PROCESSES TOWARD POST/DECOLONIAL PASTORAL LEADERSHIPS
KRISTINA I. LIZARDY-HAJBI

Abstract

This article constitutes the second in a two-part series focusing on post/decolonial pastoral leaderships that challenge constructed modern/colonial notions of leadership and church. Although an understanding of post/decolonial leaderships, including theoretical underpinnings and related frameworks, provides a preliminary foundation for pastoral leaders, the ways in which these leaderships are praxised and embodied within the contexts of community become the more critical endeavor for U.S. Protestant Christianity, thereby prompting deeper questions regarding the role of leadership in congregational change processes toward post/decoloniality.

"We have seen that colonization materially kills the colonized. It must be added that colonization kills [us] spiritually. Colonization distorts relationships, destroys or petrifies institutions, and corrupts [humans], both colonizers and colonized."[1]

Introduction

In a previous article,[2] I outlined initial definitional and characteristic frameworks for post/decolonial leaderships, including foundational articulations of postcolonialism and

Rev. Kristina I. Lizardy-Hajbi, Ph.D., is Term Assistant Professor of Leadership and Formation and Director of the Office of Professional Formation at Iliff School of Theology in Denver, Colorado.

[1] Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, expanded ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991), 151. This quote also introduces the first article in the series to emphasize theological groundings for addressing colonization and, more specifically, its enduring effects through colonialism.

[2] Kristina I. Lizardy-Hajbi, "Frameworks Toward Post/Decolonial Pastoral Leaderships," *Journal of Religious Leadership* 19(2) (2020): 100-130.

decoloniality contextualized subsequently within prevailing models of U.S. Protestant pastoral leadership and church.[3] In addition, two frameworks—anti-racism and diversity and inclusion—were differentiated from post/decoloniality while also noting important connections between them. I provided a brief overview of theological scholarship in the areas of postcolonialism and decoloniality, culminating in a deeper overview of Emmanuel Lartey's characteristics of postcolonial faith community and leadership. Finally, an initial argument was introduced for the use of *leaderships* as a subversive, subjugated re-languaging and contestation of hegemony and homogeneity embedded within the singular-as-plural use of pastoral leadership.

With these points in mind, the question then arises: How do pastoral leaders and faith communities practice—or, more appropriately, praxis[4]—post/decoloniality?[5] Although I began to detail some beginning praxes in the first article, drawing upon Lartey's characteristics, which signaled multiple "hows" of post/decolonial leaderships (i.e., counter-hegemonic and strategic activities, plurality/pluriversality, intersectionality, interactionality

[3] I introduced some definitional caveats in the use of "post/decolonial" and "pastoral leadership" within the initial article and offer them here, as well. I choose to signify this work as "post/decolonial" in order to acknowledge the separate contextual and theoretical streams from which challenges to coloniality have arisen in the literature, as well as to highlight their common foundational aims as critiques to colonial being-thinking-acting. I use the term "pastoral leadership" as a reference to individuals functioning within and among the broad spectrum of Christian traditions and faith communities, with the hope that what is articulated in this article might be applicable, at least in part, to leaders and congregations beyond Christianity. Within the article, however, I speak most directly to my own religious context of mainline Protestantism as an Ordained Minister in the United Church of Christ and as a faculty member at a seminary connected with the United Methodist Church.
[4] In this article, I am intentional about the use of *praxis* as a verb to emphasize the dynamic relationship between, and the simultaneity of, both action and reflection, as well as to bring forward an extension of the re-languaging work detailed in the initial article as critical to post/decoloniality praxis.
[5] This question lies in juxtaposition to a query worded thusly: How do pastoral leaders and faith communities become post/decolonial? In the initial article, I address the ways in which this line of inquiry is problematic and exemplifies colonial praxes and worldviews: Lizardy-Hajbi, "Frameworks Toward Post/Decolonial Pastoral Leaderships."

and intersubjectivity, polyvocality, dynamism, and creativity) and faith communities (i.e., eruption of subjugated and indigenous knowledges, collapsing of binary oppositions, pluralities of discourses and histories, recognition of social constructivism, and resurgences of the conventional), further explorations are necessary.[6] Such movements, which I name as processes toward post/decolonial leaderships, are included among the myriad ways in which leaders and communities embrace and actualize undoing, subversion, resistance, and re-existencing "for the possibilities of an otherwise,"[7] recognizing that there exist no set prescriptions, nor any finite point, by which leaders and communities arrive definitively at a monolithic "post/decolonial reality."[8]

In juxtaposition to these conceptions, modern eurocentric colonial models for enacting leadership within U.S. faith communities reflect largely corporatized, capitalistic, hegemonized, and supremacist processes, which limit possibilities for the kinds of changes that actualize post/decolonial realities.[9] The Protestant church in the United States has largely adopted these models as their own without the realization that they lend themselves to a replication of the colonial project within religious communities, whose faith products maintain the status quo by avoiding deep transformation of being-thinking-acting (otherwise known in the Christian world as repentance, the *metanoia* of turning about completely).

As such, this article seeks to challenge dominant assumptions about pastoral leadership as currently constructed in the U.S.

---

[6] The characteristics of leadership and faith communities named within both sets of parentheses are detailed in the first article.

[7] Walter D. Mignolo and Catherine E. Walsh, *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis* (Durham, NC: Duke University, 2018), 17.

[8] If one has arrived at such a reality, it would be a re-inscription of the very colonialism to be resisted and dismantled, asserting a kind of "epistemological arrogance" rather than an "epistemological humility." See Otto Maduro, "An(other) Invitation to Epistemological Humility: Notes Toward a Self-Critical Approach to Counter-Knowledges," *Decolonizing Epistemologies: Latina/o Theology and Philosophy*, eds. Ada María Isasi-Díaz and Eduardo Mendieta (New York: Fordham University Press, 2012), 87–103.

[9] On this point, examples and sources are detailed extensively in the first article.

Protestant context by interrogating the role of the pastor as a singular positional enactor of change in the church. Next, three colonially constructed and reinforced binaries regarding leadership and change are problematized and then reimagined—theory/ praxis (knowledge/action), means/ends (process/outcome), and using/rejecting the "master's tools" for change—thus invoking potential for envisioning alternatives beyond present existences. As a generative framework-and-as-process for pastoral leaders who seek to nurture practices and processes of post/decoloniality in their communities, a new binary of delinking and relinking is introduced, drawing upon experiences and practices of a United Methodist congregation in Sacramento to illustrate this offering. Finally, two specific frameworks-and-as-processes are explored as options for praxising post/decoloniality that alter the role and function of pastoral leaderships and congregations seeking change: Paulo Freire's *conscientização*/popular education and adrienne maree brown's emergent strategy.

Challenging Assumptions About Pastoral Leadership and Change

This article, in part, focuses on the processes by which pastoral leaders might nurture (or co-nurture) change within faith communities toward post/decolonial praxes.[10] This statement carries implicit assumptions that the modern colonial construction of a singular (white, cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied male) figurehead of a congregation is the most God-like or holy image of pastoral leadership and, therefore, the most capable or effective

---

[10] Processes toward post/decolonial pastoral leaderships also might invite an exploration of the ways in which pastoral leaders are formed for leadership and ministry. Although this is not the main subject of the article, Willie James Jennings provides an in-depth analysis, critique, and decolonial option based on Jesus and the crowd in his book *After Whiteness: An Education in Belonging* (Grand Rapids, MI: Willian B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2020). Jennings asserts that the goal of theological education is the formation and sustaining of the "white self-sufficient male," engendering "a performativity aimed at the exhibition of mastery, possession, and control with the tacit assumption that this ongoing work of exhibition illumines talent and the capacity for leadership" (18).

model/progenitor of change within the church.[11] These two distinct notions of the singular pastoral figurehead and the pastor as the most capable change agent are linked inextricably and cannot be detached easily from one another when considering leaderships in U.S. Protestant contexts.

Most prevailing models for pastoral leadership (and leadership in the United States as a whole) assume that the leader—often, but not always, selected by the community (or select members of the community) to a visible, professionalized role—is the major catalyst for change within a church.[12] Regardless of the model, leadership— by its very etymology—assumes a sovereign-centric method and process for invoking change. In this regard, the pastor's role is one of *singular positional enactor*, whereby the goal is to alter or shape the faith community in intentional ways. In a more generous sense, the pastor is the one who guides change (or simply helps weather change, as the case may be), invoking the often-romanticized biblical image of shepherding one's flock (reconstituting the root use of the word *pastor*). However, Emmanuel Lartey and Hellena Moon argue that

> in historicizing "pastoral," the term was used primarily to convey a metaphorical model of shepherding care that showed authority and power of one species (i.e., the human) who was considered superior to the sheep (i.e., unthinking animal who needed guidance). This communicates an uneven message of leader being superior and human, while the image of flock somehow is

---

[11] See Choi Hee An, *A Postcolonial Leadership: Asian Immigrant Christian Leadership and Its Challenges* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2020), 53: "Leadership positions in U.S. culture have been occupied by an elite upper-class white Anglo-European heterosexual male group without disabilities (the privileged white group) throughout U.S. history."

[12] This does not discount the existence of co- or tri-pastorates, but these constitute a minority within Protestant churches.

beneath that of the leader and less than fully human (read: colonialism).[13]

Or, more explicitly related to an imperial model, the pastor serves as a reflection of myriad Hebrew biblical images of sovereign kings and queens, as well as the signification of Christ as king, each of whom are assumed to take on the religious and political responsibilities of bringing about systemic-level change.[14] In all of these cases, the underlying assumption invoked is that change takes place primarily through action by a more human/holy individual in a visible position of authority upon (or on behalf of) a particular group of people. This top-down approach has been nuanced within secular and religious leadership literature; however, scholarship and practice continue largely to center leadership models that involve a sole figurehead-centric model for change within faith communities.[15]

Although this construction possesses roots in pre-modern empires of conquest as witnessed in biblical texts, and is also more recently canonized by works such as Niccolò Machiavelli's 1532 treatise *The Prince*,[16] both modern and so-called postmodern

---

[13] Emmanuel Y. Lartey and Hellena Moon, *Postcolonial Images of Spiritual Care: Challenges of Care in a Neoliberal Age* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2020), 5.

[14] For an exploration of colonial constructions of the image of Christ as king (as well as prophet and priest) in conversation with the writings of Friedrich Schleiermacher, see Jeorg Rieger, *Christ and Empire: From Paul to Postcolonial Times* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 197–236.

[15] See Christian N. Thoroughgood, Katina B. Sawyer, Art Padilla, and Laura Lunsford, "Destructive Leadership: A Critique of Leader-Centric Perspectives and Toward a More Holistic Definition," *Journal of Business Ethics* 151(3) (2016): 629. The authors outline several reasons why the literature has focused largely on leader-centrism: (1) "a fascination with [singular] leadership outcomes, particularly destructive ones;" (2) "a popular perception of *leadership* that looks to *leaders* for answers to group and organizational problems;" (3) "much of the leadership literature is a reflection of psychologists' traditional emphasis on traits and behaviors, as opposed to higher macro-level processes more inherent to fields like sociology, institutional economics, history, and political science;" and (4) "simultaneous analysis of leaders, followers, and environments is difficult given all the factors to consider."

[16] Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 2nd ed., trans. Harvey C. Mansfield (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1532] 1998).

leadership literatures have maintained elements of these understandings and practices and adapted them to the colonial enterprise, most saliently within corporate America. In reality, though, significant adaptation was not necessary because the aims of modern colonialism remain compatible with empiric aims of past centuries.[17] Likewise, various Christian traditions have assented to the primacy and assumed efficacy of the singular positional enactor model of leadership, most notably through the election of bishops, general ministers, presidents, and other heads of religious bodies, replicating royal imperial governing structures in order to gain political and religious power.[18]

At the same time, however—and more often than not in the case of congregations—the positional leader as pastor is often selected precisely for *his* ability to repel change, at least the kinds of change that might alter power structures, disrupt and reimagine processes, or engage other ways of being-thinking-acting toward

---

[17] Now classic leadership works such as Peter F. Drucker's *The Effective Executive: The Definitive Guide to Getting the Right Things Done* (New York: HarperCollins, [1967] 2006), James Collins's *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap and Others Don't* (New York: HarperBusiness, 2001), and many others perpetuate a singular positional enactor model for change within the business sector, with the end goal of increased production and profit.

[18] My own denomination, the United Church of Christ, underwent a national leadership restructure in recent history that culminated in 2000 with the creation of a shared leadership model between four executives overseeing different areas of the life of the church, with one individual serving as General Minister and President but having limited unilateral authority. Just fifteen years later, this model was deemed "ineffective" by factions of the denomination, including new denominational leadership; and a push was made for a new/old governing structure that increased greatly the authority and unilateral decision-making of the General Minister and President, thereby also decreasing the power of the other executive positions. A resolution brought to the General Synod as a rewriting of the denomination's constitution and bylaws failed in 2015 due to strong resistance but passed in 2017 with virtually no resistance or discussion. See Anthony Moujaes, "Synod Delegates Reshape UCC Leadership With Constitution and Bylaws Changes," *UCC News*, July 4, 2017, https://www.ucc.org/news_gs_synod_delegates_reshape_ucc_leadership_with_constitution_and_bylaws_changes_07042017/.

post/decoloniality.[19] In this sense, the pastor is paid to maintain colonial structures and processes that neither challenge hegemony and homogeneity, nor disrupt the theological beliefs and cultural, political, epistemological, and ontological worldviews of community members. At most, (white, male, heterosexual) pastors might be hired to "grow the church" by bringing in (white) young adults and (nuclear) families. Or perhaps toward nobler aims, the pastor is asked to extend the reach of the church into the surrounding community (for white urban or suburban congregations, this means engaging with increasingly nonwhite individuals who have moved into the church's surrounding neighborhood as a result of white flight), but with the intention of either increasing its charitable services to these communities or assimilating them into the church, both of which constitute colonial endeavors that maintain the church's hegemony.

Processes toward post/decolonial leaderships challenge assumptions about the singular pastor as primary change agent (or stasis agent, as the case may be) and instead invite possibilities for non-capitalistic, non-hegemonic, community-centered praxes around change. Before offering examples of processes, however, several other assumptions must be discussed and disrupted, particularly in their actualizations as fixed binaries related to pastoral leadership and congregational life.

Disrupting Binaries

Binaries might originate with the intention of expanding singular frameworks for being-thinking-acting, but they often become cemented as fixed polarities with time, interpretation, and implementation (particularly by colonial powers). Three such binaries as related to post/decolonial leaderships include: theory/

[19] Brazilian educator Paulo Freire wrote, "The illusion which thinks it possible, by means of sermons, humanitarian works and encouragement of other-worldly values, to change people's consciousness and thereby transform the world, exists only in those we term 'naive.' The 'shrewd' are well aware that such action can slow down the basic process of radical change in social structures." See Paulo Freire, "Education, Liberation and the Church," *Religious Education* 79(4) (1984): 525.

praxis (or knowledge/action), means/ends (or process/outcome), and using/rejecting the master's tools for change. Through problematizing each of these binaries and alternatively highlighting the interplays and interconnections between each coupling (with different resolutions offered for each pairing), ways forward in engaging and nurturing post/decolonial pastoral leaderships and community change might become more apparent.

Theory/Praxis (Knowledge/Action)

As referenced in the initial article, Mignolo and Walsh disrupt the binary construction of theory versus praxis by suggesting a decolonial "theory-and-as-praxis and praxis-and-as-theory...the interdependence and continuous flow of movement of both."[20] Although this binary seems nonexistent because praxis includes the use of thought and reflection to inform action, it is the Westernized, colonial elevation of theory and thinking *alone* as the primary, "correct" practice over a more integrated praxis that poses problems for post/decolonial pastoral leaderships. In their coauthored book *On Decoloniality: Concepts, Analytics, Praxis*, the first four chapters written by Walsh focus on queries around praxis: "The for, the how, the with whom, and what for...to disturb the notion that theoretical and conceptual frameworks must necessarily precede praxis, as well as the idea that meaning is only conceptually derived."[21] The latter chapters written by Mignolo focus on the conceptual frameworks and discussions of colonialism in terms of the what and the why, as he asserts that "decoloniality is first and foremost liberation of knowledge, of understanding and affirming subjectivities that have been devalued by narratives of modernity that are constitutive of the CMP [colonial matrix of power]."[22] Each author's commitments as articulated within the structure of the book highlight the broader tensions between theory and praxis/knowledge and action,

---

[20] Mignolo and Walsh, 7.

[21] Mignolo and Walsh, 19.

[22] Mignolo and Walsh, 146. Mignolo is referring here to an understanding that "knowledge in the CMP occupies two positions: knowledge is one of the puppets (one domain, and the domains are the content of the conversation, the enunciated), and knowledge also refers to the designs (the enunciation) that the puppeteer creates to enchant the audience" (144).

emphasizing one construct more heavily than the other. Yet, in the introduction, they solidify the interwoven nature of the two conceptions with these questions: "Are you not doing something when you theorize or analyze concepts? Isn't doing something praxis? And from praxis—understood as thought-reflection-action and thought-reflection on this action—do we not also construct theory and theorize thought?"[23]

For embodying processes toward post/decolonial pastoral leaderships, knowledge and action (theory and praxis) are engaged dialectically in creative interplay, at times not distinguishable from one another. However, what is most central to theory-and-as-praxis and praxis-and-as-theory is the "continuous work to plant and grow an otherwise despite and in the borders, margins, and cracks of the modern/colonial/capitalist/heteropatriarchal order."[24] In the realms of knowledge (recognizing such as knowledge-and-as-action), Otto Maduro proffers several important hypotheses that might move communities toward post/decolonial processes, four of which are articulated as follows:

> *Whatever we understand by knowledge, we always and only know in community, in a culture and language shared by community.* "Individual" knowledge is never merely individual: It is always knowledge claimed by an individual within a community, but not quite yet knowledge until it is understood and validated by a community (or another).

> *Whatever we understand by knowing or knowledge (or, by extension, true or truth), we almost invariably know amid unstable, asymmetric power relations, interests, and dynamics.* The meaning of an utterance, if any, is (re)produced in relation (both specific and variable) to the history, culture, and dynamics (including power dynamics) of a specific community.

---

[23] Mignolo and Walsh, 7.
[24] Mignolo and Walsh, 101.

Whatever we understand by knowing or knowledge, we could submit that it is less so (held less and by fewer people as knowledge, as "real," as "true"), the less the attention, importance, and consequences (as well as its denials, refutations, rejections, and dismissals) it is capable of bringing forth. Whatever is shared, recognized, and accepted in a certain community as knowledge is such a result of the investment of time and energy in constructing and safeguarding such knowledge as valid, legitimate, true, and important. In this sense, knowledge is accumulated labor.

A claim to know, to have knowledge, to know where knowledge is, how to get it, and who has it is more perilous than just an intellectual claim. Such an epistemological claim...might reactivate, reanimate, reawaken dormant memories, worries, patterns, and desires...regardless of, and also over against, the best intentions of those reintroducing certain knowledge claims in a particular juncture of a group's history.[25]

Knowledges, therefore, in processes toward post/decolonial pastoral leaderships constitute more than mere abstract thought or theory divorced from context, community, place, and the present moment. *Knowledge-and-as-action* (and theory-and-as-praxis) includes relational, power-laden dynamics that are conveyed not only through the content being shared, but also through the very terms undergirding the process of knowledge transmission. This begs the following questions: What knowledges are being transmitted/sanctioned/embodied by pastoral leaders within faith communities? How are these knowledges expressed or understood (as divine, holy, sacred, etc.)? Conversely, what knowledges are being negated/hidden/delegitimized by pastoral leaders, and how are such knowledges expressed or understood (as mortal, sinful, "other," etc.)? What are the terms set forth by the structures,

---

[25] Maduro, 88–89, 90, 92–93, 101–102.

domains, processes of the church and denomination/tradition that sanction some knowledges and delegitimize others?

Disrupting dominant knowledges—and the terms through which these knowledges have been sanctioned—opens possibilities for pastoral leaders toward new actions, thus bringing theory and praxis into closer relationship with one another. Such knowledges in U.S. Protestantism include traditioned rituals, liturgies, hymns, orders of worship, patterns of governance, theological truth claims, and much more. Processes/praxes that embrace post/decoloniality must interrogate knowledges, uncover the ways knowledges have been historically and culturally constructed and why they have been constructed in such ways, and engage with those knowledges that have been negated, hidden, and delegitimized in favor of colonial motives and narratives (as well as those knowledges that have been used subversively and in resistance to colonial motives and narratives).

Means/Ends[26] (Process/Outcome)

U.S. Protestantism—situated within eurowestern colonial/modern values of achievement and continual progress—generally remains mired in an implicit prioritization of ends/outcomes over means/process. Measures of success for congregations often center on two numerical variables: people and money (or money and people). Pastoral leaders or church members might not express this so bluntly, but the model of the modern/colonial congregation relies on generating enough income to pay professional staff (including the pastor's salary and benefits), cover necessary building maintenance expenses, and meet denominational dues requirements (with increasing dollars for mission and program included when surpluses exist). This requires enough people to tithe appropriately in order to fulfill those financial obligations (or, rather, a few people who are of significant means to fund the bulk

---

[26] While not the subject of this section, it is important to note ongoing ethical discussions regarding "means justifying ends" and vice versa. In the organizing classic by Saul D. Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals* (New York: Vintage Books, [1971] 1989), 24–27, Alinsky devotes a chapter to this very conundrum and offers an insightful power analysis.

of these expenses). Consequently, such a dynamic often creates a pay-for-service model of ministry whereby those who are paid by the church are expected to perform their duties to the satisfaction of the salary funders in ensuring the success of the "business." The more people in the pews and money in the bank, the more successful is the pastor,[27] minimizing both biblical visions of *ekklesia* and the importance of process in congregational change.[28]

Many congregations engage in processes of re-visioning and re-missioning, endeavors that invite changes that rarely make substantive shifts toward post/decolonial praxes of negating empire and the trappings of coloniality/modernity. As with disruptions regarding theory-and-as-praxis/knowledge-and-as-action, the content (the explicitly and implicitly named components, motivations, and theologies) and the deeper terms (the histories, structures, values, and worldviews through which these terms have been made to flourish) of any process for change must be interrogated, challenged, and dismantled within an acknowledgement of the particular power dynamics and complex relationships at play in the congregation. Ultimately, in post/decolonial activities, process—that is, the process that the community undertakes—*becomes* the outcome/ends or, at the very least, gains equality with (and, in many cases, priority over) the ends/results. In this manner, colonial reflexes of hegemony, monovocality, universalization, control, and mastery might be mitigated somewhat through what such processes engender toward the post/decolonial.

As a model/framework and a process (or framework-and-as-process), Matthew Wesley Williams, in the coauthored work *Another Way: Living and Leading Change on Purpose*, calls for

---

[27] See David E. Fitch, "Our Definition of Success: When Going From Ten to a Thousand Members in Five Years Is the Sign of a Sick Church," *The Great Giveaway: Reclaiming the Mission of the Church From Big Business, Parachurch Organizations, Psychotherapy, Consumer Capitalism, and Other Modern Maladies* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2005), 27–46.

[28] In the initial article, I referenced feminist theologian Rebecca Chopp's description of *ekklesia* as a counter-public sphere of justice and as a community of friends engaging in a praxis of connectedness, outlined in her book *Saving Work: Feminist Practices of Theological Education* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 62–69.

"liberating leadership," which "seeks to dismantle the dominant forms of living and leading that reinforce the oppressive norms of empire."[29] Williams juxtaposes the notion of warrior-hero (a singular figurehead whose tasks are to rescue and fix) with the image of warrior-healer (one who helps communities reconnect with themselves and "cocreates the conditions for the community to discover its power and address its complex challenges").[30] Based on concepts and praxes of community and church arising from indigenous African and black American traditions highlighted throughout the book, liberating leadership—as a way of freeing the notion of leadership from its conventional (i.e., empiric/colonial) utilizations—is characterized by a series of negatives thusly:

> *It is not synonymous with public speaking.* Ella Baker modeled an approach to leadership that suggests that *public listening* rather than public speaking might be the most important skill in a community when facing complex and systemic ills.

> *It is not about lone rangers.* Dominant notions of leadership arise from the [colonial] Western intellectual tradition that privileges the individual as the source and end of all useful endeavors.

> *It does not use people as means to achieve an end.* Even the most well-intentioned efforts to dismantle oppression and inaugurate eternal alternatives can fall into the habitual flaw of using people to achieve change. Borrowing logic from industrial-age innovation of interchangeable parts, this leadership reflex uses people in congregations, organizations, and movements as incidental, replaceable assets in the machine of the mission. Human beings are the ends, not the mere means, of liberation.

---

[29] Stephen Lewis, Matthew Wesley Williams, and Dori Grinenko Baker, *Another Way: Living and Leading Change on Purpose* (Saint Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2020), 129.

[30] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 129.

It is not best known for its products, but by its processes.
We tend to determine whether a leader is effective
solely by what the person acquires or achieves. What if
instead of focusing on the products of leaders, we paid
more attention to the processes of leadership?[31]

By negating the warrior-hero role of the pastoral leader
and instead cultivating options for warrior-healerships that
prioritize means/process toward the co-creation of communities
discovering their power for change, the ends/outcomes experience
liberation as well. From bottom-line numbers to the collective
flourishing of community members to live their faith in new
ways, the transformation of ends/outcomes provides pastoral
leaders and congregations with a deeper "why" and motivation
to engage post/decolonial knowledges-and-as-actions in the
first place. The question of whose human collective flourishing,
however, is important to examine, particularly if dominant faith
communities continue to flourish while subaltern communities
continue to decline and perish (culturally, economically, socially,
psychologically, emotionally, spiritually, and otherwise).[32]

Using/Rejecting the "Master's Tools" for Change

Audre Lorde said famously, "The master's tools will never
dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to
beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring
about genuine change."[33] Many leaders, changemakers, activists,
and scholars have relied upon Lorde's words to engage in the work
of decolonizing social movements, community and nonprofit
organizations, and—to a limited extent—faith communities.
Anything resembling "the master's tools" are dismissed; and processes
and plans negating modernity, white heteropatriarchy, hegemony,

---

[31] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 134–135, 137–140.

[32] *Subalternity*, a term first introduced and detailed by postcolonial scholar
Gayatri Spivak, is "less an identity than what we might call a predicament…in
Spivak's definition, it is the structured place from which the capacity to access
power [and voice] is radically obstructed." See Rosalind C. Morris, "Intro-
duction," *Can the Subaltern Speak? Reflections on the History of an Idea*, ed.
Rosalind C. Morris (New York: Columbia University Press, 2010), 8.

[33] Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider* (Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press, [1984] 2007), 112.

capitalism, exploitation, etc. are sought and implemented/experimented within these spheres. This creates, therefore, a binary reality in which such tools can either be utilized fully or rejected altogether.

The question becomes: For individuals who reside within the United States, is it possible to reject the tools of coloniality/modernity completely? Whether a pastoral leader's identities and affiliations with white heteropatriarchy, empiric aims, etc. are more or less apparent (e.g., whether one is a white, cisgender, heterosexual male serving a white, affluent, suburban church, or a gender nonbinary, queer person of color serving a lower socioeconomic urban faith community, or any combination of intersecting identities and circumstances), there exist difficulties—nay, impossibilities—to becoming a wholly post/decolonial leader or congregation. As offered in the initial article, post/decoloniality is a *process* in and of itself of complexities, tensions, and "resurgences of the conventional" (as named in Emmanuel Lartey's characteristics of postcolonial faith communities) that never reaches definitive ends. Even if the totality of coloniality's tools were to be rejected somehow, the theories-and-as-praxes and praxes-and-as-theories by which such rejections occur would be constant and continual (which is an iterative work that many social movements, organizations, and faith communities embrace in processes toward post/decoloniality).

Mignolo and Walsh quote the work of Lewis Gordon and Jane Anna Gordon in moving beyond the binary toward a praxis of "not only with the master's tools":

> Slaves have historically done something more proactive with such tools than attempt to dismantle the Big House. There are those who used those tools, developed additional ones, and built houses of their own on more or less generous soil. It is our view that the proper response is to follow their lead, transcending rather than dismantling Western ideas through building our own houses of thought. When enough houses are built, the hegemony of the master's house—in fact, *mastery*

itself—will cease to maintain its imperial status. Shelter needn't be the rooms offered by such domination.[34]

Pastoral leadership in U.S. Protestantism today has relied too heavily on the master's tools to further coloniality/modernity and reap its many benefits of legitimation, power, control, and mastery. Before such leaders and communities undertake the iterative work of rejecting or using not only the master's tools, they must learn to recognize such tools in the first place (not only the tools themselves, but when and how those tools are used to further coloniality). Such work transcends the binaries of theory and praxis to engage processes that allow for knowledge-and-as-action and action-and-as-knowledge toward liberation. This work also requires a re-prioritization of process/means in relationship to outcomes/ends, whereby the binary might then be dissolved and processes-and-as-outcomes creates new visions of *ekklesia*.

Embracing and Transcending a New Binary for Change

In the midst of reimagining fixed binaries as pluralities with multiple commonalities and intersections, one generative framework-and-as-process for pastoral leaders who seek to nurture practices and processes of post/decoloniality in their communities involves the complimentary acts of *delinking* and *relinking*. Mignolo suggests:

> Decoloniality emerges out of the need to delink from the narratives and promises of modernity—not to resist, but to re-exist...decoloniality names the vision and energy of delinking (disconnect) to relink (re-connect) with the praxis of living, thinking, doing that we, decolonially speaking, want to preserve.[35]

---

[34] Lewis Gordon and Jane Anna Gordon, "Introduction: Not Only the Master's Tools," *Not Only the Master's Tools: African-American Studies in Theory and Practice*, eds. Lewis Gordon and Jane Anna Gordon (Boulder, CO: Paradigm, 2006), ix, quoted in Mignolo and Walsh, 7.
[35] Mignolo and Walsh, 145–146, 147.

He articulates further the act of relinking: "Re-existing means using the imaginary of modernity rather than being used by it. Being used by modernity means that coloniality operates upon you, controls you, forms your emotions, your subjectivity, your desires. Delinking entails a shift toward using instead of being used."[36] In the colonial matrix of power, all individuals are being used for some ends, whether those ends are power, authority, control, profit, or otherwise (with many used to the point of oppression, violence, delegitimization, and erasure from the U.S. empire). In this manner, using the tools of coloniality operates in similar ways to drawing upon "not only the master's tools," but building from them to re-envision multiple different "houses" of faith and belonging.

For pastoral leaders and congregations, delinking and relinking actions will look and feel quite different depending on context. While engaging post/decoloniality is everyone's work, location, identity, and power matter. Pastoral theologian Melinda McGarrah Sharp articulates it in this manner:

> Postcolonializing unearths pain from structures of everyday life that are still shaped by historical colonialism whose basic logic is that some human beings are more human than others. The colonizing logic enrolls gender, identity, nationality, age, skin pigmentation, race, bodily abilities, geographic location, family history, and the myriad of other ways of identifying ourselves and other people into hierarchical patterns of superiorities and inferiorities that pervade contemporary life. Resisting these hierarchies plays out differently for folks who are crushed by them daily and folks for whom the structures are largely invisible or optional extracurricular activity if considered to matter at all. No wonder we humans differ in our desires to

---

[36] Mignolo and Walsh, 146–147.

resist this hierarchical postcolonial status quo or to resist changing anything about it.[37]

What might nurturing practices and processes of post/ decoloniality within a large Methodist church of largely white, affluent families in a suburban metropolitan area look like? In comparison, what might nurturing such practices and processes in a small, native Lutheran mission church on a reservation look like? Or a mid-size, fourth-generation, middle-class Japanese American Methodist congregation in a sprawling urban area? Coloniality has rendered—and continues to inflict—violence and pain in starkly varying degrees for each of these communities. On the whole, leaders and congregations that are majority white and/or middle- or upper-class (and/or heterosexual, able-bodied, possess citizenship, etc.) might not readily comprehend the work of post/ decoloniality because they constitute those who have benefited from the very hierarchies that McGarrah Sharp references, thus rendering modernity/coloniality invisible. Recognition of the systems and "master's tools" at play—inviting a delinking of particular knowledges—might be an important initial praxis, one that will no doubt bring challenge and resistance.

For pastoral leaders and congregations that are historically and presently othered, erased, and/or oppressed in the colonial matrix of power, knowledges-and-as-actions and actions-and-as-knowledges that *relink individuals to themselves*, their traditioned ways of knowing, being, and doing, with intention "to create rather than to be dependent on the creativity of the actors and institutions that produce and maintain the narratives of modernity," provide possibilities for re-existencing new orientations of *ekklesia*.[38] In Courtney T. Goto's work *The Grace of Playing: Pedagogies for Leaning Into God's New Creation*, Goto describes the introduction of a collaborative art installation (*The Garden Series*) at the Sacramento Japanese United Methodist Church (SJUMC), a congregation founded by Japanese immigrants who came to the United States

---

[37] Melinda A. McGarrah Sharp, *Creating Resistances: Pastoral Care in a Postcolonial World* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2020), 183.
[38] Mignolo and Walsh, 146.

before World War II. The installation was designed to mirror a distinctive feature of the church, the Issei Memorial Garden, located in the center of the church grounds. The garden, constructed in 1972 to honor the "perseverance, sacrifices, and faith" of the *issei* (or first) generation of church founders who "suffered economic hardship, racism, and incarceration with their families in wartime relocation camps," is landscaped with flora and other elements in traditional Japanese style.[39] The narratives of how the garden has been maintained over the years became as much a source of meaning and pride for the faith community as the garden itself, even helping the congregation through a particularly conflictual moment in its existence in conversation with *The Garden Series* installation. In this regard, through SJUMC's continual relinking to cultural aesthetics (the Issei Memorial Garden), congregational history (church ancestors who demonstrated perseverance through difficult times), the sharing of oral narratives by those who care for the garden (current wisdom-bearers), and aesthetically imaginative co-creation (*The Garden Series* as initially implemented by pastoral leadership), the faith community is able to re-existence itself as future generations and challenges arise.

Frameworks-and-as-Processes Toward Post/Decolonial Pastoral Leaderships

Remembering that any work engaged toward post/decoloniality is necessarily contextual, pluriversal, and communal (among other characteristics), there exist specific frameworks-and-as-processes that have arisen, elements of which may be—and, indeed, have been—useful for faith communities in the praxis of post/decoloniality. Such frameworks-and-as-processes are myriad; however, two specific models will be explored, highlighting possibilities for pastoral leaders and faith communities: *Conscientização* (as popular education) and emergent strategy.

---

[39] Courtney T. Goto, *The Grace of Playing: Pedagogies for Leaning Into God's New Creation* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016), 97.

Conscientização *and Popular Education*

Paulo Freire was a Brazilian educator who, in 1970, published *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and is most well-known for the process detailed in his work as *conscientização* (or conscientization), "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality."[40] This critical consciousness-centered process negated a banking approach to education that understood the oppressed/colonized/"uneducated" as objects and the teacher as professional authority (or *singular positional enactor*) who would impart the necessary knowledge.[41] Instead, Freire argued, those considered objects should be speaking about their own experiences and oppressions so that they themselves can alter power dynamics and negate oppression, for "it is in speaking their word that people, by naming the world, transform it."[42]

The specific process that Freire practiced involved training individuals from beyond the community, to observe said community, by holding "evaluation meetings" to share observations. In these meetings, investigators would engage with community members dialogically, listening as much as possible to articulations of "present, existential, concrete situation[s], reflecting the aspirations of the people."[43] Such conversation would create generative themes that would then lead to the community's increased collective awareness (conscientization) of the "limit-situations" they were experiencing. Through what Freire calls "critical perception," "a climate of hope and confidence develops which leads [humans] to attempt to overcome" their limit-situations.[44] Consequently, such dialogue transforms "untested feasibility" into testing action, empowering individuals within these conversations to become "teacher-students," who will work more directly with others

---

[40] Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary ed. (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, [1970] 2014), 35.
[41] Freire (2014), 73.
[42] Freire (2014), 88.
[43] Freire (2014), 95.
[44] Freire (2014), 99.

within their community to co-create knowledge-and-as-action and dismantle/transform/re-exist realities.[45]

Although this is a significantly simplified summary of the Freirean process, it provides a basic understanding of the paradigm shift from one form of knowledge gaining by oppressed peoples (i.e., the banking system) to a more dialogical, community-centered, and grounded approach in which the purpose is to liberate individuals and give voice to the subaltern so that they can negate and resist colonial realities and violences. Freire's notions of conscientization and popular education have been applied broadly around the world, including within Western, Eurocentric, colonial contexts. For example, book groups have been referred to as processes that can bring about conscientização, thus labeling (or appropriating) any educational process that rejects the banking approach as being "Freirean." However, if such groups are not centered on education for the purpose of social change and they do not lead to post/decolonial praxis, then they might not constitute Freirean approaches.[46]

As a result, Freire's process has been the subject of critique by postcolonial and decolonial scholars and leaders alike, particularly in its wider applications beyond specific localized and historied contexts in which it was first practiced, but also related to facets of the process itself. For example, Boaventura de Sousa Santos argues that Freire's "research process has a very clear sequence, and the control of the sequence is in the hands of the researcher."[47] Freire's focus was on the educational project that, while having some interconnections with post/decoloniality, is not synonymous with it. Rather, in "epistemologies of the South" (as de Sousa

---

[45] Freire (2014), 113, 120.

[46] See Loretta Pyles, *Progressive Community Organizing: Reflective Practice in a Globalizing World*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2014), 85: "Reading books as a group about progressive ideas can be a way of learning novel perspectives and formulating a value-based outlook as a group. Such study groups could evolve into publishing a newsletter clarifying the ideas, or they could evolve into some other kind of social action."

[47] Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018), 260–261.

Santos describes within decolonial praxes), the main endeavor is the "ecologies of knowledges," whereby the researcher or investigator "must be a rearguard intellectual, never a vanguard intellectual."[48] Ultimately, the Freirean model still maintains a hierarchical relationship between subject and object, although it certainly is geared toward dialogue and liberative movement. Related to broader applications of Freirean conscientization, de Sousa Santos continues, "There is a danger that the phases and sequences controlled by the researcher may turn into a recipe, that is to say, into an educational process totally disconnected from the political action it was supposed to promote."[49] Linda Tuhiwai Smith emphasized this point further to stress that Western, colonial processes and violences have occurred under the self-proclaimed use of Freirean methodologies and pedagogies, as well.[50]

Even in considering these critiques, Freirean pedagogies still might have something of substance to offer U.S. Protestant pastoral leaders and faith communities toward engaging post/decolonial knowledges-and-as-actions; for, as Catherine Walsh suggests, it is possible to "both think with and beyond Freire" for new possibilities.[51] To this point, the value of Freirean pedagogy lies within the dialogical process that has the potential to unearth silenced, oppressed, subaltern narratives and realities that contribute to a congregation's *conscientização*. However, for pastoral leaders and churches that would rely on such a process of "education," whereby knowledge is *extracted from* the other with no regard for power inequalities, reciprocities (as well as reparations), and the need for resistance/dismantling/re-existencing of the othered, such faith communities reinscribe colonialism and inflict further harm. Freire himself said of clergy and churches:

---

[48] de Sousa Santos, 261.

[49] de Sousa Santos, 261.

[50] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd ed. (London: Zed Books, 2012), 169.

[51] Mignolo and Walsh, 91.

The *sine qua non* which apprenticeship [with the oppressed] demands is that first of all, they really experience their own Easter, that they die as elitists so as to be resurrected on the side of the oppressed, that they be born again with the beings who were not allowed to be. Such a process implies a renunciation of myths which are dear to them: the myth of their "superiority," of their purity of soul, of their virtues, their wisdom, the myth that they "save the poor," the myth of the neutrality of the church, of theology, education, science, technology, the myth of their own impartiality—from which grow the other myths: of the inferiority of other people, of their spiritual and physical impurity, and the myth of the absolute ignorance of the oppressed.[52]

As such, the framework-and-as-process that Freire recommended for Christians and churches was one of apprenticeship with poor and oppressed communities[53] in Latin America working toward their own *conscientização* and liberation, not necessarily the aforementioned educational process he outlined in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (though this process was adapted and revised in various contexts throughout the world at Freirean institutes). That process, in reality, was not designed for elite Christians who benefit from the colonial matrix of power and possess closer ties with empire, hegemony, and heteropatriarchy. Instead, such pastoral leaders and

---

[52] Freire (1984), 525–526.
[53] de Sousa Santos, 258–259, notes some important points regarding differences between Freire's contexts and current contexts: "Literacy tasks [which were Freire's original concern] are today less pressing, and the oppressed groups are of such variety that they cannot be identified through the general categories of peasants and workers. They include women, indigenous peoples, Afro-descendants, Dalits, and peasants and workers with different traditions of resistance in different continents." Moreover, "The contradiction separating oppressors and oppressed is crucial in the epistemologies of the South, but the character of the domination sustaining it is now far more complex. In the work of Freire, the principal mode of domination, if not the only one, is capitalism, whereas in the epistemologies of the South, domination has three pillars: capitalism, colonialism, and patriarchy."

faith communities are to take on the role of apprentice to subaltern communities, not to extract, impose, or control but to learn from, work under the tutelage of, and experience in dialogue with, those most impacted by empire.

What is the role of the pastoral leader in such a process? This framework-and-as-process for change creates a model in which the leader is a *communal co-learner/sharer* (in juxtaposition to a singular positional enactor). Communal co-learners/sharers embody a leadership-by-example framework in the deepest sense, whereby they invite the church alongside them in the unlearning and relearning only available by doing the work of engaging with communities beyond their own (i.e., a praxical delinking and relinking). Negating and monitoring one's tendencies for asserting hegemony, control, "truth" and "knowledge" in Westernized, Eurocentric ways—at the direction of those one is being apprenticed by—becomes the means-and-as-ends by which the congregation understands other ways of being-thinking-acting as legitimate. In this manner, the pastoral leader guides the faith community in the cultivation of counter-knowledges that take seriously the third hypothesis by Otto Maduro cited earlier in the article: "Whatever is shared, recognized, and accepted in a certain community as knowledge is such a result of the investment of time and energy in constructing and safeguarding such knowledge as valid, legitimate, true, and important. In this sense, knowledge is accumulated labor."[54] By pastoral leadership's openness to, and praxis of, communal co-learning/sharing, such accumulated labor might result in new knowledges-and-as-actions that transform/reshape worship, liturgy, governance, education, and formation, as well as community values, habits, and lived beliefs and theologies in conversation and conspiration with those seeking post/decolonial realities.[55]

---

[54] Maduro, 93.
[55] While not detailed in this article, Freire provides a fitting example of the process a Christian might encounter through apprenticeship that mirrors praxical delinking and relinking, as well as the challenges such work poses to the individual's ties with imperialism. See the section "Education for Liberation," Freire (1984), 528–531.

Emergent Strategy

adrienne maree brown is a Detroit-based social justice facilitator and doula who, in 2017, published *Emergent Strategy: Shaping Change, Changing Worlds* based on her experience as a nonprofit leader, organizer, and student of activist Grace Lee Boggs and Afrofuturist Octavia Butler. brown's book is unlike any other in its organization, structure, and framework-and-as-process for leaderships and change, inviting "possibilities for an otherwise" in both regards.

Although emergent strategy—like Freirean education for change—is another process that is difficult to define and describe succinctly, brown summarizes it as a way "for building complex patterns and systems of change through relatively small interactions...emphasiz[ing] connections over critical mass, building authentic relationships, listening with all the senses of the body and the mind."[56] Such strategy relies on principles of biomimicry—"the imitation of models, systems, and elements of nature for the purpose of solving complex human problems"— and permaculture, or "a system of agricultural and social design principles centered around simulating or directly utilizing the patterns and features observed in natural ecosystems."[57] Ultimately, brown says, it constitutes "how we intentionally change in ways that grow our capacity to embody the just and liberated worlds we long for."[58] brown expands upon several grounding principles in the book:

> Small is good, small is all. (The large is a reflection of the small.)
>
> Change is constant. (Be like water.)
>
> There is always enough time for the right work.
>
> There is a conversation in the room that only these people at this moment can have. Find it.

---

[56] adrienne maree brown, *Emergent Strategy: Shaping Change, Changing Worlds* (Chico, CA: AK Press, 2017), 2–3.
[57] brown, 23.
[58] brown, 24.

Never a failure, always a lesson.

Trust the People. (If you trust the people, they become trustworthy.)

Move at the speed of trust. Focus on critical connections more than critical mass—build the resilience by building the relationships.

Less prep, more presence.

What you pay attention to grows.[59]

The elements—or ways of being-thinking-acting—through which brown frames these principles (drawing from nature and natural systems) include fractal, adaptive, interdependent and decentralized, nonlinear and iterative, resilient and transformative justice-oriented, and creating more possibilities. Evident in principles and elements are notions of leaderships that rely upon a communal approach centering change by, with, and dependent upon the people (not a single positional enactor). In a decentralized model whereby power is distributed among the multitude, those who are charismatic singular leaders or who are lifted up by any group as the leader must resist such "rock star" temptations. As brown indicates: "Rock stars get isolated, lose touch with our vulnerability, are expected to pull off superhero work, and generally burn out within a decade." She continues, "People stopped seeing us. We became a place to project longings and critiques. And we learned the hard way that rock star status is a cyclical thing. It becomes its own work, maintaining and promoting the rock star in the organization."[60] Moreover, this model of leadership replicates the very dynamics of hierarchy and power that are inherent in colonialism and which Lartey's characteristics of postcolonial leadership negate. Fittingly, those characteristics—counter-hegemonic and strategic activities, plurality/pluriversality, intersectionality, interactionality and intersubjectivity, polyvocality, dynamism, and creativity— contain similarities and complementarities to brown's emergent

---

[59] brown, 41–42.
[60] brown, 99.

strategy principles. Thus, brown redefines a great leader to be "one who is inspirational in collaborative action, accountability, and vulnerability" and who surrounds oneself with those who will name power dynamics at play through honest relationships.[61]

The entanglements of pastoral leadership with rock star status exist to various degrees based on contexts, identities, and dynamics, but are often exacerbated by perceptions of the role of pastor (whether or not such perceptions are grounded theologically, biblically, or structurally/denominationally) as set apart, more spiritual, or simply as head of the church community. Nevertheless, new ways of leadership and change like the kind that brown outlines are emerging in religious and secular settings. As an example, since the assassination of the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., many religious and political leaders have been searching for a (male, cisgender, heterosexual) leader to take his place in the struggle for civil rights. The Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement has been a direct contestation of that assumed leadership model by describing themselves as, and practicing, a "leader-full" decentralized movement. Such decentralization "would allow for a different practice of power, where many people rather than a small few determined the direction of the project," with the recognition that "hierarchy can help with efficiency—making decisions and getting things done—but of course it is also racialized, gendered, and classed, and it often reflects existing power dynamics...Black people are often on the losing end of hierarchies."[62] With chapters across the country that have their own shared leadership practices and that cultivate leaders from within, all chapters also help to make decisions about the collective actions and statements of the larger network, challenging the idea "that one leader, or even three, can speak for all or make decisions for all."[63] There is caution in such a model, however, as BLM cocreator Alicia Garza warns:

[61] brown, 101.
[62] Alicia Garza, *The Purpose of Power: How We Come Together When We Fall Apart* (New York: One World, 2020), 162.
[63] Garza, 163.

Having many leaders, or rejecting the notion of leadership altogether, means that more process is necessary to get things done. Difficult decision-making practices are not inherent in decentralized models—but a lack of skill and practice in using decentralized methods can lead to a circular process that doesn't get anything done.[64]

In this regard, brown's work offers some helpful tips, wisdom, and practices for decision-making that can be (and have been) used within congregations.[65]

Another model with notes of (and an explicit reference to) emergent strategy framework-and-as-process is one articulated by theological educators Stephen Lewis, Matthew Wesley Williams, and Dori Grinenko Baker in their work *Another Way: Living and Leading Change on Purpose*. In addition to conceptions of liberating leadership shared earlier in this piece, the authors detail a process by which congregations, educational institutions, and other faith-filled groups might move beyond colonial, Westernized, hierarchical ways of change through movements they collectively name as CARE:

C = Create hospitable space.

A = Ask self-awakening questions.

R = Reflect theologically together.

E = Enact the most faithful step.[66]

Grounded in the authors' own experiences and theologies, CARE creates alternatives for the work of religious organizations with such "what if" questions as: "What if we helped people better

---

[64] Garza, 164.

[65] See brown, "Tools for Emergent Strategy Facilitation," 213–270. brown categorizes processes and other tools according to the elements of emergent strategy; and the section includes everything from ways to create group agreements to efficient consensus decision making, conflict relationship prompts, and collaborative ideation processes.

[66] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 3.

align their espoused values with their leadership practices? What if we exposed alternative ways of leading, ways that value collective wisdom and action? What might be possible if changemaking leaders gain the tools to imagine and enact alternatives to the status quo? What if we explore together the steps that courageous change requires of us? What if we could create such opportunities for people to explore their call beyond the four walls of the church?"[67] Each aspect of CARE speaks directly to co-facilitating ways of being that echo principles of brown's emergent strategy and offer a possible response to such questions. Creating hospitable space "is about creating conditions where Spirit-inspired alternatives to the current reality may emerge," and invites the gatherers to sit face to face, share silence and stillness, establish shared guidelines, slow down, and turn to story.[68] Asking self-awakening questions entails five movements of creating space, employing a muse, discerning questions that are truly self-awakening, letting the questions breathe, and catching what surfaces.[69] Critical theological reflection invokes a communal metanoia, a "shift in our consciousness and way of being in the world that directs our action toward the embodiment of empowering alternatives."[70] Finally, enacting the most faithful step catalyzes a human-centered design (HCD) approach of listening (to those most affected by the solution), ideating (imagining alternatives), trying something (experimenting), reflecting, and beginning again (listening again to those most affected).[71]

Such models as BLM and CARE that incorporate (explicitly and implicitly, knowingly and unknowingly) principles and elements of emergent strategy in their theories-and-as-praxes of leaderships and change hold critical promise for pastoral leaders and churches seeking post/decolonial realities. In recognizing that this work necessitates delinking from hegemonic paradigms of how churches are "run" and calls into question long-held traditions,

---

[67] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 8.
[68] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 43, 33.
[69] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 68–69.
[70] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 112.
[71] Lewis, Williams, and Baker, 155.

structures, and embedded (and embodied) heteropatriarchal, hierarchical conceptions of the practicing of faith in the current U.S. colonial context, pastoral leaders who have been trained and socialized within current Protestant denominational systems might yearn for more concrete evidence that such frameworks-and-as-praxes really produce the kinds of change they seek. This yearning must be revealed for what it is: another colonial instinct that seeks proof by the standards and measures that post/decolonial pastoral leaderships negate and resist. Such seeking of "proof of concept" also includes desires for concrete examples of X Church and Y Pastor having implemented a particular model, resulting in "success." While additional examples most certainly exist in which pastoral leaders and congregations are engaging collaboratively and collectively the work of praxising post/decoloniality in and throughout various areas of life together (as illustrated in one brief instance with the narrative regarding Sacramento Japanese United Methodist Church), the contextualized grounding of processes relative to localized faith communities remains critical to any delinking and relinking movements.

Conclusion

Similar to the initial article that introduced frameworks toward post/decolonial pastoral leaderships, what is offered in this piece is preliminary, as additional analyses and configurations are needed in order to further explicate, refine, contextualize, and even question these articulations. Moreover, underlying what has been shared here exists a binary that has yet to be investigated fully, though aspects of its presence are woven throughout—the generally boundaried dichotomy between pastor and congregation, between clergy and laity. The hope is that colonialism/modernity has not saturated U.S. Protestant constructions of pastoral leadership to the point that we cannot be freed from current formulations and praxes. Movements from pastoral leader as singular positional enactor to communal co-learner/sharer—creating space for new models that consider emergent, leader-full, liberating, and other leaderships to flourish—generate permeability between what is (and who is) a pastor/clergyperson and a congregant/layperson. In

this sense, post/decolonial leaderships might begin to be expressed characteristically as counter-hegemonic, insurgent, strategic, hybrid/plural, intersubjective, interactional, dynamic, polyvocal, creative, and more. At least (or at last) the line between pastor and congregation has been pierced and the binary disrupted.[72] With the concept of change removed from the sole grasp/hands of the pastoral leader, theory and praxis (knowledge and action), process and outcome (means and ends), and rejecting and using the "master's tools" are similarly disrupted and re-existenced as power becomes shared (resisting hegemony), multiple bodies and voices contribute wisdom and knowledge-and-as-action (resisting homogeneity), and *ekklesia* takes shape. The quote by Albert Memmi introducing the initial article and this piece serves as a beacon for all pastoral leaders to resist (delink) and reimagine (relink) their roles, calls, work, and the entirety of their being-thinking-acting not only for themselves, but for the collective flourishing of the church.

---

[72] Such a "line" is an indirect reference to Boaventura de Sousa Santos's notion of the *abyssal line* that "persists as colonialism of power, of knowledge, of being, and goes on distinguishing metropolitan sociability from colonial sociability" (22).