Restoring the Five-Fold Ministry 2nd Ed: Avoiding the Pastoral Supremacy Syndrome / By Hartwell T Paul Davis

The following pages are excerpts from this book which covers the following topics:

- So You Want To Be A Preacher
- The First Mega Church
- Organizational Identity
- Christians On The Broadway
- Church Polity
- Power Structures
- The Earliest Power Structures
- Maladaptive Church Leadership
- Avoiding The Pastoral Supremacy Syndrome
- The Fivefold Ministry
- Women In Ministry
- Restoration of The Fivefold Ministry

. . . .and more

Hartwell Paul Davis

Restoring the Five-Fold Ministry 2nd Edition: Avoiding the Pastoral Supremacy Syndrome

Hartwell T Paul Davis, Ed.S, MA, M.Min

CHAPTER SIX - Church Polity

The term for church government is polity, which generally takes one of three forms: Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Congregational. In addition to these three traditional forms is the single-pastor led congregation. Also, to be considered in the concept of government are forms that pertain to power structures. Even though there are structural differences in the definitions of polity, the use of power can vary in leadership styles within any one of the forms of government.

The original model of church government has evolved, first through the selection of plural elders, and later the selection of one of the elders into a position that acted as the chairman of the board. In the latter form, the leading elder seldom operated independent of other elders or other form of accountability. Most of this accountability would have been locally self-contained, depending on the structure of collegial eldership in the local church where the several elders would be accountable to one another. The allocation of power and influence ultimately depends on interpersonal dynamics, but under a collegial model, positional authority is initially dispersed.

During the first century, and because of distance separation and no formal organization, local church leaders were independent of higher authorities. However, they were influenced and guided by apostolic letters and apostolic visits. The instructions to Timothy and Titus for elder qualifications were of utmost importance because local church elders were primarily left to their own devices for the day to day operation of the church. Elders must be spirit filled and spirit led, with full vertical accountability

to God. However, God in his wisdom, did not set aside horizontal accountability where leaders must be accountable to other leaders, and all members of the body accountable to one another.

The expansion of missions and church planting contributed to changes in polity in several ways. While the original Jerusalem church provided a semblance of structural hierarchy, its influence was limited to pronouncements, as in the Acts 15 conference, and guidance from emissaries, whether apostles or others who were sent out to visit the scattered churches. Time and distance were such that close observation or oversight of local churches were impossible. As it is today, church government is on a continuum with the strongest axis of leadership being contained within the local congregation itself and many with a form of positional authority vested in a sole pastor with diminished authority allocated to a board or other ministries.

Chute writes, "Polity may not be a popular topic in an 'anti-institutional age', but it is foundational to the local church".[17] With the increasing number of churches that identify as non-denominational, at least in the United States, there is the semblance of a rejection of traditional hierarchical styles of leadership cloaked in the guise of "we do not want doctrine". Non-denominational rhetoric is the rejection of being identified with dogmas, doctrines, or religious forms that are associated with a specific denominational brand. The "brand" of religion is based on doctrinal assertions, leadership styles, and the cultural rules that

---

[17] Anthony Chute. "Baptist Foundations: Church Government for an Anti-institutional Age." *Baptist History and Heritage* 51, no. 2 (2016): 94+. *General OneFile* (accessed March 15, 2019). https://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A468140934/GPS?u=fl_program&sid=GPS&xid=4b71fe31.

are a part of the church tradition. It is not out-of-hand rejection of the gospel message or of God but of the confusion that exist in conflicting multiple messages. Chute contends that the anti-institutional sentiment that shies away from issues of church government are because the subject "implies authority and invites division".[18]

<div align="center">#</div>

Episcopalian Polity

Episcopalian church government is hierarchical in structure where a group of local churches (diocese) are overseen by one who is known as a bishop or presiding bishop, while the local church has a priest or rector as its minister of sacraments, including the homilies. The term bishop is from the Greek, *episkopay*, as used in I Timothy 3:1 and again in Titus 1:5-7. Note that the term bishop and elder are synonymous in Paul's letter to Titus, which means the Episcopalian form is structurally different in that it creates a hierarchy that removes at least a portion of power that was to be vested in the elders of the local church.

While it may seem that that the episcopal form of bishop/elder seems to draw support from scripture, the practice of top-down authority means that there are levels of authority that extend upward to what at one time was the papacy of Roman Catholicism or in this modern day, to organizational hierarchy. The local power within the church is minimal in comparison and functions at the behest of higher power structures. The historical change from the pope to an arch-bishop under the English King Henry VIII (1509-1547) is controversial because King Henry likely did not intend that the English Church would differ in polity structure except for its rejection of the Roman pope.

---

[18] Chute, 397

The modern structure of bishops, priest, and deacons in the English form was modified in the American system to add a congregational element, a result of the American Revolution. In the United States, the bishop leaders who have power and authority are limited by the laity of the congregation which serve as delegates to conventions which establish policy. This system of check and balance was modeled much like the structure of the American government. Butler (1995) writes,

In the year following the Revolution, American Anglicans were concerned about the structure of an Episcopal church and the role of bishops within that structure. Episcopalians faced a perplexing problem of church government. Most of the states reorganized their churches around a plan of confederation proposed by William White, in which traditional terminology from bishops was avoided and replaced by "overseer", "president", and "superior order". These overseers would share authority with clergy and lay delegates in a convention.[19]

The bishops were considered to have pastoral care and authority related to those duties, but the direction of the church in the United States is heavily influenced by the laity. The result is the changing social and political climate that has fractured the leadership of the church and created divisions within the body of churches that are Episcopalian in polity.

---

[19] Diana H. Butler. *Standing Against the Whirldwind: Evangelical Espiscopalians in Nineteenth-Century America*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)

\#

Presbyterian Polity

Presbyterian polity is another form of elder rule, but the elders in local bodies are less about a ruling class of clergy, but rather a ruling class of laity, and a representative form of government. In effect, a Presbyterian polity is a form of oligarchy, which means that power is vested in a small group of people rather than a single individual. An oligarchy contrasts with a dictatorship in terms of sharing the power base. Dictatorships and monarchies typically refer to autonomous rule mostly associated with an autocracy, which is rule by one person. Few churches go that far because church going is voluntary and such power cannot be enforced by man except when it takes on cultic identity, which is the underlying danger of what I have described as the pastoral supremacy syndrome when extremes develop in behaviors of a single leader.

In the discussion of the Episcopal form, it should be noted that the American church, in which lay delegates have greater influence, moved church polity away from the strictest form of Episcopal rule toward a Presbyterian form, the difference being that under the Presbyterian polity, the church board (or assembly of representatives) has greater power than the ministry ordained by God. Presbyters are generally elected by the local churches and act as delegates to the General Assembly in setting church policy. Graham (1996) notes that Thomas Witherow (1824-1890) of Scotland identified six basic principles of Presbyterianism. These include:

- Office bearers are chosen by the people
- The office of bishop and elder are identical
- A plurality of elders in each church
- Ordination was the act of the presbytery

- There was a privilege of appeal to the elders for the right of the church to speak
- The only head of the church is Jesus Christ[20]

These six principles model closely to scriptural principles with the exception that ordaining elders in the Bible was not a matter of voting by the congregation but by ordination from apostles and elders (Titus 1:5, Acts 14:23). This is a significant point to be discussed later. In addition, within scripture it appears that the elders and leadership of the church were represented more by the preaching ministry (i.e. five-fold ministry), rather than by a congregational laity (I Timothy 5:17, Acts 13:1-3). Presbyterianism is best described as a representative form of government which is not in keeping with the implications of scripture. Biblical ordination by apostles and elders suggests an apostolic succession associated with the conferring of ministerial gifts rather than the conferring of positional authority (I Timothy 4:14).

While Presbyterianism is in one aspect a form of congregational rule, it differs from Congregationalist polity in that the arbiter of church policy and rule exist in representatives in an assembly which is higher than the local church. Presbyters are grouped in synods which in turn are joined together on a nationwide basis in their general assembly. Authority flows from top to bottom, from the assembly to the local. Only a presbytery can ordain ministers, install pastor, or make changes in opening, closing, or relocating churches.

---

[20] Ross Graham. "The Biblical Origins of the Presbytery". *Ordained Servant, 5,2, (1996).* *https://www.opc.org/OS/html/V5/2f.html*

#

Congregational Polity

Congregational polity does not necessarily mean that the congregation is the final authority in the local church. While the local church might be ruled by a body of local elders or by a single-pastor, the polity refers to the overall authority that rest in the local church and moves from bottom to top when local churches are joined in fellowship or denominational structure. Under congregational polity, the power structure in the laity is often at odds with the pastoral ministry. This gives rise to one of the major complaints of pastors – that the shepherd becomes a "hireling". Many such churches are autonomous and independent and whether the local church follows the rules of a church organization is done on a selective basis. Most of the time, local churches will pick and choose what will be followed, and much of the choosing is determined by whatever power structure exist in the local church. It is not unusual for many "evangelical" churches to have congregational power structures that are represented by family dynasties.

#

Oligarchy Polity

An oligarchy can exist under the concept of eldership in which a few elders have all the power within a congregation. An oligarchy can also exist within any of the church polity structures mentioned. What has caused pastors consternation and fear is the board of elders that turn the preacher into "hirelings" and control the man and the message. The possibility that church leaders have intermediaries between them and the head of the church, Jesus Christ, is the most dangerous form of government. Church leaders, whether preacher or not, must be in direct relationship with Jesus

Christ, the King of Kings. This highlights the importance of understanding God's Biblical model for leadership.

Most single pastor forms of church structure are simply a matter of one oligarchy that replaces another oligarchy. The pastor and inner circle replace the "elders", a form where elders rule the church. Such an oligarch is often the pastor and pastor's family, or a dynasty that develops over time. While this may be natural (see "Founder's Syndrome"), it is not the concept of "few" that is problematic – it is the perception and use of authority and power that is the cause for alarm. Under collegial eldership, authority and power is dispersed, meaning no one in the structure has sole authority except for Jesus Christ.

The reality is that whether a church is an oligarchy, collegial rule, single pastor rule, or any of the other forms of church government, the potential for abuse is always present. This book is not primarily about "government" but about the Five-Fold Ministry, which should be active in any form of church government. It is true, there is scriptural evidence that strongly supports the principle of multiple elders and deacons as the office bearers for church government. Why this structure exist is the bigger question. What is suggested is that church government is not about positional power and authority but about the execution of ministry and service. Those that are to be ordained as office bearers of elders and deacons were most often identified in scripture as those who had one of the ministerial gifts.

Very little is written about the five-fold ministry as the true expression of power and authority in the church. Instead, authority is identified almost exclusively in the term "pastor" or "elder" and the meaning of those terms are not synonymous, even though this is the perception in this modern era. Elder is a term denoting authority and pastor is a term denoting servitude, as in a caretaker

position. The problem is that both now have been combined and used to the exclusion of the other gifts of service (Ephesians 4), and both terms are now reflected in what has been reinforced in church polity – a traditional meaning that government means the exercise of authority and power to "control", rather than to "serve".

CHAPTER SEVEN - Power Structures

Leadership as a subset of organizational studies is characterized in terms of style, traits, behaviors, and roles and like all great theories is a complex subject that genders years of research, discussion, and debate. Leadership theories and organizational theories can seldom be discussed as separate issues because organizations entail vertical and horizontal relationships. As much as anything else, leadership is about relationship. The structures of organizations often mirror the style of the leaders. Formal organization may have a strong hierarchical structure, and this suggest that the structure was put in place and is maintained by leaders that also perceive leadership in terms of hierarchy. Organizations can also be informal which fosters a more cooperative style of relationship such as social networks or communities of common interest, and these also reflect perceptions of leadership styles. This suggests that there is a correlation between how leadership develops and how organizations develop as a result of forms of leadership.

Williams (2012) writes, "Organizational structure is the vertical and horizontal configuration of departments, authority, and jobs with a company" (p. 250).[21] It refers to how relationships are structured, how authority is distributed, and how work gets accomplished. Marak (1964) notes leadership structure refers both to relationship and to an authority-compliance configuration that defines the nature of the relationship. Marak writes, "The development of a leadership structure – an asymmetry in the

---

[21] Charles Williams. *Effective Management*. 6th. (Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning, 2012).

relative frequencies of control and compliance acts initiated and received by the members of a group – depends upon a situation in which one person has more power than another" (p.175).[22] The structural configuration, whether vertical or horizontal, weak or strong, close or distant can say a lot about the dynamics of the relationship.

Marak (1964) notes "Possessions, personality, and position in a social structure are interrelated variables that influence the evolution of control-compliance interaction patterns".[23] This telling comment reveals a great deal about the nature and purpose of power. Why does anyone want to be a leader? This begs the question as to whether leadership equates to power or authority – and does power infer the promise of reward, as in greater position or more possessions? Typically, the concept of leadership is enthroned in the notion of status, position, or other personal benefit. It is a given that "team-leaders" at a fast food restaurant receive a wage increase when promoted even if it only means a quarter an hour difference. Middle managers have compensating rewards, and top managers are endued with even greater rewards. The conceptualization of what leaders do and what leaders are have a cultural perspective associated with power and rewards that distort the real understanding of leadership.

<div align="center">#</div>

Configurations of Power

The uncomfortable truth is that power, position, and possessions are interrelated factors in human social context. Note the change from Marak's triad of social structure variables, where

---

[22] George E. Marak. "The Evolution of Leadership Structures". *Sociometry, 27, no. 2* (June 1964), 174-182.

[23] Marak, 175

we substitute "power" for personality in a discussion of the real-world configurations for which we are culturally familiar. Social structures are relevant to multi-disciplinary studies of sociology, psychology, organizational theory, natural sciences, and even theology. In general, any subject dealing with how things relate to one another must consider structural configurations. Structural configurations suggest position in the configuration, and how things are positioned suggest ways that we can discuss elements of power, control, status, or influence. These are elements of elite circles of influence that for many say "I have arrived" or that are associated with notions of achievement. Dogan (2003) in the book Introduction: Diversity of Elite Configurations and Clusters of Power write,

> The notion of configuration which appears in the title of this book has the same meaning as in astronomy: the position of planetary corps in relation to one another. In elite studies, configuration means the relative position and size of various elite circles (political, bureaucratic, capitalist, managerial, cultural, religious, military, etc.) in the constellation of power.[24]

Elitism entails symbols that become expectations in terms of cultural power distance. The term power distance "refers to the extent to which the members of a culture are willing to accept an

---

[24] Mattei Dogan. "Introduction: Diversity of Elite Configurations and Clusters of Power". *Comparative Sociology, 2, no. 1* (2003), 1.

unequal distribution of power, wealth, and prestige".[25] The authors also note that high power distance cultures like Brazil, Singapore, or Arabic countries rely heavily on hierarchy in their power structures. High power distance is structured vertically with more power at the top where subordinates expect to be told what to do. Low power distance cultures are more democratic and imply a horizontal distribution of power which is shared between managers and subordinates. "As a consequence of these contradictory expectations, the ideal boss in a low power distance culture is a resourceful democrat, whereas in a high- power distance culture the best boss is a benevolent autocrat".[26]

Clearly power relationships are culturally relevant, normal, and necessary. The whole notion of "law" is based on relationships of power and authority. Without law, there is no order and anarchy suggest the breaking down of power structures that are intended to provide safety and harmony to social structures. The etymology of the word "power" from the Anglo-French *pouair* and the Latin *potis* defines power as "ability, ability to act or do; strength, vigor, might, efficacy, control, mastery, dominion, authority", many synonyms that can have very positive meanings associated with accomplishment and achievement (Power, Online Etymology Dictionary). Power however is a two-edged sword either to be feared or revered, not for the fact of its existence, but only because of its consequences. A well-known quotation by Baron John Acton states, "Power tends to corrupt, and

---

[25] Mary J. Hatch and Ann L. Cuntliffe. *Organization Theory: Modern, Symbolic, and Postmodern Perspectives, ed.2*. (Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press, 2006), 181.

[26] Hatch and Cuntliffe, 183

absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men" (Aston, The Phrase Finder, n.d.).

On the other hand, the apostle Paul declares power, as a role of government, is not to be feared but to be respected. Paul writes,

> Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same (Romans 13:1-3, King James Version).

I would argue the symbols most associated with power, position and possessions, are not necessary to power. It has been said that power tends to corrupt, and if so, does this mean that the power itself is of a corrupting nature? This would certainly not be the view of Paul nor as we shall see is it a Biblical view from understanding the many scriptures that elevate power as characterized by "ability", for example, "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples, he gave them power against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease"(Matthew 10:1).

We hypothesize that it is not power that corrupts, but rather position and possessions that corrupt those that have power. Power without love is the most dangerous form of power, and since love, other than for self, suggests the opposite of self-interest; power that is non-corrupting can only be power not driven by self-interest.

#

Leadership versus power

It is important to distinguish between power and leadership. The term power refers to authority and control – leadership refers to influence, and although this is a form of power, leadership does not necessarily result from authority or control. The earlier mention of distortion concerning leadership is significant because there is a tendency in human nature to look to positional power for leadership and this is the root cause of "the blind leading the blind"[27] syndrome (Matthew 15:14). The corporate struggle for position on the ladder of success often equates to the part of the triad in our discussion, possessions, but is also about a desire for positional power. Real leadership, however, is not bound by position or possessions, but has influence as its own form of power.

Influence can come from beneath one's own status and gives rise to the concept of servant leaders. Every teacher, manager, parent, or governor is wise to listen to those who have subordinate roles. The reality is that influence is a powerful two-way street that "leads" others to action, whether good or bad. Because leaders do for the most part excel to positions of power it is normal to view leadership equating to power in relationship. The nuance of difference is that leadership in the context of influence suggests that it has more to do with the power of personality and influence, while concepts of control are based on the powers of position and possessions, for example the "power of the purse". The characterization of servant leader implies that position, possessions, and status are not what make the servant leader. The servant leader can influence from roles suggested by

---

[27] Matthew 15:14, KJV

subordinates, a student, a child, a subordinate worker, or one who is governed – meaning the obedient servant of another. The servant leader uses a frame of mind for him or her-self and a frame of reference in the eyes of the subordinate that whatever influences the leader has, it is for the benefit of the subordinate, not the leader.

<div align="center">#</div>

Servant Leadership

Servant leadership is a leadership style that focuses on building relationship and leading from core values of care, concern, and charity (love). Kent Keith posits that with so much advice available about leadership that new leaders should start with the basic principles of servant leadership.[28] (2009, p. 18). This means that leaders should strengthen relationships with their colleagues. These three principles begin with "go to work to serve others" (p.18). This is the real reason why the leadership roles exist. The leader that believes that leadership is "all about the leader" is missing the point about relationship and influence.

A second basic part of servant leadership is that leaders must "listen to colleagues and customers to identify and meet their needs".[29] The servant leader operates as a mentor, guide, counselor, adviser, and sharer of vision. Terry Bean, an old colleague of mine, had great insight into understanding relationships by simply asking the question, "Whose needs are being met?" Kent suggests that a servant leader should not begin with their own answers but should be first asking others about their

---

[28] Kent M. Keith. "Servant Leaders Oberve Three Basic Principles." Leadership Excellence Essentials 26, no. 5 (May 2009): 18-19.

[29] Keith, 18

needs, wants, and desires (2009, p. 18). Servant leaders focus on the value of the relationship to those they lead.

Third, servant leaders "develop colleagues", says Keith.[30] If leadership exists because of relationship, growth in leadership comes with growth in relationship. Many good leaders fail by working themselves out of a job. Kent is writing about servant leadership in the context of sales when he says, "Your ability to serve customers will only be as good as your colleagues", but the basic principle is that your efforts at leadership are always measured by the results of others. Whether the metric is production, achievement, or sales dollars, it reflects back to the leader which gets the recognition for the group. Servant leaders grow the value of their own leadership by leading others into the realm of success.

<p align="center">#</p>

The difference of servant leadership

Leadership structures in religious communities are varied in accordance with differences in ecclesiastical views of church polity. The traditional views of church government, episcopal, Presbyterian, or congregational continue to exist, but modern forms include the single pastor-led church, democratic congregational-led churches, or forms of plural leadership. While leadership structure in a religious community may vary it must be conceded that each of the different models work given the right conditions and for that reason they continue to exist. This is true of churches and businesses, and a discussion of which form works best is the purview of leadership studies. Here we hypothesize that the concept of servant leadership as a characteristic of leadership is unique in that it is culturally oxy-moronic. The

---

[30] Keith, 19

power of the servant leader is amplified by its very nature of standing out in contrast to how humans typically view power – and this contrast engages the human heart into becoming willing followers in a relationship with that special meaning of "being different from all the rest".

#

The Jesus model: inverted authority

Jesus understood the nature of jealousy and self-interest and addressed it early with his disciples. When the mother of James and John came to Jesus and asked that her sons could be seated next to Jesus in heaven, the other disciples were offended (Matthew 20: 20 – 28, KJV).

Jesus then contrasted his concept of leadership with the known leadership of the day,

> Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise
> dominion over them, and they that are great
> exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so
> among you: but whosoever will be great among
> you, let him be your minister. (Matthew 20:25-28,
> KJV).

In the book Restoring the Five-Fold Ministry, this is called inverted authority, which is the kind of authority required for leadership in the church.[31] It is a servant leader model that is recognized in the business world as well as the church world. Emma De Vita sums up a quote from a little-known book Servant-

---

[31] Hartwell Paul Davis, Restoring the Five Fold Ministry, 2004, p.2

Leadership stating, "True leaders must also be servants. Great leaders must serve their communities and earn loyalty by involvement rather than imposition"[32]. "Servant-leadership", a phrase coined by Robert Greenleaf, is a concept that influenced Stephen Covey's book "The 7 Habits of Highly Successful People" and John Carver's Boards That Make A Difference according to John Cassel and Tim Holt[33]. But the concept originated with God when he dethroned Moses to make him the leader of the children of Israel[34].

---

[32] Emma DeVita. "Servant Leadership". Third Sector, (24 September 2008), 25. Retrieved from https://www.thirdsector.co.uk/theory-servant-leadership/communications/article/848028

[33] J. Cassell and T. Holt. "The Servant Leader". American School Board Journal, 195, no. 10 (October 2008), 34-35. Retrieved from Academic Source Complete Database.

[34] Davis, p.3

CHAPTER FOURTEEN - Maladaptive Church Leadership

As we can see, the answer to the question, "Are leaders born or made" is yes! Just as nature and nurture contribute to our being as a person, nature and nurture contribute to personality, characteristics, and skills that operate in the life of a leader. Like it or not, even physical characteristics can make a difference in the kind of influence one person may have over another. If leadership is a skill that can be developed, for example, opportunity is key for developing skills. Physical appearance can impact one's opportunities in the workplace, and it can also impact perceptions of would be followers. An article in Estates Gazette (2012) notes, "Research by Professors Timothy Judge and Daniel Cable showed that taller employees earn more money on average than shorter employees. Employers are subconsciously short-changing (pardon the pun) some employees because of their height. Could this be an angle for a lateral-thinking lawyer to pursue?" This does not presume that being short will automatically hinder leadership ability. Interestingly, being overweight is a common occurrence among preachers, but while obesity is a common discriminator in the workforce, there are many factors that impact how leadership really develops. For years, the color of the skin or the gender of a person could negatively impact a person's opportunity, which in turn could impact how leadership skills can develop. While lack of opportunity may not impact all the characteristics needed for leadership, it does impact skill development which is also essential for leadership. However, Paul is said to have been short in stature, but leadership theories, when it comes to the church do not always hold true.

Restoring: Avoiding the Pastoral Supremacy Syndrome

Truly, one of the most overlooked leadership theories is the Lord's discipleship program that I covered in the discussion in the Called, Chose, and Faithful Leader section of this book. When it comes to the church, many leadership theories can be thrown out of the door. Indeed, we do have examples that suggest that height can impact equal opportunity, but in the kingdom of God, God does not look for leaders in the same way that man looks for leaders. Take, for example, the story of David. When God sent Samuel to Jesse's house to anoint one of his sons as the next king of Israel, even in the eyes of Samuel Eliab, Jesse's oldest son, seemed to be a perfect choice. However, God said,

> And it came to pass, when they were come, that he looked on Eliab, and said, Surely the LORD'S anointed is before him. But the LORD said unto Samuel, Look not on his countenance, or on the height of his stature; because I have refused him: for the LORD seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the LORD looketh on the heart (1 Samuel 16:6-7, King James Version).

It is interesting that the first king, Saul, was head and shoulders above every other man in Israel (1 Samuel 9:1) What must be understood is that God has complete control over who he calls and the key to leadership is continuing in the will of God to fulfill God's purposes in the church.

#

Three spirits that damage church leadership
The overarching and single most important principle for being a God called leader is being a "God called leader". Note the

play on words. One of the greatest and I believe most profound statements from E.L. Holley, president of Texas Bible College, was when he said, "Whom the Lord calls, God qualifies". Church leaders, referring to elders and deacons in the governmental roles and the five-fold ministry in the servant's role, must have the spiritual anointing and unction that provides the talent gifts needed for whatever service God requires. The parable of the talents indicates that not all gifts are the same and not all results will be the same (Matthew 25:15-28). It is not unusual for church dynasties to develop, and while many of these "successions" are ordained of God, there are those situations where the son of a preacher is not called to be a preacher. Often, they are, but as we previously alluded to preacher "wannabees", it is essential that a minister knows the difference between the voice of God and the voice of grandmother or father when taking on the mantle of ministry.

Every leader must be aware that there are three major syndromes that damage the ministry more than anything else in the modern church. All three are the result of the maladaptive influences of three spirits that ruin both the leadership ministry of the church and the body ministry of the church. These three maladaptive influences are recorded in Jude 1: 11: "Woe unto them! for they have gone in the way of Cain and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward and perished in the gainsaying of Core".

<div align="center">#</div>

The spirit of Cain

The first spirit that can damage church leadership and church growth is the spirit of "Cain" which is the spirit of jealousy. One statement that has stuck with me through the years was from a fine preacher in Erie, PA who stated in one sermon, "Comparison

is the mother of all discontent". The real focus of comparison is not the other person but is a form of self-interest and one of being self-centered. Apostle Paul observed,

> For we dare not make ourselves of the number or compare ourselves with some that commend themselves: but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise. But we will not boast of things without *our* measure, but according to the measure of the rule which God hath distributed to us, a measure to reach even unto you. For we stretch not ourselves beyond *our measure*, as though we reached not unto you: for we are come as far as to you also in *preaching* the gospel of Christ: Not boasting of things without *our* measure, *that is*, of other men's labours; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you according to our rule abundantly, To preach the gospel in the *regions* beyond you, *and* not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand. But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. For not he that commendeth himself is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth(2 Corinthians 10:12-18, King James Version).

Before I went to New York as a home missionary, Pastor Nathaniel Urshan, who at that time was the general superintendent of the United Pentecostal Church, spoke to me intent on giving me some encouragement. I had been blessed under the ministry of Corlis Dees and a very large church in Houston, Texas, but Pastor Urshan told me, "Paul, a church of 50 in New York is like a church

of 500 in Texas". Knowing that the North East United States was not the Bible belt, I was not to get discouraged or disappointed if my planting would not be the same result as that to which I was accustomed. He also let me know, "If a man has the gift of pastoring 500, he will take a church of 50 and grow it to 500. If his gift is pastoring a church of 50, he will take a church of 500 and eventually have a church of fifty." While that can be a horrible thought, the reality is that God knows where to put us and we must learn to rejoice when others are blessed and trust God for the increase.

<div align="center">#</div>

The spirit of Balaam

The second spirit that will destroy ministry, whether individually or in the church body is the spirit of Balaam, which I shall identify is the "gift for gain" spirit. In the story of Balaam, he was offered honor and riches by Balak, the king of Moab, to curse the Israel as they came out of Egypt. Notice that God had a prophet, Balaam, outside of the nation of Israel which shows that the knowledge of God is never limited to those who are in the church. This does not have to do with the issue of salvation, but it does have to do with understanding how God reveals himself throughout the world. Balaam was not only God's prophet, but he indicated a sense of original faithfulness in stating "If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of the Lord, to do less or more"(Numbers 22:18, KJV). Unfortunately, temptation eventually caused Balaam to falter as he found a way around God' word to cause Moab to Israel to sin, meaning that Israel brought a curse upon itself (Numbers 31:16). Although the text in Numbers does not tell the whole story of how Balaam gave in to temptation, the apostle Peter reveals that many false prophets have "forsaken the right way, and are gone astray,

following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness"(2 Peter 2:15, KJV).

While the Bible does not condemn wealth or having riches, for God often has blessed many of his people with material wealth, it is what is in the heart that can turn blessings into cursing. The proliferation of televangelist and even religious cult leaders, with incomes far beyond the typical livelihood of most ministers in general, can be suspect. This does not mean that all such ministers are using their "gift for gain", for only God can judge the heart. However, the scripture warned,

> But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into *this* world, *and it is* certain we can carry nothing out. And having food and raiment let us be therewith content. But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and *into* many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows (1 Timothy 6:5-10).

However, gift for gain is not limited to the concept of money. Fame, fortune, personal aggrandizement, and pride are other ways that the spirit of Balaam can exist in the church. For example, when someone prays in Old English, could it be that they are wanting to appear to be more spiritual? Just saying. Can the uses of the gift of tongues or the gift of prophecy be used to bring attention to oneself? It is possible, and God forbid that this happens. Does the gift of healing ever get abused? In the story of Jim Jones, it is recorded that he used one of his church secretaries

to disguise herself as an old lady who miraculously was healed from being lame. In my own experience, and I won't name the preacher involved, I have spoken to those who claim that they had been recruited to be foils in healing ministry campaigns. Does it happen? Yes, it does. Is it widespread? I doubt it because the healing gift is real and the number of healings and miracles in the church are beyond being counted.

None of these examples are meant to generalize the gift for gain spirit, and again God will bring judgment on such falsehood, but the reality is that the cancer does exist within the church.

#

The spirit of Kore (Korah)

The third spirit that can destroy the ministry of the church is the spirit of rebellion. Whether among church leaders or among the flock, rebellion can be manifested many ways. One of the reasons for this book is to make clear that accountability is an important part of God's plan for leadership. How can ministers of God expect saints to be in a right relationship with God, who has all authority, if rejection of authority is a pattern of life? Attitudes concerning authority, responsibility, and accountability become a part of our value system and our spirit, and these attitudes determine our relationship with those in authority. Whether in the family, school, workplace, or government, authorities exist, and even if a person lives alone on an island or as a hermit in the mountains, we all are subject to the ultimate authority of God who will eventually judge us in eternity. The judgment for our behaviors will always begin with the judgment of our heart and attitudes. After all, one scriptural truism by Solomon is "Keep thy heart with all diligence for out it are the issues of life"(Proverbs 4:23, KJV).

Restoring: Avoiding the Pastoral Supremacy Syndrome

How does rebellion manifest itself in leadership? First, if we are independent from ministerial relationship with others, do we know why? Although there are reasons why a minister may not belong to a ministerial organization, that does not mean that fellowship with other ministers should not be a part of our lives. Within the local church, does the pastor have accountability structures? How good are we at taking advice or suggestions from those who are above us, below us, or who are our peers? May I suggest a caution that anyone who thinks that only God can tell him what to do has given in to self-deception. God's Word is full of admonitions that enjoins submission in various ways.

#

The Peter, Paul, Apollos Syndrome

What is the most likely result to the church leadership or the church body when the aforementioned spirits exist within the church? It is division that manifest itself through the Peter, Paul, Apollos Syndrome, a term that I use to describe preacher religion, divisions, factions, and denominational differences in the church body. First let me lay the blame for the disenchantment with church denominations and with the recent increase in opposition to "organized religion" squarely on Satan, but what is the primary method for such division? The Bible tells us "smite the shepherd and the sheep will scatter"(Zechariah 13:7, Matthew 26:31). Note the term "scatter". The Hebrew word *pasas* or the Greek word *diaskorpizo* both mean "divided, scattered abroad, shaken to pieces, dispersed". The first church wrestled with unity, but all divisions are the result of carnality. Satan takes direct aim at church leadership as the means for the scattering and the result has been the many denominations and organizations that have developed over the centuries following the founding of the church.

Most denominations have a genesis of some charismatic leader that can be traced as the progenitor for the denomination. This is not to claim that such leaders were false prophets or even wrong in their doctrines, but does claim that there was a differentiation around which adherents coalesced, and many times this could be false doctrine or false personalities.

The Bible declares there is only one Lord, one faith, and one baptism as the true structural identity for the church. Sadly, while there are natural differences because of culture or location, there should be no differences in terms of the following:

> With all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. *There is* one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who *is* above all, and through all, and in you all. But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man,

unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of
Christ:(Ephesians 4:2-13, KJV).

Unfortunately, the lack of unity has resulted in man's own
way of solving the problem. The "non-denominational" mantra is
another cloak of deception in which preacher religion thrives based
on personalities and falsehood. Since the key to unity is "one
body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, and one baptism", the concept
of "you believe your way and I'll believe mine, and we will both
get to heaven at the very same time" is equally wrong. "Non-
denominationlism" is a form of ecumenism with false premises of
"we all worship the same God", or "let's love one another and have
no doctrine". If the doctrine in the pulpit and the experience is the
pew is in anyway inconsistent with the spirit and truth of scripture,
the fact that there is no denominational attachment matters not.

Multiple denominations or multiple ministerial
organization can be viewed in several ways. It can represent man's
efforts to unify with others by establishing a common identity for
the church doctrine, culture, or leadership. It can also represent
divisions based on church doctrine, culture, or leadership. How it
happens, however, is primarily the results of some form of
leadership, and often where leadership is at odds with other
leadership. Scattered sheep are so often a result of disunity within
the ranks of leaders.

The Peter, Paul, Apollos syndrome represents "preacher
religion" attributed to division and carnality within the church.
How much of the disunity could be attributed to the leadership of
Peter, Paul, or Apollos is only conjecture. Certainly, there is none
that can be attributed to Christ, and based on Paul's writings it
would seem that none of these leaders would be guilty of self-
promotion. This begs the question similar to the "chicken or egg

first" controversy. Does preacher religion develop because of the behaviors of the preacher or the behaviors and perceptions of the flock?