

LEADERSHIP, styles of: responses to 2Nov78 WIN, pp.5-14, article of  
Bruce Kokopeli and Geo. Lakey, "Leadership and Leaders: What's the Difference?"

For potential, and the organization should be willing to suffer some inferior leadership to make this possible. The organization is a school of Christ as the world is the school of God.

1. No all "leadership" functions need be gathered into one "leader": leadership can be "collective and egalitarian." First, I think of my marriage, which meets this ideal (described by Sun Moon as sexual transcendence: who's to lead is situation<sup>1</sup> rather than stereotypic). I suggest a formula: strain:size :: will:clarity-- i.e., the human/task factors can be synergistic (persons growing and jobs getting done efficiently) if the will to work together is adequately reinforced by clear goals-objectives and the organizational size does not overwhelm persons' capacities for living with, and making productive, the strains that appear intrapersonally and interpersonally. A factor overarching and undergirding the formula is the reach factor: the more heterogeneous the personnel, the more in number are the strains and the greater in difficulty is the arriving at goals and objectives. Given will as a constant, clarity can be arrived at, in situations of heterogeneous personnel (across lines of sex, race, class [economic sense], academic-cultural level), but "collective and egalitarian" leadership will increase in difficulty with the size of the decision-making body.
2. The authors speak from leadership experience in small, relatively homogeneous organizations (George's I know well, especially because (1) our son Mark was a full participant in the communal living of the Movement for a New Society, and (2) because George's wife Berit and I work together as Kirkridge trustees). NYTS is a greatly more complex operation than either MNS or the Seattle Men's Resource Center, and I advise caution in extrapolating from them (thus, from the article) directly into our situation. But I'm enthusiastic about our doing CE on this article, and glad that Bill's leadership style is not so "collective and egalitarian" as to cause him to hesitate to ask us to read the article and prepare to discuss it.
3. The anarchic fantasy of the "leaderless" group was a brainless reaction to authoritarianism (as the authors admit), but it reappears in our hearts when we get discouraged with "church" (worldly conformity to worldly power-paradigms [M.10]), or with "sect" (one leg in "the world," one leg out), and even with "cult" (both legs out)--and NYTS personnel, in their networks, are in all three types of organization. What makes leadership in NYTS difficult, here, is that NYTS is all three types of organization! This complicating factor closes me in on two conclusions: (1) NYTS needs internal continuing-education as to what it is as well as to what it should be doing and getting tooled up to do it, and (2) NYTS needs one person who can stand at the center of these swirling planets of personnel, programs, leader-images, and organization-images, and at the same time provide a cohesive public image for all external purposes (recruitment, institutional relationships, witness in the world of institutions, and fiscal stability)...and to do so while maintaining spirituality, sweetness, and sanity. This job is (1) necessary, (2) impossible, and (3) being performed by Bill better than it would be by anyone else I can think of.
4. Under theocracy, God (1) chooses leaders [OT-NT] and (2) creates leaders genetically-historically [NT; e.g., 1Cor.12]. So our authors are correct: role/function must be distinguished. But I cannot go with them that "we do not need leaders," for I see the need of the leader (1) for cohesion, (2) for continuity, as well as (3) for the here-and-now situation....(1) and (2) being one person, and (3) being a particular person emerging here-and-now for the particular leadership task. On (3), I can't go with "egalitarian," for the particular person emerging for the particular task should be the person best able to lead in that task, and therefore superior to the others for that task, and to be honored and followed as superior. The notion that "all are equal" is as daft as the Queen of Hearts' "all have won and all shall have prizes." But a mollifying factor is past inequality of opportunity: we shall not, as Christians, always use "the best person for the job," i.e. the person most able, because of prior advantages, to perform the leadership function in the particular situation. Again, persons need to develop their leadership