Hospitality toward the Clergy
by Rev. Stephen H. Phelps

A Presbyterian congregation with a long tradition of calling senior pastors to long pastorates was underway with the search for its next senior pastor. The organizer of the weekly adult forum asked me to present a talk in a series on "hospitality." Most presentations focused on practices of hospitality toward persons outside the congregation, but I was engaged on the question of "hospitality toward the clergy." Here was an unusual opportunity to bring attention to possibilities for organizational and spiritual development at a critical inflection point in the church's story. What can hospitality toward the clergy mean, or become?

I

The *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* defines hospitality as "cordial and generous reception or disposition toward guests." No paper is needed to expand on the cordial and generous social graces due any leader—warmth, respect, boundaries, need for time off, etc.—because, to borrow a phrase, all we need to know about these things we learned in kindergarten. This paper puts hospitality under the examination lights as a form of high-level consciousness about the self involved in the processes of any organization with a leader. Qualities unique to religious societies are often in view, but almost all the observations here apply to all kinds of organizations, from the smallest—marriages—to the largest nations.

Studying the ancient roots of words often reveals family resemblances among words in our ordinary vocabulary which we do not associate with one another. Probing the inter-connections can raise our awareness of hidden aspects of our thought processes. For example, the Indo-European root of *hospitality*[†] is **ghos-ti**, a transliteration of a proto-Sanskrit word that meant **stranger**. Thus, *hospitality* comes into English from ancestral practices and duties thought proper to the needs of a stranger—always a traveler and generally not kin, i.e., "not our kind." **ghos-ti** is ancestor to these common English words.

guest—the stranger at the home.

host, **hospice**, **hospital**(ity), and **hotel**—the person or space aiding the stranger's need.

hostile *and* **hostage** (and Greek **xeno**- as in *xenophobia*.) The contrast with "guest" may be unexpected, but the connection is uncomplicated: the stranger is unknown, feared, even enemy.

❖ ❖ ❖

In what ways is the leader of a church like a guest, or like a stranger, or even like a hostage?

How often it is said of pastors, perhaps as one member tries to calm the irritation another feels toward their pastor—"Pastors come and go, but the people stay." Certainly, the observation is valid. Yet if the people fix the pastor in the role of honored guest, the people may not only stay, but *stay the same*, year in, year out. A guest need not merely be honored, however. A guest might be invited for reasons transcending social conventions. She may be asked to help an organization to "do a new thing." Thus, *hospitality can mean* that at least some of the people learn and practice the arts of "followership," with the intention of helping the leader to lead toward that new thing. Understood this way, hospitality is an aspect of spiritual growth in members who seek to develop integrity, both in their persons and in their society.

How is the pastor "a stranger" in need of hospitality? Obviously, when a pastor begins the work, knowing no one well, he or she is a stranger. Not much to chew on there. But the unique role of pastor—of any leader—means that that person will *always* be different from the members—"not our kind." Even after decades of service, in ways essential to organizational function,

---

[†] See the Appendix of the *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*

the pastor remains a stranger. For a critical mass[†] of members, *hospitality can mean* they are open to discover aspects unknown and strange *in themselves* as individuals, as well as to support the pastor to grow in self-knowledge. Hospitality thus involves members in understanding the strange, often lonely role of the pastor, who in some respects will always be "the other" in the church.

How is the pastor a hostage? Unlike the aspect of *stranger* inherent in the pastoral role, becoming a hostage is not in the job description. But experience tells how very commonly a leader is taken hostage by events or by relationships within the organization. In telling their story, church folks prefer to paint warm images of all their relationships and tend to dismiss the notion that anyone would take the pastor hostage. In reality, all societies have adult members who are more and less mature—that is, who take or refuse to take responsibility for their own feelings and reactions, according with how well they understand their motives and needs. In every organization, the less mature are potential hostage takers. Their practices range from personal attacks on the leader to sabotaging the whole mission of the organization. "Do it my way or else" is the hostage-taker's threat, whether implicit or explicit. *Hospitality can mean* that a critical mass of members is learning the dynamics of group process and getting wiser about the risks of sabotage to the mission of the church. They learn how to identify the emotional triangles in which they themselves are engaged, and perhaps entangled, and they support the leader in the work of clarifying and effectively communicating what she stands for. With the leader, they learn more and more how to stay emotionally in touch with members of the organization, regardless the members' levels of maturity, while keeping the organization's mission on course.

I I

To gain insight into these dynamics, the phenomenon of transference offers a path to a higher point of view. The *Random House Webster's College Dictionary* defines transference as "the shift of emotions, especially those experienced in childhood, from one person or object to another." Compared with leaders of most other organizations, pastors are the objects of especially strong transference processes from some members.

In 1999, I was called to the senior pastor position of a once very large church in Buffalo, New York. From the late 1920s until about 1960, Central Presbyterian was the largest congregation of the denomination between Chicago and New York, with about three thousand members, served by multiple staff. By 1999. the membership roll carried only three hundred names, of whom not thirty lived within the city limits. The staff I headed numbered about thirty-five, but I never saw even so many as one hundred members at a regular Sunday worship celebration. By far the majority of those who were present had been part of this church for fifty, seventy, even ninety years. Baptized, confirmed and married there, they had long since seen their own children baptized, confirmed and married there. But mostly, the grown children were gone.

The people loved to tell the story of (and show old photos from) the *March of Time* national newsreel coverage of a massive architectural and engineering feat from 1930. The big sanctuary was enlarged by separating the huge Main St. wall and moving it forty feet closer to the street, increasing the seating capacity to more than 1200. In the 1990s, that large space had been artfully downsized (no newsreel coverage), but still its mostly empty pews could accommodate

---

[†] "Critical mass"—the minimum quantity of fissile material able to start a nuclear reaction—here refers to the fraction or part of any group whose behaviors can affect the whole. Since no group uniformly manifests certain behaviors among all members, and since some kinds of change have nothing to do with formal decisions by the group, awareness that a critical mass of members is "enough" to have an effect can inspire even a few people to focus their energies on a goal.

850 worshipers. I believed that the emptiness itself communicated a message about church culture harmful to both the visitor and to the long-time member. I aimed to alter that message.

From the start of my ministry, I preached from the pulpit up on the elevated chancel. After the sermon, as we sang a hymn, I walked down from the chancel to the floor of the sanctuary. From there, I conducted the remaining elements of the liturgy: an affirmation of faith, reception of the offering, the concerns and prayers of the people, the concluding hymn and a benediction. Once each month, we also celebrated Holy Communion from the sanctuary floor, at a table, with chairs on which we servers of the sacrament actually sat.

This action—my going down from the pulpit and chancel—was a decision not subject to approval by the governing board. It was my lead and it became a hot issue for some members. One couple, now deceased, made certain I knew how angry they were. I went to their home.

After some conversation, we talked about the presenting issue. I laid out the theological, educational, and organizational thinking that gave rise to my leading the celebration in this way. I listened to their expressions of anger and correction. The husband reproached me for failing to fill the pulpit as had the "great men" of former days. I stated that I believed there could no longer be "great men" in the pulpits; that the age for that relationship with the preacher had gone by; that "new occasions teach new duties," as the great old hymn puts it—though I probably forgot to mention the hymn. The wife, her face tight with anger, said "I need you up there!"

What was driving these strong emotions? My belief, based on decades of observation in pastoral leadership, is that the elevation of the pastor served their unconscious need to transfer complex feelings onto the man above, and that their anger indicated the depth of their unconscious need. If the diagnosis was correct, a cure would matter for that organization.

As leader, I had taken a direction. I intended to interrupt the norm of mid-twentieth century American church culture which elevated the pastor over the people and set a distance between him—yes, him—and the worshipers. I intended to interrupt the process of transference by which some church-goers, relying on this elevation and distance of the clergy, block or limit their sense of responsibility for their own development, their own relationship with God. *He will fulfill the divine connection, which is far beyond me.* Transference of this kind is motivated by a fear of failure, a need to justify self-limitation. If underway in a critical mass of members, the norms of such transference keep the whole church in a holding pattern, unable to stop fixating on survival, fear, and decline, or another perceived enemy.

In *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*, Erich Fromm clarified the "central dynamism" of transference:

> In order to overcome [their] sense of inner emptiness and impotence, [people] . . . choose an object onto whom they project all their own qualities: their own love, intelligence, courage, etc. By submitting to this object, they feel in touch with their own qualities; they feel strong, wise, courageous, and secure. To lose the [transference] object means the danger of losing oneself. This mechanism — idolatric worship of an object based on the fact of the individual's alienation—is the central dynamism of transference, that which gives it its strength and intensity.[†]

When their new pastor broke the wall of distance, the couple in my account lost their transference object. Their anger masked fear at the "danger of losing themselves," which fear is not different from the fear of confronting oneself, bereft of any object onto which to divert one's regard.

Alfred Adler offers a disarmingly blunt account of the conservative function of transference:
> [Transference] is basically a maneuver by which a person seeks to perpetuate his familiar mode of existence that depends on a continuing attempt to divest himself of power and place it in the hands of the 'Other.'[††]

[†]Quoted by Ernest Becker in *The Denial of Death*, p. 143 (New York: The Free Press, 1973)

[††] ibid., p.143

How often church folk are heard critiquing their unchanging ways with an awkward acronym, WADITW—we've always done it that way. Now, a little humor can lighten a heavy load, but sometimes humor only gives cover to a resistance to change so fixed that it threatens the very mission of the organization. Adler's analysis points to the possibility that an organization's most important stakeholders may be perpetuating "familiar modes of existence" by divesting themselves of some powers and placing them in the hands of the 'Other'—the Stranger, the Pastor. The transference process can proceed both as projection of one's own good qualities on the object and also as projection of shameful, negative qualities. The former leads to dependency on the leader who is thought to have special power (viz. the common notion that the prayers of the clergy are more powerful than others'); the latter gives stakeholders an object to blame for all the obstacles and weaknesses of the organization, and seems to justify aggressive emotional reactions against a leader who has taken a direction some members do not like.

Transference is a real phenomenon in group dynamics. By no means are all members influenced by it with respect to the leader, or in the same degree. Moreover, its reality does not mean that well-meaning members must invariably follow and help implement every direction from a leader, or that leaders don't sometimes make serious mistakes, or don't fail to take responsibility for same. It gets harder: Some pastors get tangled up in the transference phenomenon in ways that limit their self-knowledge and the development of the whole church.   Some identify too strongly with their role.   They crave the symbols of authority and deference transferred upon them, thus intensifying the passivity of members. Some retire badly when the time comes, for they too are in danger of losing themselves if no longer the object of transference.

How very commonly church people speak of any church in their town as "Rev. So-and-so's church."   Those thirty-page church histories lovingly prepared for a big anniversary celebration usually tell the story in terms of the accomplishments and qualities of the roster of pastors past and present, rather than as the accomplishments of the people and their mission. By more or less unconsciously pushing power and agency from themselves onto their leader, the people of an organization rationalize unarticulated anxieties about their own inaction and failure to live up to their ideals. As a group, their transference can hammer in place all manner of hierarchies and power arrangements, so that nothing changes. The phenomenon is perhaps still more prominent on the national level when citizens actively select an authoritarian leader. At least through the 1950s in the USA, however, it was a cultural norm in the mainline Christian traditions to regard the pastor or priest with an attitude of "idolatric worship," associating him with the very powers of God. The attitude has not disappeared altogether today.

Transference can also have a positive, rather than a fearful, manifestation. Why, in the Philippian church, the apostle Paul explicitly commended idealistic transference toward himself and other spiritual lights of the church. "Brothers and sisters, join in imitating me, and observe those who live according to the example you have in us." (Philippians 3:17) When we sing the cherished spiritual, "Lord, I want to be like . . . in-a my heart" we may with open eyes accept that for us, as for his disciples, and for every generation between, the person of Jesus inspires a desire to transcend the bounds of the small self. In the evangelist John's portrait of Jesus, by encouraging in the highest degree the power of his disciples to perform great works, Jesus forcefully blocks the disciples' transference process from themselves upon himself. "Very truly, I tell you, the one who believes in me will also do the works that I do and, in fact, will do greater works than these." (John 14:12) Indeed, every role model, every mentor serves as a transference object in this positive sense, for humans yearn to grow, and to overcome the temptation to shrink

back in fear of failure. Flesh and blood models for our ideal aspirations matter intensely: father and mother, the best teachers, the boss and the President—good or bad—and certainly the Pastor. All serve as transference objects for some. As Becker puts it, "The transference object always looms larger than life size because it represents all of life and hence all of one's fate."[†] What a travesty of leadership it would be if a pastor had no qualities to which one might aspire. The question that hangs over hospitality toward the clergy is whether there is sufficient consciousness of the phenomenon in the group to enhance the positive and limit the negative transference processes, for no pastor can accomplish these things alone. What is high-consciousness hospitality toward a clergy person when these facts are taken into account?

Hospitality does not amount to deference to the authority or education or status of the pastor. Nor does it mean that any member ought always agree with a decision of the leader or withhold reasoned critiques or apologize for missing church. Et cetera.

Hospitality, as limned here, begins with humility. We can acknowledge our feelings of emptiness and weakness, and further acknowledge that not we, not anyone, can fully grasp what maneuvers we may unconsciously employ to manage anxiety about our emptiness and weakness. This humble acknowledgment is not different from confession of sin—but the Christian doctrine of sin has so continuously been used to abuse the conscience of believers that we speak of it here with no little reluctance. In a word, conventional teachings about sin have only intensified guilty passivity and transference projections upon the "good teacher." A spirit of hospitality has no commerce with attitudes of unworthiness and passivity in oneself. Hospitality rather affirms the unmatched wisdom in the doctrine of sin, which is that "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God"—all, pastor too, grapple with their emptiness and their weaknesses. Therefore, all are on a level. Affirming that all are on a level was the theological aim in descending from that raised chancel long ago.

Alfred Adler called transference "a problem of courage." Hospitality toward the clergy is the *challenge* of courage to see and accept that the members of a congregation are at different levels of maturity and self-understanding, and for that reason, they are one body. As humble sinners, we can accept that the hard work of being a human means that transference will serve some as an unconscious stratagem for managing anxieties and fears. By the same sign, humble sinners can accept that all have gifts still to be strengthened, still to be discovered, through fuller engagement with the ideals made flesh and blood in people we admire. Hospitality toward the clergy demands of a critical mass of courageous members deepening insight into the action of transference, so they may better appreciate the strange, solitary, and often lonely role of the pastor.

[†]Becker, p. 146

The examination of hospitality as high-level consciousness about self in the processes of any organization now turns to conflict in a church. How can hospitality help untangle the ropes that often bind a leader and take her leadership hostage?

Conflicts arise for an effective organizational leader when her leadership heads in a certain direction. It may seem obvious that good leadership really moves in a direction, but to feel its significance, the statement needs to be laid against an alternative notion of the job of a chief executive. Especially common in churches, the alternative expectation is that the leader only manage the organization's "familiar modes of existence," changing nothing. Without articulating this expectation even to themselves, stakeholders may strongly wish that the leader have no leadership qualities at all other than to serve as a screen for their transference projections and to direct people and resources to serve stakeholders in the manner to which they are accustomed. The fact that mere management of familiar modes of existence will "lead" to the failure of the organization lies beyond the awareness or concern of some stakeholders, who have only their own needs in view, and who may hope that they will be buried from the church before any changes come.

A leader who does not lead in a certain direction in response to the crises of church and culture is avoiding conflict. He is almost certainly working overtime to keep peace with all voices and all forces. An obsession with making peace may have complex roots in the psychology of the head officer; this paper will not digress to explore them. As to the necessity of a leader's actually leading, however, it is incontrovertible that organizations must adapt to continual changes in their environments. Some changes arrive suddenly and urgently, some move at the speed of world-historical change. Failure to lead in a certain direction means the "leader" has been taken hostage, whether by issues, events, or personalities.

Effective leadership always meets resistance, for one or both of two reasons. Sometimes the leader fails to gain adequate support and must re-design the plan. Sometimes, however, the least mature members of the organization block any new direction not out of concern for the mission of the organization, but from fear of losing power, attention, and control.

On most Sundays from the very beginning of my work in the Buffalo church, I included one new hymn in the worship celebration—not more. After one service, a man with a long tenure in the church gruffly asked me. "Why are we singing these new hymns?" I told him that younger adults expressed strong appreciation for them. "Who is in the majority here, Pastor?" he retorted. "You are, sir," I said, ending that debate. Soon, he joined a small cabal seeking an end of my service, and I was the more certain that the new songs needed to keep coming—and that I needed to keep in touch with him and his group. Meeting resistance and experiencing sabotage are part of the job of a leader. What is hospitality toward the pastor as she moves toward a certain goal?

For those with courage for it, hospitality involves awareness of the dynamics of emotional triangles and of the positive effects of self-differentiation (also called "individuation") in any relational system, including one's own family. In the work of the late rabbi and organizational systems thinker Edwin Friedman, members can find precise guidance for raising their own consciousness about hospitality as defined here. In the following excerpt from his posthumously published *A Failure of Nerve*, Friedman identifies "four major similarities in the thinking and functioning of America's families and institutions . . . which . . . are at the heart of the problem of contemporary America's orientation toward leadership:"

> ▪ *A regressive, counter evolutionary trend* in which the most dependent members of any organization set the agendas and where adaptation is constantly toward weakness rather than strength, thus leverag-

ing power to the most passive-aggressive and anxious members of an institution rather than toward the energetic, the visionary, the imaginative and the motivated.

■ *A devaluation of the process of individuation* so that leaders tend to rely more on expertise than on their own capacity to be decisive . . .

■ *An obsession with data and technique* that has become a form of addiction and turns professionals into data-junkies and their information into data junkyards. As a result, decision-makers avoid or deny the emotional processes within their institutions and within society itself. . . .

■ *A widespread misunderstanding about the relational nature of destructive processes in institutions* that leads leaders to assume that toxic forces can be regulated through reasonableness, love, insight, and striving for consensus. It prevents them from taking the kind of stands that set limits to the invasiveness of those who lack self-regulation.[†] [*emphases* in the original]

In service to hospitality toward the clergy, consider how these common "orientations toward leadership" weaken the mission of the church and the effectiveness of the pastor. Start with Friedman's blunt characterizations of some of an organization's stakeholders as "the most dependent," as "passive-aggressive and anxious," as "toxic forces," "invasive," and "lacking self-regulation." Some readers, especially in churches, will feel awkward with these descriptors, not so much because they see themselves[††] thus identified but because it seems counter to the spirit of love in church culture to think openly and plainly about fellow Christians in such terms. (Private complaints among friends always seem like another matter, though they really aren't.)

Church development strategist Tom Bandy, a mentor with whom I worked closely in Toronto, characterized the church value of extreme niceness as "a cult of harmony." That harsh label rips the band-aid off, so let us confess: Yes, church people, lay and ordained alike, often so prioritize harmony over all other values of church mission that we allow power to flow toward any one who disturbs the harmony, even with unacceptable behaviors, hoping to appease him so the church can get back to harmony. Bandy told us to prepare: "When you lead, some on your governing board are bound to worry, *We're going to lose members!* That's the wrong worry. The problem is not that the church will lose members; in fact, you should agree on that point. The problem is the church council has not asked *which* members they are willing to lose—those with hopes fixed to the past—a few—or those whom we have not yet met, the whole future?" When a leader's direction is frustrated, hospitality includes sober-minded evaluation of whether it was a flawed plan that needs re-working, or whether hostage-taking is underway . Then what?

Friedman's second observation above runs straight against a strong current in organizational life, namely, telling the leader, "We need to call in the experts." That call, to which the leader may herself may be prone, all but instantly converts the leader into a hostage, if not of opponents, then of the whole tangled emotional ball of yarn which the group, unled, is devolving into. Self-differentiation (or individuation) is the strong direction the leadership needs to understand and take. Individuation has several distinct qualities.

1) It is a process never finished, never crowned, but its rewards are always available to be opened for the benefit of others as well as oneself. It is not just for identified leaders, but for anyone who intends to help lead an organization forward.

2) Under pressure to decide any matter, leaders take stock of their inner temptation to get out of the jam by drawing closer with one side and distancing from another. Only those who are aware of temptations to get satisfaction and avoid conflict in these ways are able to *not* act on

---

[†] Friedman, Edwin. *A Failure of Nerve*, pp. 12-13 (New York: Seabury Books, 2007)

[††] NB: Those in thrall to their emotional neediness cannot see their neediness. Seeing it means the thralldom is ending.

those temptations, but to "self-differentiate."

3) The differentiating leader learns to focus her central values, what she stands for, what she will stake her reputation on.

4) He communicates what he stands for to all stakeholders in ways they can understand, according to their levels of maturity. He does not hire an expert to study and find out what must be done, but rather relies on his own (growing) "capacity to be decisive."

5) When some members express negative feelings toward the leader for the stand she has taken (or even for no reasons made clear), the self-differentiating leader accepts that pain, and makes clear to hurting, angry members that she remains in touch with them, emotionally.

This is the balance sought by individuating leaders—becoming who you are, more and more clearly while maintaining emotional connection with all members including any who react against you. "Preserving self in a close relationship," writes Friedman, "is the universal problem of all partnerships."[†]

Among Friedman's observations, above, he singles out as an obsession the insistence on getting and studying more data—no, more!— before making a decision. Why are we addicted to getting and analyzing data? Try the hypothesis that we junkies use data as an avoidance mechanism. Fixating on data swallows immense quantities of time and energy in what the culture dubs meaningful and important work. Thus can leadership avoid the hard work of attending to self-differentiation and decision making inside the emotional field of relationships.

Finally, Friedman asserts that reason and seeking consensus and being loving and warm cannot bring about a shift in a power struggle which is driven by the emotional needs of the most anxious, least mature members. Assessing the causes of psychological and emotional neediness in those who lack self-regulation is not in the scope of this paper. Neither is such armchair psychologizing helpful for the organization or for those who want to offer high-consciousness hospitality to the pastor. Rather, working at self-differentiation, decisiveness, and staying emotionally connected with all stakeholders are the behaviors that prevent or close out the siege of a leader taken hostage, so the organizational mission can go forward.

By considering the opposite condition—that is, when a leader *fails* to self-differentiate—the necessity of these behaviors to organizational health comes into relief. When people fail to "preserve self in a close relationship," they merge with the other. We characterized the desire to merge with the other as a temptation because giving up one's own identity and purpose may beckon as a release from conflict and unwanted responsibilities, and may bring tenders of security and affection. In marriages and families, which are the smallest of all organizations, temptations to merge one's identity with another member occur in ways which outsiders can readily perceive. When members can hardly distinguish between their own needs and the demands of others upon them, their relationships are "enmeshed" or "triangulated."

Triangulation occurs when a member (usually unconsciously) needs to establish his own value by drawing closer in one relationship while distancing himself from another. The ubiquitous phenomenon of cliques within larger groups can best be understood as the crystalliza-tion of triangulation, as individuals shore up self-esteem by getting closer with these and more distant from those. Friedman spent his whole professional career identifying consequences for leaders in studying, and in failing to study, the triangles they are part of:

[†] Friedman, p. 8

> The stress on leaders . . . primarily has to do with the extent to which the leader has been [triangulated in] the relationship of two others . . . The way out is to have the two persons [take responsibility] for their own relationships, or to have the other person [take responsibility] for his or her problem, while still remaining connected. [†]

Emotional triangles are the fact of life in organizations. They cannot be avoided. Where "A" has a relationship with "B" and each also with me, my ways of relating with "A" will *always* have effects on "B," and vice-versa and in every combination thereof. This is a fact.

> Emotional triangles have both negative and positive effects on leaders. The negative aspect is that they perpetuate treadmills, reduce clarity, distort perceptions, inhibit decisiveness, and transmit stress. Their positive aspect is that when a leader can begin to think in terms of emotional triangles and map out . . . diagrams of the organization, such analysis can help explain alliances of the difficulties being encountered in motivation or learning . . . Thus, the concept of an emotional triangle provides a way out of gridlock [for it] describes clearly how self-differentiation can be a more powerful influence on others than any one technique or method for moving them forward.[††]

Bearing in mind the need for leaders to self-differentiate and to stay connected with the people, neither isolating themselves from conflicts nor taking refuge in supportive cliques, we can conclude this examination of the practice of courageous hospitality toward clergy.

Where strong transference needs are not controlling perceptions of the pastor, no surprise will attend the assertion that the clergy are not fully realized, not fully mature human beings. No one is. Moreover, any particular clergy person may stand at any point along a continuum of greater and lesser maturity and self-differentiation—and may sometimes grow a lot and very fast, and sometimes not at all through many years. Naturally, church officers and especially search committee members will hope their pastor is a mature leader, able to manage the responsibilities and risks of leadership. A search team is well-advised to probe candidates' experiences with self-differentiation, conflict, and staying emotionally connected with members, regardless their levels of self-understanding and self-regulation. A candidate's verbal account of experiences with any of the matters discussed in this paper can offer a search team a depth of understanding which no resumé can touch.

When the leader has begun the work, however, the time for mere hope is past; the time for hospitality as high-level consciousness begins. Conflict will come, when the leader leads. If he or she does not lead, hospitality means helping the pastor experience both her intra-personal need and the organizational need to move in a certain direction. When conflict manifests, hospitality involves encouraging the leader not to isolate herself, nor to take refuge in a welcoming clique, but to take a stand. The courageous tender of hospitality of this kind requires in turn that the member who offers it be likewise engaged in self-differentiation in his own family, in her own emotional triangles within the church as well as at the work. Near the end of *A Failure of Nerve*, Friedman pens words that serve perfectly as a coda for this paper, for hospitality involves accompaniment through pain.

> Leadership through self differentiation is not easy; imbibing data is far easier. Nor is striving or achieving success as a leader without pain: there is the pain of isolation, the pain of loneliness, the pain of personal attacks, the pain of losing friends. That's what leadership is all about."[†††]

May all who are called to lead with the mind of hospitality "stand therefore, and fasten the belt of truth around your waist, and put on the breastplate of righteousness." (Ephesians 6:14)

[†] ibid., p. 220

[††] ibid., p. 206-207

[†††] ibid., p. 233