October 1/2, 2016

The Complexities of Leadership

Courage to Lead Series

2 Samuel 3:1-39

Pastor Bryan Clark

Years ago when I was in seminary I had a few leadership classes—you know it was pretty straight-forward—they give you principles of leadership; we all read the same books; it's all kind of neat and tidy. Besides, I was going into the local church to lead. I mean, that's like heaven on earth! What could possibly go wrong? I remember being in my first church for about two months, coming home one day and saying to Patti, "I didn't know I signed up for all this!" I realized pretty quickly leadership is complicated. It's very complex; there are lots of moving parts; there are lots of things out of your control. And there's this sobering reality that there are many people's lives affected by the decisions you make. Over the years, one of the things I've figured out is there isn't much I can do to control people or all of the moving parts that create the circumstances in which you lead. Ineffective, poor leaders are leaders that consistently react. Good effective leaders are leaders that move beyond reacting and with character and integrity and compassion and kindness, but also with great skill, they learn how to thoughtfully respond. At the end of the story, it's not the people or the circumstances; it's the way the leader responds that will ultimately tell the story.

Well, that's what we want to talk about this morning. If you have a Bible, turn with me to 2 Samuel, Chapter 3. If you're visiting with us, we've been working our way through 2 Samuel. We're defining a leader as anyone who is serious about being a Christ-follower and wants to influence someone else for Christ. Where we are in our story, David is now king over one tribe—Judah in the South; Ish-bosheth, Saul's youngest son, is king over kind of a conglomerate in the North, referred to as Israel. The Philistines still have a significant presence up north in the land of Israel, and the nation is just really kind of hanging by a thread. Chapter 3, verse 1:

> **Now there was a long war between the house of Saul and the house of David; and David grew steadily stronger, but the house of Saul grew weaker continually. Sons were born to David at Hebron: his firstborn was Amnon, by Ahinoam the Jezreelitess; and his second, Chileab, by Abigail the widow of Nabal the Carmelite; and the third, Absalom the son of Maacah, the daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur; and the fourth, Adonijah the son of Haggith; and the fifth, Shephatiah the son of Abital; and the sixth, Ithream, by David's wife Eglah. These were born to David at Hebron.** (*NASB, 2 Sam. 3:1-5)

There is this civil war going on between the North and the South. Israel has the Philistines to deal with, as well as the Amalekites, the Ammonites, and the Moabites, and at this time is engaged in a civil war that could very well destroy the nation. David is gaining power; Ish-bosheth is losing power. Then it goes into a rather unusual paragraph about David's six wives and, then, six sons. Now one of the questions that comes up for us as contemporary readers is: what is the deal with multiple wives? I mean David is a man after God's own heart, and this just seems inconsistent with that claim. As a matter of fact, there's no question David is portrayed in this part of Samuel as being in tune with God—inquiring of God, walking with God—and he's presented in a way that's very pleasing to God, so it does create some confusion in our minds.

It's helpful to understand that in the ancient Near East, if you were a king, if you were wealthy or powerful, this was just extremely common. God doesn't condone it; it's not what God wanted; it's simply presented as what was actually happening. As contemporary readers we tend to often make this about sex but that isn't really what it was about at all. It was about creating a dynasty or a nation—we refer to it today as nation building. Well that is actually what they were doing—producing multiple sons through multiple wives so the king would create a family dynasty—successors. It was much more about that and survival than anything else. But it's also helpful to note that wherever it happens in the Old Testament, it always leads to trouble. It would be fair to say that those that had multiple wives never really experienced the intimacy and shalom at home that God intended. It just created unnecessary chaos again, and again, and again.

If you are familiar with the David story, as soon as we read that paragraph and see the list of sons, certain names immediately jump out because even though David has gone through very difficult times in the wilderness, the greatest moments of heartache and devastation that will come to David will come through the choices and actions of these sons. So there is significant trouble ahead for David. The point of the paragraph in our narrative, though, is to say David's kingdom was expanding. David was growing in power and that's contrasted with what's happening in the kingdom of Ish-bosheth. Verse 6:

> **It came about while there was war between the house of Saul and the house of David that Abner was making himself strong in the house of Saul. Now Saul had a concubine whose name was Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah; and Ish-bosheth said to Abner, "Why have you gone in to my father's concubine?" Then Abner was very angry over the words of Ish-bosheth and said, "Am I a dog's head that belongs to Judah? Today I show kindness to the house of Saul your father, to his brothers and to his friends, and have not delivered you into the hands of David; and yet today you charge me with a guilt concerning the woman. May God do so to Abner, and more also, if as the Lord has sworn to David, I do not accomplish this for him, to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul and to establish the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba." And he could no longer answer Abner a word, because he was afraid of him.** (Vs. 6-11)

So even though Ish-bosheth's kingdom is growing weaker, the text tells us that within that kingdom Abner is growing stronger. So then Abner supposedly sleeps with one of Saul's concubines. Now there are some who think this possibly was a false accusation but the way the text reads it seems unlikely. In the ancient world, to sleep with the previous king's wives or concubines was in essence to say, "I am the new king." It was a very open and public statement that you were taking over. So this isn't just Abner having a flirty little relationship with Saul's concubine and then having some sort of a relationship with her. This is a very deliberate move to say either, "I'm taking over the kingdom," or for all practical purposes, "I am in charge here." Ish-bosheth then calls him out on it, and Abner is deeply offended. Abner basically says, "After all I've done for you, it's because of me that you are king. I have been gracious and kind to Saul's family, Saul's friends and to the kingdom, and if it wasn't for me you wouldn't have anything." Basically then he says, "As a result of this, I have no alternative but to turn the kingdom over to David." There are a lot of scholars that think Abner had relations with Saul's concubine in order to elicit this response from Ish-bosheth, in order to create a legitimate reason why he's changing teams—and I think there's a lot of merit to that view. Clearly Abner was a mercenary. He was an opportunist and he understands Ish-bosheth and his kingdom are going down. David's going to win; he wants to be part of the winning team, so he seizes this moment to change sides. He kind of spiritualizes it—this is what God has wanted all along—and of course if he actually believed that, then why was he engaging in a civil war all these

years? But this is his moment, "This is what God wants; this is the right thing to do." He kind of packages it as something good and right and noble but it is interesting he does believe the kingdom is his to give away, and in all practical terms that is correct. Ish-bosheth is scared to death of Abner; he's not going to say anything. I mentioned last week, consistently Ish-bosheth is presented as somewhat of a fearful coward and that characterization of him certainly continues in this text.

> **Then Abner sent messengers to David in his place, saying, "Whose is the land? Make your covenant with me, and behold, my hand shall be with you to bring all Israel over to you." He said, "Good! I will make a covenant with you, but I demand one thing of you, namely, you shall not see my face unless you first bring Michal, Saul's daughter, when you come to see me." So David sent messengers to Ish-bosheth, Saul's son, saying, "Give me my wife Michal, to whom I was betrothed for a hundred foreskins of the Philistines." Ish-bosheth sent and took her from her husband, from Paltiel the son of Laish. But her husband went with her, weeping as he went, and followed her as far as Bahurim. Then Abner said to him, "Go, return." So he returned.** (Vs. 12-16)

So Abner sends a delegation to David and he offers to give the land. When he asks the question, "**Whose land is this**?" there are different opinions as to what he actually meant by that. But I think the most logical conclusion is he meant the land belongs to him. In other words, why would King David cut a covenant with Abner? Abner's not the king, but for all practical purposes, Abner was in charge. That's what he's saying, "It's not really the king's land; it's my land. I'll cut a deal with you." Literally the language is *cut a covenant*. Now David responds by saying, "It is good; let's do this thing." Now think about this if you are in David's shoes: This now begins the very difficult, complex decisions of leadership. Abner is a mercenary. There's a history between David and Abner. Abner is kind of a tricky guy; is he up to something? David's winning; Abner's losing. There's no need for this. Why not just react, take him out, and be done with it? But David also realizes there are thousands of lives of men, women, and children at stake, so rather than just reacting out of some of their past history, he's thoughtful; he's careful; he's skillful. If he can pull this off without more bloodshed, that is in everyone's best interest. So he says, "Let's do this thing, with this condition. You have to bring me Michal, Saul's daughter, and my wife."

If you were with us for the 1Samuel study, you remember how this story goes. Saul promised his daughter—his oldest daughter, Merab—to whoever defeats Goliath. David defeats Goliath and Saul gives Merab to someone else. So then Michal, his next daughter, falls in love with David and Saul says, "Tell you what. I'll give you Michal if you first go out and kill a hundred Philistines, and bring back a hundred Philistine foreskins, and we've got a deal." David brings back two hundred. Saul was sure David would die but David comes back victorious so he gives David Michal, his daughter. But very soon after that he basically declares David Public Enemy Number 1. David flees as a fugitive; Saul gives Michal to someone else. So now here you are and David is asking for Michal back. "We had a deal; I kept my part of the deal—she belongs to me."

Now, again the complexities of this are great. You see this sad, pathetic scene where poor Paltiel, who genuinely seems to love her—I'm sure they had children; they had a family—and he's devastated; he's brokenhearted. The king has just come in, taken his wife, and is giving her away, and you might say, "You know David is kind of a meany." This doesn't come off as being very compassionate and thoughtful and kind but this isn't an act out of David's emotion. This is a carefully thought-out strategy, because David understands that Michal, as Saul's daughter, makes him Saul's son-in-law which gives him a rightful claim to the throne in the eyes of the Benjamites and the Israelites. In other words, this is the basis by which they're going to accept David's right to the throne—to somehow end the civil war and bring about peace. David understands this is the

route, and so this is about strategically thinking through what is at stake. and how do we make this happen? The scene with Paltiel is sad, but again you are talking about the lives of thousands of men, women, and children at stake in these decisions, and David's trying to figure out: how do we bring Israel and Judah together without more bloodshed in a way that they can come together as one nation and move forward? So that's basically what's happening in that paragraph. Verse 17:

> **Now Abner had consultation with the elders of Israel, saying, "In times past you were seeking for David to be king over you. Now then, do it! For the LORD has spoken of David, saying, 'By the hand of My servant David I will save My people Israel from the hand of the Philistines and from the hand of all their enemies.'" Abner also spoke in the hearing of Benjamin; and in addition Abner went to speak in the hearing of David in Hebron all that seemed good to Israel and to the whole house of Benjamin. Then Abner and twenty men with him came to David at Hebron. And David made a feast for Abner and the men who were with him. Abner said to David, "Let me arise and go and gather all Israel to my lord the king, that they may make a covenant with you, and that you may be king over all that your soul desires." So David sent Abner away, and he went in peace.** (Vs. 17-21)

So Abner sits down and has a meeting with Israel—this would be the North—and he talks to the elders of Israel and says, "You know you wanted a king that would deliver us from the Philistines." If you go all the way back when they rejected God as king and wanted their very first human king, the specific request was, "We want someone who will deliver us from the Philistines." So now forty-some years later it comes back around. "David is God's man to deliver us from the Philistines." And then he goes to the tribe of Benjamin. Now this is a separate negotiation because the tribe of Benjamin was the family of Saul. The tribe of Benjamin is kind of like what we would say today, a "swing state". Benjamin went back and forth a little bit between the North and the South, but this was Saul's family and family members! This was very delicate negotiation but he convinces the Benjamites; he convinces the Israelites up north. He meets with David; David's on board, so they all come together. They have a meal that would be symbolic that the covenant has been cut—everybody's in. This is the beginning of a new day in Israel. As a matter of fact, there is this repeated statement that it ends **in peace**. David, with great skill, has brought the nation from civil war and the devastation they've experienced to the possibility of coming together, North and South, with no more bloodshed—together in peace to usher in a new day. Again, you have to understand the nation was hanging by a thread. If more civil war devastated the army, they would simply be wiped out by one of their neighbors. So everything here looks good...except...there's one significant player that hasn't been in on the deal. Verse 22: **And behold...**the purpose of the Hebrew here is kind of an "Oh no! Here comes Joab over the hill and he's not going to like this."

> **And behold, Joab came from a raid and brought much spoil with them; but Abner was not with David in Hebron, for he had sent him away, and he had gone in peace. When Joab and all the army that was with him arrived, they told Joab, saying, "Abner the son of Ner came to the king, and he has sent him away, and he has gone in peace." Then Joab came to the king and said, "What have you done? Behold, Abner came to you; why then have you sent him away and he is already gone? You know Abner the son of Ner, that he came to deceive you and to learn of your going out and coming in and to find out all that you are doing."** (Vs. 22-25)

So Joab has a history with Abner. If you remember from last week, Abner killed Joab's brother in battle. Joab is in charge of the security and the army in the South. He's in charge of the security of the king. David *had* Abner, so Joab is angry that he let him go. "You had him; what were you

thinking?" Notice the text again emphasizes **in peace**. Now Joab definitely does not trust Abner. In fact the Hebrew that's used to describe **Abner came to you** is almost identical to Ish-bosheth's claim that Abner went in to the concubine. It's kind of a clever way of saying he was up to something then; he's up to something now. It's a power grab. When it says **to deceive you**, the literal Hebrew is *to seduce you*. So it kind of has this tie—he was up to something before; he's up to something now; we can't trust him. It's easy to see why Joab would think that; he's got a history with Abner. Abner's a bit of a mercenary; Abner is going to go to the winning team; he very well may be up to something. But it's also true that Joab had a personal score to settle with Abner and at the expense of risking the lives of thousands of men, women, and children, he's determined to settle the score. Verse 26:

> **When Joab came out from David, he sent messengers after Abner, and they brought him back from the well of Sirah; but David did not know it. So when Abner returned to Hebron, Joab took him aside into the middle of the gate to speak with him privately, and there he struck him in the belly so that he died on account of the blood of Asahel his brother. Afterward when David heard it, he said, "I and my kingdom are innocent before the LORD forever of the blood of Abner the son of Ner. May it fall on the head of Joab and on all his father's house; and may there not fail from the house of Joab one who has a discharge, or who is a leper, or who takes hold of a distaff, or who falls by the sword, or who lacks bread." So Joab and Abishai his brother killed Abner because he had put their brother Asahel to death in the battle at Gibeon.** (Vs. 26-30)

So Joab, behind David's back, calls Abner back, takes him to the gate, wants to tell him a little secret mission, and stabs him in the belly. The Hebrew would be the exact same description of how Abner killed Asahel, so there's no question it's tying this to revenge. David finds out and David responds. David is so upset! He quickly announces that he and his kingdom had nothing to do with this. In the ancient world, especially in the Jewish world, there was a significant difference between killing in battle and cold-blooded murder—even different language. Asahel was killed in battle. Basically Abner did everything possible to avoid that but ultimately had no choice. What Joab did was simply cold-blooded murder, and it would have been considered wicked in the kingdom.

Now again, think about what is at stake here: Israel is engaged in a civil war and they're wiping each other out. In the best of times they could barely survive against the Philistines, and the Amalekites, the Ammonites, and the Moabites. If they continue to fight this civil war, they are going to be so weakened it is very possible they could be completely eliminated—other than the sovereignty of God. So the nation is literally hanging by a thread. David, through his skill as a leader, had brought the nation to a point of peace and unification without more bloodshed, but now Joab has put all that in jeopardy. If the North and Benjamin believe that they have been tricked and deceived by David in order to kill Abner, the kingdom is done. So David immediately responds and makes it clear he had nothing to do with what transpired with Joab.

Not stop and think about this: We live in a culture that is so divided in so many ways, and leaders are determined to defend the people on their team even when their team is doing things that are wrong. We spin the story. We put out things that aren't true. We change the subject. You have leaders that are simply unwilling to stand up and say, "What was done was wrong." If David would have led like that, it's likely the kingdom would have come crashing down. But David, with character and integrity, called out his own commander because what he had done was wrong, and he basically puts a curse—five different things on Joab and his family—as a statement that what Joab did was wicked and he deserved to be punished. Verse 31:

Then David said to Joab and to all the people who were with him, "Tear your clothes and gird on sackcloth and lament before Abner." And King David walked behind the bier. Thus they buried Abner in Hebron; and the king lifted up his voice and wept at the grave of Abner, and all the people wept. The king chanted a *lament* for Abner and said,

"Should Abner die as a fool dies?
Your hands were not bound, nor your feet put in fetters;
As one falls before the wicked, you have fallen."

And all the people wept again over him. Then all the people came to persuade David to eat bread while it was still day; but David vowed, saying, "May God do so to me, and more also, if I taste bread or anything else before the sun goes down." Now all the people took note of it, and it pleased them, just as everything the king did pleased all the people. So all the people and all Israel understood that day that it had not been the *will* of the king to put Abner the son of Ner to death. Then the king said to his servants, "Do you not know that a prince and a great man has fallen this day in Israel? I am weak today, though anointed king; and these men the sons of Zeruiah are too difficult for me. May the LORD repay the evildoer according to his evil." (Vs. 31-39)

Basically David, as a demonstration of his opposition to what Joab had done, creates a processional to honor Abner. He requires Joab and his men to lead the procession with all of the trappings of mourning and grief. He requires them then to take this walk of shame because of what they had done. David then follows the procession with weeping and mourning and offers this lament as a tribute to Abner. Basically what he says in the tribute is: Abner shouldn't have died this way. He wasn't captured. He wasn't put in prison. He didn't have handcuffs on, but rather he was just murdered in cold blood and David laments that Abner, as a warrior, died this way. The people come to David and say, "You know, you need to eat something," but David refuses to eat because of his mourning and grief over what's transpired.

Now there are two things that are happening here: One is, you might ask the question, "Why doesn't David just kill Joab because of what he's done?" The question is answered in the last verse of the paragraph—because even though David is king of Judah, he does not have the power to do that. Joab is a warrior; he's the commander of the troops. The people love and respect him. If he does that, he will start a civil war within Judah, so he's saying, "Even though I am the king, I'm not strong enough to do that." So basically David has pushed this as far as he can to demonstrate to the nation his disgust over what Joab has done—that he wanted no part of this—but in such a way that it doesn't create a whole new civil war within Judah. But also what's presented is: David is genuinely broken in grief and mourning over what has happened. This is not just some political stunt pretending to be sad to somehow get his agenda through. David loves these people. David loves Israel. He loves the North; he loves the family of Saul, and he's genuinely devastated over what has transpired. So while the people want him to eat, David is unwilling to break his fast because he's genuinely grieved and mourning because of his love and compassion for the people. What the text tells us is this won the hearts of all the people!

The people in the North realize this is a whole new kind of leader, a new kind of king. This king won't be like Saul at all. This is a new day. He won their hearts. The people of Benjamin realize, "This is the man to lead us." So David, in the midst of all these complexities, all these moving parts, where a bad reactive decision could have easily brought the kingdom crashing down and thousands of men, women, and children would have died, instead carefully, thoughtfully, compassionately, kindly, skillfully responds to situation after situation to bring the nation to a point where the North, Benjamin, and the South are all in agreement. "He needs to be our next king."

Will David become king without more bloodshed? I guess we will have to find out next week. As we wrap this up, there's no question the point of this story is to present David as a king ready to lead. He responds to the most difficult circumstances out of his control with such skill, with such compassion, integrity, character and kindness. You get this glimpse of this new king who is going to call the people to a kingdom that will be radically different from anything they have known before. The people in this story have no idea of the peace and the prosperity that lies ahead for them because of this king, which then reminds us that David is a shadow or a type of a Son of David that would come a thousand years later—the long awaited, promised Son of David, the Messiah, who would come to usher in a new kingdom unlike anything the people had ever known.

Jesus would enter a complex, violent, bloody world, a world dominated by religious legalism and oppression, a world dominated by Roman oppression and bloodshed. But He would enter that world with such character, integrity, kindness, compassion and love, but also with such great skill that again, and again, and again He would manage His way through the land mines and confound the experts of His day. He would ultimately step into the darkness and call the people to a new kingdom—the kingdom that their souls longed for, a kingdom that would be made possible through His death, burial, and resurrection. And then He would take this magnificent message of hope, of a new kingdom and a new day, and he would place it in the hands of His followers called the Church, and He would call them to be stewards of this message in the darkness and the violence and the trouble and the bloodshed and the struggles in the world to come.

We are reminded that we, as followers of Christ today, have been given the stewardship of the gospel, not to be reactionary, not to contribute to the conflict and anger and chaos and destruction of today but rather with love, and with kindness, and compassion, but also with great skill and thoughtfulness, move beyond the reactions of our culture and move into the darkness, and with great skill offer another way to let people know there is a kingdom that is so *other than* what we experience in this life. It is a kingdom made possible through the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus. It's everything that your soul longs for, and with skill we can cast a vision for a new kind of kingdom, a new way to live, in such a way that we begin to bring people together. We lead them out of the darkness into the light, that they might encounter a life-changing relationship with Jesus.

So here's the most practical way to think of this: I'm not really interested in what God might do through you someday. I'm interested in *today*. Whatever your circumstances are today—at home, in your school, in your work place, in your neighborhood—wherever God gives you influence in the midst of the circumstances such as they are today, what would it mean for you as a steward of the gospel to step into those circumstances and, rather than reacting and only making things worse, but rather with integrity, character, compassion and love and kindness, but also with great skill and thoughtfulness, step into those circumstances and cast a vision for another way—to go into the darkness and invite people to come out of the darkness into the light to experience what their souls are longing for and encounter a life-changing relationship with Jesus. The truth is: if you're not able to step into those circumstances that define your story today and do that, you're simply not ready for more influence. The issue is: how do I become a good, faithful leader in the circumstances in which I find myself today as a good steward of the gospel?

> *Our Father we celebrate the hope of the gospel in the midst of a world that is hurting, confused, struggling, and desperate for answers. God, may we as Your people, not contribute to the chaos and the breakdown. May we rather be voices of hope, that with great thoughtfulness and skill, call people to a better way in Jesus, in whose name we pray. Amen.*

Scripture taken from the NEW AMERICAN STANDARD BIBLE
Copyright 1960, 1962, 1963, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1987, 1988,
The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.
Lincoln Berean Church, 6400 S. 70th, Lincoln, NE 68516 (402) 483-6512
Copyright 2016 – Bryan Clark. All rights reserved.

October 1/2, 2016

The Complexities of Leadership

Courage to Lead

2 Samuel 3:1-39

Pastor Bryan Clark

Opening Discussion

1. Whether you're leading at home, work, church or anywhere else leadership can be very complex. What makes leadership so complex at times? What have been your leadership experiences?

2. Why is it that some leaders are highly effective in one environment and much less effective in another environment? For example, what causes some leaders to be highly effective at work and so ineffective at home? How does this confirm our belief that leadership is often highly complex?

3. What is the difference between reacting to situations and responding thoughtfully? Do good leaders react or respond? What is necessary for a leader to move from reacting to thoughtfully responding?

Bible Study

1. Read II Samuel 3:1. What is at stake as David leads through these difficult times? What might be the cost of poor, reactive leadership from David?

2. Read II Samuel 3:2-5 and pronounce all the names (just kidding). The purpose of this paragraph is to establish David's influence and power growing while the influence and power of Saul's family is diminishing. However, we are also reminded that while David will be a great king he will not be a great leader at home. Several of the sons listed will break his heart in devastating ways. What did you learn about leadership in your home growing up? How has this effected your life today?

3. Read II Samuel 3:6-11. What creates the tension between Abner and Ish-bo-sheth and what do you think is motivating Abner's behavior?

4. Read II Samuel 3:12-21. What is Abner up to? What are David's options? What all is at stake? What might have happened had David responded differently?

5. Read II Samuel 3:22-39. At the end of verse 21 it feels like the nation is finally on the threshold of peace and unity. How does Joab jeopardize that and why? Is Joab really

concerned about David and Abner's motives or is he out for revenge? How does David hold the kingdom together after Abner's murder? What were his other options?

6. What's become very common today at all levels of leadership is that leaders spin the truth, cover for bad leadership on their team, misrepresent the truth or simply throw their hands up denying any responsibility for decisions that were made by the team. How is David's response different from that? What effect does that have on all the people?

7. Review all the issues at play in this chapter. There are multiple moving parts coming from multiple people in the journey to unite the nation in peace. There are very few of the actions David could control. The key to his leadership was how he thoughtfully and carefully responded knowing that a wrong move could affect the lives of thousands of men, women and children. What do we learn about leadership from David and how does David's leadership differ from much of what is viewed as leadership in our culture today?

Application

1. Where does God have you leading today? What are the issues or complexities of that leadership role? What do you learn from David that might help you lead well?

2. How do you think David's years in the wilderness prepared him to respond so well in such a critical time in the nation's history? What things in life have prepared you to lead today?

3. Are you more likely to lead by reacting or by thoughtfully responding to circumstances and situations? What can you do to move from reacting to responding more thoughtfully in all the leadership situations you experience?

Copyright 2016 – Bryan Clark. All rights reserved.