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Abstract

What is Servant Leadership, Really? This question has pondered leadership theorists for more than a decade, ever since Robert K. Greenleaf’s (1991) *The Servant as Leader*. This paper using a bricolage approach to incorporate various quotes into convergent thought, espouses that the problem has been the erroneous concept that Servant Leadership is a *means*, rather than an *end*. Servant Leadership is *not* a means. It *is not* a new paradigm, a new leadership style, or a new philosophy. Rather, it is the *condition, state or quality* of the lead of the Servant *as* leader, a lead that *occurs* only when there is a convergence of the life calling of the individual and the organization – prompting the individual to be *naturally* motivated to accept the paradoxical role of Servant *as* Leader; a role from which *none* are exempt.
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Introduction

What is Servant Leadership, Really? This question has pondered leadership theorists for more than a decade, ever since Robert K. Greenleaf’s (1991) *The Servant as Leader* – causing many to be misled in its interpretation and application. The problem has been the erroneous concept that Servant Leadership is a *means*. Servant Leadership is *not* a means. It is an *end* – although not an end in and of its self. Rather, it is to be construed as a *result*, not obtained by direct intention, but realized “to the extent to which [we] commit ourselves to something beyond ourselves, to a cause greater than ourselves” (Frankl, 1968, p. 9). The great preponderance that has occurred is due, in large part, to the fact that Greenleaf’s essay was written poetically – to induce thought, rather than provide instruction. Frick (2004) says that “reading it reminds one of
Robert Frost’s answer to Bob when he asked the great poet about the meaning of his poem *Directive*. “Read it and read it and read it, and it means what it says to you”” (p. 282). In fact, we might look to Greenleaf’s source of inspiration – Herman Hesse’s *Journey to the East*, and construe that it, too, was written to induce thought – a parable of sorts. This literature review – while drawing upon the works of Greenleaf, Hesse, Maslow, Frankl, Millard, and others, seeks to show that Servant Leadership truly *means what it says to you* – as this relates to individual and corporate life calling; and that its essence can only be realized in the world when its nature is known and understood through individual meaning, purpose, and potentiality – through the role of servant *as* leader.

**Servant Leadership**

Servant Leadership has been identified, defined and/or referred to as a leadership style, a paradigm, and most recently – as a philosophy. Servant Leadership, however, is none of these.

*What Servant Leadership Isn’t*

*Servant Leadership is not a style.* Servant Leadership was never meant to be a style – a particular *way* of doing something. If we determine that the term *leadership* is defined as the condition, state or quality of the lead of the leader; we can then understand servant leadership as the condition, state or quality of the lead of the servant *as* leader. In *Servant as Leader*, Greenleaf (1991) shares the stories of three men who were esteemed to have actively served and led. The stories – accentuating the persuasion of John Woolman, the authenticity of Thomas Jefferson, and the conceptualization of Nikolai Frederick Severin Gruntvig, illustrate “very different types of leadership for the common good” (p. 25). Greenleaf suggests they serve “as models to be studied closely” but advises that we should
study them not to copy the details of their methods but as examples of highly creative men, each of whom invented a role that was uniquely appropriate for himself as an individual, that drew heavily on his strengths and demanded little that was unnatural for him, and that was very right for the time and place he happened to be (pp. 26-27).

Servant Leadership is not a paradigm. Daft (2005) defines paradigm as “a shared mindset [italics added] that represents a fundamental way of thinking about, perceiving, and understanding the world” (p. 8). We stated earlier that servant leadership is the condition, state or quality of the lead of the servant as leader. It is circumstantial and time specific. Understood as such, it becomes obvious that servant leadership cannot be defined as a mindset – “a way of thinking that determines somebody’s behavior and outlook” (Soukhanov, 2001, p. 918) because leadership, as heretofore defined, is the outcome – the end result(s) of a mindset.

Servant Leadership is not a philosophy. Philosophy is defined as “a precept, or set of precepts, beliefs, principles, or aims, underlying somebody’s practice or conduct” (Soukhanov, 2001, p. 1089). Greenleaf (1991), himself, alluded to a philosophy of sorts when stating that “a new moral principle is emerging” (p. 4). However, he did so in reference to a principle “which holds that the only authority deserving one’s allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader” (p. 4). It is clear from this statement that he was not referring to the principle as servant leadership but as a belief in the type of authority deserving allegiance. And, while all leaders hold to a philosophy or worldview that undergirds his/her practice or conduct as a leader, that philosophy is not one and the same as the condition, state, or quality of the leader’s lead supported by that philosophy.

What Servant Leadership Is
Spears (1998) writes in *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-leadership* that “servant-leadership is defined as “the use of gifts and talents on behalf of all of us in a way that models what we can be and empowers us to try,” and [that] it is rooted in the Scriptures” (p. 300). Spears’ definition is accurate to the extent that it describes, more than completely defines, servant leadership. This author suggests that servant leadership is much more profound, defining servant leadership as follows:

Servant Leadership is the condition, state or quality of the lead of the Servant as Leader which arises naturally when an individual positively responds to their personal life calling.

Servant Leadership is World Changing Leadership.

What can be interpreted from the above definition of servant leadership is that it can only be realized to its fullest potential when an individual positively responds to their personal life calling. In this sense, servant leadership is akin to self-actualization and as such, “also belongs to the class of phenomena which can only be obtained as a side effect and [is] thwarted precisely to the degree to which [it is] made a matter of direct intention” (Frankl, 1968, p. 8). Frankl goes on to say that while “self-actualization is a good thing…man can only actualize himself to the extent to which he fulfills meaning. Then self-actualization [or, in this case – servant leadership] occurs spontaneously; it is contravened when it is made an end in itself” (p. 8). In other words, as this understanding is applied to servant leadership, we can see that it is not achieved by seeking after it as if it were a prize to be gained. Rather, it is something to be realized in the being, not gotten in the doing, although doing is a necessary part of the process. “Being precedes doing” (Ministry in Daily Life, n.d., p. 7). And, meaning precedes being (Frankl, 1968).

Spears (1998) interprets “Frankl [to] say that the most basic need for any human being is “the call of a potential meaning waiting to be fulfilled”” (p. 260). This interpretation is incorrect,
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however. While it is true that Frankl (1968) considered meaning to be the essence of man’s existence, he did not interpret this to be a need. In *Psychotherapy and Existentialism: Selected Papers on Logotherapy*, Frankl (1968), referencing Freudian and Jungian psychology as each pertains to human motivation and mankind’s inferred need or drive to reach a tensionless (or homeostasis) state, writes that

> this is precisely the reason why I speak of a *will to meaning* [emphasis added] rather than a need for meaning or a drive to meaning. If man were really driven to meaning he would embark on meaning fulfillment solely for the sake of getting rid of this drive, in order to restore homeostasis within himself. At the same time, however, he would no longer be concerned with meaning itself but rather his own equilibrium and thus, in the final analysis, with himself (p. 8) which is a form of self-idolization.

The will to meaning, according to Baxter and Bowers (1985)

> refers to the tension [understood as a place of paradox] between being and meaning. The tension bridges one’s meaning orientation (what one is) and meaning confrontation (what one should be). Once meaning orientation turns into meaning confrontation, freedom becomes responsibility. People are responsible for fulfilling the meaning of their personal lives. People are also responsible before something or to something, be it society, or humanity, mankind or their own consciences (p. 70).

Thus far, we have defined servant leadership, noting that it is understood as the condition, state, or quality of the lead of the servant *as* leader; and given premise to the fact that it is not obtained by direct intention, rather, it is realized “to the extent to which [we] commit ourselves to something beyond ourselves, to a cause greater than ourselves” (Frankl, 1968, p. 9) and that this cause is discovered when we allow ourselves to be in a place of paradox long enough to
confront meaning and transcend our being; thus allowing our calling to flow out of our essence. But, is this conceptualization really in keeping with Greenleaf’s (1991) work? In answer to this question, we will begin where Greenleaf ends his writing in *The Servant as Leader* and continue through each aspect of our conceptualization: human motivation, meaning, paradox, and calling.

Greenleaf (1991) begins his essay, *The Servant as Leader*, as follows: “Servant and Leader. Can these two roles be fused in one real person, in all levels of status or calling?” He states affirmatively – “yes to both questions” (p. 1). Greenleaf then shares the story of where the idea of Servant Leader came from – Herman Hesse’s *Journey to the East*. What is interesting, and often overlooked by readers, is that at the end of this essay Greenleaf extends the response given at the essay’s beginning. His affirmative answer - to the question of whether the two roles of servant and leader can be fused – is given life – ironically, through Hesse’s own final paragraph used as Greenleaf’s closing lines. Greenleaf sets the stage:

Leo the servant, and the exemplar of the servant-leader, has one further portent for us. If we may assume that Herman Hesse is the narrator in *Journey to the East* (not a difficult assumption to make) [for] at the end of the story he establishes his identity. His final confrontation at the close of his initiation into the Order is with a small transparent sculpture, two figures joined together. One is Leo, the other is the narrator. The narrator notes that a movement of substance is taking place within the transparent sculpture.

‘. . . . I perceived that my image was in the process of adding to and flowing into Leo’s, nourishing and strengthening it. It seemed that, in time….only one would remain: Leo. He must grow, I must disappear.

As I stood there and looked and tried to understand what I saw, I recalled a short conversation that I had once had with Leo during the festive days at Bremgarten. We had
talked about the creations of poetry being more vivid and real than the poets themselves’ (p. 37).

Greenleaf (1991) closes his essay by asking: “Does not Hesse dramatize, in extreme form, the dilemma of us all?” He answers: “Except as we venture to create, we cannot project ourselves beyond ourselves to serve and lead” (p. 37). But how is this to be accomplished? What aspects comprise this conceptualization of servant leadership? The answer is that individuals will only serve naturally in the role of servant as leader when they have realized or are realizing their full potential through motivation, paradox, meaning making, and life calling. We will consider how each of these distinct aspects – when operating collectively - generate servant leadership.

**Servant Leadership Realized Through Motivation**

When comparing servant leadership with Maslow’s self-actualization – one could easily believe that they are a very similar, if not identical, phenomenon. Stretton (1994) states that self-actualization meant more to Maslow than the vague concepts of fulfillment. He described his conception of it as an ideal state of being whereby all the higher purposes meld, “flowing into one” with personal motivation. He [Maslow] describes it thus: “At the level of self-actualizing, many dichotomies become resolved, opposites are seen to be unities and the whole dichotomous way of thinking is recognized to be immature. For self-actualizing people, there is a strong tendency for selfishness and unselfishness to fuse into a higher, superordinate unity. Work tends to be the same as play, vocation and avocation become the same thing. When duty is pleasant and pleasure is fulfillment of duty, then they lose their separateness and oppositeness...” (p. 148).
Chalofsky (2003) states that self-actualization is a state whereby “people are devoted to a task, vocation, or calling that transcends the dichotomies of work and play” (p. 71). They “direct their lives in accordance with their underlying motivations” (Hamel et al., 2003, p. 3); and their potential is always a matter of choice (Maclagan, 2003). Self-actualizing individuals occupy a place of paradox, a place which Haaland (1987) says is “a familiar description…common to leaders in organizations” (p. 245).

**Servant Leadership Realized Through Paradox**

Spears (1998) writes that in our efforts to understand servant-leadership, we constantly work within the tensions of its inherent paradoxes, which we naturally wish to resolve for our own comfort. To use Greenleaf’s terms, we generally react as operationalizers rather than conceptualizers who accept a certain amount of ambiguity. As a result, servant-leadership runs the risk of being misunderstood through reductionism to make it “easy” (p. 354).

Reductionism is man’s way of seeking to reduce tension. Frankl (1984) warns us, however, that it is a dangerous misconception to seek a tensionless state. Instead we should take comfort in the words of Peck, as quoted by Dent (2003):

if a concept is paradoxical, that itself should suggest that it smacks of integrity, that it gives off the ring of truth. Conversely, if a concept is not in the least paradoxical, you should be suspicious of it and suspect that it has failed to integrate some aspect of the whole (p. 129).

Dent (2003) goes on to say that “paradox has been at the core of religious traditions for millennia…with over 280 paradoxes found in the Bible…[as published] in a collection by Franck in 1534” (p. 129). Since ancient times, paradox has been represented and understood by the mandorla – a
“symbol of two circles coming together, overlapping one another to form an almond shape in the middle” (The Mandorla, n.d., p. 1). Johnson (1993) has this to say about the mandorla:

The mandorla is the place of poetry. It is the duty of a true poet to take the fragmented world that we find ourselves in and to make unity of it….All poetry is based upon the assertion that this is that. When the images overlap, we have a mystical statement of unity. We feel there is safety and sureness in our fractured world, and the poet has given us the gift of synthesis (p. 103) – what Maslow refers to as “dialectical synthesis” (Heylighen, 1992, p. 43).

“Great poetry makes these leaps and unites the beauty and the terror of existence. It has the ability to surprise and shock – to remind us that there are links between the things we have always thought of as opposites” (Johnson, 1993, pp. 102-103). Greenleaf (1982b) understood this place of poetry. In The Servant as Religious Leader, Greenleaf shares one of [his] most interesting experiences…[while] at [his] alma mater, Carleton College. It was “in the early fall of 1969, just before the opening of school” (pp. 49-50). Greenleaf recalls the event:

the part that stands out in my memory now is that I read them E. B. White’s essay, “The Second Tree From The Corner.” This concerns a man named Trexler in a routine session with his psychiatrist. The interview deals with Trexler’s fears and a question that the doctor repeatedly pressed, “What do you want?” In the course of the session Trexler turns the question on the doctor, “What do you want?” And the doctor, caught short, stammers, “I want a new wing on my house on Long Island.”

When I finished reading, [I told the students that I felt that White] wrote his [poetic] essay to set the stage for two paragraphs at the end in which Trexler, as he walks down the street from the doctor’s office, muses on the question, “What do you want?” I
then reread those two paragraphs (see Appendix A). [Afterwards,] there ensued two hours of the most interesting – and exciting – discussion I ever listened to. I didn’t say a word. Just listened” (Greenleaf, 1982b, pp. 50-51).

Greenleaf (1991) understood paradox. Integration of the whole is something that he spoke of often, yet he did not diminish the fact that “seeing things whole is not always comfortable” (Frick, 2004, p. 101). Frick states that “those who are willing to dig deeper understand the inherent spiritual nature of what is intended by the pairing of servant and leader. The startling paradox of the term servant leadership often serves to prompt new insights” (p. 329).

It is important for the reader to understand and to grasp at this point that Greenleaf (1991) bridged the terms servant and leader with the term as. The significance of this is that when read – servant as leader – the focus is on servant, not on leader, which has been the error of so many in the leadership field. It is a grave error, one that has inadvertently misaligned efforts to apply servant leadership in the workplace. It is an error that Greenleaf vehemently tried to circumvent from happening, as Frick (2004) recalls:

When Bob worked with Paulist Press to collect his servant essays and other writings into a book, he wanted the title to be The Servant as Leader, the same as the lead essay, but the publisher vetoed him calling the book Servant Leadership: A Journey Into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness. Bob thought the title Servant Leadership was a step backwards…stating, “because you have to come back to what an individual can do” (p. 290).

This author agrees and suggests that we get back to the core of servant as leader – the individual who “is servant first….sharply different from the person who is leader first” (Greenleaf, p. 7).
Servant Leadership Realized Through Meaning Making

Meaningful work is not just about the meaning of the paid work we perform; it is about the way we live our lives. It is the alignment of purpose, values and the relationships and activities we pursue in life. It is about living our lives and performing our work with integrity. It is about integrated wholeness (Chalofsky, 2003, p. 80).

Frankl (1968) writes that “man is responsible for the fulfillment of the specific meaning of his personal life” (p. 12) and that which he is called to fulfill “is something beyond himself, it is never just himself” (p. 11).

As each situation in life represents a challenge to man and presents a problem for him to solve, the question of the meaning of life may actually be reversed. Ultimately, man should not ask what the meaning of his life is, but rather we must recognize that it is he who is asked. In other words, each man is questioned by life; and he can only answer to life by answering for his own life; to life he can only respond by being responsible…[this] responsibleness [is] the very essence of human existence (Frankl, 1984, p. 114).

We should not, then, be hesitant about challenging a man with a potential meaning for him to fulfill. It is only thus that we evoke his will to meaning from its state of latency (Frankl, 1984, p. 110). “Ultimate meaning necessarily exceeds and surpasses the finite intellectual capacities of man…What is demanded of man is not, as some existential philosophers teach, to endure the meaninglessness of life, but rather to bear his incapacity to grasp its unconditional meaningfulness in rational terms (p. 124).

Man’s search for meaning is a primary motivation in his life and not a “secondary rationalization of instinctual drives. This meaning is unique and specific in that it must and can be fulfilled by
him alone; only then does it achieve “a significance which will satisfy his own will to meaning” (Frankl, 1984, p. 105).

**Servant Leadership Through Life Calling**

Frankl (1984) tells us that “one should not search for an abstract meaning of life. Everyone has his own specific vocation or mission in life to carry out a concrete assignment which demands fulfillment” (p. 113). “The English word “vocation” comes from a Latin root, “vocare” which means “to call” (Weis, Hall & Haughey, n.d., p. 6). Basically, a vocation is what people believe they are called to do with their lives. Millard (2004) defines life calling as “a confidence in an overriding purpose for your life based on a conviction that your life has foundational value, unique design as an individual, and a personal vision that leads you to take action in response to the needs of the world” (p. 1). “When you begin the journey of your life, you are seeking fulfillment by searching for your dream. As your dream becomes real – manifested by your deeds – it is your dream in the end that seeks you out” (Gunn, 2001, p. 13).

“From the perspective of Ignatian Spirituality, we find our vocation by engaging the world and reflecting on how that engagement elicits fundamental desires to heal, serve and create” (Spohn, 2003, p. 11); notably, terms used by Greenleaf (1991) in reference to the servant leader in his first essay (pages 27 and 15, respectively). Spohn goes on to say that because God’s Spirit speaks through both the realities and the gifts of the individual vocation, vocation arises from this interaction of faith and justice, and the heart and the world. This understanding of vocation is captured in the words of Herman Hesse: “There are many types and kinds of vocations, but the core of the experience is always the same: the soul is awakened, transformed, or exalted so that instead of dreams and
presentiments from within, a summons comes without: a portion of reality presents itself and makes a claim” (p. 11).

The practice of faith and justice locate our sense of calling in the real world, rich with possibilities and fraught with brokenness. Without the light of faith and honest awareness that we have been gifted by God, the world’s needs can seem an overwhelming burden. Without knowledge of the actual conditions of the world, our talents and aspirations can be wasted, sadly on mere success (p. 13).

“What we end up with,” according to Spohn, “is not a road map but a compass” (p. 12).

Servant as Leader

Who is Servant Leader?

Greenleaf (1991) states that “the servant-leader is servant first….begin[ing] with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead” (p. 7). He follows this description with a continuation of the same thought and then offers the “best test…. do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants?” (p. 7).

What we understand from Greenleaf’s statement and from the presentiments in this literature review is that the proper focus is, and should always be, on servant as leader, not leadership.

“For [Greenleaf], a servant is not a “service provider,” a martyr or a slave, but one who consciously nurtures the mature growth of self, other people, institutions, and communities…. done in response to the deepest guidance of spirit, not for personal grandiosity” (Frick, 2004, p. 5). And, just as there is no master plan for living, “there is no master plan for living as a servant-leader” (Frick, p. xvii).
Servant as Leader Realized Through Individual and Corporate Discovery

The guiding principle – that we must discover and serve our purpose – resonates powerfully with Spears (1998) and this author. It also had a strong appeal for Greenleaf (1991) who viewed it as “something to strive for, to move toward, or become… Those who would be servant-leaders must take the journey within to discover their personal purpose” (Frick, 2004, p. 259). It is through the inner journey process that we identify and establish our worldview, our beliefs and values, and identify our purpose – allowing us to become “engaged [in] community [as a] follower who periodically assume[s] a [leader] role” (Douglas, 2005, p. 6) – the role of servant as leader– a role from which none are exempt. And this call to “purpose is not the exclusive province of individuals….organizations that intend to endure and excel must also embark on a journey to discover the reason for their existence” (Spears, 2003, p. 259).

So, how do organizations “operationalize” servant leadership? Not by trying to implement it as if it were a systemized program – another gimmick, as was Greenleaf’s (1991) concern. What is needed, cites Millard (2004), are “organizations where people discover their unique purpose in life and where the leaders value and ma[k]e use of their unique people” (p. 4). It is the responsibility of all within an organization but primarily “the challenge [rests with] the human resource professional. To be the catalyst for the empowering organization of creative, autonomous and self-motivated people” (Gold, 1980, p. 248). Gold also denotes that “human resource management of a new class of autonomous, actualized workers will require personal understanding and that….the human resource professional has no choice but to be themselves leaders in self-actualization” (p. 248).
Conclusion

Throughout this literature review we have dispelled the problem long facing servant leadership – the preponderance of its definition and practical application – not only in the workplace, but in the world. This was achieved by first identifying that servant leadership is not a new paradigm, leadership style, or philosophy. We have, instead, provided a definition that leaves it less abstract than that which was purported by Greenleaf (1991), while retaining the beauty and truth of it as that which can only be realized by individual acceptance in the role of servant as leader. We understand that it is not lived out as a means, but rather it is an end, and this not attained by direct intention. We have resolved that servant leadership is the condition, state or quality of the lead of the Servant as Leader which arises naturally when an individual positively responds to their personal life calling. Servant Leadership is World Changing Leadership. We conclude by concurring with Greenleaf regarding what really matters:

“…people finding their wholeness through many and varied contributions [to] make a good society [with the understanding that] able servants with potential to lead must lead and, where appropriate, they must follow only servant-leaders. Not much else counts if this does not happen” (p. 35).

“So my search shall bear fruit – not in final accomplishments on which I shall rest – but in ever widening horizons. My satisfaction shall derive from the contemplation of these horizons and in the satisfactions that accrue from expanding my powers to explore them. Life then is growth; when growth stops there is atrophy. The object of the quest is the capacity to grow, the strength to bear the burden of the search and the capacity to live nobly – if not heroically – in the situations that develop” [italics added] Robert Greenleaf (Frick, 2004, p. 109).
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Appendix A

Greenleaf at Carleton College

Greenleaf (1982b) tells of a time when he addressed young potential leaders at Carleton College:

I read them E. B. White’s essay, “The Second Tree From The Corner.”…White, I felt, wrote his essay to set the stage for two paragraphs at the end in which Trexler, as he walks down the street from the doctor’s office, muses on the question, “What do you want?” I then reread those two paragraphs.

It was an evening of clearing weather, the Park showing green and desirable in the distance, the last daylight applying a high lacquer to the brick and brownstone walls and giving the street scene a luminous and intoxicating splendor. Trexler meditated, as he walked, on what he wanted. “What do you want?” he heard again. Trexler knew what he wanted, and what, in general, all men wanted; and he was glad, in a way, that it was both inexpressible and unattainable, and that it wasn’t a wing. He was satisfied to remember that it was deep, formless, enduring, and impossible of fulfillment, and that it made men sick, and that when you sauntered along Third Avenue and looked through the doorways into the dim saloons, you could sometimes pick out from the unregenerate ranks the ones who had forgotten, gazing steadily into the bottoms of the glasses on the long chance that they could get another little peek at it. Trexler found himself renewed by the remembrance that what he wanted was at once great and microscopic, and that although it borrowed from the nature of large deeds and of youthful love and of old songs and early intimations, it was not any one of these things, and that it had not been isolated or pinned down, and that a man who attempted to define it in the privacy of a doctor’s office would fall flat on his face. Trexler felt invigorated. Suddenly his sickness seemed
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health, his dizziness stability. *A small tree, rising between him and the light, stood there saturated with the evening, each gilt-edged leaf perfectly drunk with excellence and delicacy. Trexler’s spine registered an ever so slight tremor as it picked up this natural disturbance in the lovely scene. “I want the second tree from the corner, just as it stands,” he said, answering an imaginary question from an imaginary physician. And he felt a slow pride in realizing that what he wanted none could bestow, and what he had none could take away. He felt content to be sick, unembarrassed at being afraid; and in the jungle of his fear he glimpsed (as he had so often glimpsed them before) the flashy tail feathers of the bird courage*” (pp. 50-51).


I leave the reader to speculate on why those two paragraphs spoke with such meaning to those student leaders. Two of my own speculations are: IDEAS [the mystery of which we are all a part] – one can find health amidst sickness, and strength amidst weakness [each, paradoxes], ideas, that nourish hope; and LANGUAGE that is powerful and beautiful, that lifts the spirit” [language that goes into the depths of a man’s soul] (Greenleaf, 1982, p. 52).