

University of Richmond

UR Scholarship Repository

Honors Theses

Student Research

1998

King David : God's annointed one : a study of leadership theory through analysis of King David

Chris Headley
University of Richmond

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Headley, Chris, "King David : God's annointed one : a study of leadership theory through analysis of King David" (1998). *Honors Theses*. 1227.

<https://scholarship.richmond.edu/honors-theses/1227>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Research at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshipprepository@richmond.edu.

King David

God's Anointed One

A study of leadership theory through analysis of King David

By

Chris Headley

Senior Project

Jepson School of Leadership Studies

University of Richmond

Richmond, Virginia

May, 1998

King David God's Anointed One

A study of leadership theory through analysis of
King David

Chris Headley
Senior Thesis
Dr. Ciulla
Monday, April 13, 1999

I pledge that I have neither given nor received any unauthorized assistance
during the completion of this work.



Chris Headley

Preface

The intention of this text is to examine Biblical leadership principles. Because this author believes wholly in the full Divine Inspiration of the Bible, these principles are deemed, in this text, to be accurate, appropriate, and applicable to the daily lives of leaders. The leadership principles of the Bible will not be evaluated by outside texts regardless of current academic leadership thought.

Introduction

In the study of leadership, this new field finds itself drawing information from nearly every other field of study. History, psychology, sociology, and philosophy are just a few. In a few instances, leadership studies have begun to grow into the area of religion. Books such as Zen Lessons have begun to initiate a discussion on the role of religious texts in the continued pursuit to study leaders, followers, and the systems which govern their actions.

What surprises me most about current leadership literature is that few of them ever refer to a source of wisdom which has been a book of directions for millions of people for thousands of years; the Holy Bible. Most interesting is the fact that many of today's current leadership principles find their basis in basic Judeo-Christian doctrine yet never reveal their source.

To be completely honest, there are also some Biblical principles which may contradict current leadership theory. In order to examine the intricacy of Biblical leadership, I have examined the major life events of King David, from rise to fall. In each section, there is an analysis of his actions from both a Christian and a secular perspective. Also, I have attempted to draw

basic conclusions about Biblical Leadership in each of the circumstances.

Leadership: Born or Bred

The age old leadership debate rages on among current leadership scholars. Are leaders born with their abilities or are their abilities learned: nature versus nurture. Some scholars believe that true leaders must be born with their abilities; that leadership is somehow a genetic trait. Others are vehement supporters of the idea that leadership is something that everyone can be taught. A third, and even more provocative, idea comes from God's selection of David to be king. What makes God's selection process so interesting is that it is not limited to His choosing of David, but is an unusual process that can be seen throughout Scripture.

David's selection as king was a replacement decision made by God Himself. We hear from the prophet Samuel that God was extremely disappointed in the current king, King Saul. God had previously appointed Saul as the leader of the Jewish people. God blessed Saul's reign with many military successes and it appeared that God's original intentions were to allow Saul to reign as king for many years.¹

In the process of obeying God's commands, Saul went to war against the Amalekites. The direct order from God was to "utterly destroy" the

¹ I Samuel 15:11-12

Amalekite army. In the Hebrew, “utterly destroy” literally means to “put under a ban,”² and a ban involved devoting cities, persons, animals, and other possessions to the Lord God for destruction according to the Law in Deuteronomy 7:2-6, 12:2-3, 20:16-18.³ Saul disobeyed this command by allowing Agag the king of the Amalekites to live and by allowing his soldiers to keep the best of the spoils from the battle.⁴

It was for this reason that God made the decision to choose a new king for the nation of Israel. He sent His prophet, Samuel, to the family of Jesse the Bethlehemite to find a king from among Jesse’s sons. As each son was presented to Samuel, the Lord told him that that one was not His choice. After the sons which Jesse thought Samuel might be interested in were presented, Samuel questioned, “Are these all the children?”⁵ Jesse’s response was that there was one more but that one was the youngest and in the eyes of the world, the least likely choice for any sort of leadership position.

²Strong’s Dictionary of Biblical Terms

³Ryrie Study Notes, I Samuel 15:3

⁴ I Samuel 15:9

⁵ I Samuel 16: 11

David was the name of the youngest son and God's choice to become the new king; the least likely of the choices. The natural choice was Jesse's oldest son, Eliab, whose appearance was enough to make Samuel believe that he was the Lord's choice, but, as the Lord stated to Samuel upon the recognition that Samuel believed Eliab was to be the choice for king:⁶ "Do not look at his appearance or at the height of his stature, because I have rejected him for God sees not as man sees, for man looks at the outward appearance, but the Lord looks at the heart."⁷

God's process for selecting David as a new leader teaches us three principles about both the selection process for a leader and the source of leadership ability. First, God has specific leader for each specific purpose. The Lord God Almighty is omnipotent and omnipresent which means that he was able to recognize that Saul would eventually fail at his task and that God was powerful enough to select a different leader if He had wanted one. In this selection process, it is clear that God had a purpose for David but God had a leadership purpose for many others. Samuel is another example of a leader who was selected by the Lord for another leadership purpose; to prophesy to His people and to assist Him in the selection of leaders.

⁶ I Samuel 16: 1-6

⁷ I Samuel 16:7

Second, not only must we recognize that God has planned for a specific person to be the leader for each particular situation, we also clearly learn from this passage that God's choice for a position may not always be the most obvious choice and may not be the most logical choice. For example, Samuel was one of God's chosen prophets, yet even he was fallible to the point of seeing Eliab as God's obvious choice for the new king of Israel. From Eliab's appearance, Samuel thought that "Surely the Lord's anointed is before Him." In other words, Samuel, judging purely from Eliab's appearance, thought that Eliab was the obvious choice to be the Lord's new chosen leader. God, on the other hand, chose the least likely person from the world's point of view simply because of the heart that David had for the Lord.

It was the heart that David had for the Lord which makes the third, and probably most important, point. God desires leaders to have a heart for Him and Him alone. Here, the Lord makes it accurate and apparent that He has chosen David because of his heart and not because of his qualifications. Look to the Ten Commandments:

1. You shall have no other gods before Me.
2. You shall not make for yourself and idol.
3. You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain.

4. Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy.
5. Honor your father and your mother.
6. You shall not murder.
7. You shall not commit adultery.
8. You shall not steal.
9. You shall not bear false witness.
10. You shall not covet.⁸

The first four of the Ten Commandments deal with a person's heart towards God. He desires all people to have a heart for Him and Him alone; especially His appointed leaders as we see with David.

God insists that people understand Him with heart knowledge rather than just head knowledge. The difference is difficult to explain. In God's choosing of David to become the next king, He said that He looks not at the outside of men, but at the heart. The heart appears to be in direct contrast to the outside, or everything that is superficial. That is to say that God is primarily concerned with our reasons for action. When we act, are we doing so out of a desire to please Him or is it because of another reason? God wants for all actions to be directly related to our love for Him as indicated by the first four Commandments.

⁸ Exodus 20:1-17

God's Word in the Secular World

Note: While God's Word can easily be defined within a Christian context, it continues to have extensive meaning even when secularized. While the lessons that the Bible provides may seem contrary to current theory, it provides a provocative contrasts on leadership theory. The purpose of this section in each main part is to interpret the meaning of these Christian leadership lessons into lessons for the non-Christian leader.

In the choosing of David to become the future ruler of Israel, God had a specific person in mind. He sent Samuel on a search to find this new leader and God told Samuel that He would help him to know who this new leader was to be. In the process of searching for Israel's new king, Samuel learned that God has very specific guidelines for leader selection which still apply today. In the secular world, God's process of leader selection could be beneficial to anyone looking to fill an empty leadership post with the right person for the job.

First, for every leadership position or need, there is a specific person who is best suited for that purpose. In the case of David, God sent Samuel in search of a very specific person. God prescribed which house Samuel was to go to and even the person that Samuel was to select. Despite Samuel's desire to select the most powerful leader from his standpoint, God knew

that there was only one person who could do the work the way that God had intended for it to be done.

It is the same way today. Many leadership positions open and are filled everyday. Sometimes, the right leader is found. Other times, a mistake is made when choosing the leader. There are typically more than one person who is qualified to fill the position but only one can be the best for it. For example, when the Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond began its search for a new Dean, there were literally thousands of options for filling the position. The Search Committee could have chosen a qualified person within the University, a qualified person outside of the University, or another Dean or administrator from another school.

At points along the way, the committee was frustrated by the large number of options. Many resumés were seen. Some were completely unqualified for the position, others were qualified and could have easily handled the post of Dean of the Jepson School. However, the committee went forward on the premise that God set when He selected David. There are plenty of qualified people, but only one person can be the best. The committee sought to select the best rather than the acceptable.

Second, the leader of choice for a particular situation is not always the

most obvious one. In the case of David, Samuel was searching for a powerful man and warrior who could return victory to Israel. Yet, David was a small, young boy, not a mighty warrior. God had plans that even a wise prophet such as Samuel could not understand; plans that did not make sense in his mind.

Returning to the selection of a new Dean, one finds a similar situation. When the Search Committee felt that they had found their choice for the position, John Rosenblum, they brought him before the entire school's student population. Each person present listened carefully as Dr. Rosenblum, who at the time was the Dean of the Darden School of Business at the University of Virginia, described his vision for the Jepson School if he were to be hired as the new Dean.

Dr. Rosenblum was very well versed and educated but there were several concerns about his education. First, his education was in business and some of Dr. Rosenblum's vision for the Jepson School was biased by his knowledge of business school operations. Students were quickly concerned because the Jepson School was intended to be something very different from a business school. Second, it was made known that he, unlike the former Dean, would probably not have time to teach classes. Being a very small school, the Jepson School had become very accustomed to its Dean teaching

from time to time and enjoyed that level of intimacy with the faculty and staff.

Despite all of these two specific concerns about the new choice, the Search Committee moved to recommend John Rosenblum for the position which he later accepted. Dean Rosenblum has had great success at the Jepson School and has quickly learned that a leadership school is very different from a business school. While the Dean has not taught any classes, he has maintained a level of intimacy by desiring personal office visits. Dr. Rosenblum was not the obvious choice for the position, but he has proven to be the best one.

The third and final lesson from the selection of King David is that the right leader for a job must have a heart for it. In the earlier discussion of heart, the argument was made that “heart” is a person’s desire to be in a particular position or situation because of the right motives. God was most pleased with David because he had a heart for God. Everything that David did was because of his desire to love and please God.

Today, we should desire for our leaders to have a heart for what they are doing. In Leadership Studies, one often attempts to differentiate between leadership and management. According to this lesson from David, heart is another distinguishing factor. God wants for His leaders to have a

desire to love Him and to serve others. We desire the same of our leaders. Truly excellent leaders, simply because of their love of the position and of people, attempt to do the very best job that they can.

This is the very essence of leadership. Leaders are successful at what they do because they are concerned with how their performance affects other people. They have a heart for the people and the position which, in turn, gives them the desire to be successful through innovation. Managers do not necessarily have heart for either their people or their position. They are not concerned with how their performance affects other people, but how other people's performance affects them. Their concern is how to get other people to achieve a level of performance which makes them look successful as managers. We will see in future lessons from David that as his heart changed, he changed from operating in the mind-set of a leader to operating as a manager.

Empowerment: Power from God

David had been chosen by God to be the new king. In order for that to take place, Saul had to be removed from His position and God had a plan even for that process. In David, we see that God chooses people who might not necessarily be suitable for a particular leadership position. How and why would God chose a seemingly unqualified person for a task? Because God was planning on enabling David to achieve His plan despite what conventional wisdom might have said at the time. It was a faith-walk for both David and God. God had chosen David and was placing His belief that the person He had chosen was capable of completing any task with His help. David had to rely on the fact that God would help him in times of need. In modern leadership language, one might call this empowerment. God has an interesting way of empowering people. We have seen from David that God chooses whomever He pleases regardless of their qualifications. How will God make use of an unqualified person? We see the answer to that question in David's battle with Goliath.

At this point, King Saul and his army are suffering greatly in battle against the Philistines. The Philistines had a great warrior by the name of

away because they do not fit properly and he does not have enough time to fix them. David approached Goliath with only sticks, a slingshot, and some smooth stones. As Goliath approached, David fired a stone into the forehead of the Philistine and it sunk into his head. After Goliath fell, David took Goliath's sword, killed him, and then cut off his head.¹³

With the idea that God chooses leaders for specific tasks comes three parts to God's form of empowerment. First, God does not empower those whom he has not chosen for the task. Throughout this story of David and Goliath, we see thousands of Saul's army personnel, who are completely qualified to fight, refuse to battle the Philistine's Champion. For forty days, not one other person was willing to attempt battle with Goliath despite the fact that he daily entered the Israeli territory and taunted them to come into battle against him.

Second, God does empower those whom he has chosen for the task. David and Goliath are typically misused as the story of the underdog versus the bully. In human terms, that may be the case, but in God's terms, Goliath did not even have a chance. When God chooses the person He has for a task, then He also empowers them to complete that task. David was small, without armor, poorly armed, and hardly trained; yet he accomplished

¹³ I Samuel 17: 27-52

his task quickly and easily. David knew that God would empower him to win because God had done so before in tasks for which he had been previously chosen. David had “killed both the lion and the bear” and he knew that “this uncircumcised Philistine will be like one of them, since he has taunted the armies of the living God.”¹⁴ David’s previous calling was to tending the herd and in that position, his job was to protect the sheep. Even then, in what seems to be a menial task, God empowered David to complete it by giving him the ability to fight away wild animals. David knew that God was faithful and that God would never leave him alone to complete a task to which he had been called.

A third and final point of empowerment is that God empowers to complete any task as long as it is the one for which a person has been chosen. For years prior to this battle, David had been a simple shepherd and while he was staying with Saul’s army, he was a servant to Saul.¹⁵ In all things, God give the strength to prevail.

While David was a simple shepherd, God gave him the power to be a shepherd, nothing more, nothing less. When God chose David to be the new king, yet told him that he would be subject to Saul until the proper time,

¹⁴ I Samuel 17: 36

¹⁵ I Samuel 17: 17-19

God gave David the power to be a servant to Saul. When the time eventually came for David to become king, God empowered David to rule a nation with strength and mercy.

God's Word in the Secular World

God had chosen this young boy to become King of Israel and empowered him to accomplish the task for which he had been chosen. God empowered David to do whatever needed to be done at any particular point along the way. This is not to say that David was immediately given the power to be king. God did not give David the power to become king for 15 years from the time that God first chose him. This allows us to draw several conclusions about modern leadership.

First, as any leadership scholar would agree, leaders must be empowered to complete their task and likewise they must empower others. God gave David the knowledge and the courage to defeat Goliath. Likewise, leaders must give other leaders and followers the knowledge and the power to complete the task to which they have been assigned. Followers of a leader must also be willing to give their support to their leader which is a form of empowerment.

For an example of empowerment, one can look to the military; specifically during the Gulf War of 1990. General Norman Schwarzkopf was given the power by then President George Bush to attack Iraq's troops which were occupying Kuwait. Not only was he given the power or authority to accomplish his task, but the General was also given the

knowledge. He had information from intelligence sources, media, and his own forces. He had information from the president detailing exactly what he had the authority to do. In other words, the General was equipped or empowered to accomplish what he had been ordered to do. Leaders in all walks of life should be empowered in this same fashion.

Second, leaders must be empowered to accomplish a specific task. In the case of David, God empowered him to accomplish each task as he came to it. David was able to defeat Goliath when the time came for him to do so. He was able to evade Saul during the time when he was being chased. He was able to take his place as king when Saul was defeated. David could not have become king at the time when he defeated Goliath. He simply did not have the support of the people or any claim to the throne at that time. He had not been empowered by his leader, God, nor his followers, the people of Israel, to take the throne.

It is in this same way that leadership empowerment should work today. Leaders should be given the knowledge and power that they need when they need it. Giving power or knowledge before the leader is ready may result in disastrous effects. Leaders who are not yet ready to deal with a particular situation may jump quickly to attack a problem which they are aware of because of knowledge but have not yet become empowered to

accomplish. Had David attempted to take the throne immediately when God told him that he would eventually become king, David would have found himself put to death for treason.

In the case of the Gulf War, the General was not given the power or the knowledge to take over the entire country of Iraq. That was not the intention of the United States nor the United Nations. Had the General attempted to accomplish more than he had been empowered to do, then the war may have had a different outcome.

All in God Time

In today's society, we rely heavily on completing tasks as quickly as possible. Deadlines require us to work on projects within a time-frame set by an authority figure. We work towards meeting these deadlines as quickly as possible. God desires for His work to be accomplished according to His time-schedule, regardless of how it fits into the world's perception of accomplishment. Sometimes God even uses a schedule which appears to be contrary to His purposes as with David's long ascent to the Throne.

In the sixteenth chapter of I Samuel, God declares that He has a new successor to the throne of Israel and that Samuel will help to search out that person and deliver the message to him. Samuel found David and he informed him that he was to be the next king of Israel. David then involves himself in several battles for Saul, including the battle with Goliath, and brings great success upon Saul's kingdom. Despite all that David did for Saul, Saul despises David because of jealousy and false rumors that spread about David's desire for the throne.¹⁶

As Saul grew in suspicion of David's desire for the throne (a desire which never existed), Saul made several attempts on David's life. Nearly 10

¹⁶ I Samuel 18:5-9

chapters of I Samuel are dedicated to Saul chasing David in an attempt to kill him. Throughout this time, David has several opportunities to kill Saul and accept the throne which God had promised him, but David responds: “As the Lord lives, surely the Lord will strike him, or his day will come that he dies, or he will go down into battle and perish.”¹⁷

David recognized two things about God and his desire for Godly leadership. The first is that God works in His own time. Leaders must recognize that sometimes this means that there is an appearance of failure. David waited and ran from Saul for nearly 20 years before receiving his place as king. He clung to God’s promise to raise him up as king and did not attempt to speed the process along by killing Saul. In David’s own words, he understood that the Lord had control over Saul’s life and that he would die sooner or later, either by battle or by natural death. David knew that when that day came, he would become king.

Secondly, earthly leaders are Godly followers. This is a combination concept from everything else that has been learned from David to this point. God empowers leaders here on earth; however, He is the true source of leadership. God has a purpose and a plan for every moment in time. While the years in which Saul remained king appear to have been a waste of God’s

¹⁷ I Samuel 26: 9-10

time, God still had a purpose. It was during that time that David was able to hone his fighting skills. During this time, David learned a great deal of battle command experience (he led between 400-600 men during that time), he honed his fighting experience, and he continued to gain respect as a warrior throughout Israel.¹⁸

¹⁸ I Samuel 26:1-31:13

God's Word in the Secular World

There are two short points that are made by God's slow development of David from shepherd to king. The first is that once a leader has been chosen and empowered, we must give them the time to accomplish the task. The time from when God told David that he was to become king and the time that it took for him to become king was approximately 20 years.

Today, we are so obsessed with time that we often give our leaders all of the tools necessary to complete a task with the exception of time. Time is a commodity and an asset just as much as knowledge or power. Without enough time to accomplish the task, it can never be completed. This seems to be a rather obvious point that is being ignored by the world today.

The second, and again, obvious point is that time is not subject to leaders but leaders are subject to time. David could have done very little, if anything, to speed his ascension to the throne. The events which would eventually lead to his becoming king could not be controlled by David, but those events were actually controlling David.

Likewise, today's followers and leaders often forget that time is a controlling factor. Events and situations change which can change the amount of time that a task requires. People's ability or inability to complete smaller tasks which are a part of the larger task affect the total

amount of time a complete task requires. Leaders require flexibility to complete a task in the best fashion possible, not the least amount of time possible.

Leaders as Teambuilders

In today's pluralistic society, bringing together groups of people has become more and more difficult. When two or more groups or individuals are in opposition and must be brought together, leaders are often charged with the seemingly impossible task. David was one such leader who was charged, not with bringing together two groups, but twelve; the twelve tribes of Israel. God promised David that he would make him the ruler over all of Israel. To fulfill that promise, God had to help David unify Israel following the fall of King Saul.

During Saul's reign, he was working to bring Israel together as one nation. Saul never saw his task completed because God chose to remove him from power before all of the tribes could be brought together. After Saul's death, David was charged with putting Israel back together and completing the unification of Israel.

Following Saul's death, Israel was broken into all twelve of the tribes of Israel. Some of the tribes were angered at the death of Saul and placed the blame for his death upon David. David reacted by killing the man who claimed to have murdered Saul, as required by the Law, and taking a day to honor the death of Saul. During this day, David was seen in "lament" at the

death of Saul and his son Jonathon. David went so far as to write a poem detailing his pain at the death of God's Anointed One for Israel.¹⁹

The various tribes were pleased to see that David was deeply saddened at the death of Saul. Because of David's honor and proper reaction to the death of Saul, the five of the six tribes that were not under Saul's command chose to accept David as their ruler and this laid the foundation for David's rise to king.²⁰

Immediately following David's anointment as King of Judah (one of the tribe groups), he continued to follow the Law and the code of honor with concern to the death of Saul. When David found that one of the additional tribes had buried Saul, he sent a messenger to Jabesh-gilead to thank them for burying Saul. This was another act of honor which increased David's perception by the people who were continuing to give greater respect to him each day.²¹ This later allowed this tribe to join David as well.

Also during this time, Saul's son Ish-bosheth was ruling over much of his father's former kingdom, although one of Saul's army commanders also

¹⁹ II Samuel 1: 11-27

²⁰ II Samuel 1:17 - 2:4

²¹ II Samuel 2: 4-7

was controlling a portion by using Ish-bosheth as a figurehead. As David's following grew stronger, the two divisions of Israel began to battle and a civil war began. In the end, David used an improper method to bring the remaining tribes together with him. He formed alliances with them by taking a concubine from each of their leaders and continuing his marriage with Saul's daughter Michal.²² This was one of the first times that we see David disobeying God; however, David continued to honor God in all other ways for many years. This did, however, set the scene for the David's later sins that would again destroy a kingdom.

In essence, David's method for bringing together very different people groups was to follow the Law. He honored all of those peoples by simply being understanding, courteous, and honorable. He did what was right in all things with the exception of the concubines (which ironically, despite the fact that the Law forbade multiple partners, accepting concubines from other rules was considered in that time to be extremely honorable²³). David accomplished his task of unifying a diverse nation simply by recognizing each tribe's needs and satisfying those needs with honorable and reasonable actions.

²² II Samuel 3: 1-5

²³ Ryrie Study Notes, II Samuel 3: 7

God's Word in the Secular World

Leaders often find themselves in situations which require team building. As the concept of teamwork continues to grow within the corporate culture of the United States, leaders must assemble teams and then prepare them to work together in order to implement or create a policy.

What can be seen in the lesson of David's unification of Israel is that he slowly began to show his personal honor toward each group. It was the respect that David had for each of the groups that allowed them to come together. It should also be noted that in the process of bringing together these groups, David never bowed to them out of obligation but rather responded to them with sincerity. What this means for today's leaders is not that sincerity will always bring together a group of people. What it does imply is that sincerity and honesty are at least the beginning of the path to teambuilding.

The Bathsheba Syndrome

The story of David and Bathsheba is among the most recognized narratives from the Old Testament. King David was at home in Mount Zion during the springtime and the time of battle. One night, David awoke from his sleep and decide to take a walk around the roof of his house. As he was walking, he spotted a woman bathing in a courtyard of her home below. He was very attracted to this woman so he sent a message to her that he would like for her to come up to his house. She responded to his advances and they had sex.²⁴

Shortly after, Bathsheba informs David that she is pregnant. David's response is to bring her husband home from battle and send him home to have sex with his wife so that he will think that the child is his. Unfortunately for David, Bathsheba's husband, Uriah, did not think it appropriate for him to leave the troops for two nights to sleep with his wife. Because Uriah refused to go home to his wife, David plotted a plan to send him to the front line in terrible battle so that he might be killed. This time, David's plan was a success.²⁵

²⁴ II Samuel 11: 1-5

²⁵ II Samuel 11: 6-17

Shortly after David's success at killing Uriah, the Lord sent Nathan to David so that David might recognize what he had done. Nathan told David a story of a rich man who stole from a poor one. David was furious after hearing the story until Nathan revealed that the story was about David himself. David had everything yet he went after that which one poor man had. David was ashamed and recognized his sin.

God's Word in the Secular World

This story is full of rich information concerning the pitfalls of being a successful leader. First, David falls prey to disconnection with the followers. He no longer feels that he must work together with the followers but that he is capable of giving orders from afar. In this story, David's problems begin with this lack of interaction with his followers. David "sent Joab and his servants with him and all Israel, and they destroyed the sons of Ammon and besieged Rabbah. But David stayed at Jerusalem."²⁶ David was simply not where he needed to be. All of the other men of Israel who were capable of fighting were on the battlefield. It was springtime and spring was a prime-time to attack because of the good weather and the bountiful amounts of food for war. Had David been where he was supposed to be, his opportunity for seeing Bathsheba that night would not have been possible.

Just as David lost his connection with his followers, so often do leaders of today forget about theirs. David's actions were no different than that of a management staff which fails to ask the workers on the factory floor how to better equip the factory for efficiency. Leaders need direct contact with their followers so that they can see and recognize what is happening at all levels.

²⁶ II Samuel 11: 1

Second, David fell prey to a lack of morality. To begin, David was walking on the roof of his home when he saw Bathsheba taking her bath. It was well within his ability to look away or to find somewhere else to walk so that he might not be looking at another man's naked wife. It should be noted that David was the one being immoral despite the fact that Bathsheba was bathing in an outside bathtub. Bathsheba's home was oriental and the enclosed courtyard where she was bathing was considered another part of the house. It was simply understood during that day that you were not to look in on another person's courtyard if your home was at a higher elevation.²⁷

Not only is sin or immorality a part of a leader's Bathsheba syndrome, but perpetuation of sin or wrongdoing is also a problem. David had looked into another person's home and watched the wife of another man take a bath. Rather than stop sinning following these events, David continues the sin by inviting her to his house and then having sex with her. Sin and immorality are not a part of God's plan or purpose. Each of these events led to one of God's direct commandments being broken. Throughout David's life, he lived so close to God, obeying His every word. In each case, God blessed that level of obedience with great success until finally David arrived

²⁷ Ryrie Study Notes, Matthew Henry Commentary - II Samuel 11: 2

at the pinnacle, King of Israel. As can soon be seen, just as God chose to bless David's obedience, so will his disobedience be handled with disapproval.

Immorality is unadvisable to any leader. Immorality is often looked upon by followers, such as those of David's, as so improper that the followers began to lose faith in the leader and begin to remove some of the power which they have granted to him. Also, immorality complicates any situation because immoral actions must be hidden in order to survive.

The fourth lesson of David's disobedience is his perpetuation of sin. He continues by trying to deceive Uriah into believing that the child is his. David enlists the help of his servants to lie to Uriah. Eventually, David plots a plan to kill Uriah so that he can marry Bathsheba. When one follows the course of events from the story of Bathsheba, it should be noted that the incident began with a misunderstanding. David accidentally saw down into the courtyard of Bathsheba. Unfortunately, it moved from an accidental glance into the courtyard, to watching the courtyard, to inviting her to the house, to sex, to lies, to murder. For the leader of yesterday and today, there is no place for immorality. One immoral step requires another and another until what was once a minor mistake becomes a major problem.

For today's leaders, it continues to be difficult to stop an immoral action once it has begun. Leaders often attempt to cover-up even accidental

mistakes in order to avoid criticism; however, the cover-up itself is an immoral action which often requires more improper actions to continue the cover-up or continued participation in the immoral act. The best advice for any leader is to cut off any and all improper actions as soon as possible and bring them to the attention of leaders and followers so that the problems can be addressed just as Nathan did with David.

Conclusions

There is a great deal that should be said to summarize what King David taught generations of people about leadership. Some of the lessons are solely Christian, others are very applicable to the secular world. In summary, David's actions revealed the following:

1. Leaders should be chosen to fit the task which will be their duty.
2. The leader for a particular task may not always be the most obvious choice so choose wisely and take plenty of time making decisions.
3. Choose a leader who has a desire (heart) to fill the position which you are looking to fill.
4. Empower your leaders to the best of your ability.
5. Empower leaders with the knowledge and power to accomplish the task to which they have been assigned.
6. Give your leaders time to complete the assigned task (likewise, leaders give your followers appropriate time).
7. Leaders are subject to time and cannot be expected to meet time requirements at all costs (ie. including substandard work to meet deadlines).
8. Teambuilding requires honest and honorable people working toward a

similar goal of becoming a better team.

9. Leaders should try to avoid all forms of immorality as immorality looks bad for organizations and often lessens the power of the leader.

10. All who witness immorality should confront those responsible so that the damage of immoral actions can be minimized.

King David could be called one of the greatest leaders of all time. He brought together a nation which was completely separated and he did it all within his lifetime. This is not to say that he was perfect or that some of his methods were not unusual by today's standards. What I believe that is evident in David's life is that his lessons are practical and can be put into practice in any context. In the future, I look forward to seeing the Holy Bible used more often as a resource for leadership theory and principle.