



Lecturing from the President Byeong
in the light of
Ministry, Philosophy, and Leadership of Dr. Melvin
(Number 23)



Are they [F.A.T]?

F-Faithful?; A-Available?; and T-Teachable?

Dear students,

There is a saying that when selecting a leader, or even a small group leader, it should be in accordance with [F.A.T]. F-faithful; A-available; and T-teachable; that is, is he faithful? Does he have time? And is he teachable? This seems a bit of an ideal, but it seems like a necessary checklist in selecting a leader.

Being Faithful is the case where they work faithfully in their job, and gain trust from people around and from their boss. There is also a Bible saying that whatever you do, do as you do to the Lord. Socially speaking, it is the case of doing more than the amount of salary. Some salaried people do less, some do as much as they get, and some do more than that, and moreover, they are people who work steadily and hard. As a result of studying successful people, there were many third cases. It means that they are sincere in small things, so they are given the big job.

The second checklist is, "**Is he Available;** that is, time for this job?" Some people are like, saying, "I will take it." He has good intentions of working for it. But he can't do it because he doesn't have time. There is an example around me. He took an important task which should be taken care of for a week, but I found he wasn't doing anything for a week, so I was waiting for a few weeks but none yet, and another few months gone, but still no job done, and the worst even a year. Terrible! Isn't he supposed to postpone it? If he really doesn't have time, we can understand it. Even so, there is a problem with not being able to make time at all. This is a fatal disqualification in team ministry. Anyway, I'm talking here about those who don't have time at all. It is difficult to make a team leader who is always absent at meetings, even if he has wonderful intentions. Then finally we might question, "Is he really available?" or "just lip service always?" I am personally saying here, "if they are already really busy with other things, we can't get them to be a leader in any given task even though he has wonderful talents."

The third checklist, "**Is he Teachable?**" which means that I can paraphrase "can be corrected by him? Or 'can he change his style? Sometimes there are people who are too stubborn naturally. Once, we are making a 'leadership course' in the training curriculum, which is a top-level course that absolutely requires good character. Some people are very smart, but their decisive weakness is too strong egocentric, so they are ineligible as a leader. People suspect and question, "Is he teachable?" Will it be taught?"

As you can see, three checklists are important. Maybe the first question, "Is he faithful?" contains both of the other things, but I'd like to highlight the question, "Is he supposed to be taught?" Also, we might ask ourselves, "are we qualified in these three things?"

Weekly Axiom

*The important thing is not that you have rank, but that you have responsibility.
Everything else flows from that.*
(P.F.D)