ty of basic values and of value related phenomena, such as autonomy, fairness, rationality, love and law. Without sophisticated study of these interdependent variables—including how they have been understood in the history of thought—it is all too easy for values to be trivialized or shortchanged. On the other hand, philosophy alone, uninformed b

drove them by fear and paranoia to make and execute what they thought were strategic plans that were morally good but ended up wrong for their family or children. We personally have been carried off by our own radical thoughts on

occurs when a leader lives only by her own moral mindset and the other forms of moral leadership are not valued or they are crowded out, first out of the leader's

God through Samuel outlined clearly how a king-type structure would debilitate both its kings and the nation as a whole. "He will take your sons and make them serve with his chariots and horses. He will take your daughters to be perfumers and cooks and bakers. He will take the best of your fields and vineyards and olive groves." (vv. 11–15, NIV). Herein lies the structural reasons kings probably don't get a lot of praise in Scripture. Notice the operative verb "take." Kingship easily distorts natural relations to levels of hierarchy in which one feels privileged to take from another. For kings, that came in the form of forced labor, forced taxation, sexual exploitation, war drafts, and other coercive demands. That goes in ET BT 10 0 0 10 208.3026 508.2719 Tm /Tc4 1 Tf (.) Tj ET 10 0 0 10 330

FOUR TYPES OF MORAL LEADERSHIP

probably wish we had more r

ROLE	PRIESTS		
THEMES			
Other OT Social Frame	Ox Face of Man		
Gospels Theme	Mark Luke		
Lead by	Using rituals and teachings to fos- ter forgiveness and reconcilia- tion to God and others; breed community		
Time Focus	ast eal with guilt and shame		
Predominant Value	Mercy, ealing, econciliation		
Driving Ethic	Grace		
Effective in Solving Issues of	Guilt 5 in, 5 hame, Unfaithfulness		
Weakness	econcc		
Modern Equivalents			

ommon hemes from iblical to ecular T hemes	
Moral	

The five most common amoral frames by which are deontology (principle-bared by a limit in the part of the part of

to be forged and the leader has to tame the tigers or be killed. They must be shrewd advocates who use power to tame extremes.

Another work that has helped us confirm our model as useful for examining

driving leader pushes for better outcomes, creates some competitive engines of quality improvement, and looks at the bottom line of profits and purpose.

Gail Furman's (2004) work has also added understanding to our four frame model. A leading researcher on school-community relations, she argued that most educational ethics were too focused on eithe

response to God's ideals for the poor (social justice) or against a nation. Because judgment is

has some of the structures of a democracy but with built-in protection against the majority if the minority is being violated.

It is essential that individuals do not surrender that power but learn how to integrate it through the process of shared dialogue and judgment. Gary Hamel, one of the leading scholars on management, has repeatedly pointed out the limits of innovation, decision-making, and responsiveness to customers when centralized management dominates an organization. Working to empower individuals to manage their own area is crucial for organizations who want stronger morality in their

 $1\ Tf(g)\ TjET\ BT\ 10\ 0\ 0\ n^{1} Abrik 8286975 - 513 + 2719\ Tm\ /Tc3\ 1\ Tf(g)\ TjET\ BT\ 100 + 100\ n^{1} Abrik 8286975 - 513 + 100\ n^{1} Abrik 8286975 - 100\ n^{1} Abrik 8286$



Conclusion

This model presented three types of moral leadership—priest, king, prophet—that can be integrated with the help from a fourth type, the judge. In this model, each leader brings her own moral voice to the dialogue, and each, paradoxically, can weaken the moral growth of the group if she doesn't adjudicate these "witnesses" into practice. Moral superiority kills morality because it kills dialogue that can work to create more creative ideasiand outcomes. Those who understand the weakness of their strengths keep that superiority at bay and seek dialogue that grows matugity. This is the engine of the judgment process. Eacth must embrace himm

n 4c 15 Miller, N. (2012).