a new, ancient/future ontology of leadership based on Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of God. This will enable the Church to be relevant in the twenty-first century.

Chapter two will evaluate Jesus' teaching regarding the kingdom of God. This examination will reveal four characteristics of that kingdom which will serve as the basic framework for the ontology of leadership.

In chapter three Saint Augustine's monumental work, *City of God* will be analyzed. His descriptions of the differences between the city of man and the city of God will be compared, revealing these same four realities, further supporting their use as foundational to this ontology of leadership.

Attention will then be given in chapter four to the developments of the modern world and the impact they had on the Church. Evidence will show how the Church adapted to the modern era by embracing the opposite of each of the four characteristics, thus adopting a modern ontology of leadership for that time.

Chapter five will outline the significant changes happening in the world with the emergence of the postmodern era. Facts will show how this postmodern world devalues each of the characteristics embraced by the modern ontology of leadership, but elevates each of the original traits found in the kingdom of God and the ontology of leadership.

In chapter six, four metaphors will be introduced which correspond to the characteristics of the ontology, delineating their implications for church leadership.

The final chapter will provide a basic synopsis of what has been covered in this dissertation and will draw it to a conclusion.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Narrative

“So, what are we going to do?”

“I don’t know exactly,” Lane said as we both let the weight of what had happened sink into our heads and our hearts.

We had just finished an hour long conversation with Tom and Jamie, a young couple who had recently begun attending our church. They were wonderful people who showed lots of promise for our future. They represented one of the growing groups of people in our community of Redding, CA. This white, middle-class couple had just moved to our town from Southern California because, in their words, they were, “looking for a great place to raise their family.”

When they first began attending our church they took great interest in all of the children’s programs we had going. They asked lots of questions about our youth ministry and young adult fellowships. Lane, our senior pastor, and I had already talked about moving them into positions of leadership within our congregation as soon as they felt like they were ready. Maybe that’s what was so surprising about this conversation because Tom and Jamie had just finished telling us they were going to look for another church family.

It seems they were having a difficult time getting connected with our church, both with other young families and with our worship services. As Lane and I explored that with them, they told us it seemed like we had a pretty large, older adult population, and while we had good programs for their children, there just weren't very many young families like themselves with whom they could become friends.

This was not something that was new to me or Lane. We had talked on several occasions about our need to attract a younger crowd. While we had begun to make some strides that direction, we were fighting an uphill battle. Redding First Church of the Nazarene had been in existence for more than sixty years and there were still one or two charter members, as well as several direct descendants of many more who were attending on a regular basis. Much of the congregation, and the core leadership in particular, helped to build the current church facility we were using some forty years ago. The most recent addition to the property was already twenty-five years old.

Added to these factors was the influx of senior adults we were seeing in Redding, something Tom and Jamie had obviously noticed. This younger retirement generation liked the hot summers and they had begun to relocate to our area, bringing with them a longing for a slower pace of life. That included a desire for church that looked and felt more like it did when they were growing up – church services that included lots of hymns and a traditional style of preaching. These younger retirees wanted a church that was going to teach the younger generations the truth and help set them straight on the paths of life.

This was the issue that was really the most difficult for Tom and Jamie. Yes, they were concerned about the lack of other young couples, but what really concerned them

was that they didn't feel at all connected to our worship services. When they first started coming they attended our 11:00 AM traditional service. It didn't take them long to matriculate to the 9:30 AM contemporary service. Even there they had a tough time feeling like church was really impacting their lives.

Tom and Jamie were looking for a community of believers that was serious about their faith. When we asked them to explain what that meant, they said it was a place where they could come and not worry about what other people might think of them; a place where they could feel free to explore their spiritual lives without any concern for how their questions might be perceived by others. They wanted to feel the freedom to invite a neighbor who may not have ever attended a church service before. Tom and Jamie also shared that they wanted to experience services where they could feel and touch the presence of God, where they would be challenged to live out their lives in a tangible way that touched the poor and the broken in our community.

Lane and I decided to let their words roll over in our hearts and minds as we prayerfully considered them under the leadership of the Holy Spirit. After a few weeks, God began to plant what seemed to be the seed of a dream in my heart. I realized that if we didn't address these issues that were raised by Tom and Jamie, Redding First would eventually lose its effectiveness and would then die a slow, painful death. I knew I didn't want to be a part of that and I knew that wasn't God's design either. He wanted our church to not only survive but continue to be a force for Him in our community for generations to come. So I began asking this question: how can our church be a community of faith that embraces multiple generations of people, calling and

empowering all of them to deeper levels of intimacy with Christ and engaging them with our community?

God began to plant a vision inside my head that revolved around the idea of multiples. Maybe we didn't have to give up on the older members of our community in order to reach out to the younger ones. Maybe we could develop a church that had multiple expressions of worship gatherings, as well as leadership structures that best fit with various demographics of people. Maybe we could develop one church that was made up of multiple congregations, each structured in a way that would allow for maximum growth and opportunity.

After some more thought and prayer on the issue, I began to realize this idea of multiple congregations might be the form we needed to use for the next phase of our church. But then I began to wonder if that form could continue to work indefinitely. With all of the changes that seemed to be happening around us in the culture, maybe we needed to think about more profound changes beyond just forms and structures. What if we could develop a philosophy of leadership that allowed for a wide range of forms and structures that could all be utilized in this new world that we were beginning to see emerge around us? What if we could embrace an ontology, or basic understanding of leadership, that would enable the church to boldly move into the 21st Century?

I got together with Lane so I could pitch my idea to him. His reaction was mixed, and rightly so. First, he wasn't sure if there was such a thing as an ontology of leadership. He had done lots of reading and attended many conferences on the issue of leadership but he hadn't ever heard of this idea. Second, if there was an ontology of leadership, what was the current one we were using that was driving our structures and why wouldn't it

work for the future? And third, if the current ontology of leadership wasn't going to work for the days ahead, what would this ontology look like and how would it remain true to the mandates in Scripture?

I agreed these were all valid concerns but that if we didn't do something, we might be doomed to repeat the scenario with Tom and Jamie over and over again. Since neither one of us wanted to do that, we embarked on a quest to discover what an effective ontology of leadership might be for the twenty-first century.

Problem

The church in North America is finding it almost impossible to meet the demands of our rapidly changing world. There is a significant decline in the growth of churches, as well as an increasing number of individuals who no longer attend church. Consider these statistics from researcher George Barna:

- A new report based on its annual tracking survey by The Barna Group reveals that one-third of the adult population (34%) has not attended any type of church service or activity, other than a special event such as a funeral or wedding, during the past six months. (2006)
- There has been a 92% increase in the number of unchurched Americans in the last thirteen years. In 1991 there were 39 million unchurched Americans compared with 75 million currently. (2004)
- 33% of Mosaics, 43% of Busters, 49% of Boomers, 53% of Elders attend church on a given Sunday. (2006)

- In a typical week, 32% of Mosaics, 42% of Busters, 47% of Boomers, 58% of Elders read the Bible. (2006)¹

These trends seem to expand as you move into the younger generations implying that unless something is done to address these issues, the church will become marginalized in our culture, if it hasn't already.

There has been an abundance of information written about leadership in the past thirty to forty years. This might lead one to consider that perhaps the problem lies with the leadership structures being utilized within modern churches today. If that is the case then simply changing those leadership styles and structures should help to reverse the current trend of decline.

But what if this is more than just a leadership structure issue? What if the problem with the current application of leadership isn't just about the structures, but with a fundamental understanding of leadership at its core? Perhaps there is a basic understanding, or ontology of leadership that lies behind the current models and structures being used by the modern church that is faulty and needs to be examined and changed in order to meet the demands of the 21st Century?

The current shift from the modern era to the postmodern era is significant. The changes in the world and its systems are causing great shifts in the way people view and

¹ George Barna, [Website] (Ventura, CA: The Barna Group, LTD., 2006, accessed 10 July 2006); available from <http://www.barna.org>; Internet. These statistics utilize the following as reference points: An unchurched person is an adult (18 or older) who has not attended a Christian church service within the past six months, not including a holiday service (such as Easter or Christmas) or a special event at a church (such as a wedding or funeral). Mosaics are those born between 1984 and 2002; Busters are those born between 1965 and 1983; Boomers are those born between 1946 and 1964; Builders are those born between 1927 and 1945; Seniors are those born in 1926 and earlier; and Elders are the Builders and Seniors combined.

understand the world. Leonard Sweet calls this time in history the Perfect Storm.² As this new world emerges, the issues facing the church particularly in the areas of leadership are becoming more drastic and disconnected from this new world. The systems and understandings of leadership which have been employed within the church will not be sustainable for very long, and local churches will continue to be marginalized and rendered irrelevant.

In order to address this problem, an ontology of leadership will be proposed that allows for maximum flexibility and adaptability, enabling church leaders to develop forms and structures that will work in many different church settings. This ontology will help them reverse the negative growth trends and begin to reach the growing number of people who would be considered unchurched. The framework and guiding metaphor for this ontology of leadership will center around the concept of the kingdom of God as introduced by Jesus in the Gospels.

Thesis

Effective church leadership in the postmodern world will embrace an ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God.

Definitions

In order to move forward in the development of this thesis, several definitions must be clarified.

² Leonard Sweet, "Weathering Christianity's Perfect Storm," (George Fox University, 2006). This is from an unfinished document that was made available through the Doctor of Ministry Program at George Fox University. Sweet contends the convergence of the tsunami of postmodernity, the hurricane of post-Christendom, and the global-warming of post-scale are creating this perfect storm.

- Modern Era/Modernity: This is the time period in history that covers approximately the past 100 years. Its foundational understandings are rooted in the Enlightenment Age and the Industrial Revolution. Several authors consider the time period that begins with the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution as the full modern era. Some even subdivide it into two separate time periods. “The term Modern Times is used by historians to describe the period of time immediately following what is somewhat confusingly known as the Early Modern Times. Early Modern Times lasted from the end of the 15th century to the end of the 18th century. Modern Times began in the end of the 18th century, continuing to the present.”³ For the purposes of this thesis however, it will be limited to the most recent 100 years.
- Postmodern Era/Postmodernity: This is the time period in history which began with the end of the modern era. It is generally characterized as beginning around the middle of the 20th Century, but its effects are only now being fully realized by most of the world. It is also usually seen as a reaction against the modern era or modernity.
- Ontology of Leadership: In order to come to an understanding of this concept, it must first be broken down into its various components and then reattached. First a look at ontology. Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary defines ontology as “a branch of metaphysics concerned with the nature and relations of being.”⁴ This concept has generally been associated with philosophical thoughts and ideas related in particular to what actually exists, which is the question ontology attempts to answer. Another

³ *Modern Times* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 10 July 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modern_age; Internet.

⁴ *Ontology* [Online Dictionary] (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2005, accessed 10 July 2006); available from <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/ontology>; Internet.

way to express this would be to say that ontology attempts to examine the foundational elements of what it means to be or exist. Second, leadership must be defined. Gary Yukl in his book, *Leadership in Organizations*, provides a list of various definitions of leadership which have been proposed throughout the previous fifty years.⁵ He ultimately concludes that, “Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how it can be done effectively, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish the shared objectives.”⁶ In other words, leadership is essentially helping to provide guidance and direction to others in order to achieve a desired outcome.

When these two concepts are harnessed together into the ontology of leadership, what results is a basic attempt to examine the foundational nature or make-up of leadership. For example, the practices and principles of leadership which are applied to various settings have a basic understanding or ontology of leadership behind them. The forms and structures which result from leadership decisions are based on foundational understandings of the core of leadership. When this concept is applied to the modern and the postmodern eras, what can be seen then is an attempt to discover the basic understanding or nature of leadership in those time periods which resulted in various forms and structures being utilized by people and organizations within those eras.

⁵ See Appendix 1 for the complete list.

⁶ Gary A. Yukl, *Leadership in Organizations*, 5th ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002), 7.

- Kingdom of God: As a part of this thesis, the metaphor of the kingdom of God is also going to be explored. The basis for this concept comes from the life and teachings of Jesus Christ as portrayed in the four Gospels. Donald Kraybill, in his book, *The Upside-Down Kingdom*, helps with this understanding. “The central theme in the ministry and teaching of Jesus is the kingdom of God, or as Matthew calls it, the kingdom of heaven. This key idea ties Christ’s entire message together. The ‘kingdom of God’ permeates Jesus’ ministry, giving it coherence and clarity. It is the undisputed core, the very essence, of his life and teaching.”⁷

The centrality of this idea to Jesus’ life must clearly be understood in relational terms. Kraybill is again helpful in bringing clarity to the definition. “The kingdom of God is a collectivity – a network of persons who have yielded their *hearts and relationships* to the reign of God. The kingdom is actualized when God rules in hearts *and* social relationships. Kingdom life is more than a series of individualized email connections linking the King to each subject. The reign of God infuses the web of relationships, binding King and citizens together.”⁸ For the purposes of this thesis, the kingdom of God is the reality of God coming to bear on the lives and relationships of all those who have declared their allegiance to God, and who place Him in the center of those relationships.

⁷ Donald B. Kraybill, *The Upside-Down Kingdom*, 25th Anniversary ed. (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 2003), 16.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 19.

Overview

Chapter two will evaluate some of Jesus' teaching regarding the kingdom of God. This examination will reveal four characteristics of the kingdom of God which will serve as the basic framework for the ontology of leadership being argued for in this dissertation. Those characteristics are that the kingdom of God is about faith, not power; it is about spirituality, not structures; it is about inclusion, not separation; and it is about God, not people.

In chapter three these four characteristics will then be compared to Saint Augustine's descriptions of the differences between the city of man and the city of God in his monumental work, *City of God*. It will be revealed that these same four realities emerge from within that comparison, further supporting their use as foundational to this ontology of leadership.

Attention will then be given in chapter four to the developments of the modern world and the impact they had on the Church. Support will be delineated which demonstrates how the modern Church adapted to the modern era by embracing the opposite of each of the four characteristics, namely power, structures, separation, and a people-centric view of life, thus adopting a modern ontology of leadership for that time.

Chapter five will outline the significant changes happening in the world today creating a new postmodern era vastly different than the modern one. It will show how this postmodern world now devalues each one of the characteristics embraced by the modern ontology of leadership, and how it is elevating each one of the original traits found in the kingdom of God. This will lead to the development of the new, ancient/future ontology of leadership for the postmodern world based on the kingdom of God.

In chapter six, four metaphors will be introduced which each correspond to one of the characteristics in this ontology of leadership. It will be shown how spirituality can be seen in the metaphor of exegativity; how faith is found in the metaphor of the leader-as-parent; how inclusion is demonstrated through the metaphor of grafting; and how the Theo-centric view of life is best demonstrated through the metaphor of the kingdom of God. Each one of these metaphors will further emphasize this new, ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God.

The concluding chapter will then summarize the entire dissertation and draw it to a final statement for the twenty-first century church leader.

CHAPTER 2

AN ANALYSIS OF JESUS' TEACHING ON THE KINGDOM OF GOD

In order to develop an ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God the teachings of Jesus on the kingdom of God must first be analyzed. This chapter will examine a significant portion of that material from the gospels and will discover the implications for the foundations of that ontology.

Changing Times, Unchanging Book

Come gather 'round people
Wherever you roam
And admit that the waters
Around you have grown
And accept it that soon
You'll be drenched to the bone.
If your time to you
Is worth savin'
Then you better start swimmin'
Or you'll sink like a stone
For the times they are a-changin'.⁹

These words by Bob Dylan are the title song to an album released in February, 1964. While they were certainly true then, they are definitely also true today. Much has been written and documented on the shift from the modern era to the postmodern era, making this a very turbulent time in the life of the Church.

People who are leaders within God's Church ought to be "people of the book," a term used in Islam to describe people who have "received divine scriptures"¹⁰ simply

⁹ Bob Dylan, *The Times They Are a-Changin'* (New York: Columbia Records).

because of their relationship to the Scriptures. The sheer number of Biblical commentaries in any North American pastor's library reinforces this reality. As "people of the book," how should those leaders go about the process of using this ancient text to provide guidance in the twenty-first century?

The answer to this question lies in a text found within the Book of Hebrews, "For the word of God is living and active. Sharper than any double-edged sword, it penetrates even to dividing soul and spirit, joints and marrow; it judges the thoughts and attitudes of the heart. Nothing in all creation is hidden from God's sight. Everything is uncovered and laid bare before the eyes of him to whom we must give account."¹¹ God's Spirit brings life to His Word that empowers it to speak to all peoples in any generation, including this one. It is this understanding that enables leaders within God's Church to examine the Bible for help and guidance in navigating these turbulent times of change.

Jesus and the Kingdom

When one considers the Scriptures, particularly the words and teachings of Jesus, a significant pattern begins to emerge. Jesus spends a great deal of time addressing something he calls the kingdom of God, or the kingdom of Heaven.¹² It becomes very clear early in his ministry that this kingdom is central to his identity and to his life-

¹⁰ *People of the Book* [internet collaborative encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 22 May 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/People_of_the_Book; Internet.

¹¹ Heb. 4:12-13 NIV (New International Version).

¹² These terms seem to be interchangeable in the Gospels. Most references in Matthew use the term kingdom of heaven, while Mark, Luke and John mostly use the term kingdom of God. Both terms will be used throughout this document, mainly keeping in line with the references from which they are drawn, but their meaning is the same.

mission. Just after Jesus is tempted in the wilderness at the beginning of his public ministry, three texts speak to the centrality of this kingdom for him.

- “From that time on Jesus began to preach, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is near.”¹³
- “Jesus went throughout Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, preaching the good news of the kingdom, and healing every disease and sickness among the people.”¹⁴
- “But he said, ‘I must preach the good news of the kingdom of God to the other towns also, because that is why I was sent.’”¹⁵

In these verses it’s possible to see through the eyes of the observers, as well as from Jesus’ own words, the reality that this kingdom is the focus of his identity and mission. Further exploration into the gospels reveals that the kingdom continues to be a part of Jesus entire life and ministry. There are no less than 121 references to the term “kingdom” in the New International Version of the gospels, including statements right up to the moment of Jesus’ death. The thief hanging next to him on the cross recognized Jesus as King, and wanted to be included in his kingdom. “Then he said, ‘Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom.’ Jesus answered him, ‘I tell you the truth, today you will be with me in paradise.’”¹⁶ From beginning to end, this kingdom is vital to who Jesus was and what he taught.

¹³ Matt. 4:17 NIV.

¹⁴ Matt. 4:23 NIV.

¹⁵ Luke 4:43 NIV.

¹⁶ Luke 23:42-43 NIV.

One of the most recognizable statements Jesus made regarding the kingdom is found in the Lord's Prayer. Jesus' disciples ask him to teach them how to pray. In response to their request Jesus begins: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven."¹⁷ Jesus is saying there is a kingdom, an order, a reality that exists in the heavenly realms which people should seek here on earth. There is a basic essence or framework of the kingdom of God that people should seek and desire. Leonard Sweet, in his book The Three Hardest Words, describes this as a metanarrative for all of humanity. "Whether you are young, old, or middle-aged; Jewish, Muslim, or Christian; African, Asian, or Anglo; the truth is universal: the 'secret place of the Most High' is now dwelling among us and within us. A loving God is ushering us into the ways and wisdom of the kingdom....In short, the Christian metanarrative is the story of God's kingdom."¹⁸ The kingdom of God was at the forefront of who Jesus was and what he wanted his followers to not only understand, but also to live.

Since the kingdom of God was central to Jesus' life and teaching and he desires for it to be manifest here on earth, this concept will be the focus of this chapter. The teachings of Jesus regarding the kingdom of God will be examined and several patterns and characteristics of that kingdom will emerge:

¹⁷ Matt. 6:9-10 NIV.

¹⁸ Leonard Sweet, *The Three Hardest Words* (Colorado Springs: Waterbrook Press, 2006), 44-45.

- The kingdom of God is not about structures, but spirituality.
- The kingdom of God is not about power, but faith.
- The kingdom of God is not about separation, but inclusion.
- The kingdom of God is not about people, but God.

Once these patterns develop they will be analyzed to determine the implications in the formation of a core ontology of leadership.

Not Structures, but Spirituality

When Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of God is considered, one of the first characteristics that emerges is his belief that the kingdom is not about structures but about spirituality. This can be observed through his instruction on the kingdom being near and within.

The Kingdom is Near

Throughout Jesus' life and ministry he declares that the kingdom of God is near. This declaration started at the beginning of his ministry¹⁹. Mark says it this way: "After John was put in prison, Jesus went into Galilee, proclaiming the good news of God. 'The time has come,' he said. 'The kingdom of God is near. Repent and believe the good news!'"²⁰ Later in Jesus' life, he sent out the twelve disciples to go into the surrounding

¹⁹ As already referenced in Matt. 1:17.

²⁰ Mark 1:14-15, NIV.

areas to proclaim this same reality. “As you go, preach this message: The kingdom of heaven is near.”²¹

The implication is the kingdom was a present reality. The people of that time were surrounded by the kingdom and empire of Rome, so they were familiar with this idea of a kingdom being present. “The Romans determined the conditions of life in Galilee where Jesus lived and carried out his mission. In the decades before Jesus was born, Roman armies marched through the area, burning villages, enslaving the able-bodied, and killing the infirm.”²² The people of Jesus’ day were looking for the Messiah to come and establish his kingdom here on earth in opposition to the rule of the Romans, as seen from the request of James’ and John’s mother, “Grant that one of these two sons of mine may sit at your right and the other at your left in your kingdom.”²³ But by declaring the kingdom of God being near, was Jesus saying that this kingdom would be an earthly one?

The Kingdom is Within

To answer this question the text must further be analyzed. Luke is helpful here by sharing a significant statement Jesus made in response to some of the Pharisees. “Once, having been asked by the Pharisees when the kingdom of God would come, Jesus replied, ‘The kingdom of God does not come with your careful observation, nor will people say, ‘Here it is,’ or ‘There it is,’ because the kingdom of God is within you.’”²⁴ This statement

²¹ Matt. 10:7, NIV.

²² Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and Empire* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003), 15.

²³ Matt. 20:21, NIV

of the kingdom being within implies that the kingdom to which Jesus was referring was more than just a present reality, but had a dimension that went beyond just an earthly understanding. The kingdom of God was not just near, but it also had the capacity to be within. So what does this concept communicate?

The Kingdom is Spiritual

When all of the texts from the gospels are examined in detail, one of the interesting observations about Jesus' use of the kingdom is that there are only two references in the book of John where Jesus uses the term kingdom of God. These two texts, however, provide significant insight.

In reply Jesus declared, "I tell you the truth, no one can see the kingdom of God unless he is born again." "How can a man be born when he is old?" Nicodemus asked. "Surely he cannot enter a second time into his mother's womb to be born!" Jesus answered, "I tell you the truth, no one can enter the kingdom of God unless he is born of water and the Spirit. Flesh gives birth to flesh, but the Spirit gives birth to spirit."²⁵

Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world. If it were, my servants would fight to prevent my arrest by the Jews. But now my kingdom is from another place."²⁶

In both these instances, Jesus is in dialogue with someone regarding the kingdom of God. In the first passage, Jesus is talking with Nicodemus and declares that the kingdom of God is spiritual in nature. In the second one, Jesus is in the presence of Pilate and states that his kingdom is not of this world. Clearly these two passages reveal the continuation of this understanding that the kingdom of God is not a physical kingdom.

²⁴ Luke 17:20-21, NIV.

²⁵ John 3:3-6, NIV.

²⁶ John 18:36, NIV.

When these three realities are taken into account together, the kingdom is near, it is within, and it is spiritual, a pattern emerges that clearly shows Jesus and the gospel writers believed the kingdom of God was of a spiritual nature. “But the separate contexts of the announcements made by John and by Jesus show that with Jesus the kingdom has drawn so near that it has actually dawned.”²⁷

This conclusion leads to a question. What is the implication of this reality for the current context of church leadership? If the kingdom of God is spiritual in nature, how does this impact church leadership in the twenty-first century?

Since Jesus came declaring a kingdom of God that was spiritual, that reality must be factored into the bedrock of church leadership decisions and even into leadership structures. There has been significant pressure within the church community to adopt a leadership position that is based on a business model, particularly within the last thirty to forty years. With book titles such as *Minding God's Business*,²⁸ *The Art of Management for Christian Leaders*,²⁹ and *Leading and Managing Your Church*,³⁰ the implication is that structure must be a high priority in church leadership. But when these words of Jesus about the kingdom of God being spiritual in nature are considered, the ramification is that organizational structures must always submit to the spiritual realm. Church leadership in the twenty-first century must have as its highest priority the reality that this is a spiritual

²⁷ D. A. Carson, *Matthew*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelein, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 8 (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishers, 1984), 117.

²⁸ Ray Sherman Anderson, *Minding God's Business* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1986).

²⁹ Theodore Wilhelm Engstrom, Edward R. Dayton, and author joint, *The Art of Management for Christian Leaders* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1976).

³⁰ Carl F. George and Robert E. Logan, *Leading & Managing Your Church* (Old Tappan, N.J.: F.H. Revell, 1987).

kingdom, not an earthly one. Forms and structures must always yield to that reality rather than place any type of model or structure ahead of it. Twenty-first century church leadership, in light of the kingdom of God, is not primarily about structures but about a spiritual reality.

Not Power, but Faith

Further analysis of Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God reveals a characteristic that the kingdom is not about power but about faith. This is revealed through his words regarding the kingdom and children, and being the least in the kingdom.

The Kingdom is Children

As the examination of the kingdom of God in the gospels continues, another image begins to emerge from the text: Jesus clearly associated the kingdom with children.

Two references from Matthew's Gospel are clear:

At that time the disciples came to Jesus and asked, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" He called a little child and had him stand among them. And he said, "I tell you the truth, unless you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, whoever humbles himself like this child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven."³¹

Then little children were brought to Jesus for him to place his hands on them and pray for them. But the disciples rebuked those who brought them. Jesus said, "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these." When he had placed his hands on them, he went on from there.³²

³¹ Matt. 18:1-4, NIV.

³² Matt. 19:13-15, NIV.

When Jesus placed these children in the presence of the people gathered around him, he was making a statement about the qualities of the kingdom. Matthew Henry states, “We must be humble as little children, who do not take state upon them, nor stand upon the punctilios of honour.”³³ Jesus was declaring that the kingdom of God embodies the qualities of children: humility, not power; innocence, not strength; simple faith, not complex reasoning. Jesus was calling all those who would be a part of this kingdom to allow these qualities of children to be primary in their lives.

The Kingdom is Least

There are a few other references that relate to Jesus’ words about the Kingdom and children. The first two are found in the Beatitudes:

“Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.”³⁴

“Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.”³⁵

These two statements are the only ones from the Beatitudes which specifically reference the kingdom by name. They both clearly portray a kingdom that is downward in its movement, not upward, searching for position and power.

The other statement Jesus makes which resonates here is found in Luke 7:28 where Jesus is speaking about John the Baptist. “I tell you, among those born of women there is no one greater than John; yet the one who is least in the kingdom of God is

³³ Matthew Henry, *Matthew to John*, 6 vols., Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible, vol. 5 (McLean, Virginia: MacDonald Publishing Company), 253.

³⁴ Matt. 5:3, NIV.

³⁵ Matt. 5:10, NIV.

greater than he.”³⁶ Jesus makes a comparison between the greatness of John the Baptist and the person who would be considered the “least” in the kingdom of Heaven. Again the symbolism is of a kingdom that is downward in its movement. “Our Lord designs here to show the great danger of pride and ambition; whatever profession men make, if they allow themselves in this sin, they will be rejected both from God’s tabernacle and from his holy hill.”³⁷ Clearly this component of the kingdom of God reveals a view of the kingdom that is not power focused. But if that is the case, what kind of a focus does it reveal and what are the leadership implications from it?

The Kingdom is Faith

This view of the kingdom is not one of power, but of faith. Jesus paints a picture of a kingdom reality that desires downward movement and simple trust and humility. When that is compared to the power structures of the current world and culture, and at times even the culture within the church, there is disparity between the two. And this often translates into the leadership frameworks within the church. For example, when awards are given to churches based on numerical statistics alone, leadership that strives for “larger” and “greater” are esteemed and rewarded for being more powerful and influential. Those leaders are held in higher regard than leaders within “smaller” organizations.³⁸ But Jesus paints a different picture here, one that says faith, humility and innocence are the greatest standards within the kingdom.

³⁶ Luke 7:28, NIV.

³⁷ Henry, 253.

³⁸ These reflections are a result of my recent attendance at our annual district convention for the Sacramento District Church of the Nazarene. I was not aware of any churches that were “rewarded” for

When this reality is applied to twenty-first century church leadership, the implication is that leaders must strive for greater and greater humility and faith, like children, rather than for power and prestige. They must be willing to ultimately trust and believe in God's "power structures" that esteem the faith and simplicity of children and which promote becoming less in the kingdom. Twenty-first century church leadership, in light of the kingdom of God, is not about power, but about faith.

Not Separation, but Inclusion

Continued investigation into Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God also reveals another characteristic of the kingdom of God that it is not about separation, but inclusion. This is discovered through his instruction on the kingdom being indiscriminate and accepting.

The Kingdom is Indiscriminate

Jesus clearly used the kingdom of God as the central reality in his life and ministry. As this examination continues into what he said in relationship to that reality, more images emerge that provide further instruction into the nature of this kingdom. There is a particular section in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew that reveals seven different metaphors for the kingdom which supply illumination and insight.

Matthew 13 opens and closes with two images that are directly related:

Then he told them many things in parables, saying: 'A farmer went out to sow his seed. As he was scattering the seed, some fell along the path, and the birds came

having strong faith or for showing great courage in the face of difficulty. I am certainly not trying to imply that numbers are not important, but when they become our only measuring stick, we feed back into a system which says bigger is better, and more powerful wins. This seems to go against the grain of what Jesus was saying when he spoke of the kingdom being about children and the "least."

and ate it up. Some fell on rocky places, where it did not have much soil. It sprang up quickly, because the soil was shallow. But when the sun came up, the plants were scorched, and they withered because they had no root. Other seed fell among thorns, which grew up and choked the plants. Still other seed fell on good soil, where it produced a crop—a hundred, sixty or thirty times what was sown.³⁹

Once again, the kingdom of heaven is like a net that was let down into the lake and caught all kinds of fish. When it was full, the fishermen pulled it up on the shore. Then they sat down and collected the good fish in baskets, but threw the bad away. This is how it will be at the end of the age. The angels will come and separate the wicked from the righteous and throw them into the fiery furnace, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.⁴⁰

In the first passage Jesus tells the story of a sower casting seed in the field. One of the usual interpretations of this passage reveals an understanding of how the message of the kingdom is received. In fact, later in this same chapter (Matthew 13) Jesus interprets this parable to his disciples in this same manner.

There is another understanding that can be taken from this parable which is outlined by William Barclay in his commentary on this passage. “When a man sows the seed of the word, he does not know what he is doing or what effect the seed is having....No preacher or teacher ever does. It is our task to sow the seed, and to leave the rest to God.”⁴¹ This perspective reveals that the kingdom of God is indiscriminate in its distribution. There are no decisions made about who is told or not told about the kingdom. The Good News is distributed in an indiscriminate manner.

In the second passage listed above, the parable refers to the common practice of fishing in the time of Jesus. Again, the idea of the kingdom being indiscriminate in its distribution is portrayed. The fishermen aren’t selective over what fish they cast their

³⁹ Matt. 13:3-8, NIV.

⁴⁰ Matt. 13:47-50, NIV.

⁴¹ William Barclay, *The Gospel of Matthew*, Revised Edition ed., 2 vols., The Daily Study Bible Series, vol. 2 (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1975), 62-63.

nets. The net isn't "aimed" but "cast." They aren't selective in what fish they draw in either. They simply draw in all the fish that get caught in the net.

When taken together these two parables reveal a picture of the kingdom of God being indiscriminate in nature. It is broadcast for all who would hear it, whether they eventually choose to receive it or not.

The Kingdom is Acceptance

Another one of the parables Jesus uses in Matthew 13 to describe the kingdom relates to these previous two, but in a slightly different way.

Jesus told them another parable: "The kingdom of heaven is like a man who sowed good seed in his field. But while everyone was sleeping, his enemy came and sowed weeds among the wheat, and went away. When the wheat sprouted and formed heads, then the weeds also appeared. The owner's servants came to him and said, 'Sir, didn't you sow good seed in your field? Where then did the weeds come from?' 'An enemy did this,' he replied. The servants asked him, 'Do you want us to go and pull them up?' 'No,' he answered, 'because while you are pulling the weeds, you may root up the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest. At that time I will tell the harvesters: First collect the weeds and tie them in bundles to be burned; then gather the wheat and bring it into my barn.'"⁴²

When viewed from the perspective of the sower, two realities are revealed which enlighten this discussion. First, the wheat and the weeds are allowed to grow together for fear that the wheat may be pulled up when the weeds were removed. "It teaches us how hard it is to distinguish between those who are in the Kingdom and those who are not....It teaches us not to be so quick with our judgments."⁴³

⁴² Matt. 13:24-30, NIV.

⁴³ Barclay, 74.

The second reality is that the final sorting and judgment comes after the harvest has been completed. This can be interpreted to mean that God will be the final judge of all people at the appropriate time. Later in the passage Jesus interprets this parable for his own disciples saying, “He answered, ‘The one who sowed the good seed is the Son of Man. The field is the world, and the good seed stands for the sons of the kingdom. The weeds are the sons of the evil one, and the enemy who sows them is the devil. The harvest is the end of the age, and the harvesters are angels.’”⁴⁴ Final judgment is reserved for the very end of the age.

When these two realities from the parable of the wheat and weeds are harmonized, another common thread surfaces. “So, then, ultimately this parable is two things – it is a warning not to judge people at all, and it is a warning that in the end there comes the judgment of God.”⁴⁵ This leads to the conclusion that one component of the kingdom of God for Jesus was the issue of acceptance. There is the acceptance of all people regardless of whether they are a part of the kingdom of God or not, and there is also the acceptance or trust in the final judgment of God.

The Kingdom is Inclusive

If this idea of acceptance in the kingdom is laid beside the concept of it also being indiscriminate in nature, then it is possible to conclude that the kingdom of God is not about separation, but inclusion. All people are included in the broadcasting of the kingdom. All people are included in the acceptance of the kingdom. While the kingdom

⁴⁴ Matt. 13:37-39, NIV.

⁴⁵ Barclay, 75.

is still a part of this world, prior to its manifesting itself in a final outcome, judgment is withheld by all people and is ultimately reserved for God.

The leadership implications from these realities are significant. Leadership decisions within the church ought to be made that foster inclusion and acceptance rather than exclusivity and rejection. The ripple effects from these decisions will potentially involve issues as broad as race and sex to membership and attendance. Instead of church being a place where people are either “in” or “out,” depending on their status in the kingdom, it can become a community where all are welcomed and received with the love of Christ. Twenty-first century church leadership, in light of the kingdom of God, is not about separation, but inclusion.

Not People, but God

One final characteristic from Jesus’ teaching on the kingdom of God is that the kingdom is not about people, but about God. This is best viewed through his words on the kingdom related to growth, movement, and the cornerstone.

The Kingdom is Growth

Further examination of the parables Jesus used in Matthew 13 regarding the kingdom of heaven reveal another pattern arising from the images. This one relates to who is the central focus in this kingdom.

The disciple Matthew writes, “He told them another parable: ‘The kingdom of heaven is like a mustard seed, which a man took and planted in his field. Though it is the smallest of all your seeds, yet when it grows, it is the largest of garden plants and

becomes a tree, so that the birds of the air come and perch in its branches.”⁴⁶ Here Jesus takes a vivid picture of a common seed and plant that would have been highly recognizable by his hearers, and a common saying that would have also been easily understood. “This picture is that of a tiny seed being sown in the ground and growing to a tree-size plant, large enough for birds to perch on its branches. Actually, the mustard seed is not the least of all seeds, but this was a proverbial expression for something exceedingly small.”⁴⁷ With this picture firmly implanted in the hearers’ minds, Jesus showed them a kingdom that was almost boundless in the significance of its growth. This kingdom has the potential of exponential expansion.

Since it has been almost 2,000 years since Jesus’ life and ministry, the evidence of that reality being true can clearly be seen. The kingdom of God has grown from a small band of followers in the region of Galilee to reaching around the world. It extends to the far ends of the earth and encompasses almost every people group on the planet. The kingdom of God is a kingdom of growth!

The Kingdom is Movement

Following this parable, Jesus tells another story that is contained in one verse. “He told them still another parable: ‘The kingdom of heaven is like yeast that a woman took and mixed into a large amount of flour until it worked all through the dough.’”⁴⁸ Again Jesus uses a common analogy to describe a kingdom reality, this time from the

⁴⁶ Matt. 13:21-32, NIV.

⁴⁷ Ralph Earle, *Matthew*, ed. A. F. Harper, 10 vols., Beacon Bible Commentary, vol. 6 (Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1964), 136.

⁴⁸ Matt. 13:33, NIV.

kitchen. “Leaven was a little piece of dough kept over from a previous baking, which had fermented in the keeping.”⁴⁹ This piece of leaven would have been worked into the dough of the new loaves of bread and would have caused it to rise.

There is a familiar type of bread available today that gets passed from person to person, family to family called “friendship bread” that is similar to what Jesus described. This bread has a “starter” dough that is passed from one person to another along with the recipe, so the next person will know how to make it. Once the bread is made, another “starter” is generated in hopes that it will be passed along to someone else. The “starter” is essentially the equivalent of the leaven to which Jesus referred.

In both the circumstances Jesus described, as well as this modern version of friendship bread, the bread rises in response to the yeast. Jesus’ description of the kingdom of God being like this leaven, or yeast, is a symbol of the reality that the kingdom of God is one of movement. Once it is active and working it causes transformation and change. “The whole point of the parable lies in one thing – the transforming power of the leaven. Leaven changed the character of a whole baking....The introduction of the leaven causes a transformation in the dough; and the coming of the Kingdom causes a transformation in life.”⁵⁰

When these two parables are considered together, their impact is quite significant, especially regarding the issue of church leadership. “Since this parable is very closely related to the previous one, they may well be interpreted together.”⁵¹ The kingdom of

⁴⁹ Barclay, 79.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Earle, *Matthew*, 136.

God is not about people, but about God. Jesus didn't say the mustard seed grew because someone planted it, watered it, and then cared for it until it came into maturity. The interpretation is that the mustard plant grew on its own. He also didn't say the bread was moved and transformed because of the hard work of the cook. The bread grew and changed because the yeast had been added.

The Kingdom has a Cornerstone

There is another parable Jesus tells which brings further illumination to this reality. In Matthew 21 he tells the story of some evil farmers related to the kingdom.

"Now listen to this story. A certain landowner planted a vineyard, built a wall around it, dug a pit for pressing out the grape juice, and built a lookout tower. Then he leased the vineyard to tenant farmers and moved to another country. At the time of the grape harvest he sent his servants to collect his share of the crop. But the farmers grabbed his servants, beat one, killed one, and stoned another. So the landowner sent a larger group of his servants to collect for him, but the results were the same. Finally, the owner sent his son, thinking, 'Surely they will respect my son.' But when the farmers saw his son coming, they said to one another, 'Here comes the heir to this estate. Come on, let's kill him and get the estate for ourselves!' So they grabbed him, took him out of the vineyard, and murdered him. When the owner of the vineyard returns," Jesus asked, "what do you think he will do to those farmers?" The religious leaders replied, "He will put the wicked men to a horrible death and lease the vineyard to others who will give him his share of the crop after each harvest." Then Jesus asked them, "Didn't you ever read this in the Scriptures? 'The stone rejected by the builders has now become the cornerstone. This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous to see.' What I mean is that the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation that will produce the proper fruit. Anyone who stumbles over that stone will be broken to pieces, and it will crush anyone on whom it falls."⁵²

In this parable Jesus paints the picture of a landowner who rents his estate to some tenant farmers. These people are supposed to care for the estate in place of the owner, who retains the right of ownership and the ability to collect from its harvest.

⁵² Matt. 21:33-44, NLT.

The pains the landowner takes show his care for the vineyard. He builds a wall to keep out animals, a watchtower to guard against thieves and fire, and digs a winepress to squeeze the grapes right there. All this shows his confidence that his vineyard will bear fruit. The tenant farmers take care of the vineyard during the owner's absence and pay rent in kind.⁵³

Clearly the estate is the owner's. He never intends to transfer its ownership to the tenant farmers, but simply let's them care for it. He retains ownership at all times, demonstrating the reality that the kingdom is always God's.

Jesus continues by quoting a passage from the Psalms regarding a rejected stone becoming the cornerstone of the building. "Jesus now turns to the image of a building....The building metaphor makes no explicit allusion to the church: the point is Christological, not ecclesiastical. The reversal of what man holds dear, the elevation of what he rejects, can only be the Lord's doing...."⁵⁴ In quoting this passage Jesus is making a clear statement concerning the reality of the kingdom being founded on Himself. He is at the very heart of the kingdom.

When these two ideas of kingdom ownership and the cornerstone are harnessed together a clear image emerges from this parable in which the kingdom is always God's, founded on the work of Christ. The kingdom is not about people, but about God. He always retains ownership of the kingdom asking His people to work within the boundaries, but simply continuing the work Jesus began through His life, death and resurrection.

⁵³ Carson, *Matthew*, 452.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 453-454.

The Kingdom is Centered on God

This means the growth and movement of the Church is not dependent on any one person or group of people but is dependent on God and is always centered on the work of Christ. While it is true that God chooses to use the people who comprise the Church to help spread the seed and the yeast, the growth and the movement of the kingdom is God's responsibility and action, based on the primary work of Jesus. It has always been, and will always be His kingdom, founded on the cornerstone of Christ.

The implication for church leadership is that while people must be willing to work and do their part to spread the kingdom, God is the one who will provide the growth and movement necessary for His kingdom to continue expanding and gaining new territory. This also implies that church leaders should be willing to trust the Lord to supply the growth and movement necessary to keep His kingdom on the road forward, always with the reminder that it is His kingdom, founded on Christ. Twenty-first century church leadership, in light of the kingdom of God, is not centered on people, but God.

Implications - Worth Everything

There are two final parables Jesus uses to describe the kingdom of God in Matthew 13. Both of them reinforce the significance of Jesus' whole focus on the kingdom. They encompass three verses and their meanings are completely intertwined. "The kingdom of heaven is like treasure hidden in a field. When a man found it, he hid it again, and then in his joy went and sold all he had and bought that field. Again, the

kingdom of heaven is like a merchant looking for fine pearls. When he found one of great value, he went away and sold everything he had and bought it.”⁵⁵

Once again Jesus uses two very familiar images from the people’s lives to reinforce the reality of the kingdom. It was common practice for the people to bury their valuables in the ground since there really wasn’t any kind of established banking system.⁵⁶ So in a man’s normal work as a hired hand he stumbles across someone’s buried treasure and buys the field to claim it as his own. Here Jesus conveys the message that the kingdom of God is worth everything in life.

In the second picture Jesus uses the image of a pearl, which was sought after for its beauty and was highly treasured by the people of Jesus’ time.⁵⁷ This is also a picture of a very valuable item which is discovered by someone who was searching for it, and when it was found they risked everything in order to acquire it. Again the message is that the kingdom of God is worth everything in life.

At the beginning of this chapter a question was posed. What are the implications of the kingdom of God from the gospels to the current changing world of church leadership? Four significant implications have emerged:

- The kingdom is not about structures, but about spirituality. It is near, and within, and it is spiritual, showing that leaders must be willing to hold this element of spirituality above structures within the church.

⁵⁵ Matt. 13:44-46, NIV.

⁵⁶ Barclay, 84.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 86.

- The kingdom is not about power, but about faith. It is children and it is least, revealing the reality of its downward movement and a need to not strive for power but to trust the Lord.
- The kingdom is not about separation, but about inclusion. It is indiscriminate and it is acceptance, exposing the fact that leaders must be willing to hold judgment and accept all those to whom the kingdom reaches, and remember that God is the ultimate judge.
- The kingdom is not about people, but about God. It is growth and it is movement, both of which are not the responsibility of the leader but God. It is also centered on the foundational work of Christ. The leader's role is to help spread the kingdom, trusting Him to produce the results, continuing His work.

All of this now culminates in these final two pictures of the kingdom of God being worth everything. Here the final reality rises to the forefront. If leaders don't choose to value this kingdom and all of these leadership implications, then the Church won't be "a-changin'" with the culture around it, leading it to a place of significant irrelevance. But by embracing the full reality of the kingdom of God, the church can change with the culture in such a way that the kingdom of God continues to reshape the landscape of people's lives. The kingdom of God becomes our guiding reality in how the church should be led in the twenty-first century, and it *is* worth everything!

CHAPTER 3

AN ANALYSIS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE'S *CITY OF GOD*

In the further development of this thesis it is necessary to interact with material from the realm of Church history. When considering the subject of embracing an ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God, there is a classic piece of Christian literature from one of the great fathers of the Church which must be considered. Saint Augustine's *City of God* contrasts two cities of people who are coexisting within the same world and yet are headed in completely different directions. These two entities are defined by two different kinds of love and exist for opposite reasons. Their foundational motivations and their final destinations are completely contradictory. These two cities, the city of man and the city of God, closely parallel Jesus' teachings on the kingdom of earth and the kingdom of God.

This chapter contains a brief examination of the origins of Augustine's life and the circumstances which led to his writing this monumental work. The characteristics of the two cities Augustine outlines will be analyzed and then compared with Jesus' concept of the kingdom of God, and the implications from this comparison will be superimposed on the ontology of leadership being developed in this thesis. Specifically it will be shown that each of the four characteristics from the kingdom of God correlate to four themes from the *City of God* (see the following chart).

Kingdom of God Characteristic

Spirituality, not Structures

Faith, not Power

Inclusion, not Separation

God, not People

City of God Characteristic

Life in the Spirit

The Simplicity of the City

God Desires Unity

God is the Source

Biographical Information

In order to understand Augustine's writings in the *City of God*, it is necessary to consider some biographical information from his life. In this section of chapter three his historical background, writings, and the political context in which he lived and wrote will be examined.

Historical Background

Aurelius Augustinus was born in 354 in the North African town of Tagaste (located in modern Souk Ahras, Algeria). Born into a religiously divided home, his mother, Monica, was a devout Catholic, and his father, Patricius, was a pagan.⁵⁸ "As a youth Augustine lived a hedonistic lifestyle for a time, and in Carthage, he developed a relationship with a young woman who would be his concubine for over fifteen years. During this period he had a son, Adeodatus, with the young woman."⁵⁹ Augustine was

⁵⁸ *Augustine of Hippo* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 18 November 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint_Augustine; Internet.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

educated in philosophy and rhetoric during this early portion of his life, which eventually led to his great abilities to reason and preach.

Prior to his acceptance and baptism into Christianity, Augustine followed the Manichaeism religion which contributed to some of his foundational understandings of dualism so clearly portrayed in the competing worlds within the *City of God*.⁶⁰ That foray into Manichaeism led to a sense of disappointment due to an encounter with one of its leaders. Coupled with the constant pressure of his mother and the bishop of Milan, Ambrose, Augustine found himself at a crossroads.

In the summer of 386, after having read an account of the life of Saint Anthony of the Desert which greatly inspired him, Augustine underwent a profound personal crisis and decided to convert to Christianity, abandon his career in rhetoric, quit his teaching position in Milan, give up any ideas of marriage, and devote himself entirely to serving God and the practices of priesthood, which included celibacy. Key to this conversion was the voice of an unseen child he heard at one point telling him in a sing-song voice to "tolle lege" ("take up and read") the Bible, at which point he opened the Bible at random and fell upon the Epistle to the Romans 13:13, which reads: "Let us walk honestly, as in the day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying" (KJV).⁶¹

Following this flashpoint in Augustine's life and his subsequent baptism by Ambrose, Augustine returned to North Africa and was ordained a priest in 391 in Hippo Regius. Five years later "in 396 he was made coadjutor bishop of Hippo (assistant with the right of succession on the death of the current bishop), and remained as bishop in Hippo until his death in 430."⁶²

⁶⁰ *Manichaeism* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 20 November 2006); available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manichaeism>; Internet.

⁶¹ *Augustine of Hippo*.

⁶² *Ibid*.

Writings

Saint Augustine's educational training in philosophy and rhetoric provided him with significant foundations for writing. He is known for many works and was one of the most prolific writers in the early Church.

In the history of world literature we find many authors who have achieved fame and lasting influence through the writing of one great work. Augustine of Hippo produced several masterpieces. His *Confessions* is doubtless the outstanding spiritual autobiography by a Christian writer; his *Literal Commentary on Genesis* sets the standard for later Biblical interpretation; and the *Enarrations on the Psalms*, his longest writing, was most prized by the humanistic scholars of the Renaissance. In the sphere of formal theological writing, his fifteen books *On the Trinity* are unequaled in the early Church. Even the little dialogue called the *Soliloquies* has been put in a class by itself, as an example of spiritual introspection.⁶³

All of these works are significant in their own way, but the *City of God* is the work which Augustine considered his masterpiece. "He devoted a good part of fourteen years to its composition, starting the first book at the age of fifty-nine (when many a lesser man would be thinking of retiring) and completing the twenty-second book in A.D. 426, when he was seventy-two years old."⁶⁴

This work was not only a masterpiece in Augustine's eyes, but it has become a classic in modern literature as well, having been translated from the original Latin into multiple languages. The first English translation was produced in 1610, but contained a significant number of errors resulting in the first reputable translation by the Rev. Marcus

⁶³ Vernon J. Bourke, "Introduction to *City of God*, by Saint Augustine," in *City of God* (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 7.

⁶⁴ Ibid.

Dods, D.D., from Glasgow, Scotland in 1871.⁶⁵ Commenting on the profundity of this work, Dods wrote in the preface to his translation:

If it were asked to what this popularity is due, we should be disposed to attribute it mainly to the great variety of ideas, opinions, and facts that are here brought before the reader's mind. Its importance as a contribution to the history of opinion cannot be overrated. We find in it not only indications or explicit enunciation of the author's own views upon almost every important topic which occupied his thoughts, but also a compendious exhibition of the ideas which most powerfully influenced the life at that age The book has its faults; but it effectually introduces us to the most influential of theologians, and the greatest popular teacher; to a genius that cannot nod for many lines together; to a reasoner whose dialectic is more formidable, more keen and sifting, than that of Socrates or Aquinas; to a saint whose ardent and genuine devotional feeling bursts up through the severest argumentation; to a man whose kindness and wit, universal sympathies and breadth of intelligence, lend piquancy and vitality to the most abstract dissertation.⁶⁶

While most of Augustine's writings are significant, the *City of God* is the only work which will be considered for the purposes of this thesis.

Political Context

In order to understand some of the reasoning which led Augustine to write the *City of God*, the political context in which it was written must be examined. In 410 the city of Rome was plundered.

Alaric entered Rome, and, although a Christian, pillaged the city for a period of three days. On the fourth day, his troops left the city, carrying off vast booty and leaving behind a mass of corpses and ruins. Thus, for the first time, an empire fell at the very moment the Church was hoping to find a support in it. . . . The Empire had become Christian and it was during the reign of a Christian emperor that Rome, for the first time in her long history, was conquered and sacked.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Marcus Dods, *Translator's Preface to St. Augustin's City of God* [Book On-Line] (New York: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1890, accessed 18 November 2006); available from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf102.iv.i.html>; Internet.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

This resulted in a number of leading philosophers and church leaders questioning how this could happen, and it even caused some of them to blame the Christian way of life for this terrible tragedy. Two men who were closely connected to Augustine and were a part of this crowd of skeptics were the Christian, Marcellinus, and the pagan, Volusianus.

Volusianus raised the objection that the preaching and teaching of Christ was in no way compatible with the duties and rights of citizens....The Christian Marcellinus, and not the pagan Volusianus, raised the last and most formidable argument, namely, that "it is manifest that very great calamities have befallen the country under the government of emperors practicing, for the most part, the Christian religion."⁶⁸

It is within this historical context that Augustine embarked on writing the *City of God* as a defense of Christianity. In fact, Augustine used the first ten books of this great work to lay his foundations for refuting these claims that Christianity was to blame for the fall of the Roman Empire. He proceeded to show the full extent of what would happen if the two cities were followed to their consequential ends, and the significant impact those courses of action would have on the world as a whole.

Defining the Cities

Now that a basic understanding of Augustine's background is in hand it is necessary to consider how he defined the two cities within the *City of God*. In this section of chapter three the nature of the cities, their origins, and their histories will be examined,

⁶⁷ Etienne Gilson, "Forward to *City of God*, by Saint Augustine," in *City of God* (New York: Doubleday, 1950), 16.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 17.

and the question of why Augustine developed the concept of these two cities will be answered.

The Nature of the Cities

In beginning this examination of the *City of God* there must first be a basis for understanding the two cities which occupy the central focus of this work. Augustine describes two cities which coexist in the world, the city of man and the city of God. The city of man is founded on a desire for self to be supreme and includes all those individuals who do not follow Christ and walk with God. The city of God is founded on a desire for God to be supreme and includes all those individuals who follow Christ and walk with God.

What we see, then, is that two societies have issued from two kinds of love. Worldly society has flowered from a selfish love which dared to despise even God, whereas the communion of saints is rooted in a love of God that is ready to trample on self. In a word, this latter relies on the Lord, whereas the other boasts that it can get along by itself. The city of man seeks the praise of men, whereas the height of glory for the other is to hear God in the witness of conscience. The one lifts up its head in its own boasting; the other says to God: "Thou art my glory, thou liftest up my head."⁶⁹

On the heels of this description Augustine quotes Romans 1:21-25 to further define the nature of the city of man.

Yes, they knew God, but they wouldn't worship him as God or even give him thanks. And they began to think up foolish ideas of what God was like. The result was that their minds became dark and confused. Claiming to be wise, they became utter fools instead. And instead of worshiping the glorious, ever-living God, they worshiped idols made to look like mere people, or birds and animals and snakes.

So God let them go ahead and do whatever shameful things their hearts desired. As a result, they did vile and degrading things with each other's bodies. Instead of

⁶⁹ Saint Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Demetrius B. Zema Gerald G. Walsh, Grace Monahan (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 321. Here Augustine quotes Psalm 3:4.

believing what they knew was the truth about God, they deliberately chose to believe lies. So they worshiped the things God made but not the Creator himself, who is to be praised forever. Amen.⁷⁰

He further describes the city of God. “In the City of God, on the contrary, there is no merely human wisdom, but there is a piety which worships the true God as He should be worshipped and has as its goal that reward of all holiness whether in the society of saints on earth or in that of angels in heaven, which is ‘that God may be all in all.’”⁷¹ Thus Augustine provides a basic framework for understanding the nature of these two cities or societies.

Following this line of reasoning, Augustine defines these two cities according to the nature of love. If a person loves himself or anything else more than he or she loves God, that person is a part of the city of man. But if a person has supreme love for God alone, then he or she is a part of the city of God.

St. Augustine has, therefore, never conceived the idea of a single universal society, but of two, both of which are universal – at least in the sense that every man whatsoever is necessarily a citizen of one or the other. In this sense, it is true to say that two loves have produced two cities; one, in which the love of God unites all men; a second, wherein all citizens, regardless of time and place, are united by their love of the world.⁷²

Augustine goes on to delineate various ways this love manifests itself in the lives of people, but concludes the foundational element is always love.

Augustine has differentiated the two societies in several ways: love of God or love of the world; love of God to the point of self-contempt or love of self carried to a contempt of God; love of the flesh or love of the spirit. In every case, however, they are distinguished by love, which is their very root. Yet, by

⁷⁰ Romans 1:21-25, NLT.

⁷¹ Augustine, 322. Here Augustine finishes with a quote from 1 Corinthians 15:28.

⁷² Gilson, "Forward to *City of God*, by Saint Augustine," 26-27.

whatever name they are designated, it is still true to say that two loves have produced two cities.⁷³

Augustine believed that the focus of a person's love is what determined of which city they were a part.

The Origin of the Cities

In order to better comprehend these two realms, Augustine also provides some definite direction as to their origins. He spends a significant portion of the early books describing how the angels were divided into two realms by their choices. For the purposes of this thesis, however, the main focus must remain on the human realm, and Augustine was explicit that as far as humanity goes, both cities were created within the first man, Adam.

But now, since I must put an end to this Book, I shall merely say that, in my view, in this first man created in the beginning, there was established, not as yet, indeed, in actual appearance but in the foreknowledge of God, the origin of these two cities or societies, as far as concerns the human race. From this first man were to come all men, some to be associated with the bad angels in their punishment and others to be fellow citizens with the good angels in their reward.⁷⁴

After the sin of Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden and the birth of Cain and Abel, the cities began to appear in the choices made by those sons. "Now, the first man born of the two parents of the human race was Cain. He belonged to the city of man. The next born was Abel, and he was of the City of God....Now, the city of man was first founded by a fratricide who was moved by envy to kill his brother, a man who, in his

⁷³ Ibid., 27.

⁷⁴ Augustine, 268.

pilgrimage on earth, was a citizen of the City of God.”⁷⁵ Following this act of murder, Augustine sees in the birth of Seth, the third son of Adam and Eve, further clarification of the two cities.

Adam, then, was the ultimate father of two lines of succession, one of which was that of the earthly city and the other was that of the heavenly City. But from the time when the death of Abel revealed itself as a marvelous symbol of the persecuted City of God, each of the two lines had its own father, Cain being the father of the one and Seth of the other. It was in their sons who were to be mentioned in Scripture that we begin to see more clearly the specific characteristics of the two cities as they appear in this mortal life.⁷⁶

The History of the Cities

After outlining the origins of these two cities, Augustine takes great length (Books XV – XVIII) to outline the historical roots of both societies. He moves from Adam down to Noah, through David and the surrounding kingdoms of Babylon and Assyria, into the time of Christ, ending in the modern era of the Roman Empire, representing the city of man, and the Church, representing the city of God. Speaking in regard to the line of individuals who carried the hope of the city forward to the time of Christ, O'Donnell states, “In the desolation of a sinful world, these figures have held out the hope that the journey home is possible, that men need not resign themselves to citizenship in a corrupt city but may already participate in the citizenship of heaven, with faith and hope in its full restoration.”⁷⁷ All of this outlining of the historical background

⁷⁵ Ibid., 324-328.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 353.

⁷⁷ James J O'Donnell, *Augustine, City of God* [Unpublished Article On-Line] (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1983, accessed 18 November 2006); available from <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/augustine/civ.html>; Internet.

is done with precise detail in order to help the reader fully understand the basic nature and structure of the two cities.

Hence it is that just because humility is the virtue especially esteemed in the City of God and so recommended to its citizens in their present pilgrimage on earth and because it is one that was particularly outstanding in Christ, its King, so it is that pride, the vice contrary to this virtue, is, as Holy Scripture tells us, especially dominant in Christ's adversary, the Devil. In fact, this is the main difference which distinguishes the two cities of which we are speaking. The humble City is the society of holy men and good angels; the proud city is the society of wicked men and evil angels. The one City began with the love of God; the other had its beginnings in the love of self.⁷⁸

For Saint Augustine, outlining the history of the two cities was necessary to prove their existence and to help people see the foundational nature of those societies.

Why Two Cities

At this point it is necessary to consider the reason why Augustine would outline these two contrasting cities. Three citations from the work of James O'Donnell will again be helpful at this point.

The fundamental pastoral point made by Augustine writing on the two cities is that Christians live in this world but they are not of this world. They are present here as strangers sojourning in a foreign country, enjoying the blessings the world has to offer, but always ready to move on. Heaven is the Christian's true home, and it is to heaven that his affections and his loyalties should be directed.⁷⁹

At the center of the whole work is a single scriptural theme, illuminated and made the basis for an extended meditation on the whole message of revelation itself. The fall of angels and men, itself the result of a derangement of loves, has brought schism into the soul of man. In the natural state, man is now a stranger to himself, incapable of self-knowledge; thinking himself good and virtuous but in reality full of pride and disordered loves. How this can come about is a mystery in some ways (*City of God* 12.7), but it is a fact. Left to itself, human society would be

⁷⁸ Augustine, 310.

⁷⁹ O'Donnell.

nothing but the city of this world, cut off from God, destined to die in body and soul.⁸⁰

The aim of Augustine's exposition is not to satisfy intellectual curiosity: none of his mature works were ever written to that end. The purpose was entirely pastoral: to dismantle first (in Books 1-10) the prevailing, all-too-natural, interpretation of the meaning of human affairs, and then to find hidden just beneath the surface a second interpretation, divine in origin, full of hope for the future. The error of those who would lament bitterly the fall of a single earthly city of bricks and mortar is the error of those who are unable to distinguish shadow from reality: the sovereign remedy is the intervention of the divine Word of redemption and illumination.⁸¹

Augustine's deepest desire in writing the *City of God* was to demonstrate how natural it should be for people to choose to embrace the city of God and become a part of its glorious existence here on earth, as well as in Heaven to come. If he could persuade people as to the existence of these two cities, and he could clearly show the superiority of the city of God for everyone, then people would naturally choose to love God and become a part of this great city.

The City of God / The Kingdom of God

In the proceeding chapter of this thesis, four main characteristics of the kingdom of God emerged from the teachings of Jesus: the kingdom is not about structures, but about spirituality; the kingdom is not about power, but about faith; the kingdom is not about separation, but inclusion; and the kingdom is not about people, but God. These same four characteristics also emerge within Augustine's comparison between the city of

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid.

man and the city of God. Each of them will be examined to further illuminate the ontology of leadership being defined in this thesis.

Life in the Spirit

One of the characteristics of the kingdom of God that was outlined in chapter two is that the kingdom is not about structures, but spirituality. This directly relates to a theme found within the *City of God*, that Augustine believed true life was only found through life in the spirit.

Augustine believed the two cities were fundamentally different in the way their citizens lived. The city of man lived for the flesh, while the city of God lived for the Spirit.

This is the reason why, for all the difference of the many and very great nations throughout the world in religion and morals, language, weapons, and dress, there exist no more than the two kinds of society, which, according to our Scriptures, we have rightly called the two cities. One city is that of men who live according to the flesh. The other is of men who live according to the spirit. Each of them chooses its own kind of peace, and when they attain what they desire, each lives in the peace of its own choosing.⁸²

This distinction was important to Augustine because it spoke to the motivation of control in people's lives. A person's decision about who was going to be in control, either themselves or the Spirit, was crucial to which city they belonged.

Augustine put this concept another way by stating that when man lives according to the flesh he lives for himself, but when he lives according to the Spirit he lives in harmony with the will of God.

When man lives according to himself, that is to say, according to human ways and not according to God's will, then surely he lives according to falsehood....Rather,

⁸² Augustine, 295.

man has been so constituted in truth that he was meant to live not according to himself but to Him who made him – that is, he was meant to do the will of God rather than his own. It is a lie not to live as a man was created to live....When, therefore, we said that two contrary and opposing cities arose because some men live according to the flesh and others live according to the spirit, we could equally well have said that they arose because some live according to man and others according to God.⁸³

This difference between the flesh and the spirit pointed to the origin of the two societies, as well as to the establishment of their citizenships, and this duality was important for Augustine because it showed how vital it was to live life in the power of the Spirit for those who desired to be in the city of God.

Augustine even believed that the flesh of a person could also be used for good in order to point a person toward the heavenly peace of the city of God. “Not even the holy and faithful followers of the one true and supreme God are beyond the reach of demonic trickery and temptation in its many forms. Yet our anxiety in this matter is good for us, so long as we inhabit this frail body in this evil world, for it sends us seeking more ardently after that heavenly peace which is to be unshakeable and unending.”⁸⁴ The flesh was able to help push a person toward the divine peace available in the city of God.

This leads to another set of terms Augustine used to describe this life in the Spirit, earthly peace or heavenly peace. If a person was living by the flesh and seeking earthly peace they were a part of the city of man. If, however, a person was living by the spirit and was seeking heavenly peace they were a part of the city of God.

So, too, the earthly city which does not live by faith seeks only an earthly peace, and limits the goal of its peace, of its harmony of authority and obedience among its citizens, to the voluntary and collective attainment of objectives necessary to mortal existence. The heavenly City, meanwhile – or, rather, that part that is on

⁸³ Ibid., 300-301.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 449-450.

pilgrimage in mortal life and lives by faith – must use this earthly peace until such a time as our mortality which needs such peace has passed away.⁸⁵

And because, so long as man lives in his mortal body and is a pilgrim far from the Lord, he walks, not by vision, but by faith. Consequently, he refers all peace of body or soul, or their combination, to that higher peace which unites a mortal man with the immortal God and which I defined as “ordered obedience guided by faith, under God’s eternal law.”⁸⁶

Augustine believed all people were seeking peace. The question was which one were they seeking, earthly peace corresponding to the flesh, or heavenly peace corresponding to the Spirit. That decision made the determination as to whether they were in the city of man or the city of God.

There is one small nuance from the city of God which needs a brief mention since it relates to this concept of life in the Spirit. Augustine was convinced that since clothes and social order within society was a part of the realm of the flesh, they had no bearing on the city of God. “The City of God does not care in the least what kind of dress or social manners the man of faith affects, so long as these involve no offense against the divine law. For it is faith and not fashions that brings us to God.”⁸⁷ This was further evidence of just how important this concept of life in the spirit was to Augustine. The external trappings of life were of no consequence to which city a person was a citizen.

When all of these factors are considered together, the pattern which emerges and has already been alluded to is that life must be lived in the Spirit if a person wants to be a part of the city of God. One of the characteristics of the kingdom of God from chapter two was that the kingdom is not about structures but about spirituality. It becomes

⁸⁵ Ibid., 464.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 459.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 466.

evident how these two concepts parallel one another. Citizenship in the city of God is not determined by any structure from the fleshly world, including external trappings, or even from seeking peace on earth through governments or systems. No, citizenship in the city of God is based on a person choosing to live by the Spirit, just like being a part of the kingdom of God is a spiritual reality, not a physical one. Saint Augustine agreed with Jesus that citizens of the city of God live life in the Spirit.

The Simplicity of the City

A second characteristic of the kingdom of God which was evaluated in chapter two of this work is that the kingdom is not about power, but faith. This connects to another theme from the *City of God* which will be analyzed in this chapter, the simplicity of the city.

One of the key concepts within the *City of God* which has already been alluded to is the notion of peace. Augustine believed that every person sought some type of peace in this life and that ultimate peace was only found through a relationship with God and entering into eternal life.

By genuine virtue we mean here that we refer not only all good things which are being rightly used, and all the right use we are making of blessings and misfortunes, but our very virtue itself to that End in which there will be a peace so good that no peace could be better, a peace so great that a greater would be impossible. Thus, we may say of peace what we have said of eternal life – that it is our highest good....⁸⁸

But, in that final peace which is the end and purpose of all virtue here on earth, our nature, made whole by immortality and incorruption, will have no vices and experience no rebellion from within or without. There will be no need for reason to govern non-existent evil inclinations. God will hold sway over man, the soul over the body; and the happiness in eternal life and law will make obedience

⁸⁸ Ibid., 451.

sweet and easy. And in each and all of us this condition will be everlasting, and we shall know it to be so. That is why the peace of such blessedness or the blessedness of such peace is to be our supreme good.⁸⁹

Augustine believed every person's need for peace could only be found in the peace of God, which should become the basic desire of every individual on earth, thus ushering them into the city of God and the everlasting peace of eternity.

In order to find this peace Augustine also believed that a person needed to engage in some other simple realities, the first of which was joy. "The peace of the heavenly City lies in a perfectly ordered and harmonious communion of those who find their joy in God and in one another in God."⁹⁰ For Augustine, the joy of balanced relationship with God and the body of Christ was a pathway to embracing the everlasting peace of God.

Joy was not the only way to attain this everlasting peace. The love of God and one's fellow man was also a source of embracing this peace.

Meanwhile, God teaches him two chief commandments, the love of God and the love of neighbor. In these precepts man finds three beings to love, namely, God, himself, and his fellow man, and knows that he is not wrong in loving himself so long as he loves God. As a result, he must help his neighbor (whom he is obliged to love as himself) to love God. Thus, he must help his wife, children, servants, and all others whom he can influence. He must wish, moreover to be similarly helped by his fellow man, in case he himself needs such assistance. Out of all this love he will arrive at peace, as much as in him lies, with every man – at that human peace which is regulated fellowship. Right order here means, first, that he harm no one, and, second, that he help whomever he can.

Earthly peace, as well as peace in eternity, was found through the simplicity of love for God and love for neighbor.

Augustine concludes that peace, both in this world and in the one to come, is found through the simplicity of joy and love. These two childlike qualities begin to point

⁸⁹ Ibid., 481.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 456.

us to another characteristic of the kingdom of God explored in chapter two, that the kingdom of God is not about power, but about simple faith like a child.

In order to better understand this correlation, there are two other facets of the city of God which Augustine enumerates that further illuminate this characteristic of the kingdom. The first one is the Greek concept of *latreia*, or adoration. “The heavenly City, on the contrary, knows and, by religious faith, believes that it must adore one God alone and serve Him with that complete dedication which the Greeks call *latreia* and which belongs to him alone.”⁹¹

Any parent can understand how this concept of adoration relates back to the characteristic of childlike faith in the kingdom. Children, no matter what their parents may have done to them in their lives, still love them with an adoration that sometimes can seem unnatural.⁹² It is to this kind of total devotion that Augustine calls anyone who would want to become a citizen of the Godly society.

The other characteristic of the city of God which relates to this childlike faith of the kingdom is Augustine’s view of position and power within that city. “Nor should the man of action love worldly position or power (for all is vanity under the sun), but only what can be properly and usefully accomplished by means of such position and power, in the sense which I have already explained of contributing to the eternal salvation of those

⁹¹ Ibid., 464-465. Italics are in the original text.

⁹² I recently had a conversation with a sixteen year old girl whose mother got her started doing drugs. She would purchase the drugs, give some of them to her daughter, and then use them with her. This resulted in the daughter going into deep depression and attempting suicide, which is what helped to remove her from that environment. As she has become involved in the youth ministry of our church and has found her new identity in Christ, she has blossomed. As a part of that growth in Christ, she told me that even though she knows what her mom did was wrong, she still loves her and wants to be a part of her life.

committed to one's care."⁹³ Augustine goes on to quote the Apostle Paul in 1 Timothy where he writes, "It is a true saying that if someone wants to be an elder, he desires an honorable responsibility."⁹⁴ He uses this verse to show that Paul "wanted to make clear that the office of bishop, *episcopatus*, implies work rather than dignity.... Thus no one can be a good bishop if he loves his title but not his task."⁹⁵ According to Augustine, no one in the city of God should desire power or prestige for their own sake, but only so they might be able to help others live as citizens of that Godly society as well.

There is direct correlation between this concept and the reality of the kingdom of God being about simple faith and not power. When this is taken into consideration with the previous concepts of devoted adoration, and finding peace through joy and love, we see how closely it corresponds to the reality that the kingdom of God is not about power, but simple, childlike faith. So for Augustine, there was a blessed simplicity found within the city of God.

God Desires Unity

Another characteristic from the kingdom of God which was outlined in chapter two of this thesis is that the kingdom is not about separation, but inclusion. This corresponds to a third theme which surfaces within the *City of God*, which is that God desires unity within the city.

⁹³ Augustine, 467.

⁹⁴ 1 Tim. 3:1, NLT.

⁹⁵ Augustine, 467. Italics in the original text.

Earlier in this chapter Augustine's belief that God established the world through one man, Adam, and that both the city of man and the city of God originated within that one man was described. This concept outlines another major facet within the *City of God*, namely that God's desire is for unity within the city of God, in contrast to the division which is present within the city of man. "I have already said, in previous Books, that God has two purposes in deriving all men from one man. His first purpose was to give unity to the human race by the likeness of nature. His second purpose was to bind mankind by the bond of peace, through blood relationship, into one harmonious whole."⁹⁶ Augustine believed that all of humanity was united through Adam in the nature of its creation and through humanity's desire for peace, and this unity in Adam was essential in order for people to desire unity in their lives. "Therefore, God created one sole individual, not that he was meant to remain alone deprived of human companionship, but in order that the unity of society and the bond of harmony might mean more to man, since men were to be united not only by the likeness of nature but also by the affection of kinship."⁹⁷

Gilson helps to identify the significance of this unity in Augustine's thinking.

There was a moment in history when the unity of mankind was perfectly realized, that is, when it was composed of a single man. In fact, it was precisely to secure this unity that God first created a single man, from whom all others are sprung. In itself, this was not necessary; the earth could be peopled today with the descendents of several men, simultaneously created at the beginning of time, to whose stock each and every one would belong. Even so, the unification of mankind would still be both desirable and possible; but, through the one ancestor, from whom all men are spring, this unity is not only a realizable ideal, it is a fact. It is a physical fact, since all men are related. Likewise, it is a moral fact, for, instead of considering themselves bound together by a mere likeness of nature, men are conscious of a real family bond. None of the faithful could doubt that all men, regardless of race, color or appearance, have their origin in the first man

⁹⁶ Ibid., 295.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 262.

created by God, and that this first man was alone of his kind. There was no doubt in St. Augustine's mind that God Himself had created the human race in this way so that men might understand how pleasing unity, even in diversity, was to God; nor could they doubt that their unity was a family unity. Thus, men are naturally brothers in Adam even before being supernaturally brothers in Christ; of this we are assured by faith.⁹⁸

Augustine believed that humanity's desire for unity resulted from its origin in Adam which created within every person a desire for unity. But real unity was only going to be found through Christ for those who were a part of the city of God. So for Augustine, God created unity as a supreme reality for all people when he created everyone from Adam, demonstrating God's desire for unity among His people.

Augustine demonstrated this desire for unity in other ways. He believed the lack of unity within the city of man and true unity within the city of God could be observed in the way people from each city embraced various philosophies and the handling of holy scriptures.

Is it not the case, rather, that the ungodly city has, without the smallest degree of critical discrimination, taken all these scrapping ideas from here, there, and everywhere, clutching them in pell-mell confusion to her bosom? . . . No wonder, then, that this earthly city has been given the symbolic name of Babylon, for Babylon means confusion, as I remember having already remarked. . . . How differently has that other race, that other commonwealth of men, that other City, the people of Israel, to whom was entrusted the word of God, managed matters! No broad-minded, muddle-headed mixing of true prophets with false prophets there! They have recognized and held as the true-speaking authors of Holy Writ only those who are in perfect harmony with one another.⁹⁹

By comparing how these two cities dealt with teachings and the scriptures, Augustine was further demonstrating his conviction that God desired unity among His people.

⁹⁸ Gilson, "Forward to *City of God*, by Saint Augustine," 24-25.

⁹⁹ Augustine, 411.

This longing for unity was also evident in the way Augustine wrote about pantheism in the earthly city and monotheism in the heavenly city.

The city of this world, to begin with, has had certain “wise men” of its own mold, whom true religion must reject, because either out of their own daydreaming or out of demonic deception these wise men came to believe that a multiplicity of divinities was allied with human life....The heavenly City, on the contrary, knows and, by religious faith, believes that it must adore one God alone and serve Him with that complete dedication which the Greeks call *latreia* and which belongs to Him alone....So long, then, as the heavenly City is wayfaring on earth, she invites citizens from all nations and all tongues, and unites them into a single pilgrim band.¹⁰⁰

The earthly city’s willingness to embrace any number of gods all with different roles, contrasted with the city of God’s desire for true worship of only one God, was further evidence to Augustine of God’s desire for unity.

If this desire for unity by God is used as a backdrop when considering the kingdom of God, the characteristic of the kingdom which emerges is not separation, but inclusion, as was written about in chapter two. Several parables from Matthew 13 were considered in that chapter that led to an understanding of the kingdom being indiscriminate and accepting. It is a reality where everyone is valued and fills a vital role in the kingdom.

These ideas harmonize with Augustine’s concept of unity within the *City of God*. Because of humanity’s unity first in Adam, and God’s desire for that unity to be recaptured through Christ in the city of God, everyone is invited to become a citizen of that heavenly city, and all who are willing to embrace the city of God are welcome. There is natural unity of humanity in Adam, and there is the possibility of spiritual unity for

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 464-465.

everyone through Christ. The kingdom of God is not about separation, but inclusion, and the city of God is enveloped in God's desire for true unity.

God is the Source

The final characteristic of the kingdom of God from chapter two which will be analyzed and compared to the *City of God* is that the kingdom is not about people, but about God. This correlates to another theme found within the *City of God*, that God is the source of that city.

One of the foundational elements of the city of God which Augustine outlined was that this city is based and exists in God.

This same Trinity is also the source, the light, the joy of the Holy City "which is above" with the holy angels. For, if we ask whence it came, the answer is: "God created it"; whence its wisdom, "God enlightens it"; whence its happiness, "God is its joy." By subsisting in Him it is what it is; by contemplating Him it receives its light; by abiding in Him it possesses beatitude. It is; it knows; it loves. Its life is in the eternity of God; its light is in the truth of God; its joy is in the goodness of God.¹⁰¹

The city of God is founded in the very nature and character of God and everything emanates from that Source.

As Augustine examined this nature of God, he concluded that goodness, in fact supreme goodness, is at the very heart of God's character.

In fact, there is no other good which can make any rational or intellectual creature happy except God. Not every creature has the potentialities for happiness. Beasts, trees, stones, and such things neither acquire nor have the capacity for this gift. However, every creature which has this capacity receives it, not from itself, since it has been created out of nothing, but from its Creator. To possess Him is to be happy; to lose Him is to be in misery. And, of course, that One whose beatitude depends upon Himself as His own good and not on any other good can never be

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 233.

unhappy since He can never lose Himself. Thus, there can be no unchangeable good except our one, true, and blessed God.¹⁰²

The explanation, then, of the goodness of creation is the goodness of God. It is a reasonable and sufficient explanation whether considered in the light of philosophy or of faith. It puts an end to all controversies concerning the origin of the world.¹⁰³

All goodness in creation is a result of the goodness of its Creator and if individuals are going to be a part of the city of God they must first recognize this reality. God in His goodness is at the very center of the existence of the world.

One of the ways Augustine reinforces this concept of God being the center of all things is in his examination of creation. Augustine believed that all of creation has its foundation in God.

It is, therefore, because we are men, created to the image of a Creator, whose eternity is true, His truth eternal, His love both eternal and true, a Creator who is the eternal, true, and lovable Trinity in whom there is neither confusion nor division, that, wherever we turn among the things which He created and conserved so wonderfully, we discover His footprints whether lightly or plainly impressed. For, not one of all these things which are below us would either be, or belong to a particular species, or follow and observe any order, unless it has been created by Him whose existence, wisdom, and goodness are all transcendent.¹⁰⁴

For Saint Augustine, the very nature of every created thing has its beginnings in God. If that is the case, then how is it possible that humanity walked away from this goodness of God and there are some who are separated from it and are therefore a part of the city of man?

¹⁰² Ibid., 245.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 228.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 239.

In answer to that question, Augustine outlines how Adam and Eve first brought destruction to their souls through their own choices. The root of these evil choices and sin lies in the hands of simple pride and the exultation of self.

For, “pride is the beginning of all sin.” And what is pride but an appetite for inordinate exaltation? Now, exultation is inordinate when the soul cuts itself off from the very Source to which it should keep close and somehow makes itself and becomes an end to itself. This takes place when the soul becomes inordinately pleased with itself, and such self-pleasing occurs when the soul falls away from the unchangeable Good which ought to please the soul far more than the soul can please itself. Now, this falling away is the soul’s own doing, for, if the will had merely remained firm in the love of that higher immutable Good which lighted its mind into knowledge and warmed its will into love, it would not have turned away in search of satisfaction in itself and, by so doing, have lost that light and warmth. And thus Eve would not have believed that the serpent’s lie was true, nor would Adam have preferred the will of his wife to the will of God nor have supposed that his transgression of God’s command was venial when he refused to abandon the partner of his life even in a partnership of sin.¹⁰⁵

Even though God is the supreme Good and humanity was created in God’s image, Adam and Eve made a choice to exalt themselves and their own choices above the ultimate connection they enjoyed with God. The end result was that all of humanity is now separated from God and his goodness and must make a choice to return to that connection.

This is the key to reclaiming that connection, making a decision to yield to God and allowing Him to restore the severed relationship, placing God back at the center of each person’s life. Augustine was clear that if anyone wanted to be back in this right relationship they had to seek God in every way.

But, in fact, God is the Author of the existence of our nature and, therefore, He must be our Teacher if we are ever to be wise, and He must be the Source of our inmost consolation if we are ever to be happy.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 308-309. Augustine quotes Ecclesiastes 10:15.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 235.

Now, if man was created so that by his highest faculty he might attain to the highest of all realities, that is, to the one, true and supreme God, apart from whom no nature exists, no teaching is true, no conduct is good, then let us seek Him in whom all we find is real, know Him in whom all we contemplate is true, love Him in whom all things for us are good.¹⁰⁷

In summarizing this concept, Augustine believed God was at the center of everything. He was the source of all supreme goodness and created the world and everything in it so that He “looked over all he had made, and saw that it was excellent in every way.”¹⁰⁸ Adam and Eve, however, through their choices brought sin into the world and tainted all of humanity’s right relationship with God. This created the need for everyone to make their own personal choice to yield their lives to God so He could restore that broken relationship with Him and thus place those individuals within the boundaries of the city of God.

In chapter two of this thesis one of the foundational concepts of the kingdom of God was determined to be that the kingdom was not about people, but God. This was based on the kingdom being about growth and movement that is centered on the activity of God, rather than the activity of people, formed on the foundational work of Christ. Three parables from the teachings of Jesus were used to analyze this reality, the growth of the mustard seed, the movement of the leaven in the bread, and the evil tenant farmers,¹⁰⁹ resulting in this understanding that the kingdom of God is centered on the activity of God.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 150.

¹⁰⁸ Gen. 1:31, NLT.

¹⁰⁹ The parable of the mustard seed and the leaven in the bread from Matt. 13:21-33, and the parable of the evil tenants from Matt. 21:33-44.

The parallels here to Augustine's concept of God being the source of all goodness are significant. Whether people are a part of the city of God or the city of man, God is still the supreme good in the universe and He created everyone with that capacity to choose to live either in separation from or with a yielded heart to that goodness. When individuals make that choice to yield to God, through His cleansing power they come to realize the full extent of His being the source for every part of their lives. The kingdom of God is not centered on people, but on the Source of all Goodness.

Final Analysis

Saint Augustine undertook an immense task when he embarked on the writing of the *City of God*. It is an enormous work with far-reaching implications for all of Christianity. For the purposes of this thesis, there are four major themes which have emerged from its pages. Each one of these themes corresponds to one of the four major characteristics of the kingdom of God found within the teachings of Jesus and documented in chapter two of this work. Each theme supports the leadership implications for the ontology of leadership which is being revealed in this thesis.

Saint Augustine was insistent that entrance into the city of God was a matter of life in the Spirit. The city of man was characterized by a life lived in the flesh, seeking only earthly peace, while heavenly citizens sought after the eternal peace only offered through a life lived in the Spirit. This distinction compares to the reality of the kingdom of God being about spirituality and not about structures, particularly human ones. In consideration then of the thesis of this work, the leadership implications on the ontology

of leadership are significant, revealing the high priority of life in the Spirit being a part of the very fabric of this ontology.

Augustine expounded the simplicity of the city of God, relating its search for ultimate peace through simple joy and love, revealing its deep adoration of the Father, and proving its lack of desire for power and prestige. This simplicity directly coincides with the quality of the kingdom of God not being about power, but about a simple, childlike faith. Again, the leadership implications continue to reinforce the reality that the ontology of leadership must be willing to embrace this simplicity.

It has also been revealed that Augustine believed that God desires unity within the framework of the city of God. This unity has its natural foundation in Adam and is spiritually grounded in the open invitation for all to join its citizenship. The correlation between this unity and the quality of the kingdom of God which desires inclusion and not separation is readily apparent, revealing another leadership implication for the ontology of leadership being promoted in this thesis. One of the foundational components of this ontology must be this same desire for unity and inclusion found with the *City of God*.

Finally, the city of God holds God as the ultimate source of its existence and being. God is at the very heart and center of this heavenly society. This reality corresponds to the characteristic of the kingdom of God being about God and not about people. The leadership implications of these concepts for the ontology of leadership being developed in this thesis are a reminder that God must remain at the core of this understanding of leadership, where He is the ultimate leader.

The *City of God*, one of Saint Augustine's most monumental works, when placed beside Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God, provides reinforcement and support for

the ontology of leadership being espoused within this thesis. It becomes vital to understanding and embracing this ancient/future ontology of leadership for the twenty-first century Church.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE MODERN CHURCH IN A MODERN WORLD

In order to further analyze the ontology of leadership for the twenty-first century church being outlined in this thesis, time must be spent considering the modern era and the modern Church. It is the contention of this chapter that the modern Church had to adapt to the modern era and its characteristics in order to thrive in that world.

In chapter one of this work, the modern era and modernity were defined as the time period in history that covers approximately the past 100 years. Its foundational understandings are rooted in the Enlightenment Age and the Industrial Revolution. Therefore it is necessary to consider some of the distinctives of these two movements in history in order to help further clarify the characteristics of the modern era and the modern Church.

Age of Enlightenment

Encompassing the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Age of Enlightenment was a period in history of significant discovery and growth. One of the main characteristics that defined this era was the belief that everything could be solved through reason and rationality.

The Age of Enlightenment (from the German word *Aufklärung*, meaning "Enlightenment") refers to either the eighteenth century in European and American philosophy, or the longer period including the seventeenth century and the Age of Reason. It can more narrowly refer to the historical intellectual movement *The Enlightenment*, which advocated Reason as a means to establishing an authoritative system of aesthetics, ethics, government, and logic,

which would allow human beings to obtain objective truth about the universe. Emboldened by the revolution in physics commenced by Newtonian kinematics, Enlightenment thinkers argued that same kind of systematic thinking could apply to all forms of human activity. The Enlightenment is often closely linked with the Scientific Revolution, as both movements emphasized empiricism, reason, science, and rationality.¹¹⁰

This foundational belief in the supremacy of reason was a driving force for every facet of life within the Age of Enlightenment.

Like a lamp shining in a dark room, the philosophy of Enlightenment was supposed to open the eyes of the world's poor and free them from unjust rule. Excited writers and poets believed the spirit of Enlightenment could lift the world from an age of darkness and ignorance into a world of science, rationality and equality.... To its supporters, the Enlightenment was much more than a philosophy; it was a way of thinking that stemmed from faith in human reason and progress.¹¹¹

Respected scientists and thinkers within this era believed that everything could be solved through the capacity of human reason if one simply had the time and ability to examine anything in ever increasing detail.

This foundational understanding that reason was supreme was rooted in a growing dissatisfaction with the restrictions of the Dark Ages and a renewed sense of discovery which began to break down many of the precepts and beliefs that had been held so tightly during that time.

Enlightenment thought was the culmination of many scientific advances such as Isaac Newton's laws of gravity and writings from Europe's most famous thinkers. These supporters believed that humankind was coming out of ages of darkness and superstition. They foresaw a future where all people were educated and free

¹¹⁰ *Age of Enlightenment* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 8 December 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_Enlightenment; Internet.

¹¹¹ Jessica Bennett, *Introduction to Enlightenment Thought and the French Revolution* [Web Content Producer] (Denver, CO: Associated Content, Inc., 2005, accessed 8 December 2006); available from http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/15970/introduction_to_enlightenment_thought.html; Internet.

and liberty reigned as the supreme law of the land. Pamphlets, essays and newspapers filled the streets of Europe all forwarding a new and brighter era - The Age of Reason.¹¹²

Zygmunt Bauman describes this as “liquid modernity,” because the modern era was associated with the process of breaking down, or liquifying the old barriers of the past in order to build new, improved, and lasting solids based on this supreme reason.

Let us remember, however, that all this was to be done not in order to do away with the solids once and for all and make the brave new world free of them forever, but to clear the site for new and improved solids; to replace the inherited set of deficient and defective solids with another set, which was much improved and preferably perfect, and for that reason no longer alterable....Modern times found the pre-modern solids in a fairly advanced state of disintegration; and one of the most powerful motives behind the urge to melt them was the wish to discover or invent solids of – for a change – lasting solidity, a solidity which one could trust and rely upon and which would make the world predictable and therefore manageable.¹¹³

Elevating reason to such a high position of authority led to the determination that it was possible for humanity to discover the correct way of thinking, understanding and relating to the world. If human reason was applied to every component of life, and each of those areas was broken down into its smallest parts, they could then be fully understood and reconstructed into their correct and proper structures.

When the Enlightenment gave humanity the freedom to use reason and rational thinking on their own individual terms, it was not without repercussion. This freedom fostered an extreme sense of individuality. People were encouraged to think for themselves and to test all of the old boundaries in an attempt to locate the new, more accurate ones. This can be seen within the translation of Immanuel Kant’s definition of enlightenment:

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Inc., 2000), 3.

Enlightenment is when a person leaves behind a state of immaturity and dependence ("Unmündigkeit", translated here as the phrase "immaturity and dependence") for which he himself was responsible. Immaturity and dependence are the inability to use one's own intellect without the direction of another. One is responsible for this immaturity and dependence, if its cause is not a lack of intelligence or education, but a lack of determination and courage to think without the direction of another. *Sapere aude! Dare to know!* is therefore the slogan of the Enlightenment.¹¹⁴

Kant believed that a person must be able to search and discover on their own terms, without the direct supervision of someone else. This ability placed the individual in the center of their own world. "Modernism began as a radical change with the Renaissance and Humanism. From then on, man, no longer God, time and each individual's earthly state of health, became the center of interest....A kind of man develops who, from now on, finds his own vital interest in himself."¹¹⁵

The Age of Enlightenment was marked by an elevation of reason and individuality. Humanity began to believe that it could solve all its problems through individual knowledge and understanding. While this seemed like the beginnings of a new, perfect world, it wasn't without consequences.

The Industrial Revolution

The elevation of reason and individuality within the Age of Enlightenment also brought an almost unforeseen backlash, the development of experts of knowledge. This was a result of not all people being able to come to an exhaustive knowledge on multiple subjects. People had to become specialists in their fields.

¹¹⁴ *What Is Enlightenment?* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 11 December 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/What_Is_Enlightenment%3F; Internet.

¹¹⁵ Rolf Hille, "Transition from Modernity to Post-Modernity: A Theological Evaluation," *European Journal of Theology* 11, no. 2 (2002): 89-90.

This unexpected result of the Enlightenment is most clearly seen through the evolution of the Industrial Revolution.

The Industrial Revolution was the major shift of technological, socioeconomic and cultural conditions in the late 18th and early 19th century that began in Britain and spread throughout the world. During that time, an economy based on manual labour was replaced by one dominated by industry and the manufacture of machinery.... The advent of The Enlightenment provided an intellectual framework which welcomed the practical application of the growing body of scientific knowledge — a factor evidenced in the systematic development of the steam engine, guided by scientific analysis, and the development of the political and sociological analyses....¹¹⁶

The creation of a magnitude of new ideas and subsequently new machines, meant that one person could not be expected to know how everything worked. This led to the development of specialized jobs and a group of people who controlled various aspects and components of those jobs. For the first time there were people who specialized in the running of all these new machines, and people who also specialized in running the people who were running the machines. The manager and a hierarchical nature of industry was birthed.

One of the terms used to describe this new system of working was called Fordism, based on the work of Henry Ford and the development of his ideas of mass production. “‘Fordism’ was coined about 1910 to describe Henry Ford's successes in the automobile industry. Ford improved mass production methods and developed the assembly line by 1910. He sold very large numbers of inexpensive automobiles, and made a vast fortune, while his employees became the highest paid factory workers in the world.”¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ *Industrial Revolution* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 11 December 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_revolution; Internet.

¹¹⁷ *Fordism* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Peterburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 16 December 2006); available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fordism>; Internet.

Ford's factories, with their assembly lines and use of mass production, were the epitome of this new era of specialization and management. Each person was required to only assemble one part of the product, becoming a specialist of that component. Other people took care of other parts, and managers oversaw the entire assembly, managing the parts, machines and workers, even though they didn't know how to necessarily put together the individual parts. In addition, all of the pieces and components of the final product were produced with the use of machinery which made them standardized, thus further simplifying the assembly process.

In mass production, each worker repeats one or a few related tasks that use the same tool to perform identical or near-identical operations on a stream of products. The exact tool and parts are always at hand, having been moved down the assembly line consecutively. The worker spends little or no time retrieving and/or preparing materials and tools, and so the time taken to manufacture a product using mass production is shorter than when using traditional methods.¹¹⁸

Everything was standardized and specialized within Fordism, a result of reasoning power and the encouragement of individuality.

This may seem like a contradiction, since none of the workers on the assembly line seemed to be expressing their individuality or their own ability to reason, but that was a by-product of the further specialization created through educational opportunities. The people who had greater access to education and were more apt to use their power of reason, were moved into higher positions of the hierarchical structure of the overall company. "Heavy, Fordist-style capitalism was the world of law-givers, routine-designers and supervisors, the world of other-directed men and women pursuing fixed-by-others ends in a fixed-by-others fashion. For this reason it was also the world of authorities: of

¹¹⁸ *Mass Production* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 16 December 2006); available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass_production; Internet.

leaders who know better and of teachers who tell you how to proceed better than you do.”¹¹⁹ It was a world where your place in the structure, your level of “expertise,” was dependent on your level of specialization, your ability to apply reason, and your access to educational opportunities to develop that reason.

Fordism was in its heyday simultaneously a model of industrialization, of accumulation, and of regulation.... But the Fordist model was more than that, an epistemological building site on which the whole world-view was erected and from which it towered majestically over the totality of living experience. The way human beings understand the world tends to be at all times praxeomorphic: it is always shaped by the know-how of the day, by what people can do and how they usually go about doing it.¹²⁰

The Industrial Revolution helped to further create the modern world where reason and individuality were supreme.

Modern Outcomes

Understanding the Age of Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution provides a framework for examining the characteristics of the modern era and its leadership implications for the modern Church. This framework can best be seen through two outcomes which resulted from making reason and individuality the pinnacle of modernity: the development of hierarchies, and the placement of faith in knowledge. These two outcomes will be analyzed in the next section of this chapter.

¹¹⁹ Bauman, 63.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 56.

The Development of Hierarchies

One of the outcomes of the modern era placing reason and individuality as its highest objective is the development of hierarchies. This has been alluded to earlier in this chapter. As people specialized in different areas of knowledge and expertise depending on their access to education, structures emerged that were defined by what people understood and how they had mastered certain levels of information. That mastery determined which place they held within the framework of the structure, and it helped to hold the entire hierarchy together, creating a massive machine of the entire organization. “Fordism was the self-consciousness of modern society in its ‘heavy’, ‘bulky’, or ‘immobile’ and ‘rooted’, ‘solid’ phase. At that stage in their joint history, capital, management and labour were all, for better or worse, doomed to stay in one another’s company for a time to come, perhaps for ever – tied down by the combination of huge factory buildings, heavy machinery and massive labour forces.”¹²¹ Everyone had a particular place within the hierarchy.

One of the implications of this hierarchical structure was that the more knowledge a person acquired and the more ability they had to gain that knowledge, the higher they moved within the framework. Therefore those who had the most knowledge and the highest capability to gain knowledge were at the top power positions within the hierarchy. Bauman relates this in terms of mobility and accessibility. “Velocity of movement and access to faster means of mobility steadily rose in modern times to the position of the principal tool of power and domination.”¹²² If a person could acquire and

¹²¹ Ibid., 57.

¹²² Ibid., 9.

assimilate information more efficiently than others, they were rewarded with positions of power and prestige.

One illustration of this hierarchical outcome of the modern era can be seen in the position of the corporate CEO. The chief executive officer of the modern corporation was at the pinnacle of the hierarchy. They had access to the greatest amount of knowledge and had the resources to easily acquire any other knowledge or information they might need in order to remain at that position of power. The CEO was a creation of the modern era and its subsequent outcome of the development of hierarchies of power.

Faith in Knowledge

The second outcome of the modern era placing reason and individuality as its highest objective is that people's greatest faith was placed in knowledge and objective truth. If something was not understandable it simply needed to be further analyzed or dissected in order to discover how it really worked. It was a simple matter of accumulating greater knowledge through objective observation.

This world of predictability and ultimate faith in knowledge was also a result of the developments of Newtonian thinking that came about through the Enlightenment, as has previously been described in this chapter.

The universe that Sir Isaac Newton described was a seductive place. As the great clock ticked, we grew smart and designed the age of machines. As the pendulum swung in perfect periodicity, it prodded us on to new discoveries. As the Earth circled the sun (just like clockwork), we grew assured of the role of determinism and prediction. We absorbed expectations of regularity into our very beings. And we organized work and knowledge based on our beliefs about this predictable universe.¹²³

¹²³ Margaret J. Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1999), 28.

The world could be understood by greater and more detailed analysis of reason and knowledge, logically resulting in humanity placing its ultimate faith in that knowledge. Propositions and postulates came to be held in the highest regard.

One of the by-products of this scrutinizing was that everything was dissected and broken down into parts and then placed within clearly defined categories. Boundary lines were drawn that helped define and explain the world in tight categories. “A world based on machine images is a world described by boundaries. In a machine, every piece knows its place. Likewise, in Newtonian organizations, we’ve drawn boundaries everywhere....These omnipresent boundaries create a strong sense of solidity; we use them to both protect and define us. Boundaries make it possible to know the difference between one thing and another.”¹²⁴ The presence of these boundaries meant everything could be grouped and given clear definition of what made it either in or out of any given category.

These definitions then gave rise to what constituted groups or communities. Zygmunt Bauman is again helpful in this understanding. He uses the modern shopping mall (referring to it as the temple) as an example of how boundaries help provide clarity and definition to communities.

Inside the temple the image becomes the reality. The crowds filling the corridors of shopping malls come as close as conceivable to the imagined ideal ‘community’ that knows no difference.... For that reason that community demands no bargaining, no deals, no effort to empathize, understand and compromise. Everyone within the walls can safely assume that everyone else likely to be bumped into or passed by has come there for the same purpose, has been lured by the same attractions (thereby acknowledging them as attractions), is moved and guided by the same motives. “Being inside” makes a true community

¹²⁴ Ibid., 30.

of believers, unified by the ends and means alike, by the values they cherish and the logic of conduct they follow.¹²⁵

The boundaries of the shopping mall and its common experience helped to define the community which existed within its walls. This serves as a specific example of how the compartmentalization of reasoning power resulted in boundaries that defined communities.

When humanity placed its faith in knowledge and in trying to objectively understand and compartmentalize all aspects of life, it created a world of propositions which helped to define communities. If a person believed a certain way, that put them in a certain category and the community that was associated with it. By believing and placing one's faith in various truths, a person became a part of pre-defined communities of faith, and were excluded from other categories of faith and belief.

Leadership Implications for the Modern Church

In the modern era the Church continued to adapt and develop. The characteristics and outcomes of the modern world were adopted into the life of the Church in order for it to grow and thrive.

The promising character of the Modern Age shines forth in this context as well: we will be able to penetrate everything with reason. The conviction of the 18th century was that reason could take you a lot further than Christian tradition. Finally, people posited the following simple idea: why shouldn't reason, if it has tried true in temporal things, not also have the final word in the area of religion, regarding the ultimate questions of life?¹²⁶

¹²⁵ Bauman, 100.

¹²⁶ Hille: 95.

When reason and individuality were placed at the pinnacle of the modern world it seemed natural for the Church to embrace them. The outcomes of that decision were also realized with the development of hierarchies and the Church's faith being placed in knowledge. Multiple schemes of propositions and formulas were created which resulted in boundaries and groupings of various communities of faith, most noticeable in the proliferation of denominations which currently exist.

With all of these factors present what developed was a modern ontology of leadership which embraced the opposite ontology being argued for in this thesis. It was a leadership that valued structures, power, separation, and a people-centric view of life. Each of these characteristics emerged from the two outcomes of the modern era which have been developed in this chapter: the development of hierarchies and the placing of faith in knowledge.

Hierarchies Produce Structures and Power

When the modern Church embraced reason and individuality as the pinnacle, one of the natural outcomes of that decision was the development of hierarchies. Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch describe this as an "institutional-hierarchical notion of leadership and structure."¹²⁷ The two places within the modern Church where this can be most readily seen is in the development of denominational machines and the power and authority of the pastor.

¹²⁷ Michael and Hirsch Frost, Alan, *The Shaping of Things to Come* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003), 9.

Denominational Machines

In the beginnings of the Christian movement there was an explosion of new believers with the coming of the Holy Spirit. As the movement progressed and expanded it became evident that some organization was in order.

But as the believers rapidly multiplied, there were rumblings of discontent. Those who spoke Greek complained against those who spoke Hebrew, saying that their widows were being discriminated against in the daily distribution of food. So the Twelve called a meeting of all the believers.

“We apostles should spend our time preaching and teaching the word of God, not administering a food program,” they said. “Now look around among yourselves, brothers, and select seven men who are well respected and are full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom. We will put them in charge of this business. Then we can spend our time in prayer and preaching and teaching the word.”

This idea pleased the whole group, and they chose the following: Stephen (a man full of faith and the Holy Spirit), Philip, Procorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas of Antioch (a Gentile convert to the Jewish faith, who had now become a Christian). These seven were presented to the apostles, who prayed for them as they laid their hands on them.

God's message was preached in ever-widening circles. The number of believers greatly increased in Jerusalem, and many of the Jewish priests were converted, too.¹²⁸

In order to prevent the further neglect of these widows a division of labor was needed and the first organizational structure developed within the Church.

This structural organization continued to expand and became more formalized in the Church. This is evidenced by two words from the Greek text of 1 Timothy 3, *episcope*, which is either translated overseer, or bishop, and *diakonos*, which is most often translated deacon.¹²⁹ Paul's use of these two words reveals that the organizational structure of the Church had developed into more formal structures.

¹²⁸ Acts 6:1-7, NLT.

¹²⁹ See 1 Tim. 3:1 for *episcope*, and 1 Tim. 3:8 for *diakonos*.

While this kind of organizational structure was vital to the growth and health of the Church, what happened in modernity was the explosion of denominational machines. Layers of administration and hierarchy were developed to help manage the work of the local church, including the development of denominational headquarters and publishing houses, colleges, universities, and seminaries.¹³⁰ All of these became necessary for the health and growth of the Church within the modern era. The Church had to adapt in order to thrive within that framework, embracing an ontology of modern leadership that valued structure.

The Power and Authority of the Pastor

The development of hierarchies within the modern Church also had an impact on the role and leadership function of the pastor. Frost and Hirsch describe it as “leadership by an institutionally ordained clergy operating primarily in a pastor-teacher mode.”¹³¹ With the development of specialization and the importance of education within the hierarchies, the professional training and development of the pastor became vital. This person was recognized as an expert and source of power for the local church.

One of the models the Church adopted from the business world to adapt to this structure was the pastor as CEO. Brian McLaren writes about his feelings of the pastor as CEO. “I spent most of the ‘80s and early ‘90s wishing I could fulfill the CEO model of Christian leadership. CEOs made it. They were unflinchingly confident, powerful,

¹³⁰ The evidence of this can be seen even within my own denomination. The Church of the Nazarene has just reached the century mark as a denomination and so has lived all of its life within this world of the modern era. What began as an affiliation of holiness churches has developed into a denominational machine with a world headquarters, multiple institutions of higher education around the world, and a publishing house.

¹³¹ Frost, 9.

knowledgeable, larger than life. I admired such CEO-model leaders in Christendom, I attended their seminars, and returned home wildly inspired....”¹³² He goes on to compare the modern pastor to the wizard in the movie, *The Wizard of Oz*, developing a list of ten characteristics of the high modern leadership of the CEO pastor. Some of these include Bible analyst, objective technician, problem solver, and knower. His simple description of the Bible analyst will be helpful here. “Bible analyst. The modern Christian leader dissects the Bible like a scientist dissects a fetal pig: to gain knowledge through analysis. And in modernity, knowledge is power.”¹³³ In the modern world of the Church the pastor as CEO translated into the person with the knowledge and therefore the power and authority.

This position of power worked well within the modern world. “Amid all the evidence that our world is radically changing, we retreat to what has worked in the past. These days, leaders respond to increasing uncertainty by defaulting to command and control. Power has been taken back to the top of most major corporations, governments, and organizations....”¹³⁴ The pastor as CEO was a necessary role in the modern Church. It had to adapt in order to thrive within that framework, embracing an ontology of modern leadership that valued the power and authority of the pastor.

Faith in Knowledge Produces Separation and a People-Centric View of Life

¹³² Brian D. McLaren and Tony Campolo, *Adventures in Missing the Point* (El Cajon, CA: Youth Specialties, 2003), 141.

¹³³ Ibid., 142-143. For the complete list and descriptions of these ten characteristics, see Appendix 2.

¹³⁴ Margaret J. Wheatley, *Finding Our Way* (San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2005), 64.

The second outcome of the modern world embracing reason and individuality as its pinnacle was also a result in the modern Church, namely that it placed its faith in the power of that knowledge. Two results emerged from this decision: the separation of people and ideas into various categories, and the placement of people and their ability to understand God at the center of the modern Church.

Separation Through Definition

When the modern Church placed its faith in the power of knowledge it led to the development of propositions within the Church, especially related to the concept of truth. “How were the truth-claims of Christianity presented in the modern era, other than as objective facts, historically or scientifically verifiable (we hoped), as abstract absolutes, as a kind of impersonal third party intruding upon our subjective experience with objective information?”¹³⁵ Truth became a subject to be studied and defined, dissected and discovered in the modern Church.

The result of this propositional faith in knowledge was a system of boundaries that defined who was in and who was out, which was based, just like in the modern world, on whether or not a person believed a certain set of propositions. This translated into the realm of soteriology, drawing lines and boundaries around who will or will not be accepted by God in eternity. It gave rise to various schools of Biblical interpretation and denominations of every shape, size and variety. Everything that could be defined was clarified, mystery was relegated to the margins of the Church, and people were

¹³⁵ Campolo, *Adventures in Missing the Point*, 239.

separated and placed into categories. The modern Church embraced separation as a necessity to survival.

People-Centric

Another result of the modern Church placing its faith in knowledge centered around humanity's ability to comprehend and understand God. People depended on their own ability to dissect and define God, treating Him as an object to be studied. "What was the goal of theology in the modern era, other than this: to describe God as a scientist describes an object – objective, detached, sanitized of subjectivity, removed from the variable of personal relationship?"¹³⁶ God was effectively placed within the framework of people's ability to identify and define Him.

Once God was moved from a subject to whom people could relate, to an object to be studied, people and their ability to reason and understand moved to the center of the universe. God was no longer the center of worship, humanity's ability to reason became the object of primary worship. By embracing reason as the pinnacle and placing their faith in knowledge, both based on the ability of individuals, the modern Church became people-centric.

The Effective Modern Church

It is the contention of this chapter that the modern Church needed to embrace all of these characteristics and realities. When the modern world placed reason and individuality at the pinnacle of its existence, the Church needed to adapt to that mentality. When the modern world developed hierarchies and placed its faith in knowledge, the

¹³⁶ Ibid., 238.

Church naturally adjusted. All of this adaptation resulted in the modern Church embracing an ontology of leadership that valued structures, power, separation and a people-centric view of life. This ontology helped the modern Church thrive in the modern era.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE WORLD OF POSTMODERNITY

In chapter one the postmodern era was defined as the time period in history which began with the end of the modern era, generally characterized as beginning around the middle of the 20th century. “The word ‘postmodern’ first appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary in 1949. Postmodern is what’s come about after – and often in reaction to – modernism, which dominated Western thought for a majority of the twentieth century. In recent decades, every major sphere of life has evolved to become postmodern....”¹³⁷ It is necessary at this point in this dissertation to consider the postmodern world and the impact the shift from modernity to postmodernity is having on leadership, particularly in the Church. This chapter will specifically examine how the postmodern world is devaluing the four major components of the modern ontology of leadership described in chapter four, and embracing the four foundational understandings of the postmodern ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God outlined in chapter two.

A World of Change

The world is in a state of flux, shifting from modernity to postmodernity. It is difficult to grasp the immeasurable changes that are occurring and the incredible speed at which they are taking place. In 1965 Gordon Moore made an observation known as Moore’s Law which states that the speed of microprocessors doubles approximately

¹³⁷ Spencer Burke, *Making Sense of Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003), 25.

every 18 months, while the price is cut by 50%.¹³⁸ One of the implications of that law is an estimate that somewhere between the years 2012 and 2030 microprocessing speeds will match, and then exceed, the speed of the human brain.¹³⁹ This serves as an example that the world is rapidly changing.

Changes are happening in many places, not just in the computer industry. “We live in a time of great stirring storms, both natural and human-made. Disruptive elements seem to be afoot, gathering strength through the halls of power. The daily news is filled with powerful changes and many of us feel buffeted by forces we cannot control.”¹⁴⁰ Drastic shifts are occurring in the realm of science and industry, in the areas of politics and government, and even in the sacred halls of the Church.

The sources of these changes are difficult to precisely define. But one of the obvious realities is that much of the shift is a result of humanity’s inability to completely dissect and define everything the way modernity desired. The deeper people delve into the world and try to define and understand it, the more that world opens up and expands.

The more we know, the more we know how much there is to know and how little we really know. The more our knowledge of the universe expands, the more we know the universe itself is expanding and the more there is to know....More information has been collected in the past three years than had been collected before that since the beginning of time. More than 100,000 scientific journals annually publish new research from the world’s laboratories. But the distance between the amount of information being generated and our ability to alchemize that information into knowledge and wisdom is growing ever greater.¹⁴¹

¹³⁸ Gordon Moore, “Cramming More Components onto Integrated Circuits,” *Electronics* 38, no. 8 (1965).

¹³⁹ Leonard Sweet, “Leadership in the Emerging Culture - First Advance,” in *Leadership In the Emerging Culture - First Advance* (Portland, OR: 2004).

¹⁴⁰ Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science*, 137.

¹⁴¹ Leonard Sweet, *Summoned to Lead* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishers, 2004), 121-123.

More information is being gleaned in the world than ever before, but people realize there is still exponentially more to know than could possibly ever been understood.

This goes in direct opposition to the world of modernity where everything would eventually be defined in its true and objective state. All of that is changing in the postmodern world. “In every academic discipline and institution, we live today with questions for which our expertise provides no answers.”¹⁴²

This realization that it is impossible to ever fully comprehend the world has also had a marked impact on Christianity and the Church. Stuart Murray describes the modern era of Christianity as Christendom. His description of the comparison between the worlds of modernity and postmodernity and their impact on Christendom and Christianity are very helpful.

Postmodernism represents a more thoroughgoing deconstruction of Christianity than modernism. Modernism challenged Christian truth claims and relegated religion to the private domain; postmodernism relativises all truth claims. Modernism had alternative explanations of reality; postmodernism suspects all explanations of being partial and oppressive. To the ‘hermeneutics of order’ and ‘hermeneutics of justice’ options from the Christendom era, it adds a ‘hermeneutics of scepticism’. Postmodernism not only challenges Christianity but presents a powerful critique of Christendom: its unwitting captivity to dominant social values, authoritarian and institutional ethos, oppressive attitudes, domination by a male professional caste and marginalising of dissent are all glaringly visible in the searchlight of postmodernist scrutiny....For Christianity to thrive in postmodernity, Christendom assumptions and attitudes must go.¹⁴³

The world of postmodernity presents such an enormous and profound change, that the modern world of being able to comprehend and identify every part of Christianity is quickly coming to an end. With this dramatic shift as a backdrop, the question which

¹⁴² Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science*, 5.

¹⁴³ Stuart Murray, *Post-Christendom, After Christendom*. (Carlisle England: Paternoster, 2004),

emerges is what impact does this have on the ontology of leadership, particularly within the realm of the Church?

When an attempt is made to try and answer that question, one of the realities which surfaces is that the shift causes the devaluing of the four major characteristics embraced by the modern ontology of leadership in the Church. In the process it also elevates the four major components of the postmodern ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God. Specifically the shift results in the devaluing of structures and the elevation of spirituality; it devalues power and elevates faith; it devalues separation and elevates inclusion; and it devalues people and their ability to reason, and elevates God and His mystery. Each one of these changes will now be considered.

Re-Embracing Spirituality

Material was presented in chapter four which showed how the modern era valued reason and its ability to define and categorize everything in the world. By drawing boundaries of definition, systems and structures were developed that aided in the process of keeping everything within those categories. But with the drastic changes taking place in the shift from modernity to postmodernity the world is discovering that everything cannot be maintained in systematic categories. There is a renewed sense of the value of relationships and a search for spirituality which is emerging in the postmodern world.

This renewed search for relationship and spirituality is appearing everywhere.

From my café table I browse a recent purchase, *Spirit at Home*. It reminds me that our current cultural air is definitely more spiritual than it once was. I see it in the crosses and statues of Jesus in Luhrmann's *Romeo and Juliet*. I experience it in the successes of *Buffy the Vampire Slayer* and the Harry Potter series. Spiritual seekers stroll the pick-and mix supermarket of spiritual options, looking for spiritual practices. They search out ritual and mystery, hoping for relevance and

cultural coherence. They want an individualism holistically connected with others.¹⁴⁴

It almost seems oxymoronic to think about an individualism that also wants to holistically connect with others, but that is the climate of the postmodern world. The structures that defined people and groups are not as important anymore as the connections which hold them together.

Margaret Wheatley learned this through her study of quantum physics.

Participation, ownership, subjective data – each of these organizational insights that I gain from quantum physics quickly returns me to a central truth. We live in a universe where relationships are primary. Nothing happens in the quantum world without something encountering something else. Nothing exists independent of its relationships. We are constantly creating the world – evoking it from many potentials – as we participate in all its many interactions. This is a world of process, the process of connecting, where “things” come into temporary existence because of relationship.¹⁴⁵

It is impossible to keep life within the boundaries humanity prescribes because those boundaries are not a true reflection of reality. Instead of highly defined structures that dictate how things function, it is discovered that their function has more to do with the way they relate to everything around them than it does any kind of defining process. In other words, they are more defined by their relationships than they are by their analytical descriptions, and that is spiritual and subjective.

One result of this shift away from boundaries and structures toward spirituality and relationships is that people are seeking authenticity within those relationships.

¹⁴⁴ Steve Taylor, *The out of Bounds Church? Learning to Create a Community of Faith in a Culture of Change* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005), 81.

¹⁴⁵ Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science*, 69.

“Postmodern people don’t have a lot of patience for fakes. Authenticity, even if it’s not pretty, is always preferred.”¹⁴⁶

Writing about this from a teamwork perspective, Tom Phillips states: “One of the keys to effective maintenance - as opposed to survival maintenance - is for the leader to be so in love with the team that he will sacrifice his precious time for the sake of individual members, to weep when the team weeps and to share tough love whenever necessary. The leader is a steward of the complex web of relationships that comprise the heartbeat of the team.”¹⁴⁷ If the leader is not authentic in his or her relationships within the team, trust will be eroded and the structures may disintegrate. But as authenticity is developed and the relationship is placed above any need for a form or structure, the health and well-being of the team or organization is improved.

When this reality is superimposed on the world of leadership within the postmodern Church, it allows leaders the freedom to be authentic and to let spirituality take higher precedence than any form or structure. “Deep yearnings for spiritually authentic, culturally attuned and attractive expressions of church are hopeful features of contemporary church life.”¹⁴⁸ In the postmodern world structures are devalued and relationships and spirituality are elevated. The result is a postmodern ontology of leadership that is based on relationships and spirituality, not structures.

¹⁴⁶ Burke, *Making Sense of Church*, 73.

¹⁴⁷ George Barna, ed., *Leaders on Leadership* (Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1997), 237.

¹⁴⁸ Murray, *Post-Christendom*, 253.

Re-Embracing Faith

One of the characteristics of the modern world which was described in chapter four was the development of hierarchical systems of power. As people gained greater amounts of knowledge and understanding and the means to access that information, top-down structures emerged which were based on power. The people who had the easiest access and control of the information and knowledge had the power and were at the top of those structures. The shift from the modern world to the postmodern world has begun to decrease those power structures and create what Thomas L. Friedman calls a flat world – a world where power and control are devalued.¹⁴⁹

According to Friedman, one of the significant contributors to this flattening was the fall of the Berlin Wall. “The fall of the Berlin Wall on 11/9/89 unleashed forces that ultimately liberated all the captive peoples of the Soviet Empire. But it actually did so much more. It tipped the balance of power across the world toward those advocating democratic, consensual, free-market-oriented governance, and away from those advocating authoritarian rule with centrally planned economies.”¹⁵⁰ When that wall was broken and removed it became a symbol of an incredible shift in thinking and understanding about power.

Humanity began to realize that power is not about control. That was just an illusion. Power is not controlled and maintained by a few individuals at the top of a hierarchical structure, but in the faith and beliefs of the people who make up any organization. “Yes, the world became a better place to live after 11/9, because each

¹⁴⁹ Thomas L. Friedman, *The World Is Flat*, First Updated and Expanded ed. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006).

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 51.

outbreak of freedom stimulated another outbreak, and that process in and of itself had a flattening effect across societies, strengthening those below and weakening those above.”¹⁵¹ The crumbling of that wall became a powerful symbol of the devaluing of hierarchical structures of power.

The ‘bigger’ is not just not ‘better’ any more, but devoid of rational sense. It is now the smaller, the lighter, the more portable that signifies improvement and ‘progress’. Traveling light, rather than holding tightly to things deemed attractive for their reliability and solidity – that is, for their heavy weight, substantiality and unyielding power resistance – is now the asset of power.”¹⁵²

Contrasted against this devaluing of hierarchical structures of power is an increased sense of faith in others, whether that is God, other people, or even just the process of life itself. “When a leader has a lifelong developmental perspective, that leader expects God to shape him over a lifetime. The leader views the things that happen to him as God’s sovereign way of developing him. That leader recognizes that all of life, while being vital and true for the moment, is also used to prepare him for all of the rest of life.”¹⁵³ People are recapturing the sense that God is ultimately the one in control, which gives them the confidence to trust Him rather than their own sense of reason and rationality. That confidence translates into every facet of life, renewing humanity’s ability to exercise its faith.

The shift from the modern to the postmodern world is leading to the devaluation of hierarchical structures of power and a heightening of the importance of faith. This has resulted in humanity’s ability to ultimately trust in God and to believe in one another,

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 53.

¹⁵² Bauman, 13.

¹⁵³ Barna, ed., *Leaders on Leadership*, 156.

which corresponds to one of the foundational elements of the postmodern ontology of leadership within the Church: the kingdom of God is about faith, not power.

Re-Embracing Inclusion

Another characteristic of the modern world which has been alluded to is the value placed on clear definitions and boundary creation. As humanity believed it could break down everything and fully understand how it functioned, it used that knowledge to draw boundaries around ideas, concepts, and even people groups. Everything was separated and placed in categories of knowledge and understanding. The dramatic shifts happening in the world as a result of postmodernity are beginning to break down those boundaries and walls which had become so divisive in the modern world.

Thomas Friedman's analysis on the fall of the Berlin Wall is helpful at this point too.

The fall of the Berlin Wall didn't just help flatten the alternatives to free-market capitalism and unlock enormous pent-up energies for hundreds of millions of people in places like India, Brazil, China, and the former Soviet Empire. It also allowed us to think about the world differently – to see it as more of a seamless whole. Because the Berlin Wall was not only blocking our way; it was blocking our sight – our ability to think about the world as a single market, a single ecosystem, and a single community.¹⁵⁴

The fall of the Berlin Wall became a symbol of the devaluation of dividing walls and barriers that kept people and ideas separate and unable to work together.

As the postmodern world devalues separation, inclusion is being embraced in its place.

The dense and tangled web of life – the interconnected nature of reality – now reveals itself on a daily basis. In recent years, think about how much you've

¹⁵⁴ Friedman, *The World Is Flat*, 53.

learned about people, nations, and ways of life that previously you'd known nothing about. We've been learning how the lives of those far away affect our own and how we affect theirs. We're beginning to realize that to live peacefully together on this planet, we need to be in new relationships, especially with those far distant from us.¹⁵⁵

There is a renewed sense that all of life is connected together which means humanity must be willing to be inclusive in order to survive.

In the life of the postmodern Church, particularly as it relates to the developing ontology of leadership, the implication is that leaders must be willing to look for that connectedness and make decisions to be inclusive, rather than separate people into categories and draw boundaries around dogmas.

In this increasingly globalized world, we need the countervailing centripetal force of a grand narrative that can pull us together in the face of all the centrifugal forces that would rip us apart....More than ever, the entire world needs to be brought into a single global discourse about its common heritage and its common destiny. The hopes and dreams of the farmer in Fallujah and the machinist in Detroit are not all that different.¹⁵⁶

The priority of leadership within this globalized world is to be that inclusive force which pulls people and resources together, breaking down barriers that for too long have been tools of division and exclusion.

One of the practical outcomes of this inclusive world is the renewed sense of community and mission within the postmodern Church.

As a passionate participant in (and observer of) the Church, I see God raising up 'missional communities' that can influence 'from the margins.' I can't remember where I first heard the term 'missional communities', or I'd give the person credit. But the picture it paints in my mind is a group of people who are highly intentional about truly obeying Jesus' commands so as to increasingly be like him. The *individuals* pursuing this life-goal are in *community*. They live out their new, loving, powerful kingdom reality not as 'Lone Ranger Christians' (going

¹⁵⁵ Wheatley, *Finding Our Way*, 204.

¹⁵⁶ Sweet, *The Three Hardest Words*, 35-36.

about their work-a-day life isolated except for an occasional hour on Sunday), but non-negotiably as a vital part of a group of Christ-followers.¹⁵⁷

When the Church can focus on the journey of everyone together, and remove the individualism of modernity, the result is a community of people who are following Christ together, rather than divided or separate.

The shift from the modern world with its boundaries and separation, to a postmodern world that values the tapestry of interconnectedness within the world is underway. This emerging postmodern world devalues separation and is learning to re-embrace inclusion, translating into a postmodern ontology of leadership that corresponds to the characteristic of the kingdom of God which is about inclusion, not separation.

Re-Embracing Mystery

Evidence was presented in chapter four which revealed how humanity's ability to reason was elevated to the point of placing that reasoning power at the pinnacle of life above everything else. That was even true of people's ability to comprehend God.

A vast and complex machine had been entrusted to our care. We searched to know the mind of the clock maker, even as he receded deep into the distance. We made assumptions about him (gender was never a question). He was infinitely rational, his works were totally predictable, and a few simple laws would reveal what made everything work. Reductionist thinking seduced us into believing that, eventually, we would figure everything out. We would control it all, even life and death. Science displaced God.¹⁵⁸

What resulted was a leadership ontology that placed humanity and its ability to reason at the center of its own universe rather than keeping a Theo-centric view of the world.

¹⁵⁷ Todd Hunter, "The Church of the Future: Missional Communities," in *Next Wave* (Next-Wave.org, 1999). All bold and italicized print is in the original text.

¹⁵⁸ Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science*, 30-31.

The immense changes happening in the world right now are beginning to call all of that into question. Reason is being devalued because people are coming to understand that it is impossible to fully comprehend almost anything, including God.

God is greater than any theology or system of ideas we come up with about God. God is not defined by our systems, by our theologies – not even by our firm convictions about him or her....Far from any individual's theology being The Right One, in one sense all theologies are heresies. For theologies, like heresies, are major or minor distortions of the truth....In other words, what you believe may be partly correct, but is certainly not completely correct.¹⁵⁹

The world is beginning to rediscover that God cannot ever be fully explained or comprehended.

At the same time the world is devaluing reason and a person-centered universe, there is also a growing desire to embrace the mystery of God and humanity's inability to actually comprehend God. People in the postmodern world want to know God through relationship, including specifically His mystery. "People seem to be hungering for a return to mysticism. Increasingly, they want to encounter the Divine, not just hear a great sermon. They want to experience God sensually, not just understand cognitively."¹⁶⁰ The result is a shift back to a Theo-centric focus of life.

One of the places this change in focus can be observed is in the interplay between fellow Christians traveling the journey of faith together. In the modern world people tended to try and solve one another's problems and the pastor was often seen as the person who had the answers which could fix all of those problems. In this new postmodern context there is a growing sense that life is too complex to fix, and there simply are not answers for everything. There is a new sense of trust in the Spirit of God

¹⁵⁹ Campolo, *Adventures in Missing the Point*, 32.

¹⁶⁰ Burke, *Making Sense of Church*, 54.

to be at work in people's lives, helping them to deal with their issues and concerns.

"When we believe in another Christian, we are actually believing in God's work within that Christian....Our confidence in the other person is abundantly warranted because *our trust is placed in the Spirit working in that person*, relentlessly driving them toward more and more Christlikeness."¹⁶¹ Trust is placed in the Spirit of God to work within people's lives because they believe God is the only one who can fully comprehend the circumstances of life.

The profound shift from modernity to postmodernity has caused the devaluation of humanity's ability to reason and elevated an embracing of the mystery of God. This has resulted in recapturing a Theo-centric world where relationship with God is again the pinnacle, which corresponds to one of the foundational elements of the postmodern ontology of leadership within the Church: the kingdom of God is about God, not people.

Leadership Implications for the Postmodern Church

A significant cultural shift is currently taking place in the world. Modernity has drawn to an end and postmodernity is here. In order to continue to thrive in this new era, the Church must also be willing to adapt and change, particularly in its understanding of leadership. Specifically a postmodern ontology of leadership that takes this shift into account should be embraced.

The modern world was a place that valued reason and individuality, which resulted in the development and elevation of hierarchical structures of power and

¹⁶¹ Stephen Shields, *Christian Discipleship in Postmodernity: Toward a Praxis of Spiritual Friendship* [Internet] (Next-Wave.org, 2001, accessed 8 December 2004); available from <http://www.next-wave.org/aug01/friendship.htm>; Internet. Italics included in the original text.

authority. This led to the development of a modern ontology of leadership within the Church which embraced those structures and their power, as well as the separation and boundaries which were created through humanity's reasoning. It was natural for the modern church to employ that ontology in order to thrive in that world.

Now that the postmodern world is emerging, those same realities which were valued in the modern ontology of leadership are now being devalued. The world now realizes it is impossible to fully comprehend everything, so people's ability to reason is being devalued. It is now believed that ultimate power is a façade. It too is being devalued. The structures which were designed to bring clarity and direction to the world are beginning to crumble. Those structures as well as the separation they caused are also being devalued.

In their place realities are emerging which provide a basic framework for a postmodern ontology of leadership. Relationships and the spiritual connectivity of the world is of utmost importance. Faith is placed in God and humanity, as well as the journey itself. All people are welcomed as participants. The mystery of God is elevated and embraced. These realities resound in direct harmony with the four characteristics of the kingdom of God: the kingdom is about spirituality, not structures; faith, not power; inclusion, not separation; and God, not people. This results in a postmodern ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God, and this ontology is perfectly suited for the twenty-first century Church.

CHAPTER SIX

A POST-MODERN ONTOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP

The previous one hundred years of history has seen an explosion of literature on the subject of leadership. This subject has come to be a source of much study and debate, with people from every facet of life trying to figure out exactly what is leadership. Since most of this discovery has been at the end of the modern era, the basic understanding, or ontology of leadership which people have adopted during that time has been based on a modern view of the world.

This has also been true of the modern Church within the past one hundred years. It developed an ontology of leadership which embraced power, rigid structures, separation, and a people-centric view of life. Because the shift to the postmodern world devalues each of those realities, the postmodern Church needs to now consider an ontology of leadership which embraces faith, spirituality, inclusion, and a Theo-centric view of life.

The difficulty with moving in this direction is that it requires the Church to break new ground and travel in an unexplored direction. That is exactly what postmodern church leaders must do. "Leadership is all about taking people on a journey. The challenge is that most of the time, we are asking people to follow us to places we ourselves have never been."¹⁶² This journey is going to require an enormous amount of

¹⁶² Andy Stanley, "The Uncertain Leader: You Can't Always Be Sure, but You'd Better Be Clear," in *Leadership Journal* (Christianitytoday.com, 2003).

courage and boldness. Yet by embracing this ontology of leadership the postmodern leader will be well equipped for the task.

It was outlined at the beginning of this thesis that this ontology of leadership was going to be ancient/future in nature, reaching back to the foundations of Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God in order to look forward into the future of the Church.

Throughout the previous chapters it has been shown how this ontology was based on four main characteristics from the kingdom of God, how they corresponded to the writings of Saint Augustine in *The City of God*, how they were inadvertently pushed aside during the modern era, and how they are once again relevant in the postmodern world. The assertion of this concluding chapter is that these same four realities are necessary to the formation of this ontology of leadership and that each of them can best be seen through four different metaphors.

Ontological Reality

Spirituality

Faith

Inclusion

Theo-centricity

Guiding Metaphor

Exegetivity

Leader-as-Parent

Grafting

Kingdom of God

Each one of these metaphors will be considered along with their applications for the postmodern church leader in this concluding chapter.

Spirituality is Exegeativity

The first characteristic of a postmodern ontology of leadership which will be examined in this chapter is spirituality. When this reality was first introduced in chapter two it was shown that spirituality must take precedence over structures. This might lead to the conclusion that structures are not valuable or important in the postmodern ontology of leadership. That would be an incorrect assumption. Structures are valuable and necessary in any organization, including the Church, but there must be a willingness in this new world to allow those structures to submit to the Spirit. Spirituality must take precedence over structures, but not necessarily replace them.

Structures are a necessary part of any organization. If they are going to submit to the Spirit they must be fluid and pliable, rather than rigid and restricting. These submissive structures are formed when two key elements of creativity and exegesis are combined, resulting in “exegeativity,” the basic concept that assists in the development of flexible structures. This metaphor of exegeativity will now be considered in order to further explain this component of spirituality in the ontology of leadership.¹⁶³ Attention will be given to the impact of exegeativity on a church in helping her find her identity and then fulfilling her unique calling from the Lord.

Optimal Ethos

Before the key elements of creativity and exegesis can be ascertained, some groundwork must be covered. First an understanding must be reached which gives meaning to the overall atmosphere or climate of an organization or team, namely its

¹⁶³ Exegeativity is an original concept developed by the author of this dissertation.

ethos. Ethos is defined as “the disposition, character, or fundamental values peculiar to a specific person, people, culture, or movement, or the distinctive spirit of a culture or an era.”¹⁶⁴

This ethos is important in the development of flexible structures because without the right atmosphere neither the individuals nor the team itself will be able to reach their full potential. “Organizational consultants have long assumed a positive link of some kind between a business unit’s human climate and its performance....But now we have results from a range of industries that link leadership to climate and to business performance, making it possible to quantify the hard difference for business performance made by something as soft as the ‘feel’ of a company.”¹⁶⁵ This “feel,” or ethos, is vital to the health of the leader and the organization, especially in the development of submissive structures.

Creativity

In the quest to develop fluid structures the first key element that should be examined is creativity. The Mosaic Church in Los Angeles has adopted as one of its core elements EARTH, which represents “Character: Creativity is the Natural Result of Spirituality.”¹⁶⁶ They use Genesis 2:7 as the key Scripture for this element. “And the LORD God formed a man's body from the dust of the ground and breathed into it the

¹⁶⁴ *Ethos* [Online Dictionary] (Los Angeles, CA: Lexico Publishing Group, 2005, accessed 30 May 2005); available from <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=ethos>; Internet.

¹⁶⁵ Daniel Goleman, Boyatzis, Richard, & McKee, Annie, *Primal Leadership* (Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2002), 17.

¹⁶⁶ “Origins 2005,” in *The Origins Project* (Los Angeles, CA: Mosaic Church, 2005).

breath of life. And the man became a living person.”¹⁶⁷ Their premise is that since God is the ultimate Creator, and humanity has been created in His image, then part of the natural expression of our spirituality is to be highly creative.

Mosaic has also adopted WOOD as one of their core elements. This represents “Connection: Structure Must Submit to Spirit.”¹⁶⁸ For this element they use the words of Jesus to provide guidance. “Yes, I am the vine; you are the branches. Those who remain in me, and I in them, will produce much fruit. For apart from me you can do nothing.”¹⁶⁹ The connotation here is that structures are temporary and man-made and therefore must always submit to the leadership of the Holy Spirit.

When these two elements are considered together a unique way of thinking about creativity emerges. Since creativity is a part of the natural makeup of human beings, and structures are a part of the creative activity as guided by the Holy Spirit, then creativity guided by the Spirit should be a key element in the development of structures, with those structures always submitting to the leadership of the Spirit.

While it’s one thing to be as creative as possible when forming structures, creativity must go beyond their simple development. If those structures must submit to the Spirit then Spirit-guided creativity should be the key element in the very atmosphere in which those structures are developed. In other words, Spirit-guided creativity must govern the overall ethos of the organization, and not just the development of the structures. Spirit-guided creativity is one of the key elements necessary to elevating

¹⁶⁷ Gen. 2:7, NLT.

¹⁶⁸ "Origins 2005."

¹⁶⁹ Jn. 15:5, NLT.

spirituality over structures because it produces a dynamic ethos from which the structures will ultimately develop.

One example of this could be in the weekly sermon preparation of a pastor. If a pastor invited a group of people to participate in the process of shaping the sermon with a basic understanding that this team would be guided by the creativity of the Spirit, an ethos could develop among that team which allowed the structure of the sermon to emerge from their work. The pastor could supply a basic framework for evaluation but that would only serve as a guide, because once the Spirit-guided creativity was brought to bear on the process, the entire sermon might be restructured making it stronger. In this way an ethos is created by the Spirit-guided creativity which results in a more powerful structure.

Exegesis

If creativity is the key element in developing and expanding the ethos, then it would seem that detailed examination is the key to the development of the fluid structures. If a leader or an organization can efficiently and effectively assess what resources they have available, they can then provide a structure that will be of greatest value to accomplishing their goals and objectives.

Exegesis is defined as “critical explanation or analysis, or critical interpretation.”¹⁷⁰ While this idea is most often applied to texts, particularly the Bible, its nuances are a perfect match for the development of spiritually fluid structures. To exegete a situation or a person’s talents or abilities would simply mean to critically analyze,

¹⁷⁰ *Exegesis* [Online Dictionary] (Los Angeles, CA: Lexico Publishing Group, 2005, accessed 30 May 2005); available from <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=exegesis>; Internet.

interpret, and explain those components in as detailed way as possible in order to put them together into an optimal framework for accomplishing goals and objectives.

This practice is currently employed in many areas beyond literature. It simply isn't called exegesis. Marcus Buckingham writes about this from a management perspective. "In my research, . . . I've found that while there are as many styles of management as there are managers, there is one quality that sets truly great managers apart from the rest: They discover what is unique about each person and then capitalize on it. . . . Great managers know and value the unique abilities and even the eccentricities of their employees, and they learn how best to integrate them into the coordinated plan of attack."¹⁷¹ This is the exegesis of people and resources in such a way that it leads to fluid structures based on an optimal ethos. Exegesis becomes the key component in the development of the structures that submit to the Spirit.

Synthesis – Exegeativity

While these two elements of Spirit-guided creativity and continual exegesis seem to delineate a powerful model for creating a dynamic ethos and fluid structures, the question which now emerges is, what would happen if these two elements were combined?

Consider what would happen if both of the key elements of Spirit-guided creativity and exegesis were further applied to both the development of the dynamic ethos and the fluid structures. The result would be a continually-Spirit-guided, creative exegesis, or simply "exegeativity." This unique combination would take the best of both

¹⁷¹ Marcus Buckingham, "What Great Managers Do," *Harvard Business Review* 83, no. 3 (2005): 70-72.

of these elements and utilize them in the formulation of a dynamic ethos and the development of the fluid structures. The Spirit-guided creativity would be harnessed with the continual exegesis to produce flexible structures that were always willing to submit to the Spirit, exegeativity!

The impact this would have on the formation of a dynamic ethos could be significant. Not only would there be Spirit-guided creativity at work, but also continual exegesis of the ethos itself. This critical analysis and interpretation would help to heighten the ability to foster a truly creative and dynamic ethos as well as have a significant impact on the overall development of the structures. Not only would there be the continual exegesis in the formation of those structures, but they would always submit to the Spirit-guided creativity at work as well. This would only increase the impact of both the ethos and the structures in the organization and make certain that the basic characteristic of the ontology was functioning, with structures submitting to spirituality.

Spirituality in the Church

The impact this understanding of exegeativity and its relationship to spirituality has on the Church could be monumental. Two specific areas surface where exegeativity would have the greatest impact in helping a local church reach its full potential. The first concerns the relationship of the pastor and/or staff to the overall congregation. The second examines the actual make-up of the church and how that relates to its calling.

When exegeativity is applied to the relationship that exists between the pastoral staff and the church community, it is discovered that the real key in this arena relates to the ethos created by the staff. As the pastoral staff continues to grow and function at ever

increasing levels of their full leadership potential, they will use exegetivity to help create an ethos that exudes creativity and the freedom for the congregation to truly follow the leadership of the Spirit.

In the church's case it is a function of the leadership to passionately value imagination and creativity and rate them as essential resources for mission, ministry, and leadership. The leadership of a given community will need to give organizational permission for rethinking and allow for lots of experimentation, recognizing that this process is dangerous, tricky, and inevitably chaotic.¹⁷²

The more freedom and creativity that is breathed into the ethos of the church, the more the Spirit will be unleashed within that community.

The second area of the church where exegetivity will have its greatest impact relates to the very make-up of the congregation itself. When the church is using exegetivity to maximize itself as a whole, it will be forced to ask two very basic questions. First, what is our identity? This requires a great deal of honest reflection and analysis on the part of the congregation but will result in the church discovering its own unique fingerprint in the world. Each church will be able to discover what their individual core values are as they are guided by the leadership of the Spirit. This will result in forward movement.

This first question inevitably leads to the second: what is God calling us to do? As a church continues to apply and use exegetivity they will not only discover their unique identity, but they will also hear their own unique calling from God. "The power and life of God's Spirit working in his people result in nothing less than cultural transformation."¹⁷³ That transformation will be unique to every congregation in every

¹⁷² Michael Frost and Alan Hirsch, *The Shaping of Things to Come: Innovation and Mission for the 21st-Century Church* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003), 196.

community in the world because “we who believe are carefully joined together, becoming a holy temple for the Lord.”¹⁷⁴

The full impact of exegeticality on a church will be for her to find her identity and then fulfill her unique calling from the Lord. Exegeticality enables the church to reach its full potential and employ the ontology of leadership, allowing spirituality to rise above the use of structures.

Faith is the Leader-As-Parent

Further examination of the postmodern ontology of leadership reveals another one of its characteristics, faith. Throughout this thesis it has been argued that faith needs to take precedence over power. In order to understand how that faith functions within the life of the postmodern Church and leader the metaphor of the leader-as-parent will be presented.

Defining the Leader-As-Parent

In Matthew 12:50 Jesus responds to a request from his mother and brothers by saying, “Anyone who does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother!”¹⁷⁵ The church has long used the family metaphor as a way to describe the kingdom of God, as evidenced in many places by the use of the terms “brother” and “sister.”¹⁷⁶ The Apostle Paul even uses the image of spiritual father when speaking about

¹⁷³ Erwin Raphael McManus, *An Unstoppable Force* (Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2001), 14.

¹⁷⁴ Eph. 2:21, NLT.

¹⁷⁵ Matt. 12:50, NLT.

members of the Body of Christ.¹⁷⁷ This concept has not lost its merit. Quoting Ken Hemphill, president of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, C. Gene Wilkes notes, “Keep the biblical context of family constantly before the church through your preaching and teaching. But you must begin the process of modeling family before it will become reality. Start with a few key leaders and parent them to maturity.”¹⁷⁸ The family metaphor is useful in the world of postmodern leadership.

This idea of the leader-as-parent produces a problem. Parenting styles vary almost as much as parents do, plus there is the added dimension of trying to decide what is good parenting versus bad parenting. So parenting must be defined. Dr. Kevin Lehman in his book, *Making Children Mind Without Losing Yours*, makes reference to three common types, or styles of parenting: permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. A brief look at these three styles will help in this discussion.

“The permissive parent essentially says, ‘Oh, do your own thing. Whatever you want is okay.’”¹⁷⁹ In this style of parenting the child is *permitted* to do whatever they want, giving them abundant, and at times, even absolute freedom with their lives. Dr. Lehman believes this type of parenting leads to rebellion against parents and authorities. “My years of counseling parents and children have shown me that in a permissive environment the kids rebel.”¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁶ Rom. 8:29; Rom. 15:30; 1 Cor. 8:9; Gal. 4:28; James 1:19 as examples.

¹⁷⁷ 1 Cor. 4:15 and 1 Thess. 2:11 are two such references.

¹⁷⁸ C. Gene Wilkes, *Jesus on Leadership* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1998), 91.

¹⁷⁹ Kevin Lehman, *Making Children Mind without Losing Yours* (Grand Rapids, MI: Flemming H. Revell, 2000), 39.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

The authoritarian style of parenting is at the opposite end of the spectrum. “When we deal with children from an authoritarian viewpoint, we come at them with the general attitude that we know what’s best for them, we make all their decisions for them, and they essentially don’t have the wherewithal to make the kinds of decisions that life requires.”¹⁸¹ This type of parenting centers around the issue of control and can leave a child unprepared to move into adulthood.

Dr. Lehman also proposes a middle ground which he calls authoritative parenting. “Authoritative parents do not dominate their children and make all decisions for them. Instead, they use the principles of reality discipline, which are tailor-made to give children the loving correction and training of which the Lord approves (Eph. 6:4).”¹⁸² This style of parenting engages the child in the realities of normal life, and allows those realities to be the teacher. “I believe that parenting and disciplining children in an authoritative way involves at least three things: 1. Discipline by way of action.... 2. Parents must listen to their children.... 3. Parents should give themselves to their children.”¹⁸³ This style of parenting deals in reality. It recognizes the changing landscape of the world and embraces the centrality of relationships in that world. It is what is meant by good parenting and will serve as the basic framework for the metaphor of leader-as-parent being presented.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 37-38.

¹⁸² Ibid., 41.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 42-44.

In adopting this metaphor as a way of understanding the reality of faith in the ontology of leadership, it's possible to wonder if faith even plays a role in this metaphor. After all, isn't the process of being a parent about providing guidance and wisdom?

"The prevailing mindset is that leaders 'win' by applying smarts and style....the real 'stuff' of a leader goes deeper than his gifts. We all know the right answers: Substance before style; what you are is more important than what you do."¹⁸⁴ What emerges however, is a basic understanding that the effective leader-as-parent must first focus time, effort and energy inward toward their faith relationship with Christ if they hope to have any influence at all.

Faith in Christ

The leader-as-parent recognizes that his or her leadership must primarily be centered around their faith relationship with Christ. "The inner morphing of the leader is so critical because what is going on inside us automatically overflows into the space around us.... Morphic leadership means profound interior transformation, and it forms the basis for seeing cultural change with lasting results."¹⁸⁵ As the leader goes through inner transformation due to their faith in Christ, the community around them is impacted by that transformation, and their abilities and skills as a leader function at their peak.

Without the Spirit of Jesus in our hearts and minds, we will gravitate to natural ways of becoming great and getting to the front of the line. Those outside a relationship with Christ may appreciate the wisdom of Jesus, but they cannot live

¹⁸⁴ Barna, ed., *Leaders on Leadership*, 62.

¹⁸⁵ Ron Martoia, *Morph! The Texture of Leadership for Tomorrow's Church* (Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2004), 32-33.

out his teachings fully. A heart in relationship with the teacher is necessary before you can know the meaning of greatness and leadership in the kingdom of God.¹⁸⁶

Effective leadership begins with the cultivation of a deep, personal relationship with Christ. This work helps to deepen the wells of a person's soul, thus providing a greater amount of spiritual depth and resource from which to lead and guide others. Faith in Christ must be a part of the primary leadership focus of the leader-as-parent.

Faith in Chaos and Change

Faith in Christ is not the only source of faith for the leader-as-parent. The twenty-first century church leader must also be willing to place their faith in the reality of the chaos and change of this new postmodern world.

Margaret Wheatley, in her book on *Leadership and the New Science*, describes the scientific work of chemist Ilya Prigogine:

Prigogine's work demonstrated that disequilibrium is the necessary condition for a system's growth. He named these systems *dissipative structures* to bring attention to their paradoxical nature. They dissipate or give up their form in order to recreate themselves into new forms. Faced with increasing levels of disturbance, these systems possess the innate ability to reorganize themselves to deal with the new information. For this reason, they are called *self-organizing systems*. They are adaptive and resilient rather than rigid and stable.¹⁸⁷

When the leader-as-parent is able to embrace chaos and change with a measure of faith it is possible to teach children and others the ability to respond and adapt to the changing world. This creates stability and the possibility of growth, more so than if the changes had not occurred at all. "The viability and resiliency of a self-organizing system comes from its great capacity to adapt as needed, to create structures that fit the moment.

¹⁸⁶ Wilkes, *Jesus on Leadership*, 110.

¹⁸⁷ Wheatley, *Leadership and the New Science*, 79-80.

Neither form nor function alone dictates how the system is organized. Instead, they are *process structures*, reorganizing into different forms in order to maintain their identity.”¹⁸⁸ The leader’s willingness to utilize these process structures requires an enormous amount of faith in the reality of the chaos and change of the present world.

This is in direct contrast to what occurs if chaos and change are not embraced. “When leaders strive for equilibrium and stability by imposing control, constricting people’s freedom and inhibiting local change, they only create the conditions that threaten the organization’s survival.”¹⁸⁹ In this static structure, the life-lesson communicated is one of rules and regulations based on power, rather than the ability to be creative and adaptive which is achieved through faith. What results is an organization that is governed by legalism, about which Jesus had much to say. “How terrible it will be for you teachers of religious law and you Pharisees. Hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs – beautiful on the outside but filled on the inside with dead people’s bones and all sorts of impurity.”¹⁹⁰ In order to prevent this empty and dead life, leaders-as-parents will embrace the chaos and change of the postmodern world with a great deal of necessary faith, trusting that it will help to create greater growth.

Faith in the Church

The leader-as-parent must also be willing to place their faith in the community of believers which they are trying to help lead, essentially the Church. In the parent-child

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., 82.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., 89.

¹⁹⁰ Matt. 23:27, NLT.

relationship this commitment might be described as “belief in the child.” The parent believes in the child’s growth and development and in their personhood enough that they are willing to empower them and release them to become all that God wants them to be. “To be a parent is to empower. A parent who is a servant leader will invest great amounts of time into the life of a child in order to empower the child to live as an adult. The goal of parenting is to empower a child to live out God’s plan for his life.”¹⁹¹ This belief in the child translates into a belief in the members of the community to which the leader-as-parent belongs. It is a faith that is willing to empower and release those people to truly be the Church in the world.

The leader-as-parent recognizes this reality as being crucial to the fulfillment of the mission. Growth and maturation are only fully realized when believers are empowered and released to embrace God’s work in them and through them, to become a part of the missional community and live out God’s mission together through their authentic, Christian relationships. The leader’s commitment to faith in these people ensures the fulfillment of God’s mission in the world.

When these three facets of faith are taken together in the metaphor of the leader-as-parent, what emerges is a sense of just how crucial a role faith plays in the life of the postmodern leader, and in this basic ontology of postmodern leadership. Without faith in Christ first there is not any framework from which to build. That faith, when coupled with a willingness to trust the creativity and adaptability that results from the chaos and change of this new world, unleashes significant growth. It is then harnessed with a basic faith in the people of God’s Church and a willingness to empower and release them to

¹⁹¹ Wilkes, *Jesus on Leadership*, 227.

carry out His mission. All of these components work together within the life of the leader-as-parent, reinforcing the necessary role of faith in this ontology of leadership.

Inclusion is Grafting

The continual analysis of the postmodern ontology of leadership leads to another one of its main characteristics, inclusion. Throughout this thesis one of the key elements of the postmodern world is an elevation of inclusion over separation. Separation was a natural result of the modern world, which was also adopted by the modern Church. Now in the postmodern era separation is being devalued and inclusion is being elevated and embraced. Inclusion has also been identified as one of the key components in Jesus' teaching on the Kingdom of God, which makes it a necessary part of this ancient/future ontology of leadership.

In order to better understand this concept of inclusion over separation the metaphor of grafting will now be examined.

Grafting – An Overview

Grafting is the process of taking two different types of plants and joining them together to form one new plant. In Northern California one of the trees which utilizes the grafting process is the walnut.¹⁹²

Grafting is a method of plant propagation by which one woody plant is mechanically attached to another so that the two eventually fuse together. This is a very common method of propagating trees. A twig from one tree is grafted onto

¹⁹² These walnut trees are used in particular because they are common in the region where the author of this thesis resides.

the stump of a rooted tree. The stump, which already has an established, healthy root system, is called the rootstock. The tree part being grafted onto the rootstock is usually called the *scion*. The scion is the tree which has the fruiting properties desired by the propagator, and the rootstock is the working part which interacts with the soil to nourish the new fruit tree. After a few years, the tissues of the two parts will have grown together, producing one tree which is genetically two different plants.¹⁹³

In the case of the walnut trees in Northern California, the Black Walnut becomes the rootstock and the Persian Walnut becomes the scion.

In order for grafting to take place, the two original species must be similar, but there are other variations which can occur in the process. “The rootstock can be a different species from the scion, but the two must be closely related. A grafting can also be done in stages, with a closely related scion being grafted to the rootstock, and a much less closely related scion being grafted to the first scion. Also, with a serial grafting of several scions one may produce a tree that bears a number of different fruits. The same rootstock absorbs and disperses water to the whole system.”¹⁹⁴ Again, with the Northern California walnuts part of the reason it works so well is because they are both varieties of walnut trees. This makes them more compatible so the graft is effective.

There are several reasons why grafting is used in horticulture. Sometimes it is used to help produce a stronger and healthier plant that can withstand the climate in which it is growing. A very strong and hearty rootstock may be combined with a scion that is better able to handle the changing temperatures. At other times, grafting is used to help produce a wider-range of fruit, even resulting in several different types of fruit

¹⁹³ *Rootstock* [internet collaborative encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2005, accessed 18 December 2005); available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/rootstock>; Internet.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

coming from the same plant. Grafting may also be employed to assist in the pollenization process.¹⁹⁵ All of these reasons help to explain the grafting process and why it is used.

Relationship is the Key

Now that the foundational elements of grafting have been outlined a case can be made for embracing inclusion using this metaphor. The key to this application rests in the relationship that exists between the various individuals or groups who are attempting to be inclusive. In the case of the grafting metaphor, the graft will not succeed unless the two separate species join together in a living relationship. “For successful grafting to take place, the cambium tissues of the stock and scion plants must be placed in contact with each other. Both tissues must be kept alive till the graft has taken, usually a period of a few weeks. Successful grafting only requires that a vascular connection takes place between the two tissues.”¹⁹⁶ The grafting is successful when the “connection” happens and manifests itself through the relationship. This occurs in two main ways; first the grafting relationship honors diversity, and secondly, the grafting relationship grows new life.

The Grafting Relationship Honors Diversity

Grafting is being utilized in walnut trees within Northern California because there isn't one particular type of tree that best fits the specific conditions of that area.

¹⁹⁵ *Grafting* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia] (Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2005, accessed 18 December 2005); available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/grafting>; Internet.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

Persian walnut seedlings (*J. regia*) are the most popular rootstock worldwide, and in areas where blackline disease is a problem. 'Manregian' is the selection most tolerant of blackline disease (see below). Trees usually lack vigor and yield efficiency in California when propagated on this rootstock, so it is not used there. It is also more sensitive to salinity and flooding, and less tolerant of root and crown rots than northern California black walnut. Northern California black walnut (*J. hindsii*) is the most common stock for Persian walnut in California, but has not been used elsewhere, perhaps due to its susceptibility to blackline disease....'Paradox' (*J. hindsii* x *J. regia*) is a hybrid of Persian and Northern California black walnut, and generally superior to its parents in several traits. Therefore, 'Paradox' is the most preferred rootstock in California....¹⁹⁷

This is also true with some of the types of walnut trees which are grown in the East, with certain species better suited for those climates. This reveals the way grafting acknowledges both the strengths and the challenges presented by the various varieties of trees, and how it uses all of those attributes to its greatest advantage.

The fact that one type of tree produces the best rootstock for Northern California but not for other parts of the world, isn't viewed as a weakness in the rootstock, but a strength for Northern California. The specific species is fully honored for what it brings to the equation, not for what it doesn't bring to certain locations.

The implication for embracing inclusion shows that the relationship between the people or groups attempting to come together must fully acknowledge and honor all aspects of each party. If a person is attempting to be inclusive with someone from another culture, they must be willing to accept all of the differences between them as a full expression of their diversity. There may be a temptation to view some of the components from the other person's culture or personality as a hindrance, but that could be situation specific, since those same components may be very beneficial within the context of their culture. "We need to look for what we have in common and also what makes us different

¹⁹⁷ Mark Rieger, *Walnuts* [internet article] (Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 2005, accessed 18 December 2005); available from <http://www.uga.edu/fruit/walnut.htm>; Internet.

from each other. All of that is integral to diversity. The idea is not to reject something that is different.”¹⁹⁸

When diversity can be embraced in this way, it encourages the parties involved to view everyone as bringing value to the relationship. Each person involved in the grafting relationship can embrace the diversity and be inclusive because they believe everyone else involved has value and adds it to their lives. “The essence of empowerment is in the awareness that the power is already in people.”¹⁹⁹ The relationship is mutually empowering because everyone brings value to it and they are willing to embrace the diversity and be inclusive.

The Grafting Relationship Grows New Life

The second component of a successful grafting relationship is that it grows new life. Within the walnut trees of Northern California the new tree which is produced from the two parent trees is a much stronger, heartier tree for survival in that climate. “‘Paradox’ (*J. hindsii* x *J. regia*) is a hybrid of Persian and Northern California black walnut, and generally superior to its parents in several traits.”²⁰⁰ The new life produced from the graft is greater than the originals.

When individuals or groups are able to become inclusive through this grafting relationship, everyone is strengthened and the overall health and well-being of the organization is increased. “A well-rounded, diverse team will produce valuable

¹⁹⁸ Shobhana Chakrabarti, *Sangam: Inclusive Leadership* (Mirrabooka, Western Australia: Ishar Multicultural Centre for Women's Health, 2005), 70.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 92.

²⁰⁰ Rieger, *Walnuts*.

brainstorming sessions, imaginative problem solving and decision making, unique perspectives on strategic planning, and inventive product development ideas. Recognizing that discrimination prohibits the expression of ideas, the leader will be a role model for appreciating diversity.”²⁰¹

This idea of greater strength through inclusion seems to move in opposition to what natural instincts may suggest. One could be led to think that when so many different sets of values and perspectives are drawn together, it only weakens the focus and direction of the organization. But Shobhana Chakrabarti, in her work with a wide variety of women from many different cultures in Western Australia, determined just the opposite to be true. “The old paradigm told us humans that we needed to compete, that there was never enough to go around and we had to fight for our small slice of the action....Experience at women’s gatherings has taught a different mathematics: that collaboration multiplies resources rather than dividing them; that resources are abundant when we share them fairly; that the old values of interdependence, mutuality and empathy can bring us all back into grace and balance.”²⁰² When diversity is embraced, inclusion is achieved through the grafting relationship and lives and forces are joined together to form new growth that wouldn’t have been possible had separation been elevated over inclusion.

²⁰¹ Cathy L Greenberg Marshall Goldsmith, Alastair Robertson, Maya Hu-Chan, *Global Leadership: The Next Generation* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall, 2003), 38.

²⁰² Chakrabarti, *Sangam: Inclusive Leadership*, 66.

Biblical Connections

In Romans 11 the Apostle Paul uses this metaphor of grafting to help the Gentiles understand their position in the life and growth of the church. “But some of these branches from Abraham's tree, some of the Jews, have been broken off. And you Gentiles, who were branches from a wild olive tree, were grafted in. So now you also receive the blessing God has promised Abraham and his children, sharing in God's rich nourishment of his special olive tree. But you must be careful not to brag about being grafted in to replace the branches that were broken off. Remember, you are just a branch, not the root.”²⁰³

Within this context Paul is remarking how some of the Jews had chosen not to believe that Jesus was the Messiah, and so had brought judgment upon themselves. But since salvation was now being offered to all people, including the Gentiles, anyone who believed in Christ was being grafted into the body of Christ and adopted by God. Essentially the Gentiles were experiencing the power of a grafting relationship in which their diversity was embraced and they were offered inclusion. Paul was even hopeful that through the Gentiles' relationship with God that the Jews who had been cut-off would be brought back into that grafting relationship with the Father. “I am saying all of this especially for you Gentiles. God has appointed me as the apostle to the Gentiles. I lay great stress on this, for I want to find a way to make the Jews want what you Gentiles have, and in that way I might save some of them.”²⁰⁴

²⁰³ Rom. 11:17-18, NLT.

²⁰⁴ Rom. 11:13-14, NLT.

Here the power of a grafting relationship that truly embraced diversity and was inclusive can be seen. That relationship honored the diversity of the Gentiles and caused new growth as a result. They brought a whole new understanding to the early Church regarding salvation through faith, rather than following the Law. They were the avenue through which the Gospel spread to the Western world.

Inclusion in the Church

As these ideas of a grafting relationship are applied to the arena of the Church, a whole new approach to the lives of congregations is opened up. Diversity and inclusion is something many churches desire but have a difficult time knowing how to achieve. If churches apply this concept of a grafting relationship they immediately gain a framework for moving forward. They can begin to celebrate and honor the diversity that already exists within their congregations. They can look for opportunities to reach out and embrace other groups from their communities who aren't yet a part of their congregation. They can encourage new growth to emerge from those diverse relationships, potentially breaking down stereotypes and normative practices that may have been hindrances to inclusion in the past.

Once churches move forward in these grafting relationships, they must remember one thing – God's Church is a living organism, and this process of embracing diversity won't necessarily follow any prescribed patterns or norms but will be an ever-evolving, organic process itself.

Many people view organisations as if they were machines: if it's broken fix it. Just get the right part, stick it in and turn it on and it will work again. But organisations are not mechanical; they are organic. They should be viewed more from the agricultural than the mechanical perspective. Organisations are living,

growing things made up of living, growing people. Living things are not immediately 'fixed' by replacing malfunctioning parts; they are nurtured over time to produce the desired results.²⁰⁵

As churches keep this perspective in mind they can enter into grafting relationships that embrace diversity and inclusion and move forward into a powerful future with God, providing further evidence that inclusion, rather than separation is a necessary component to the ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God.

Theo-Centricity is the Kingdom of God

Attention must now be turned to the final characteristic of the ontology of leadership, namely that the kingdom of God must be Theo-centric. In order to analyze this reality the metaphor of the kingdom of God will be examined. While this may seem like a circular proof, it is simply a greater reinforcement of this reality.

Submission to God

There are two statements Jesus made about the kingdom of God from the Sermon on the Mount that will provide further clarity on this issue. The first one was briefly mentioned in chapter two and is found in the Lord's prayer. "This, then, is how you should pray: 'Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name, your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as it is in heaven.'"²⁰⁶ It was determined that this statement provided credibility to the reality of the kingdom. Taken in the context of this metaphor and the need for a Theo-centric view of life, what is discovered by this statement is that

²⁰⁵ Chakrabarti, *Sangam: Inclusive Leadership*, 93.

²⁰⁶ Matt. 6:9-10, NIV.

Jesus believed that God's kingdom should be primary in the lives of His followers. "The kingdom of God is that moral and spiritual kingdom which the God of grace is setting up in this fallen world, whose subjects consist of as many as have been brought into hearty subjection to His gracious scepter, and of which His Son Jesus is the glorious Head."²⁰⁷ This is a prayer of submission to the will and reign of God's kingdom here on earth, which implies that any desire for a human will to be realized is placed in subjection to God's kingdom.

The other statement from Jesus' teaching which relates directly to this metaphor is also found in the Sermon on the Mount. "And he will give you all you need from day to day if you live for him and make the Kingdom of God your primary concern."²⁰⁸ Here Jesus is teaching about money and possessions and the role they should play in people's lives. He declares that if people will make the kingdom of God their primary focus then God will supply all the needs they have in their lives. "To seek God's righteousness is not, in this context, to see justification....It is to pursue righteousness of life in full submission to the will of God, as prescribed by Jesus throughout this discourse....Within such a framework of commitment, Jesus' disciples are assured that all the necessary things will be given them by their heavenly Father...."²⁰⁹ Once again the idea of humanity's desires and wishes is placed in submission to the kingdom of God and what He determines is really necessary for people to live and survive. It is a Theo-centric view of life simply because it is the kingdom of God, not man.

²⁰⁷ Robert Jamieson, Fausset, A.R., and Brown, David, *A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical*, III vols., vol. III (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1880; reprint, 1990), 40.

²⁰⁸ Matt. 6:33, NLT.

²⁰⁹ Carson, *Matthew*, 182.

Devotion to God

In both of these passages submission to the kingdom of God is the key to the Theo-centric view of life. This is further clarified by examining one other encounter Jesus had with a young man while He was here on earth. In Matthew 22 Jesus encounters an expert in religious law who was trying to trap Jesus into saying something damaging.

This teacher of the Mosaic law would have been involved in the process of dividing the 613 precepts of the Jewish law into categories of importance.²¹⁰ Here he attempts to get Jesus to weigh in on this process, hoping to trap Jesus into saying something for which he could be held accountable. “Teacher, which is the most important commandment in the law of Moses?”²¹¹

Jesus responds by quoting two sections of the Pentateuch.

Jesus replied, “‘You must love the Lord your God with all your heart, all your soul, and all your mind.’ This is the first and greatest commandment. A second is equally important: ‘Love your neighbor as yourself.’ All the other commandments and all the demands of the prophets are based on these two commandments.”²¹²

In quoting this passage from the *shema* (Deut. 6:5) and saying it is to be the primary commandment for the followers of Christ, Jesus is essentially saying that the love of God, or a Theo-centric life is the pattern for all of His disciples. “But the clear meaning is that one is to love the Lord with all his being.”²¹³ “Love in the truest sense demands abandonment of self to God, and God alone is the adequate incentive for such

²¹⁰ Earle, *Matthew*, 204.

²¹¹ Matt. 22:36, NLT.

²¹² Matt. 22:37-40, NLT.

²¹³ Earle, *Matthew*, 205.

abandonment.”²¹⁴ The Theo-centric life is completely devoted to God alone, revealing the importance of this component to the ontology of leadership.

Theo-Centricity in the Church

When considering how this impacts the life of the Church and its leaders, another passage of Scripture becomes helpful. In Ephesians chapter four, Paul is writing about the nature of the Church. “We are all one body, we have the same Spirit, and we have all been called to the same glorious future. There is only one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and there is only one God and Father, who is over us all and in us all and living through us all.”²¹⁵ He goes on to remark that Christ is the head of the body, the Church.²¹⁶

Here Paul reinforces this reality of the Theo-centric life, claiming that God is the central focus of the Church and all of its members, helping to bring about complete unity in the body. “The ‘one God over all’ (in His sovereignty and His grace) is the crowning apex of unity.”²¹⁷ By embracing the Theo-centric life, unity is achieved in the Church under the leadership and direction of God in Christ. As human leaders within the Church continue to submit to His leadership and maintain absolute devotion to Him, He will help to produce unity within His body. The Theo-centric life is best described by the metaphor of the kingdom of God and is vital to the basic understanding of this ontology of leadership in the postmodern world.

²¹⁴ Carson, *Matthew*, 464.

²¹⁵ Eph. 4:4-6, NLT.

²¹⁶ See Eph. 4:15.

²¹⁷ Jamieson, *A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical*, 410.

A Postmodern Ontology of Leadership

Through this chapter, four metaphors have been examined which provide clarity and further support for the ancient/future ontology of leadership being presented in this dissertation. Spirituality was described through the metaphor of exegativity; faith was pictured through the metaphor of the leader-as-parent; inclusion was demonstrated with the metaphor of grafting; and the Theo-centric life was revealed by the metaphor of the kingdom of God. Each one of these images brings greater illumination to the postmodern ontology of leadership and its impact on the Church and its leadership.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS

At the outset of this dissertation the following thesis was adopted: Effective church leadership in the postmodern world will embrace an ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God. In chapter two, four characteristics of this ontology were developed based on Jesus' teaching regarding the kingdom of God: the kingdom of God is about spirituality, not structures; it is about faith, not power; it is about inclusion, not separation; and it is about God, not people.

In chapter three these four characteristics were then compared to Saint Augustine's descriptions of the differences between the city of man and the city of God in his monumental work, *The City of God*. It was discovered that these same four realities emerged from within that comparison, further supporting their use as foundational to this ontology of leadership.

Attention was then given in chapter four to the developments of the modern world and the impact they had on the Church. Support was presented which demonstrated how the modern Church adapted to the modern era by embracing the opposite of each of these four characteristics: structures, power, separation, and a people-centric view of life. Thus the Church adopted a modern ontology of leadership for that time. This was understandable given the enormous influence that era had on the Church.

In chapter five significant changes happening in the world today were outlined creating a new postmodern era vastly different from the modern one. It was revealed how

this postmodern world now devalues each one of the characteristics embraced by the modern ontology of leadership, and how it now is elevating each one of the original traits found in the kingdom of God. This led to the development of the ancient/future ontology of leadership for the postmodern world based on the kingdom of God, which is the foundation on which this thesis stands.

Chapter six introduced four metaphors which each corresponded to one of the characteristics in this ontology of leadership. It showed how spirituality can be seen in the metaphor of exegetivity; how faith is found in the metaphor of the leader-as-parent; how inclusion is demonstrated through the metaphor of grafting; and how the Theocentric view of life is best demonstrated through the metaphor of the kingdom of God. Each one of these metaphors further emphasizes this ancient/future ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God.

It is the contention of this dissertation that if leaders in the twenty-first century Church are willing to reach back and embrace this ancient ontology of leadership based on the kingdom of God, they will be well equipped to walk into the future with great boldness and confidence and help lead the postmodern Church to fulfill God's mission of redemption for the whole world!

Appendix 1

Definitions of Leadership²¹⁸

1. Leadership is “the behavior of an individual...directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal” (Hemphill & coons, 1957, p.7).
2. Leadership is the “influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization” (D. Katz & Kahn, 1978, p.528).
3. “Leadership is exercised when persons...mobilize...institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers” (Burns, 1978, p. 18).
4. Leadership is “the process of influencing the activities of an organized group toward goal achievement” (Rauch & Behling, 1984, p. 46).
5. “Leadership is a process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort, and causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose” (Jacobs & Jaques, 1990, p. 281).
6. Leadership “is the ability to step outside the culture...to start evolutionary change processes that are more adaptive” (E. H. Schein, 1992, p. 2).
7. “Leadership is the process of making sense of what people are doing together so that people will understand and be committed” (Drath & Palus, 1994, p. 4).
8. “Leadership is about articulating visions, embodying values, and creating the environment within which things can be accomplished” (Richards & Engle, 1986, p. 206).
9. Leadership is “the ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization...” (House et al., 1999, p. 184).

²¹⁸ Quoted from: Yukl, 3.

Appendix 2

10 Wizardly Characteristics of High Modern Leadership²¹⁹

Bible Analyst. The modern Christian leader dissects the Bible like a scientist dissects a fetal pig: to gain knowledge through analysis. And in modernity, knowledge is power.

Broadcaster. In modernity, when one amplifies his voice electronically and adds a little reverb, his power quotient goes way up. Being slick, being smooth, being big, being on the air – that’s what makes you a leader.

Objective Technician. The organization (church, ministry, et cetera) is a machine, and the leader knows how to work the machine, how to make it run, how to tweak it, how to engineer or reengineer it. He’s the subject, and the organization is the object.

Warrior-Salesman. Modern leadership is about conquest – “winning souls,” launching “crusades,” “taking” this city (campus, whatever) for Jesus, et cetera. It’s about marketing, getting buy-in, and selling. (And sometimes selling out.)

Careerist. The modern leader grasps the bottom rung of the ladder, and – earning his credentials along the way – climbs, climbs, and climbs. This is as true for young preacher boys on the rise as it is for young stockboys who would be CEOs.

²¹⁹ Quoted from: Campolo, *Adventures in Missing the Point*, 142-143.

Problem Solver. Bring it to him, and he'll fix it. Come to him, and he'll fix you.

Apologist. He'll tell you why he's right, and why your doubt or skepticism is wrong.

Threat. A powerful and underrated weapon of the modern Christian leader: the threat of exclusion. Through mocking caricatures or other rhetorical forms of demonization, a gifted orator (or editor) can make you fear that if you don't agree with (or follow or submit to) his leadership, you'll be slashed from the membership list and banished – like the Wizard bellowing threats from behind his curtain.

Knower. The modern Christian leader is supremely confident in his opinions, perspectives, beliefs, systems, and formulations. While the rest of us question and doubt, he is the answer-man who really *knows*.

Solo act. There's only room for one in the Wizard's control booth – and there's only room for one at the top of the church organizational chart.

Working Bibliography

- Age of Enlightenment* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 8 December 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Age_of_Enlightenment.
- Anderson, Leith. *A Church for the 21st Century*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Bethany House Publishers, 1992.
- Anderson, Ray Sherman. *Minding God's Business*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans, 1986.
- Augustine of Hippo* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 18 November 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint_Augustine.
- Augustine, Saint. *City of God*. Translated by Gerald G. Walsh, Demetrius B. Zema, Grace Monahan. New York: Doubleday, 1958.
- Barna, George. [Website]. Ventura, CA: The Barna Group, LTD., 2006, accessed 10 July 2006; Available from <http://www.barna.org>.
- _____. *Revolution*. Carol Stream, Illinois: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2005.
- _____, ed. *Leaders on Leadership*. Ventura, CA: Regal Books, 1997.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. *Liquid Modernity*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Inc., 2000.
- Bell, Rob. *Velvet Elvis: Repainting the Christian Faith*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005.
- Bennett, Jessica. *Introduction to Enlightenment Thought and the French Revolution* [Web Content Producer]. Denver, CO: Associated Content, Inc., 2005, accessed 8 December 2006; Available from http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/15970/introduction_to_enlightenment_thought.html.

- Bourke, Vernon J. "Introduction to *City of God*, by Saint Augustine." In *City of God*, 7-12. New York: Doubleday, 1958.
- Buckingham, Marcus. "What Great Managers Do." *Harvard Business Review* 83, no. 3 (2005): 70-72.
- Burke, Spencer. *Making Sense of Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003.
- Cahill, Thomas. *Desire of the Everlasting Hills: The World before and after Jesus*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1999.
- Campolo, Tony and Brian D. McLaren. *Adventures in Missing the Point*. El Cajon, CA: Youth Specialties, 2003.
- Capon, Robert Farrar. *The Fingerprints of God*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- Carson, D. A. *Matthew*. Vol. 8. 12 vols. The Expositor's Bible Commentary, ed. Graebelein, Frank E. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1984.
- Chakrabarti, Shobhana. *Sangam: Inclusive Leadership*. Mirrabooka, Western Australia: Ishar Milticultural Centre for Women's Health, 2005.
- Cordeiro, Wayne. *Doing Church as a Team* [Book; Internet Resource]. Regal Books, 2004, accessed <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/toc/ecip053/2004026661.html>
- Dean, Kenda Creasy and Ron Foster. *The Godbearing Life: The Art of Soul Tending for Youth Ministry*. Nashville: Upper Room Books, 1998.
- Dods, Marcus. *Translator's Preface to St. Augustin's City of God* [Book On-Line]. New York: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1890, accessed 18 November 2006; Available from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf102.iv.i.html>.
- Earle, Ralph. *Matthew*. Vol. 6. 10 vols. Beacon Bible Commentary, ed. Harper, A. F. Kansas City, MO: Beacon Hill Press, 1964.

Eckhardt, John. *Leadershift: Transitioning from the Pastoral to the Apostolic*. Chicago, Ill.: Crusaders Ministries, 2000.

Eldredge, John. *Epic: The Story God Is Telling and the Role That Is Yours to Play*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2004.

Engstrom, Theodore Wilhelm, Edward R. Dayton, and author joint. *The Art of Management for Christian Leaders*. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1976.

Ethos [Online Dictionary]. Los Angeles, CA: Lexico Publishing Group, 2005, accessed 30 May 2005; Available from <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=ethos>.

Exegesis [Online Dictionary]. Los Angeles, CA: Lexico Publishing Group, 2005, accessed 30 May 2005; Available from <http://dictionary.reference.com/search?q=exegesis>.

Fordism [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Peterburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 16 December 2006; Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fordism>.

Friedman, Thomas L. *The World Is Flat*. First Updated and Expanded ed. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.

Frost, Michael, and Alan Hirsch. *The Shaping of Things to Come: Innovation and Mission for the 21st-Century Church*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2003.

George, Carl F., and Robert E. Logan. *Leading & Managing Your Church*. Old Tappan, N.J.: F.H. Revell, 1987.

Gilson, Etienne. "Forward to *City of God*, by Saint Augustine." In *City of God*, 13-35. New York: Doubleday, 1950.

Gladwell, Malcolm. *Blink: The Power of Thinking without Thinking*. 1st ed. New York: Little, Brown and Co., 2005.

- Goldsmith, Marshall, Cathy L Greenberg, Alastair Robertson, Maya Hu-Chan. *Global Leadership: The Next Generation*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice Hall, 2003.
- Goleman, Daniel, Richard Boyatzis, and Annie McKee. *Primal Leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2002.
- Grafting* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2005, accessed 18 December 2005; Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/grafting>.
- Henry, Matthew. *Matthew to John*. Vol. 5. 6 vols. Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible. McLean, Virginia: MacDonald Publishing Company.
- Hille, Rolf. "Transition from Modernity to Post-Modernity: A Theological Evaluation." *European Journal of Theology* 11, no. 2 (2002): 87-107.
- Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and Empire*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003.
- Hunter, Todd. "The Church of the Future: Missional Communities." In *Next Wave*, 4: Next-Wave.org, 1999.
- Hybels, Bill. *Courageous Leadership*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.
- Industrial Revolution* [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 11 December 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Industrial_revolution.
- Jamieson, Robert, A.R. Fausset, and David Brown. *A Commentary: Critical, Experimental, and Practical*. Vol. III. III vols. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1880. Reprint, 1990.
- Kraybill, Donald B. *The Upside-Down Kingdom*. 25th Anniversary ed. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 2003.
- Leadership* [Online Dictionary]. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2005, accessed 10 July 2006; Available from <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary/leadership>.

Lehman, Kevin. *Making Children Mind without Losing Yours*. Grand Rapids, MI: Flemming H. Revell, 2000.

Manichaeism [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 20 November 2006; Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manichaeism>.

Martoia, Ron. *Morph! The Texture of Leadership for Tomorrow's Church*. Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2004.

Mass Production [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 16 December 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mass_production.

McLaren, Brian. "Personal Interview." ed. Campbell, Stephen, Personal 30 minute interview. Atlanta, 2004.

_____. *A Generous Orthodoxy: Why I Am a Missional, Evangelical, Post/Protestant, Liberal/Conservative, Mystical/Poetic, Biblical, Charismatic/Contemplative, Fundamentalist/Calvinist, Anabaptist/Anglican, Methodist, Catholic, Green, Incarnational, Depressed-yet-Hopeful, Emergent, Unfinished Christian*. El Cajon, CA: Emergent YS; Zondervan, 2004.

_____. *A New Kind of Christian: A Tale of Two Friends on a Spiritual Journey*. 1st ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.

McManus, Erwin Raphael. *Seizing Your Divine Moment*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2002.

_____. *An Unstoppable Force*. Loveland, CO: Group Publishing, 2001.

Miller, Donald. *Blue Like Jazz: Nonreligious Thoughts on Christian Spirituality*. Nashville: T. Nelson, 2003.

Modern Times [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 10 July 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modern_age.

Moore, Gordon. "Cramming More Components onto Integrated Circuits." *Electronics* 38, no. 8 (1965).

Murray, Stuart. *Post-Christendom: After Christendom*. Carlisle England: Paternoster, 2004.

Myers, Joseph R. *The Search to Belong: Rethinking Intimacy, Community, and Small Groups*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Youth Specialties, 2003.

O'Donnell, James J. *Augustine, City of God* [Unpublished Article On-Line]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1983, accessed 18 November 2006; Available from <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/augustine/civ.html>.

Ontology [Online Dictionary]. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc., 2005, accessed 10 July 2006; Available from <http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/ontology>.

"Origins 2005." In *The Origins Project*. Los Angeles, CA: Mosaic Church, 2005.

Pagitt, Doug. *Reimagining Spiritual Formation: A Week in the Life of an Experimental Church*. Grand Rapids, MI; Zondervan, 2003.

People of the Book [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 22 May 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/People_of_the_Book.

Rieger, Mark. *Walnuts* [Internet Article]. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 2005, accessed 18 December 2005; Available from <http://www.uga.edu/fruit/walnut.htm>.

Rootstock [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2005, accessed 18 December 2005; Available from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/rootstock>.

Sanborn, Mark. *The Fred Factor*. Colorado Springs: Waterbrook Press, 2004.

Schaff, Philip. *St. Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine* [Book On-line]. New York: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1890, accessed 18 November 2006; Available from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf102.html>.

Shields, Stephen. *Christian Discipleship in Postmodernity: Toward a Praxis of Spiritual Friendship* [Internet]. Next-Wave.org, 2001, accessed 8 December 2004; Available from <http://www.next-wave.org/aug01/friendship.htm>.

Stanley, Andy. *The Next Generation Leader*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, 2003.

_____. "The Uncertain Leader: You Can't Always Be Sure, but You'd Better Be Clear." In *Leadership Journal*, 6: Christianitytoday.com, 2003.

_____. *Visioneering*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Sweet, Leonard. "Leadership in the Emerging Culture - First Advance." In *Leadership In the Emerging Culture - First Advance*. Portland, OR, 2004.

_____. *Summoned to Lead*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishers, 2004.

_____. *The Three Hardest Words*. Colorado Springs: Waterbrook Press, 2006.

_____. "Weathering Christianity's Perfect Storm." George Fox University, 2006.

Sweet, Leonard ed. *The Church in Emerging Culture: Five Perspectives*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003.

Taylor, Steve. *The Out of Bounds Church? Learning to Create a Community of Faith in a Culture of Change*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005.

The City of God [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikipedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 18 November 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_City_of_God.

What Is Enlightenment? [Internet Collaborative Encyclopedia]. Saint Petersburg, FL: Wikimedia Foundation, 2006, accessed 11 December 2006; Available from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/What_Is_Enlightenment%3F.

Wheatley, Margaret J. *Finding Our Way*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 2005.

_____. *Leadership and the New Science*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 1999.

Wilkes, C. Gene. *Jesus on Leadership*. Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1998.

_____. *Paul on Leadership: Servant Leadership in a Ministry of Transition*. Nashville, TN: LifeWay Press, 2004.

Yukl, Gary A. *Leadership in Organizations*. 5th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2002.