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Abstract

This paper is divided into three sessions: The first is an overview of the Ten Commandments which explicitly called for a higher wisdom and authority and the three historical groupings of the Decalogue. Then this work focused on the first commandment to advocate that without the first commandment there is no law so does morality. Examining in detail the first commandment, this second session supported the first commandment as the source and pillar of law, gives legality and judiciary to every law, and very foundational to the definition of morality and the morality of law. Further, this paper investigated the relationship between the first commandment and moral leadership. Expanding on the moral leadership, this paper proved that moral leadership is the natural regulator against the tendency to overrule, has self-worth and self-image as a benchmark, and cannot be lab-fabricated nor epistemologized. Convinced that “there is a god behind every system of law” and standing on the first commandment, this work rejected transactional leadership in favor of individualized consideration in transformational leadership and as a compass for emotional intelligence.
FLOWERS TO JUDGE ROY MOORE

Roy Moore is the former Alabama Supreme Court chief justice known as the “Ten Commandments Judge” after he refused a federal order to remove a 2-ton stone monument depicting the Biblical laws from the state court building in Montgomery (USA Today, 2012, 15A).

What really matters, according to Moore and his followers, is not what the federal appellate court ordered - or even what the U.S. Supreme Court has said. What matters is that he, Moore, believes that the Ten Commandments, and the Judeo-Christian tradition in general, are the bedrock of American law….Anyone who attempts to argue that the Commandments are not drawn from a particular religious tradition has not read the first four, which mandate a monotheistic religion, and knows precious little about the actual range of religious beliefs in the world (Hamilton, 2003).
“There is a god behind every system of law”

(Lutzer, 2010).
THE FIRST COMMANDMENT: THE GENESIS & BASIS OF MORAL LEADERSHIP

Moral relativists believe that laws are nothing more than the result of social conditioning, subject to the whim of leaders and nations (Lutzer, 2010). In clear, the chief argument that religion or spirituality has been conventionally considered as irrelevant to grooming of leaders, especially the corporate leaders (Shah, 2009) rather underscored the necessity of a moral foundation to leadership. The ontological foundation of morality is heaving into view. In the Bible’s judgment, something about this before-ness is a presupposition of morality – which is why God’s precedence is asserted at the head of the commandments (Glouberman, 2011). Sadly, on behalf of logic and freedom, pragmatism and utilitarianism have become the driving forces of daily actions, behaviors, and unfortunately leadership. Though the key role of a leader has never been ignored the profit-oriented, competition-driven corporate organizations and business schools, which have given a new meaning and significance to this concept. Factually, who consciously says utilitarianism highlights the Machiavellian understanding of “The end justifies the means.” As such, leadership is about gain, profit, and results even in flagrant violation of morality or moral codes/ethics. Astonished, the world is asking: Where are the modes of judgment characteristic of behavioral and leadership in the current world? Leadership has nothing impressionistic if it does not help individual and societies dissociate character from personality and values from needs. If the end justifies the means, how do humans codify and define their value systems and what supports them? How do humans address the problem of properly defining human behavior in spheres of influences and communities? A sincere look at the Ten Commandments with of zoom on the first rather shines as the prerequisite, genesis, and the basis of moral leadership because for a moral to be moral, there needs to be an authority endorsing the moral principles whose root cause is the first commandment.
After overviewing the Ten Commandments and the three historical groupings, this work amplified the first commandment by positioning it as the source of law, the only beacon of legality and judiciary and later analyzed it as the definition of morality and the morality of law. Then this work studied the first commandment par rapport moral leadership arguing that the first commandment is the regulator of the natural tendency to overrule and nullifies the Machiavellian philosophy and political architecture and structure, proving that the first commandment cannot be lab-fabricated not epistemologized, and supported that moral leadership starts with self-image in God. Further, in the second section, this works rejects in block transactional leadership supporting that leadership is not moral unless it is exercised as the lawgiver treats every single human. To end, this work found the first commandment as a clear support of emotional intelligence in the fact that it encompasses the knowledge of self-emotions, how to manage them by/and recognizing emotions in others to better handle interpersonal relationships.

**Overview of the Ten Commandments**

Fuller (1975) argued that “The first desideratum of a system for subjecting human conduct to the governance of rules is an obvious rule: there must be rules” (p. 46). For Rooker (2010) the Ten Commandments are literally the ‘Ten Words’ (āšeret haddêbārîm) in Hebrew. The use of the term dābār, ‘word,’ in this phrase distinguishes these laws from the rest of the commandments (mišwâ), statutes (hōq), and regulations (mišpāṭ) in the Old Testament. Easton’s Illustrated Dictionary reads that “ten words” i.e., the Decalogue, is a summary of the immutable moral law. In the Old Testament the Decalogue is uniformly referred to as “the ten words” (Exodus 34:28 margin; Deuteronomy 4:13 margin; 10:4 margin), or simply as “the words” spoken by Yahweh (Exodus 20:1; Exodus 34:27 Deuteronomy 5:22; Deuteronomy 10:2), or as “the words of the covenant” (Exodus 34:28). In the New Testament they are called
“commandments” (Matthew 19:17 Ephesians 6:2), as in most Christian lands (International Standard Bible Encyclopedia).

According to Clement of Alexandria\(^1\) the Decalogue can be viewed as an image of heaven, embracing sun and moon, stars, clouds, light, wind, water, air, darkness, fire. For him, the Ten Commandments are the physical Decalogue of the heaven. On a different note, according to the Jewish tradition, Exodus 20:1–17 constitutes God's first recitation and inscription of the ten commandments on the two tables, which were broken in pieces by Moses, and later rewritten on replacement stones and placed in the ark of the covenant. The same tradition teaches that Deuteronomy 5:4–20 consists of God's re-telling the Ten Commandments to the younger generation who were to enter the Promised Land. The passages in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 contain more than ten imperative statements, totaling 14 or 15 in all.

Though Farkas (2011) informed that the Torah had yet to be given in Nimrod's time, but according to rabbinic tradition, the Noahide laws were already known, Farkas warned that since God was no longer the final arbiter on what was right or wrong instead, man was because of the emergence of Hammurabi/Nimrod, with the enactment and acceptance of Hammurabi's Code, man began to emerge from his complete dependence upon God as the source of all law. Hammurabi's Code gave mankind the gift of self-government Although Hammurabi pays lip service to the god of justice as the originator of the Code, and on the top of the stone stele is a carved relief of Hammurabi receiving the law from the sun god Shamash, in the preamble and epilogue he himself claims to be the wise author of the laws. This code taught man that God alone was no longer the source of the law. Rather, the law was to come from man, using the human faculties endowed within him.

The historical groupings of the Ten Commandments & The Focus of this Work

\(^1\) Clement of Alexandria. The Stromata, or Miscellanies Book VI. Chapter XVI.—Gnostic Exposition of the Decalogue.
There were three historical ways of groupings the material in the Decalogue (deca= ten; logoi = words) or the *Eser dabar* ² (Ten Words) in Hebrew:

1. the Jewish Reckoning,
2. the Augustinian-Lutherian Reckoning, and
3. the Orthodox-Reformed Reckoning circles.

Based on the grouping illustrated above and to meet the ultimate goal of this work, this paper chose to use the Augustinian-Lutherian Reckoning.

**EXAMINING THE FIRST COMMANDMENT**

The first commandment according to the Augustinian-Lutherian Reckoning is the following:

“You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself a graven image.”

**Overview of the First Commandment**

Dale (1986) wrote that the first commandment was first promulgated at Mount Sinai as a part of the covenant between *Yhwh* and Israel (Ex. 20:3; Deut. 5:6; Ex. 34:14). The question is how does Yhwh gain the authority to promulgate the commandment? Dale stated that according to Exodus 19:3b-8, the people are offered a choice to accept a relationship with Yhwh in which they will be set apart for him if they acknowledge the binding authority of his will; they accept it by pledging “to do all that Yhwh says” (Ex. 19:8, cp. 34:3,7-8). The first commandment is delivered among the things Yhwh says.

Unfortunately, the only thing many scholars say about the first commandment is the extreme religiosity or the spiritual exclusiveness of it. For example, Rooker (2010) argued that “In the first commandment we find a prohibition against the worship and the service of any other

---

god than Yahweh, the true God and Lord of Israel. The Hebrew formula lōʾyiḥyeh (לֹּ֜יִיחֵּ֣ה) means to keep or refrain from having a relationship with (p. 25). For Kreeft (2001) the religious or spiritual aspect of the first commandment is just its social aspect. The duty of offering God genuine worship concerns man both individually and socially (CCC, 2105).

In addition to exclusive monotheism, the first commandment in view of this paper is the basis of all, the cornerstone of human behavior be it moral, spiritual, legal, penal... Like Kreeft underlined, the first commandment is not just the wake-up call against superstition, all forms of divination, all practices of magic or sorcery, sacrilege, simony (buying or selling of spiritual things (Acts 8:9-24) but the right and solid foundation of moral life and leadership. Rightly, Kreeft said that the “Ten Commandments are to the moral order what creation story is to natural order” (p. 203). This explains and supports the necessity of the before-ness of moral leadership. Though there are negative sides of the first commandment, it is so brilliant on the part of Kreeft to argue that: “All sins are sins against the first commandment; the first commandment contains the whole of the Decalogue. For all sins serve some other god, obey another commander: the world or the flesh or the devil. So, if we obeyed only the first commandment perfectly, “we would not need nothing more” (p. 205). The first commandment embraces faith, hope, and charity (CCC 2086). So moral leadership based on this Roman Catechism is not to sin against faith, against hope, and against charity.

**The First Commandment as the Source of Law**

First and foremost Barr (1990) argued that

A commandment is not to be reduced to its conceptual content; it effects something between the speaker and audience as well. To put this pointedly, a commandment is a distinctive type of utterance which creates the reality it describes. Its revelatory form, in
this case, coheres with its constitutive character: the authority of the utterance depends upon the act of the speaker exercising authority (p. 18-19).

In a comparative and historical perspective, the first commandment brings to mind the Jewish *shema* which is (1) a strong pre-text, committed to memory and used in daily prayer and other rituals, (2) the belief that the Lord is one, as described in the shema, was a core value in the first century Jewish religion, and (3) the use of shema and the first commandment made the belief in one God an explicit core value, and (4) belief in one God, as described in the shema, was a boundary marker (Waaler, 2008). The Jewish tradition holds that the ideal law is God's law, as expressed in His Torah. Man might be obligated to establish legal codes for temporal life, codes with which man is expected to abide. But no man-made legal system could ever supplant God's Torah as the ideal legal system. The very suggestion of it is ludicrous, in the eyes of tradition, for no mere mortal could ever match the divine wisdom contained in the Torah (Farkas, 2011, p. 162).

The existing God, above every doubt, whether absolute or Cartesian, is the one revealed to us in the First Commandment, and it is precisely this commandment that defines who we are and what we are about in this world (Miller, 2004). If the first commandment gives the nature of law and the natural law (Raz, 2009), Lutzer (2010) was clear and strict arguing that “Laws reflect a nation’s priorities, agenda, and values” (p. 58). But before a law becomes a national law, where does law come from? What is the genesis of law? What do we call a law? Miller asked: What do you do with the God you have? He proposed four responses: trust, reverence, conscience, and praise.

The Ten Commandments in general and the first in particular shed more light on exploring the ABCs of morality. One of the reasons why the first commandment is the most important of all the other commandments is the truth that
If the source of law is the individual the individual is the god of that system…if source of law is our court then our court is our god. If there is no higher law beyond man, then man is his own god…when you chose your authority, you choose your god, and when you look for your law, there is your god (Lutzer, p. 59).

The first commandment is the source of law, and leadership because, if you look behind the law, “there is your god.” Kreeft argued that the Decalogue is a path of life and is also the path to freedom. The commandments do not limit freedom; they protect freedom, as the fence around the city schoolyard does not imprison the children playing there but protects them from life-threatening dangers …and frees them to play and enjoy their games within that fence.

Lutzer vehemently challenged scholarship stressing that if we must point out in passing that if God does not exist, no such transcendent laws exist. If God does not exist, this means that laws are relative, and each country has its own idea of what laws they should enact. What is the great danger and depression this creates? The danger of it is lack of universal standard by which laws can be judged as Lutzer pointed out. In consequence and as a preventive mechanism in place, Lutzer did not hide the fact that “Only an appeal to God and revelation can give us the laws by which individuals and countries can be uniformly judged…either we derive our laws from theistic universal values, or we say that the individual countries or cultures are the lawgivers” (p. 61).

Watson (2007)³ purported that there are two requisites in a lawgiver:

1. Wisdom (laws are founded upon reason, and he must be wise that makes laws. God has a monopoly of wisdom (Job 9:4; 1 Timothy 1:17). Therefore, God is the fittest to enact and constitute laws;

2. Authority

---

Barr showed that if a subject makes laws, however wise they may be, they want the stamp of authority. Logically, God has the supreme power in his hand: he gives being to all and he who gives men their lives. He has the most right to give them their laws. In *principe* Barr mentioned that the first commandment is a performative utterance within a complex of performative and supportive utterances. Such utterances create the reality they describe. The commandment binds the audience to an obligation because the speaker, Yhwh, has the authority to impose it. To know its truth, the audience must recognize the authority of the lawgiver. God has attained that authority, according to Exodus 19, by the consent of the people. This consent in the view of Barr, was in turn, elicited by a recitation of Yhwh's deeds designed to persuade the people that Yhwh was worthy and deserving of their obedience.

Like Barr, Dale also supported that the first commandment is a performative utterance which created obligation in the act of speaking. Its validity depended not upon the rational or experiential confirmation of its rightness but on the authority of Yhwh to command. However, suasion was required as well. The narrative and poetic tradition celebrating Yhwh's might and faithfulness were designed to do that, but when gentle persuasion failed, he exercised judgment for breaking faith. If those two prerequisites are not validated by any leadership, Lutzer’s claim or remark became valid: that is “Either God is the lawgiver or man is. Either God is supreme or the state is supreme” (p. 61). Is the Lutzeran observation not rampant in our nations, leadership, and courts? In our nations and courts around the globe, who is supreme? God, states, or humanism? This question underlines Malik’s (1980) lament: In the world today, which Evangelical can stand up to the great secular and naturalistic or atheistic scholars on their own terms of scholarship and research?

Heartbreaking enough, Gross and Simmons (2009) shamefully discovered that “the incidence of born again Christians at elite-level doctoral institutions is 1%” (p. 101).
Table 1

College and University Professors’ Belief in God

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief in God</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don’t believe in God</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know whether there is a God</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do believe in a higher power</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find myself believing in God some of the time</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While I have doubts, I feel that I do believe in God</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know God really exists and I have no doubts about it</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the study by Gross and Simmons only 5.7 percent of the respondents say the Bible is the “actual word of God,” with 48.3 percent describing it as “an ancient book of fables, legends, history, and moral precepts.” About 39.5% of respondents are of the view the Bible is “the inspired word of God.” Roughly 7 percent refused to answer this question (p. 119).

This Malikan SOS raises the crucial role of the Christian academe in the world today and in high level education. Gross and Simmons added that in regards to the question “Do you believe in God or a universal spirit” the public response was 91% yes, 8% no, and 1% no opinion in May of 2011. A breakdown of that question in 2010 had 80% believing in God, 12% in a universal spirit and 6% belief in none (1% other, 1% no opinion). Compared to the above numbers for professors, there is clearly more lack of belief, but not radically so (9.8% v. 8%). The fact that Gallup did not ask the agnosticism question makes direct comparison difficult.
Is there some hope since we have power to take captive minds which stand against the knowledge of Christ (2 Cor. 10:5)? Christians like quoting the verse. But is that all? In consequence, knowing the law is one thing, living by it is another. Also living by something is one thing and proclaiming it and ensuring it is expanding and multiplying is another. Such is the mandate of Christians around the globe. In that perspective, knowing, living, and proclaiming the first commandment as foundational to moral leadership leads to endorse Fuller’s observation that when the world fails to decide according to the first commandment, every issue is to be decided on an ad hoc basis. This is dangerous for morality and damageable to leadership. This is precisely what James Barr says about the first commandment that “A total failure in any one of these eight directions does not simply result in a bad system of law” (p. 39). Barr does not want to be legalistic but mindful of the necessity to proclaim, teach, and voice the first commandment if Christians go through the following routes:

(1) a failure to publicize, or at least to make available to the affected party, the rule he is expected to observe,

(2) the abuse of retroactive legislation, which not only cannot itself guide action, but undercuts the integrity of rules prospective change,

(3) failure to make rule understandable,

(4) the enactment of contradictory rules, or

(5) rules that require conduct beyond the powers of the affected party,

(6) introducing such frequent changes in the rules that the subject cannot orient his action by them, and finally,

(7) a failure of congruence between the rules as announced and their actual administration (pp. 38-39).
Let’s be specific with Barr that in order to show that the description of revelation of the first commandment is not overly eccentric or lacking in theological rootage, Barr correlated it with Soren Kierkegaard’s description of natural and revealed religion in Philosophical Fragments. Natural religion, or the “religion of immanence,” according to Kierkegaard, seeks to discover religious truth from human reason and experience. Socrates is its exemplar. He insisted that all purported religious truth, all commands of deity, all myths and piety, be judged by rational ethics and metaphysics. Plato makes this evident in his Euthyphro and his Apology. There may be divine revelations, such as the oracle to Socrates himself, but their truth depends upon the confirmation of “natural reason.”

Barr insisted that the first commandment differed from the others by the claim on the audience it makes for the speaker. Yhwh, the God of Israel, claims Israel's exclusive recognition of himself as God. The other divine commandments govern particular actions by Israelites, making them duties owed Yhwh as well as reasonable rules for communal life; they do not, however, establish and maintain Yhwh's unique position in the community - the first commandment performs that unique function.

**The First Commandment: Beacon of Legality and Judiciary**

“If evil is called good, then it becomes good” (Lutzer, 2010, p. 58). Are these words from Adolph Hitler, former German Nazi Furher having the power of law? An average person can testify that there is a strong pressure and orchestration highly supported by anti-first commandment legislations and leaders to call good bad and call evil good for utilitarian goals. Fuller was right to observe that it is obvious that obscure and incoherent legislation can make legality unattainable by anyone, or at least unattainable without an unauthorized revision which itself impairs legality.” So what gives law its power? Also the leadership should not ensure “a lawless unlimited power” because “its very absurdity, its brutal pointlessness may let the subject
know that there is nothing that may not be demanded on him and that he should keep himself ready to jump in any direction” (pp. 70-71). Because of such a fast moral degeneration and morphing, finding the real definition of good must have an absolute concept and be based on the first commandment.

This is so critical because “whoever controls a nation’s law also controls a nation’s agenda.” The first commandment actually exemplifies the Supremacy of God over humanity, law over lawlessness and disorder. Lutzer was right to say that “behind every system of law there is a god” (p. 59). In addition, today says Fuller, “there is a strong tendency to identify law, not with rules of conduct, but with a hierarchy of power of command. This view confuses fidelity to law with deference for established authority…” (p. 63). Since God is the personal omnipotent Creator…law should be consistent with his revelation. No law should be passed that would be contrary to the law of God (Lutzer, p. 64). Lutzer argued that the divine understanding of law emphasizes that God is the source of all laws, and all men are created equal.

The First Commandment and the Definition of Morality

Adadevo (2010) underlined that morality can only be understood by investigating the meaning of the root word for the English word “moral” (p. 9). Talking on Alasdair (1984) he argued that:

In Latin, as in ancient Greek, there is no word until our word moral is translated back into Latin. Certainly moral is the etymological descent of moralis. But moralis, like to translate the Greek predecessor ethikos – Cicero invented “moralis” to translate the Greek word in the De Facto – means “pertaining to character,” where a man’s character is nothing other than his set of dispositions to behave systematically in one way rather than another, to lead one particular kind of life (Alasdair, 1984, p. 38).
More than the etymological derivatives of morality, the natural obedience charter established by God between Him and mankind welds moral leadership. A child is naturally supposed to obey his parents so does the student to his teachers, or slaves to their masters (Ex. 20:12). Even those who even fight mounts and valleys to remove God from Governance, politics do forget that the citizen right to obey government is the application of the first commandment. Lyman (2003) stated that moral principle in particular “can never be a weather vane, spinning around this way and that with the shifting winds of expediency. Moral principle is a compass forever fixed and forever true – and that is as important in business as it is in the classroom” (p. 48).

According to Gewirth (1980) a morality is “a set of categorically obligatory requirements for action that are addressed at least in part to every actual or prospective agent, and that are concerned with furthering the interests, especially the most important interests, of persons or recipients other that or in addition to the agent or the speaker” (p. 1). Regarding the distributive and the substantive questions of morality, Gewrith distinguishing the two aspects of morality argued that “morality is inherently egalitarian and universalist, so that it follows from the meaning of ‘moral’ that ‘moral rules must be for the good of everyone alike whereas to the other aspect, a moral consideration is one that, from the very concept of ‘moral’, is concerned with the attainment of well-being and the avoidance of ill-being” (p. 9).

**The First Commandment and the Morality of the Law**

Fuller argued that when the “law is compared with morality it seems to be assumed that everyone knows what the second term of the comparison embraces” (pp. 3-4). To get there Fuller, referring to Thomas Reed Powell, pointed out that if you can think about something that is related to something else without thinking about the thing to which it is related, then you have the legal mind. In clear, to study the connection between law and morality in this study, legal
mind must be circumvented in the sense that “the legal mind generally exhaust itself in thinking about law and is content to leave unexamined the think to which law is being related and from which it is being distinguished” (p. 4). Those two things are law and morality.

Fuller in investigating the morality that makes law possible insisted on the distinction between the morality of aspiration and the morality of duty. To assess and dissociate moral leadership from law or place moral leadership into law which makes it powerful and useful, socio-rhetorical texture analysis is conducted. He also wrote that someone discovered in an ancient author a passage that seemed apt: “to command what cannot be done is not to make law; it is to unmake law, for a command that cannot be obeyed serves no end but confusion, fear and chaos” (p. 37). If this understanding goes with the 10 commandments, then its purpose to serve as a leadership compass and social behavior pattern and balance will be revoked on behalf of freedom.

After overviewing the Ten Commandments and the three historical groupings, and underlining first commandment as the source of law, the only beacon of legality and judiciary and as a metric of morality and the morality of law, the following section is an examination of the first commandment with three leadership theories such moral leadership, transactional, transformational, and emotional intelligence. Beginning with moral leadership, in the following lines, each of the targeted leadership models are studied in accepted length.

EXAMINING THE FIRST COMMANDMENT AND MORAL LEADERSHIP

Rhode (2006) asked a very simple but though stretching question: Where is the leadership in moral leadership? Before she answered the question, she argued that “Moral leadership is now in a boom cycle. At last count a Web search revealed that some forty-seven thousand sites” (p. 1). For Rhode “the first is that leadership is inescapably “value-laden”: “all leadership, whether good or bad, is moral leadership at the descriptive if not the normative level”
(p. 6). This means that all leadership has a moral dimension. If this is true how do we explain all the moral failures and flaws in leadership all over the world? John Gardner in The Moral Aspect of Leadership argued that leaders should “Serve the basic needs of their constituents,” defend “fundamental moral principles,” seek the “fulfillment of human possibilities,” and improve the communities of which they are part (Rhode, 2006, p. 6).

What the contemporary leadership schools or organizations forget is the blatant truth that “To start with, the whole concept of leadership training is a misconception; humans can’t be trained to become leaders; however they may be groomed and developed” (Shah, 393). Rhode added that historical records and contemporary studies across the cultures have confirmed the central place of morality and spirituality in leadership development. For leadership to be moral, it requires a personal and living relationship between the divine and humanity. Kreitner (1995) defined leadership as “a social influence process in which the leader seeks the voluntary participation of subordinates in an effort to reach organizational objectives. Kreitner did encompass all it takes to have leadership in his definition and all of them derive and exist in and because of the first commandment: a leader (here the law giver: God), social influence process (sincere and truthful relationship among humans and divine), subordinates, voluntary participation for a goal (pleasing God and being moral to other humans).

Though I don’t know if Kreitner would agree with my deduction, he acknowledges that every relationship and voluntary participation should have a common agreement, here the first commandment. More so, to achieve the common objectives of divine and humanity, accepting and applying the first commandment deem necessary. In light of the first commandment you cannot be a moral leader without being a student and follower of the commandment number one. It establishes the link between leader and moral leadership and also codifies the relationship between leader and follower. Perpetually, a moral leader is a follower of the first commandment.
The Ten Commandments are called the moral law because it is the rule of life and manners (Watson). The law itself, all these words that is, all the words of the moral law, which is usually styled the Decalogue, or ten commandments. The Scripture, as Chrysostom says, is a garden, and the moral law is the chief flower in it: it is a banquet, and the moral law is the chief dish in it. This paper strongly argued that in the divine authority of the first commandment, moral leadership is not a simple verbal energy but a behavior, a constant one. It is in that perspective that Rushdoony (1971) challenged any leader as follows: “Show me your laws and I will show you your God” (p. 60). Olsen, Eid, and Johnsen (2006) argued that the relation between morals and leadership has been a long-standing issue in leadership theory. On the one hand some theoretical perspectives have stated that successful leaders must be able to manipulate, deceive, and take advantage of their subordinates (and opponents) to achieve leadership success (Bailey, 1988).

It is to be mentioned that for the purpose of this paper, leadership is considered as “a spiritual relationship between the leader and the followers whereby the followers, being inspired by their leader, are ready to carry out their willing and enthusiastic efforts towards attainment of common objectives” (p. 389). Why is moral leadership critical to our world today? First of all, research on morals and leadership behavior should include a variety of moral developmental constructs, such as moral sensitivity, moral motivation, and moral character (Rest, 1986; Turner, Barling, Epitropaki, Butcher, & Miller, 2002). Moral leadership is moral not because of what the leader does but because of who gives the moral principles.

Morgeson, DeRue, and Karam (2009) suggested that leadership originated from four sources, derived from two structural dimensions: locus of leadership (internal vs. external) and formality of leadership (formal vs. informal). Further, Morgeson et al. (2009) addressed the effectiveness of specific leadership functions deriving from each of the four sources under the
overarching assumption that team work occurs in cycles. The first commandment indicates that leadership is above geography, historicity, and economy. For example Pearce, Perry, and Sims (2001) identified five conditions: geographic dispersion, demographic heterogeneity, team size, skill heterogeneity, and maturity. Pearce et al. claimed that geographic dispersion, large team size, and demographic heterogeneity are expected to negatively impact the likelihood of shared leadership emerging as coordination and communication. Though Wiese et al. identified some conditions to leadership, especially a shared one, this first commandment insists, points, and encourages only one source: God. The rest is only and simply a vivid ramification and exemplification of the first commandment.

The first commandment is to facilitate leadership function hence the comprehensive list of the dimensions of human life and its responsibilities: social, legal, moral, spiritual, psychological…The degree of commitment to the responsibilities mentioned depends on the degree of commitment to the first law. The work theorizes that the degree of commitment to the first law is positively related to the degree of commitment to the other commandments. The higher the commitment the better the observance of the other commandments. In clear, the other commandments have no power or value if value and obeisance are not given to the first law.

The first commandment is the moral scale of leadership or what Fuller called “a kind of scale or yardstick which begins at the bottom with the most obvious demands of social living and extends upward to the highest reaches of human aspiration” (pp. 9-10). To this regard the first commandment is “the foundation of all morality.” A leadership will never be moral if the “natural tendency in most of the people to aspire for better living standard, more authority and power, continuing success …” is not regulated. Because, as Shah pointed it out so well,

In order to fulfill such desires, many people want to occupy important positions in their respective organizations. When such people are given the responsibilities of important
assignments, they tend to presume that they have become the leaders. However, getting appointed on a certain post is altogether different phenomenon than becoming leader of people (p. 390).

Though Bell and Kozwloski (2002) positively observed that leadership is to develop appropriate behavior, their observation underlines the essence of the first commandment in such an undeniable and indisputable ways. In the light of Bell and Kozwloski’s proposal, behavior (the other commandments) should be a routine for a leader. The first commandment is to help develop “appropriate habitual routines early in the team’s lifecycle, which will aid in perpetuating patterns of behavior. The other commandments are like the action phase or action plan for leadership. Habitual routines aid in establishing expectations and reducing uninhibited individual behavior, which can be problematic in virtual teams (Siegel, Dubrovsky, Kiesler, & McGuire, 1986; Straus & McGrath, 1994). As well put, establishing habitual routines may be especially beneficial when leadership is shared, as it provides some standards as to which members will be serving particular leader functions, and how these leader functions may be shared amongst multiple or single members at any given time (Hambley, O’Neill, & Kline, 2007).

The structuring and planning functions of the commandments establishes a potential interaction between the lawgiver and the law abider. The first commandment also establishes the role clarification, social climate regulations, and interpersonal relationships road maps because the way a leader relates to God is in the same way he/she is supposed to lead. The first law is the pillar which is holding the other laws valid, positive, and useful. The first commandment is the spiritual activator of the rest of the decalogual list. When the first commandment is wrongly activated, the rest of the ten is wrongly applied. The first commandment can be explained by understanding that social climate is critical to individual and corporate groups effectiveness.
when the first commandment is working. The first commandment is key to address
“interpersonal issues within the teams, which might be more likely to occurred in shared
leadership teams if there is a disconnect between team member’s perceptions of teams roles,
expertise, and the like” (Wiese, p. 13).

Why is such relationship between a leader and the first commandment very important?
Clement of Alexandria referred to in the overview of the Ten Commandments on page five argued that:

The first commandment of the Decalogue shows that there is one only Sovereign God;
who led the people from the land of Egypt through the desert to their fatherland; that they
might apprehend His power, as they were able, by means of the divine works, and
withdraw from the idolatry of created things, putting all their hope in the true God (p.
3451).

By extension, the originality and origin of moral leadership derives from the sovereign
constitution to all the earth and its nations who are under the sovereignty of the first moral
leader, God, whose representative they all are. Implicitly, every leader is supposed to be and live
out what the sovereign leader does. Thus the Lord Himself is called “Alpha and Omega, the
beginning and the end,” (p.3462) “by whom all things were made, and without whom not even
one thing was made.” The rest of the commandments are only and simply the externalization of
leadership not leadership. The rest of the commandments are the content, orientation about
leadership and how far a leader can go.

Moral Leadership as the Regulator of Natural Tendency to Overrule

Moral leadership is the appropriate power exercise framework God has adequately
designed for leaders first and for every human being. In the light of the first commandment,
moral leadership is to teach leaders that a leader is not above God and thus should not overdo or

ill-treat his followers. On behalf of the first commandment, everybody is equal. The first commandment reminds leadership that since God does not look down upon any human being no leadership has such prerogative. The first commandment helps leadership to stay in the mainline of good governance or leadership, and not to abuse power nor become authoritative. The good news is that “Since the morality of duty must inevitably incorporate standards borrowed from the morality of aspiration there is neither occasion nor warrant for drawing a clear line between the two moralities” (p. 10). Moral leadership is not moral without law and law has no value unless it is morally led.

With the first commandment, morality comes to be virtue and Socrates identified virtue with knowledge. This means that “if men truly understood the good they would desire it and see to attain it” (Fuller, p. 15).

**Moral Leadership Cannot be Lab-fabricated nor Epistemologized**

Gewirth (1980) set the tone for moral leadership arguing that contrary to the most of the contemporary philosophers attempt to solve the problem of morality from the epistemological assumptions that define the dominant cultural perspective of our age. Can there be morality in an epistemological way? The first commandment opposes the scientific approach of developing morality. The Ten Commandments fit better for moral leadership and there is no appropriate method or moral shuttle to digitally assess human behavior and influence it with medicine or psychological orientation.

Deng (1984) in Sudan saw the limitedness and incapacity of science and technology in mass producing morality when he argued that “A nation without moral values is like a bird stripped of its wings so does its society” (pp. 168). Dieng clarified that:

A society dethroned from its basic human values and institutions is like a bird stripped of its wings – it cannot move or fly to its desired destination. Science and technology,
though necessary, are not sufficient by themselves in achieving a development that is based on human dignity and self-respect in the Dinka institution of cieng (unity and harmony) (pp. 168-169).

As right as Dieng is, there is no need to prove that no amount of academic, intellectual, or professional or sophistication of leadership training will make a good if the Ten Commandments are not tailored with the first commandment. Shah argued that:

No amount of leadership training at Staff Colleges, appointments at key posts, or attendance of myriad management and leadership courses can create leaders, though these experiences provide important inputs and impetus towards preparing people for the leadership roles. In short, an individual’s own commitment, organizational environment, leadership development by the organization, and the spiritual states of people are known to determine whether one would become leader of the people or not (p. 390).

Dale (1994) argued that over the history of Christian theology, theologians have frequently made a distinction between truths which can be demonstrated by rational argument or grasped by some other natural faculty, and truths which God graciously reveals to the people whom he loves. The issue here is not how to know the truth of morality alone, but how to live it. How to exemplify morality and enforce it? Bunge (1983) was definite by saying that “Morality cannot be biologized nor sociologized” (p. 16) though epistemology, alien to ethics or the study of morality but normative epistemology is about rules of correct (or successful) inquiry; and rules, unlike laws of nature, can be either obeyed or broken with honest or dishonest intentions. Frequently, Gilkey (1969) purported that the natural knowledge of God has been equated with rational knowledge, but since the Romantic era some theologians have held that poetic intuition,
personal and social experience, and the structures of the subconscious mind and of language may be “organs” of spiritual knowledge.

In a nutshell, morality is beyond mere observation or the realm of natural knowledge that scientific method and analysis focus on and beyond scientific interpretation. Moral leadership is not a data quantitatively collected to be SPSS analyzed. Bunge noted that whereas traditional epistemology focused on knowledge, modern epistemology is also interested in the applications of knowledge. Second, whereas classical epistemology was concerned solely with the knowing subject and his (never her) accomplishments, or both, modern epistemology is also interested in learning communities as well as in the social function of cognition and in the social constraints on it. Science and technology are not the only ones that failed to reproduce morality in people, psychology failed as well. Gilkey noted that the working of the human mind without supernatural intervention or empowerment remains in the realm of natural knowledge. For reasons explored by Watson in the overview of the Ten Commandments, the moral law is perfect; science is not and keeps changing daily. The first commandment remains solid. It is an exact model and platform of religion; it is the standard of truth, the judge of controversies, and the pole-star to direct us to heaven. The commandment is a lamp (Prov. 6:23). The moral law is unalterable; it remains still in force though the ceremonial and judicial laws are abrogated…It is written on stone to show its perpetuity. To be a moral leader means to be personally moral. A leadership that is not moral is like the blind man Jesus referred to in the Gospels leading other blinds to the pit of amoral leadership. It is dangerous for humanity! Christian academes have to rise and proclaim the morality of leadership which originates from the first commandment.

Moral Leadership Starts With Self-image in God

Self-image in God is the best instrument to be moral for it gives identification and internal security necessary not to lord over people (Mark 10: 42). Moral leadership based on the
first commandment or inspired by it helps the leader develop the fear of the Lord and internal security which is the joy to serve others and develop them and become better than yourself (Mark 10: 43-45). Why is moral leadership lacking? The only stratagem the world is fighting is to remove God from leadership. Once that is established everything is allowed. Here, the first commandment is ever capital, it is the antidote to a world without leadership accountability or responsibility. The first commandment is the divine legal instrument which gives man and leadership its human leadership component and necessity. In a sense,

“What others think of you, is their problem, not yours. … As a human being, one’s true worth reflects from what one does to self and/or to others. On the other extreme, a person might have a boastful self-image, but if his actions, habits and character do not provide credence to that image, he won’t be able to leave his mark as a leader. In a nutshell, one can’t assume the responsibilities of a leader, if one has been nursing low self-image or an arrogant one” (Shah, p. 392).

Shah wrote that no inputs are more important and long-lasting than the person himself or herself in the preparation for the leadership roles. For Shah, the self-image in God is the real worth. This means that to be moral, a leader should care more about the first commandment than what followers might say.

MORAL LEADERSHIP: A REJECTION OF TRANSACTIONAL LEADERSHIP

Consider the following passage in the New Testament:

And the king will answer them, ‘I tell you the truth, just as you did it for one of the least of these brothers or sisters of mine, you did it for me.’ Then he will answer them, ‘I tell you the truth, just as you did not do it for one of the least of these, you did not do it for me.’ 46 And these will depart into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life” (Matthew 25: 10, 45, New English Translation, 2006).


This passage illustrates transactional behavior the most and also a sound indication of divine rejection of transactional leadership. Failing to do good to other people means focusing on self-egoistic desires and pleasures, not minding other people’s business. Transactional leader does mind business but to his or her own benefits or glory. In light of these sentences Jesus made about transactional behaviors, can transactional leadership and the first commandment go hand in hand? Taylor and Rosenbach (2005) argued that “the transactional leader, who emphasizes control over subordinates by the use of corrective transactions (contingency theory) aimed at fulfilling the personal needs of the subordinates in exchange for a specific work effort” (p. S38).

Actually, Bass (1985) divided transactional leadership into three components: (a) contingent reward (providing rewards contingent on performance), (b) management-by-exception–active (monitoring behavior and correcting anticipated errors), and (c) management-by-exception–passive (responding to errors and correcting problems if they have occurred). In addition to the transformational and transactional behaviors, Bass originally also included a laissez-faire style as a distinct form of dysfunctional leadership behavior. Later research has suggested that the management by exception–passive dimension should be combined with laissez-faire leadership to form a new dimension called passive–avoidant leadership (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 2000; Den Hartog, Van Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). Based on a principal component analysis, Hetland and Sandal (2003) found that the factors of contingent reward and management-by-exception–active could be defined as a coherent transactional factor. In his full range leadership model, Bass stated that to be effective, leaders must master all components, but employ the transformational components most frequently, which substantially augments the effects of transactional leadership (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990).
According to Rest (1986) people high on moral reasoning must also be motivated to act morally to implement moral thinking into behavior. The secret here is the reality that the real motivator to moral action is the first commandment with the responsibility and accountability it carries. Without the first commandment which actually is written on every heart (Heb. 10: 16). Hence, based on the suggested motivational effect of both symbolized and internalized moral identity on moral behavior (Aquino & Reed, 2002), this paper therefore postulated that a strong moral identity will augment the effect of moral reasoning on moral behavior, and explained more of the moral component of transformational leadership (Bass, 1998a, 1998b; Burns, 1978). Contrary to Bass and Steidlmieier (1999) who also emphasized morals as central in transactional leadership to gain trust and secure a fair contract regulating the exchange processes, this paper argued that the first commandment does not provide any extra avenue nor addendum to itself to ensure gain nor cultivate trust. The best avenue ever for trust and security is to abide by the first commandment and be mindful of it in horizontal relationships and group dynamics. Based on the above this paper condemned the similar effect Bass and Steidlmieier thought to augment effect as for transactional leadership, but weaker due to the more static nature of transactional leadership. More than condemnation, this paper purported that any moral identity based on the first commandment will augment a negative correlation to passive–avoidant leadership.

Shah was strict saying that:

Before you motivate yourself to enhance your self-image through some of the quick fix methods, remember that self-image is not cosmetic reflection of your personality, your clothes, your bank balance or your apparent talk. Self-image is the ultimate product of our character and conduct and it cannot be changed from low to high just by reading some articles or books on leadership and personal improvement, by presenting the
pleasant side of our personality, or by quoting the examples of great leaders (Shah, p. 392).

Given the above, there is no room for transactional leadership in the Decalogue. The focal raison d’être of the nine other commandments are designed or created or written to seek the best for the other person without neglecting yours. It is a win-win law system. By doing good to your neighbor you are doing good to yourself. The nine commandments seemed to have been summarized in Matthew 25 which depicts a real picture of anti-transactional leadership, hence amoral in the light of the first commandment.

MORAL LEADERSHIP: HIGH BEAM OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE (EQ)

Salovey and Meyers (1990) defined EQ as integrated effect of five qualities of a person, namely (1) knowing one’s emotions (the ability to recognize and understand one’s moods, emotions and drives, as well as their effect on others), (2) managing emotions (the ability to control or redirect disruptive pulses and moods, and the propensity to suspend judgment to think before acting), (3) motivating oneself (a passion to work for reasons that go beyond money or status, and a propensity to pursue goals with energy and persistence), (4) recognizing emotions in others (the ability to identify emotional makeup of other people, and skill in treating people according to their emotional state), and (5) handling relationships (proficiency in managing relationships and building networks, and an ability to find common ground and build rapport).

Based on the review above, this paper argued that the first commandment is the best picture of an implicit summary of emotional intelligence, its guidelines and headlines. Why? Whereas people are struggling to know themselves, to manage themselves to better manage or lead others, the first commandment gives the secret for self-knowledge, self-control, and the ingredients of interpersonal relationships detailed in the other commandments. Knowing God and serving him alone, is to know that there is God above every single being. Such awareness
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and understanding informs the way a leader treats his fellow or followers. Such emotional intelligence in moral leadership is determined by the acceptance of the absolute truth that the God who created the leader created the followers, all equal. It also means that the same God controls them all and requires from the leader a fair and just leadership. In other word, “Treat others the same way you want them to treat you” (Matthew 6) requires the application of the first commandment. Accordingly, on the basis of his and numerous other researches Taylor and Rosenbach asserted that a high level of emotional intelligence is the sine qua non of leadership. Without it, a person can have the best training in the world, an incisive, analytical mind, and an endless supply of smart ideas, but he still won’t make a great leader.

MORAL LEADERSHIP & INDIVIDUALIZED CONSIDERATION

In fact, individualized consideration is the fourth component of transformational leadership. In the full range of leadership model, Bass (1998b) divided transformational leadership into four components: (a) idealized influence (by inspiring visions, sharing risks and hardships, and earning trust and confidence from their subordinates), (b) inspirational motivation (display enthusiasm and optimism in ways that motivate those around them by providing meaning and challenges), (c) intellectual stimulation (stimulating efforts to find new ideas and creative solutions to existing problems, encouraging innovation, creativity, and new approaches), and (d) individualized consideration (recognizing that subordinates have different needs and desires, and acting as a coach to develop their full potential).

The relationship between moral leadership and transformational leadership might not have explicitly analyzed but the natural and general knowledge teaches that a moral leadership knows that each individual is unique, is not a waste but a divine contribution to corporate development and must be valued and celebrated. Once again, it takes the first commandment to instill such morality and write it on the heart of leaders. Burns (1978) underlined the connection
between moral and transformational leadership when he argued that the transformational leader as a morally mature agent who focuses on developing the moral maturity, values, and ideals of his or her subordinates and strengthening their commitment to serve the well-being of others, their organization, and society beyond self-interest. This is exactly the reason for the first commandment.

Also, in recent work, Bass (1998a, 1998b) and Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) explicitly advocated that moral character and ethical behavior are both a precondition for and an outcome of transformational leadership. By claiming that moral competency is vital to transformational leadership, Bass and coworkers seem to have closed the gap toward Burns’ initial theory (Ciulla, 1998). However, the issue still remains about how to operationalize this moral competency.

Zhu (2012) argued that transformational leaders provide followers with greater opportunities for decision latitude, challenge, and responsibility, which will cause followers to feel more confident and meaningful, and therefore psychologically empowered. This helps to satisfy followers’ need for affiliation within the organization by improving their self-esteem, which eventually may enhance their identification with the organization (Ashford et al., 2008). More recent theories have emphasized ethics and morals at the heart of successful leadership (Burns, 1978; Ciulla, 1998; Gardner, 1990).

As the moral transformational leader pays attention to individual differences (uniqueness) of his followers, he establishes relationship with each of them, and offers them work opportunities that challenge their growth and development. At the heart of individualized consideration lies the leader’s concern for each individual’s unique gifts and talents (Bass, 2000). Bass did get the divine golden and premium intention to have endowed humanity with the Decalogue. Specifically, the first commandment establishes equal horizontal and vertical consideration to all. The first commandment invites everyone to be in personal vertical
relationship with the lawgiver. This means that the lawgiver values each and every one. As such a leader who doesn’t consider his followers should go back to the first commandment to assess his leadership roles, functions, and duties.

Also, transformational leadership is defined as a type of leadership in which the leader motivates the followers and increases their commitment. The greatest teaching conveyed by the first commandment is the lesson that you cannot be a good moral leader if you are not a good follower of God, the first commandment. The first commandment is the communicational channel God has chosen to help every individual to understand “the emotion through relevant emotional cues and managing these emotions are vital skills for a transformational leader. These leaders choose their followers and enhance their performance through personal communication” (Eshraghi, Harati, Ebrahimi, & Nasiri, 2010, p. 2545). Eshraghi et al. argued that these leaders work to awaken dormant needs of the followers and challenge them to reach a collective higher purpose. Thus, these leaders must have a desirable level of emotional understanding and proper personality traits. Through the first commandment God proves that he understands what is best for each individual and calls on transformational leaders to “use intellectual stimulation skills and their own individualized considerations in actualizing these issues.” Mandell and Pherwani (2003) and Barling et al. (2000) showed that there is a positive linear relationship between the three factors of transformational leadership (individualized influence, individualized consideration and inspirational motivation) and leadership outcomes.

The first commandment, capitol of the individualized consideration is the backbone of the American Declaration that “All men are created equal.” Only the first commandment ensures and guarantees that truth and its application. For that reason, the first commandment gives credit to moral transformational leadership exercised with biblical emotional intelligence and negates transactional leadership. Proven that without the first commandment there is no moral nor
positive, progressive and transformational leadership, this paper summarizes the benefits of the first commandment in moral leadership as follows:

1. You shall not have any other law before my law.

2. You shall not craft any amendment or by-law contrary to mine.

3. You shall not mention my law in vain and with/to abuse.

4. Remember my law and stick to it.

5. Honor my law in courts, in homes, and everywhere that your days be long in the land your Lord has given you

6. You shall not murder my law.

7. You shall not commit to any law that is not mine.

8. You shall not steal any law or from my law.

9. You shall not bear false witness against my law.

10. You shall not covet any jurisdiction or legislation other than my law.
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