Spirituality, Ethics, and Leadership

By Walter Earl Fluker

Known as an expert in the theory and practice of ethical leadership, Fluker explores the inner core of our social lives as leaders, contending that “spirituality demands that leaders cultivate and nourish a sense of self that recognizes the interrelatedness of life or a sense of community” in practical, everyday encounters. Through an introspective journey of understanding ourselves through facing “the other,” Fluker challenges readers to think about the dynamic relationship among spirituality, ethics, and leadership.

Discussions of spirituality cover a broad and increasingly complex spectrum of beliefs, practices and approaches within and beyond traditional religious circles. For our purposes, spirituality refers to a way or ways of seeking or being in relationship with the other who is believed to be worthy of reverence and highest devotion. In this definition, I am concerned with the other as inclusive of both individuality and community. The other is not impersonal, but intimately related to who I am and who I become. According to Emmanuel Levinas, the other has a face – and the face of the other is the foundation of ethics and the origin of civil society. Beyond our private quests for meaning and authenticity, we are connected to others. Indeed, in order to be fully human and ethical, we must “face the other.”

I encounter the face of the other in everyday life but also in its strangeness and transcendence, in its force of obligation and interdependence. James Hillman writes, “The Other’s face calls upon my character. Rather than thinking my character shows in my face and that my face is my character exteriorized…character requires the face of the Other. Its piercing provocation pulls us from every possible ethical potential. In bad conscience we turn away from the face in the wheelchair, the face of the beggar; we hood the face of the executed, and we ignore the faces of the socially ostracized and hierarchally inferior so that they become ‘invisible’ even as we walk down the same street.”
The human face is also the face that is hidden and present for me in all its power and meaning. Indeed, in its deepest expression it is spiritual – in the heat of passion and desire, lovers face one another; in courtrooms, victims face their assailants; in reconciliation, the penitent child faces a forgiving parent; and in reverence and conviction, the devout faces the God she serves. But in the final analysis, spirituality requires that we face ourselves – our stories and memories. The face invites me to revel in memory – my own memories and in collective memory as diverse and beautiful as the world. If such a face were to visit me, I would understand that I am not alone, unrelated neither to history nor to memory.iii

In C. S. Lewis’s classic retelling of the story of Cupid and Psyche, Till We Have Faces, the dying Queen Orual remembers her sad story and comes to the great realization that Psyche, the sister she envied because of her beauty and Cupid’s love for her, was never the problem that she faced. Nor was it the faceless stone gods in the temple who needed faces. Rather, she first had to see her face, which she despised, before she could see the god’s. In the end, she discovered that her face and the face of Psyche were one and the same, mirroring the mystery of all that was and is to come. How can the gods speak to us face to face till we have faces? And how shall we face ourselves until we have faced the other?iv

Spirituality involves facing the other as we face ourselves. This experience of facing the other reveals the deep longing and yearning to be in unity with ourselves. The following meditation from my journals speaks to this dimension of facing the self:

I am climbing the mountain with Him who has invited me to come. He is climbing as though there were nothing to it. He must know the mountain well; he seems to like the climbing itself. My joints ache and I have the wrong attitude for climbing. I am fussy and absorbed in myself – my struggles, my pain, my loneliness, my likes and disappointments. I have not noticed that he is really tired, too – but for Him the journey is non-negotiable.

I fear that tomorrow I will awaken from this sleep and will curse myself for being so easily deluded, smooth-talked into making this climb, knowing my temperament and deep feelings about such things. “I am a mother hen!” “There I go again. Stop it! Just climb!”

“I believe I shall see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.” “The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.” “I would have fainted if it had not been for the Lord.”

“Now faith, hope, love abide – but the greatest of these is love.” “I believe in the universal church, the resurrection of the body…I believe in God the Father Almighty, creator of heaven and the earth…I believe all mountains are illusions and only faith says that we have arrived.”

“I believe that the Transfiguration is completed not when we arrive at the top of the mountain, but when we come down.”

“Maybe today, I will see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living…maybe…if I continue to climb.”

I am climbing the mountain today. I am alone with the Alone. Who then is this fellow-traveler? His face is very familiar. I must become better acquainted with him if I am to continue this journey. Friend, tell me, who are you? And what is your name?
Spirituality is also a discipline that places emphasis on practice – spirituality is something that we do. Prior to any act of cognition, spirituality has to do with the practical, day-to-day encounter with the other; the other being both friend and stranger, comrade and opposer, individual and collective, divine and demonic. In its active, dynamic expression, spirituality is life-generating and disfiguring.

Using these indicators, spirituality can be viewed from three perspectives: 1) formal notions of spirituality that are related to established religions; 2) informal notions of spirituality that are "self-actualized" or self-defined by individuals or small groups that may or may not be associated with an established religious institution; and 3) philosophical or ethical notions of spirituality related to values and perceived goods, (e.g. truth, beauty, justice, etc). I also use these three categories as heuristic devices that provide lenses through which to look at the vast landscape of a developing literature that incorporates ideas, beliefs and practices from an array of traditions and perspectives – health, science, technology, politics, business and education.

Spirituality plays a key role in the development of ethical leaders. Moreover, spirituality demands that leaders cultivate and nourish a sense of self that recognizes the interrelatedness of life or a sense of community. A sense of community refers to the larger extended ecological sphere made tangible by nature, defined as the universe and the cosmos, but in its final essence, it is spirit.

This idea of spirit finds resonance with Peter Paris’s definition of spirituality in the African context, (i.e., spirituality is never individualistic, but is part of a larger sphere of unity that is diverse in its dynamics and character). “The spirituality of a people,” he writes, “refers to the animating and integrative power that constitutes the principal frame of meaning for individual and collective experiences.”

For Robert M. Franklin, spirituality refers to “a person’s sense of identity in relation to other people and that which is conceived as ultimate concern. Rooted in spiritual identity are a person’s fundamental values, moral commitments, and ability to engage in ethical reasoning. Spiritual health is reflected in a person’s ability to trust and care for others.” In summary, spirituality demands that we face the other, personally and collectively – and in facing the other we are transfigured and transformed and called to the larger quest of building community in the world.

Spirituality is the core of the inner and social lives of ethical leaders. It informs the relationship between the private and public spheres of leadership at the intersections where worlds collide. How then do leaders utilize spirituality as a resource in making fitting ethical decisions in the various contexts and situations that lead to transformation of powerful, intransigent systems?

The relationship among spirituality, ethics, and leadership is important because leaders in many public venues are increasingly turning to approaches that emphasize some form of spirituality as an authoritative source in making decisions that impact the lifestyles, attitudes, and behaviors of many people, especially in the areas of education, government, health, science, and business. Often these appeals to spirituality fail to address the larger ethical questions of justice, equity and truth-telling that are raised in public life.
They also speak to the role that spirituality and ethics will increasingly play in the development of leadership for the future. A significant challenge for the next generation of leadership is the increasing promotion and advancement of science, technology and business to serve the interests of human development and the environment. The changes produced by this triumvirate have already resulted in a significant upheaval in society, the meaning of life, intelligence, and work. For example, there is a growing movement within non-profit and for-profit sectors to incorporate ethical principles and practices pertaining to issues of transparency, diversity, trans-cultural dynamics, sustainability, the environment, and human development. Increasingly, large corporations, think tanks, and political leaders are relying upon spirituality as a form of human resource development to address these larger structural issues.

Finally, in order for a just civil society to exist, persons in responsible leadership roles must make decisions based on ethical guides. For historically marginalized peoples, the relationship of spirituality, ethics, and leadership is most urgent. With the long-range economic, political and social costs of war, a troubled market economy and rapid advances (crusades) in technology, science, and global democracy, we now have the makings of a social anarchy that threatens the very foundations of our social purpose. The impending catastrophic fallout of the present situation will have far-reaching negative consequences for the least of these, those whom the late Samuel DeWitt Proctor called “the lost, the left-out and left behind.”

At a deeper level, however, there is a spiritual malaise, a nihilistic threat promoted by the predominance of a utilitarian individualism that appeals endlessly to therapeutic remedies that begin and end with self. Who will lead in the 21st century? Better yet, how shall they lead? Who will go for us, and whom shall we send? For answers to these questions, it is instructive to inquire regarding fundamental assumptions of ethical theory and how these inhere in our construction of spirituality and leadership.
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