2004

[Introduction to] The International Library of Leadership

J. Thomas Wren
University of Richmond, twren@richmond.edu

Terry L. Price
University of Richmond, tprice@richmond.edu

Douglas A. HIcks
University of Richmond

Recommended Citation

Wren, J. Thomas, Douglas A. Hicks, and Terry L. Price. *The International Library of Leadership*. Vol. 1-3. Cheltenham, UK: E. Elgar, 2004.

NOTE: This PDF preview of [Introduction to] The International Library of Leadership includes only the preface and/or introduction. To purchase the full text, please click here.

Traditional Classics on Leadership

Edited by

J. Thomas Wren

Associate Professor of Leadership Studies
Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond, USA

Douglas A. Hicks

Associate Professor of Leadership Studies and Religion
Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond, USA

and

Terry L. Price

Associate Professor of Leadership Studies
Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond, USA

THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF LEADERSHIP

Preface

J. Thomas Wren, Douglas A. Hicks and Terry L. Price

This book is one of a three-volume set devoted to bringing together in one place the most significant writings and scholarship on leadership. When Edward Elgar Publishing first contacted the editors about creating a reference collection pertaining to leadership, an opportunity presented itself to reshape the traditional formulation of leadership studies and to suggest a deeper and more fundamental understanding of the phenomenon. In scholarly circles, the term *leadership studies* has often been used to connote a rather narrow corpus of social science analyses, chiefly from the fields of social psychology and management science. Such studies have contributed mightily to our understanding of leadership, yet they are limited in scope and purpose. On the other hand, the recent popularity of 'leadership' has spurred an outpouring of publications in the trade press. These popular treatments are almost invariably simplistic and shallow.

The premise underlying this collection is that the phenomenon of leadership is too important and too complex to leave the field to these champions alone. Our view of leadership is that it is a universal component of the human condition. It is the process by which and through which groups, organizations, and societies seek to achieve their perceived needs and objectives. As such, leadership has occupied center stage throughout human history. It embraces far more than the mere running of modern formal organizations, and it is much too complex to summarize neatly in a short paperback. Fortunately, because leadership has played such a central role in the human endeavor, it has not lacked for study and analysis. Indeed, the greatest minds in history have considered its implications, probed its dilemmas, and prescribed solutions for its problems.

The goal of this collection is to make readily available to the serious student of leadership a compilation of sources the editors think are representative of the best insights into this important phenomenon. The selections contained in these volumes, it should be noted, come solely from Western traditions. Many works from other cultural traditions are obviously relevant, but constraints of space would limit our inclusion of them to anecdotal status. Such works deserve fuller treatment, perhaps in a future Edward Elgar collection.

Volume I, *Traditional Classics on Leadership*, contains our version of the most insightful and important writings on leadership from ancient times to the dawn of the twentieth century. Moreover, the selections are arranged according to what we believe have been the key leadership issues in the preindustrial age. The volume begins with the central question of the moral purpose of leadership. The selections in this section – from Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, Kant, Madison, and Nietzsche – suggest the sort of

intellectual capital that has been brought to bear upon our topics. Other issues that the volume addresses include: What is the nature of ideal leadership? What constitutes legitimate authority? What is the role of followers? How might one go about challenging authority? We have taken care to include voices that have traditionally been out of the mainstream: women such as Christine de Pizan, Mary Wollstonecraft, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Virginia Woolf, and men of color such as David Walker and W.E.B. Du Bois. Taken together, the selections in this volume provide a rich and textured reference collection for an initial understanding of some of the central issues of leadership.

Volume II we have labeled *Modern Classics on Leadership*. It is here that we collect for the reader the seminal articles and chapters that have shaped what is commonly known as the modern field of leadership studies. With the rise of the modern business corporation (and other precedent-shattering developments such as modern warfare), there was an increasing perception that the role of leadership needed closer study. Concurrent with this was the rise of professional academic disciplines in the social sciences. Thus began a fortuitous pairing of leadership with serious academic scholarship that has spawned enormous insights. This volume seeks to bring together the best of that work. Beginning with the paradigm-shaping work of Frederick Winslow Taylor early in the twentieth century, this volume traces the field of leadership studies as it evolved throughout the twentieth century and became a sophisticated scholarship of considerable influence. We place at the reader's disposal the path-breaking studies that led to trait theory, behavior theory, contingency theories of leadership, transformational leadership, charismatic leadership, cognitive approaches to leadership, and studies of power. We also trace the insights that social scientists have brought to the study of followers, organizational culture, and such specific leadership issues as the role of gender. Thus, this volume provides in one place the 'giants' of modern social science leadership literature.

Volume III we call *New Perspectives on Leadership*. Here we seek to demonstrate how the insights of many intellectual approaches contribute to an understanding of current leadership issues. In this volume you will find writings by contemporary philosophers, management scientists, political scientists, social and political activists, and others. We have sought to organize these writings around the questions and themes that we believe most pertain to the study of leadership in the postmodern age. The questions include how leadership should be conceptualized; the role of power and authority; and questions of values, morality, and ethics. The themes that this volume explores reflect what we believe are the most important for our contemporary society: leadership and service, social change, democratic leadership and inclusion, and international leadership. Volume III of the Edward Elgar collection, then, should provide an important intellectual foundation for anyone interested in the current challenges of leadership.

If one were to take a step back and look at the Edward Elgar *International Library of Leadership* collection as a whole, it is our hope that the view thus gained would be one of coherence. It has been our goal in this editing project to do more than just collate

good writings on leadership. Our aim has been one of integration. The challenges of our modern world make an understanding of leadership too important to leave to happenstance or haphazard experience. We have sought to make it possible for those serious about leadership to have easy access to the best thinking of the great minds of past and present. Moreover, we have arranged these selections around what we believe are the central issues that modern leaders continue to confront. Many of the selections in these volumes are not an easy read. But they represent what the editors believe to be the most important collection of sources on leadership now available. The 'unity' we have sought is the unity of a common subject matter that has, through the ages, occupied the attention of the brightest luminaries. We hope that this collection may serve as the steppingstone toward a better understanding of the subject of leadership and, in the process, a better world.

Introduction

J. Thomas Wren, Douglas A. Hicks and Terry L. Price

Leadership might be thought of as the process that facilitates the achievement of societal objectives. As such, it has been at the center of learned reflection and debate since such reflection began. This volume draws together in one place some of the best thinking on leadership from great minds of Western traditions. From earliest times, philosophers, religious leaders, political theorists, and reformers have struggled with (and argued about) the ends of leadership, how individuals and societies can best go about achieving those ends, and what role leaders and followers play in the process. Some of the most incisive thinking about leadership has sprung from the maelstrom of societal conflict, as those faced with the frustration of their ideals groped for ways to nudge (or push) their society on to the correct track. What follows is a thematic tour of what the editors believe is the best of such commentaries on leadership.

Since the chosen selections represent some of the greatest minds of history, they often contain arguments of a sophisticated and complex nature. It has been the editors' conscious decision to include sufficient portions of each writer's argument so as to allow the reader the opportunity to gain a firsthand acquaintance with the author's position. Accordingly, each selection is as long as the constraints of space will allow, and, whenever possible, our editing has been minimal, so that each selection represents contiguous portions of the primary source material. The editors also chose to retain the original spelling and punctuation of the sources. Readers of all three volumes in this collection, published by Edward Elgar under the title *The International Library of Leadership*, will note that the typeface for *Traditional Classics on Leadership* differs from that of its compatriots. This is due to idiosyncratic editing decisions relating to this volume that required its contents to be reset in different type.

The purpose of this Introduction is to provide the reader with a succinct overview of the arguments of each contributor, together with a narrative of how the respective selections interrelate with one another, and thus provide a sense of the development of the historical argument. There follows, then, our guide to the source material of *Traditional Classics on Leadership*.

The Moral Purpose of Leadership

Perhaps the most important debate in which any society engages is that which determines its ultimate ends and objectives. The resolution of that debate, in turn, fundamentally

shapes how it goes about seeking to achieve those ends and objectives – in other words, how leadership will and should operate. The contributors in this initial section reflect deeply upon the desired ends of leadership in a society. Their arguments are moral arguments in the classic sense of the term: they are debates over fundamental principles of the good society.

As in so many other realms, an appropriate starting point is the thinking of Plato. The first selection, from his *Republic*, finds Plato debating with friends about the nature of justice. When Thrasymachus argues that 'might makes right,' Plato (through the voice of Socrates in the selection) responds with a ringing affirmation of his view of the proper end of leadership and relationship between leaders and followers. A ruler (and a state) will have but one end in mind: 'All that he says and does will be said and done with a view to what is good and proper for the subject for whom he practises his art.' The motivation for leadership should never be money or honor. Rather, the focus for Plato is the good of the people. His ultimate recommendation – to be pursued in the next section of this volume – is the establishment of government under the rule of a virtuous elite, his 'philosopher kings.'

Aristotle takes a slightly different tack. The desired end of government is not all that different from that of Plato. 'A state exists,' argues Aristotle, 'for the sake of a good life.' This can be achieved through the auspices of a good state – a community of common interest dedicated to virtue and justice. Aristotle differs from Plato in his implementation, however. According to Aristotle, how such a state might be structured can vary, although a strong argument can be made that the multitude, taken as a collective, possesses more virtue and wisdom than the few. Nonetheless, Aristotle is no particular friend of unbridled democracy. Only when there are wise and virtuous leaders, ruling in conjunction with the participation of the people (defined in such a way as to exclude women, slaves, and those with an insufficient stake in society), will a state be likely to achieve the desired end.

If Plato and Aristotle set out the initial parameters of the discussion, Jean-Jacques Rousseau weighs in on the conceptions put forth by the earlier writers. He agrees with Plato that might does not make right. Indeed, society is formed in an effort to thwart that principle. The problem is 'to find a form of association which shall defend and protect with the public force the person and property of each associate ....' The challenge is to do so while protecting one's freedom. This is achieved by means of a social contract, in which each individual alienates his natural liberty to the community, which will, under the guidance of the 'general will,' establish notions of justice and morality and protect one's civil liberty. Through the exercise of the general will, man acquires 'moral liberty,' an improvement over the state of nature. In principle, then, Rousseau gives the people power in governing, as they deliberate to determine the general will.

Although each of the contributors thus far has addressed the issue in his particular terms, each is seeking answers to essentially the same question: What is the purpose of the state, and how does the state go about achieving it? The next selection, by Immanuel Kant, is less direct but no less substantive. Kant picks up on Rousseau's theme of

liberty while indirectly addressing Aristotle's discussion of the role of the people. He discusses liberty in terms of 'enlightenment.' To Kant, to be enlightened is to have the ability to use one's own understanding in all matters, without the guidance of another. This applies to all realms, including the political. To have enlightened citizens one needs enlightened rulers, who permit the citizens the freedom to reason. These citizens, then, have the opportunity to think for themselves and to criticize policy. The duty of the leader is to protect and support this process.

James Madison also addresses issues relating to the role of the people in a state and the role of leaders in a state purporting to rest upon popular power. Madison's concerns have to do with the proper ends of political society, which he thinks is the achieving of the common good – the 'permanent and aggregate interests of the community.' In the face of challenges to this objective created by democratic majorities run amok, Madison suggests a new structure of government – a large republic – that would make it difficult for the majority to organize and oppress the rights of others. Such a republic would also lead to the selection of virtuous leaders who would keep the larger interests of the community in view.

In one form or another, all of the contributors thus far can be said to take benevolent views of the ends of the state and the contributions of leaders. Whether the ends of the state are follower interests, virtue and justice, freedom, or the common good, the state appears dedicated to the betterment of society. Likewise, the role of leaders has generally been to foster similar goals. This section ends on a provocative note. In the last selection Friedrich Nietzsche takes quite a different stance regarding the purpose of the state and the role of the leader. Nietzsche provides a narrative of the state and its leaders that is at once a creative and conflicted tale of oppositions and a call for the freedom of self-creation. Rejecting Rousseau's contract notions of the origins of the state, Nietzsche suggests the state began when 'a herd of blonde beasts of prey, a race of conquerors and masters which with all its warlike organisation ... pounces with its terrible claws on a population....' These leaders know nothing of responsibility or consideration and instead have an 'instinct of freedom,' or 'the will to power.' Ironically, as time passed, the oppressed generated what Nietzsche considers a monstrous swing to the other extreme. In the process, the powerful group of initial leaders became deified, and with the rise of religion (Christianity) came notions of guilt, duty, and even concern for others. Nietzsche calls for a new leader or leaders to free us from this sickness. What must come, he argues, is another warlike and savage leader who will again liberate the will to power. His goal is not so much totalitarian rule but the overcoming of any value system that stifles philosophical/artistic creativity by leveling man to a herd mentality. Clearly Nietzsche begins from differing premises than the others, and it is not without reason that he is linked to some of the evil developments of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, his aspirations for the creative freedom that accompanies the will to power are not lacking in their attractions.

It is obvious from our last selection that debates about the desired ends of the state and its leaders do not necessarily lead one to happy outcomes. This is all the more

reason for those interested in the study of leadership to consider fully such first principles when engaging in an analysis of leadership. If this section has helped to begin that process, the next should place a finer point on what comprises good leadership.

Ideal Leadership

Closely related to the moral purpose of leadership is the question of what constitutes ideal leadership. This question has also been the subject of considerable discussion and much insight. Here, again, it is appropriate to begin with the insights of Plato.

Plato's solution to the problems of the state is justly famous. He turns to a very special type of leader, the philosopher king. 'Unless either philosophers become kings in their countries or those who are now called kings and rulers come to be sufficiently inspired with a genuine desire for wisdom; unless, that is to say, political power and philosophy meet together ... there can be no rest from troubles ....' Such a leader will love truth, be magnanimous, and be known for justice, courage, and temperance. Plato acknowledges that implementing such a rule will be difficult. Although followers should defer to such wisdom, the masses have not always shown a propensity to do so. In his later writings – in his *Statesman*, *Laws*, and *Letters* – Plato suggests that laws can help achieve such appropriate rule. Nevertheless, Plato holds out hope that, if such a leader can be put into place, the public will recognize his abilities and follow him.

In a later epoch, Thomas Aquinas had reason to reflect upon ideal leadership. Aquinas was much influenced by his reading of Aristotle, and hence echoes him in speaking of the need for political society and in giving his typology of the various forms such government could take. The contribution of Aquinas is in his focus upon the criterion for distinguishing between good and bad leadership and his choice of the appropriate leadership structure. A good leader is one who governs 'for the common good of the multitude and not his own profit.' Under this criterion, Aquinas finds monarchy to be the best form of government because it is most efficient in securing the common good. Democracy is the worst, since it is most inefficient at the same task.

If Plato and Aquinas portray ideal leadership as a benevolent despot whose objective is to achieve the happiness of society, Niccolo Machiavelli's *The Prince* provides a dramatically different sort of ideal. For Machiavelli, the goal of leadership is to maintain 'the prince' in power. Machiavelli's work is, in effect, a handbook to accomplish just that. In the selection included in this volume, he argues that 'a prince who wishes to maintain his power ought therefore to learn that he should not be always good, and must use that knowledge as circumstances and the exigencies of his own affairs may seem to require.' The prince should be both 'the fox and the lion,' and 'have a spirit disposed to change as the winds of fortune and variations of things command him.'

Perhaps because of the dark possibilities of leadership, the Scottish moral philosopher Adam Smith takes a more cautionary approach. He shares with Plato and Thomas Aquinas a commitment to the general welfare but has less faith in leaders. In this selection

from *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Smith addresses the dilemma leaders face when society loses equilibrium and faces social and political challenges. He advises leaders to attempt to avoid such difficulties by balancing interests within society. But if discontent arises, the leader faces a real balancing act. He should be open to moderate reform, because thereby society can be improved. Yet fundamental change, particularly that championed by ideologues, should be avoided at all costs. Such movements usually lead to fanaticism and evil. Instead, the leader of public spirit should advocate moderation and be content with what pragmatic changes are possible within the system. Smith thus argues for a conservative response to societal and political change, even as his moral philosophy upholds justice, benevolence, and virtue.

If Smith prefers a careful and pragmatic approach to leadership over some ideal system with perfectionist ends, John Stuart Mill is even more skeptical of the notion of some ideal leader presiding over society. Indeed, he challenges that very premise. Mill holds that a benevolent despot is not a realistic solution. Even if it were possible to secure such rule, it would still be undesirable, because any despotism quashes the realization of human possibilities. What is needed is a government grounded in the people. This will assure that the interests of all will be addressed in efforts to achieve sound policy for the good of the community. Mill acknowledges that direct democracy is not always feasible and champions representative government as the means to a just and free society.

For all their differences, Plato, Aquinas, Smith, and Mill represent a body of writings that address ideal leadership in structural terms; that is, each seeks to construct a leadership structure that will ultimately secure the moral ends of society. The remaining selections in this section address ideal leadership in behavioral and cognitive terms. In effect, they advocate proper leader behavior or suggest ways of thinking about leadership that will lead to desirable results. The first of these selections harks back to the Middle Ages to capture a rare woman's voice from that time period, that of Christine de Pizan. Her text is a reminder that the formal leadership roles thus far under debate were applied exclusively to men. Yet women played important roles as informal leaders nonetheless. De Pizan, writing advice to one who aspires to be a 'good princess,' sets out several guidelines. The good princess should be humble, kind, gracious, merciful, and charitable. 'The benevolent princess ... will celebrate other people's worthiness as greater than her own and rejoice in their welfare as if it were her own.' Moreover, there are times when she should add her counsel to the man's work of her husband, the prince. Specifically, she should counsel against avoidable war because of the harm it inflicts upon the people. She should go so far as to be a peacemaker, if possible. Although it might seem dated to our modern sensibilities, this piece suggests that both men and women always had leadership roles to play, and each had attendant expectations. Despite their socially imposed restrictions, elite women were able to exercise substantial public influence.

In contrast to de Pizan's portrayal of the behavioral attributes of the ideal (female) leader, Virginia Woolf, in her classic *A Room of One's Own*, takes a more cognitive

approach. In this selection, Woolf, although ostensibly thinking about the challenges that women writers face, nevertheless makes an important point about our thinking about ideal leadership. Having reflected upon the distinctive ways that men and women approach thinking and writing (as well as the lack of opportunities for women), Woolf suggests that the 'androgynous mind,' one that combines the best of male and female characteristics, would lead best. There is much to learn from each other. Her view of ideal leadership, then, would entail including perspectives and people who were currently outside the formal leadership process. In contrast to Adam Smith, of course, this calls for more fundamental social change.

Our final selection in this section, by Sigmund Freud, also takes a cognitive – in this case psychological – approach to the notion of the ideal leader. Freud asks how it is possible for one man to be considered 'great,' and to be perceived as a leader. Using Moses and the Jews as a case study, Freud finds that followers are drawn to such a leader due to their need for authority; specifically, by their longing for a father figure. Thus the great man has the traits of a father. His followers admire and trust him but also fear him. Moses is the perfect example of such an ideal leader.

The initial sections have introduced the reader to alternative idealized ends and means of leadership. Leadership, however, is almost by definition grounded in everyday life, and some of the great leadership tracts in history have sprung from quite pragmatic public issues. The next section traces one of the most important of these debates.

The Nature of Legitimate Authority

Virtually all of the important writings about leadership, prior to the twentieth century, at any rate, had to do with 'public' or political leadership. This makes sense, since the private corporation, which became the focus of so much modern leadership attention, did not rise to prominence until the late nineteenth century. Prior to that time, it was the great public events that spurred the important intellectual outpourings related to leadership. So it was that events of the Early Modern Age – that is, from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries – generated one of the more profound debates related to leadership. The specific catalytic events varied, ranging from the Reformation to political upheavals in England and on the continent, but the resulting intellectual ferment surrounded a single issue: What are the source and nature of legitimate authority in a polity? The selections that we have ranged before you in this section provide some of the chief answers to this central leadership query.

John Calvin was the principal founder of the Reformed Protestant tradition and a bold experimenter in political and religious affairs in Geneva. In his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, he articulates his thinking about legitimate government. In this selection, Calvin acknowledges that the source of authority is a sovereign God and that the responsibility of the state is to be a deputy of God's society by maintaining order and justice. Within that purview leaders have a rather wide discretion as vicars of God,

but all laws must be based upon equity. Followers are expected to show deference to rulers and be obedient to them, even if they are unjust. Calvin adds the caveat that lesser magistrates can resist a leader who is unjust and that no one can obey a leader if it means disobedience to God.

James I of England, partly in response to a restive Parliament, goes one better than Calvin and champions the divine right of kings. James quotes the biblical King David when he says that 'kings are called Gods.' They arose before laws, and therefore all laws derive from kings, and the king himself is above all law. While kings should keep the interests of subjects in mind, these leaders are a law unto themselves, and followers are out of line to question the monarch. Consequently, no such resistance is ever justified.

The breakdown of English royal government under James's son Charles I in the 1640s led to some of the most radical political writings prior to the modern era. In the midst of this intellectual ferment, a group called the Levellers articulated a basis for governmental legitimacy that would have profound implications in a later era. Government secures its legitimacy, the Levellers say, from the people. Moreover – and it is this that made them so radical – the people never surrender that sovereignty to government. The Levellers give considerable powers to members of Parliament, but the power of these representatives is 'inferiour only to theirs who chuse them.' Thus we have a line drawn in the sand regarding the issue of the source of legitimacy regarding leadership. The final selections, written in the century after the 'Agreement of the People,' represent some sophisticated attempts at a resolution.

Thomas Hobbes, although his conclusion is a Leviathan of leadership that echoes earlier absolutist writings, nevertheless grounds the legitimacy of government upon a quite different basis. Hobbes imagines a state of nature in which there is 'a condition of warre of every man against every man.' In this state of nature, life is, in Hobbes's famous phrase, 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.' As a result, men covenant together to place restraints upon themselves in the form of commonwealth. The only way to do this successfully is 'to confer all their power and strength upon one Man ... that may reduce all their Wills ... unto one Will ....' When they do this, each member promises to 'give up my Right of Governing my self, to this Man ....' The resulting leader becomes the sovereign power, and the others subjects. Thus, although the resulting leader may not look all that different from the divine kingship of James I, the source of his legitimacy is altogether different. Here, leadership is grounded in the covenant of the people.

John Locke begins from a similar premise, in the sense that the legitimacy of leadership and government is based upon the consent of the people, but his investigation of consent and the limits placed upon it yield quite a different model of leadership. Somewhat like Hobbes, Locke posits a state of nature and man's agreement to create a civil society for the purpose of preserving 'himself, his liberty, and his property.' By their consent, men agree to set rulers over themselves. Locke takes some care to explore the nature of that consent and to whom and in what manner it extends. There are some things to which this consent emphatically does not extend. For example, since the protection of property

is the end of government, 'the supreme power cannot take from any man any part of his property without his own consent.' We see here, then, a similar grounding of government, not in religion, but in a sovereign people. However, contrary to the Levellers, the relationship between the followers and their leaders is much more complex. Under Locke, there are clear limitations upon government, but the people – by consent – agree not to upset the governing structure for other than weighty reasons.

The Scottish moral philosopher David Hume serves as our final selection in this section. He rejects both the religious basis for legitimacy and the consent argument. Regarding those who think 'the Deity is the ultimate author of all government,' Hume argues that it is irrational to assume that God ever entered so specifically into the affairs of each state and even more unlikely that one can decipher the divine will. Likewise, Hume takes social contract theorists to task for the view 'that all men are still born equal, and owe allegiance to no prince or government, unless bound by the obligation and sanction of a *promise.*' Even a superficial look at the realities of the world gives the lie to such assertions, Hume says, and social contract thinking also engages in a circularity of argument. Hume is more pragmatic. He proposes that the foundations of government are 'the general interests or necessities of society' and concludes that 'new discoveries are not to be expected in these matters.'

We see, then, how key intellectuals sought, in the heat of events, to articulate some form of legitimation for government and leadership. Bundled within such arguments – in some more obviously than others – are profound implications for the role of participants in such polities. Our last two sections of this volume take up the notion of followers and the options they face when leadership goes bad.

The Status of Followers

Although the focus of much of the intellectual energy devoted to leadership was the leader, there were important acknowledgements of the key role that followers might play. The selections in this section are representative samples of commentators acknowledging the importance of followers.

For those unfamiliar with the entire corpus of his writings, Niccolo Machiavelli might seem an unusual choice to demonstrate the importance of followers. Yet, quite contrary to *The Prince*, his *Discourses on Livy* does exactly that. In the chosen passage, Machiavelli disagrees with those who fear the passions of the people. To the contrary, Machiavelli argues, 'I say that the people are more prudent and stable, and have better judgment than a prince ....' Indeed, according to Machiavelli, 'The voice of a people is the voice of God ....' Now, it must be said that Machiavelli advocates that the people should be well regulated by laws, but so too should a prince and, of the two, the people are definitely more trustworthy. It is not unimportant that Machiavelli, in his *Discourses*, addresses leadership in republics. Nevertheless, his is a strong early statement of the value of followers in the leadership equation.

Taking a somewhat different tack on the role of followers is Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. In this selection Hegel develops his famous master–slave dialectic in the context of a dense discussion of the notion of self-consciousness. In the beginning, the master has power and independence: 'The master relates himself to the bondsman mediately through independent existence, for that is precisely what keeps the bondsman in thrall; it is his chain, from which he could not in the struggle get away, and for that reason he proves himself dependent, shows that his independence consists in being a thing.' But the master comes to see that 'just where [he] has effectively achieved lordship, he really finds that something has come about quite different from an independent consciousness. It is not an independent, but rather a dependent consciousness that he has achieved.' In the end, the slave gets power and independence: 'By serving he cancels in every particular moment his dependence on and attachment to natural existence, and by his work removes this existence away.' Hegel thus provides us with an important piece for rethinking the central historical paradigm for the relationship between leaders and followers.

Yet another important statement is that by Mary Wollstonecraft, writing in the late eighteenth century. The chosen selection from her *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* makes the argument that women and men should be treated as full moral equals. All human beings are endowed with reason, Wollstonecraft argues, but women are not permitted to develop theirs. Instead, women are brought up to rely upon emotion and feeling. Women have 'acquired all the follies and vices of civilization, and missed the useful fruit.' They should instead 'acquire the noble privilege of reason, [and] the power of discerning good from evil.' By so empowering 'one half of the human race,' Wollstonecraft concludes, mankind can better achieve morality and virtue and 'render the present state more complete.' Thereby could be achieved a 'true civilization' in which leaders and followers (including men and women) are treated as equals.

The hopeful note of Wollstonecraft finds its counterpart in the hurly-burly of the political arena in the form of Elizabeth Cady Stanton's 'Address to the American Equal Rights Association.' Stanton's address is an important (and representative) example of the nineteenth-century women's movement. In it, Stanton couches her call for women's suffrage in an appeal for universal suffrage. Both sexes can benefit from mutual interaction with the other. In addition to their potential role in the public realm, women can play a central leadership role in the private sphere as well. Stanton views the danger to society as not the threat of a dictator but the 'corruption of the people.' Women are the mothers and educators of the race, and, accordingly, play a crucial role in combating this. Thus, providing women with the proper respect will increase their ability to be leaders in both public and private life.

If Stanton calls for reform in the form of the empowerment of women, Ralph Waldo Emerson looks at what it takes to be a reformer. Emerson says it is the duty of every man (every follower) to call the institutions of society to account. These institutions, rather than being grounded in evil, must be based upon truth and justice. This can be achieved by individual efforts on the part of followers. The true reformer will try to

avoid any activity that lends support to a corrupt system. One should therefore return to minimalism: live simply and, to the extent possible, consume only what one creates through manual labor. Moreover, reformers should pay particular attention to the plight of the poor. These efforts at reform must, in turn, be guided by noble principles. An individual should pursue knowledge and virtue, but the noblest principle of all is love.

In our final selection, John Dewey looks to the role of education in the creation of effective citizens of a democracy. At the most obvious level, 'a government resting upon popular suffrage cannot be successful unless those who elect and who obey their governors are educated.' Yet on another, more sophisticated plane, Dewey argues that education performs a social function, the nature of which depends upon the aims of the group served. In a democracy, which is characterized by the recognition of mutual interests and free interaction among groups, education must facilitate interaction and the diversity of views. Education must not serve class interests but must equip all for success. The result of successful education in a democracy will be the freeing of individual capacity and the utilization of that capacity toward binding people together in cooperative pursuits directed toward social aims.

This section has traced thinking about followers from the acknowledgement of their value in Machiavelli; through Hegel's dialectical overturning of the expected role of leaders and followers; to the possibilities for and reality of reform in the persons of Wollstonecraft, Stanton, and Emerson; and finally to Dewey's explication of the role education plays in creating effective followers. These selections, taken together, demonstrate the potential power of followers in the leadership relation. The final section turns to some important examples of how one might mount challenges to authority, always an important option in a healthy leadership climate.

Challenges to Authority

As we have seen in the preceding two sections, the concept of leadership is often hedged in by issues of authority. This does not preclude the possibility that authority itself must sometimes come into question. This is the explicit focus of our final section. The context, predictably, is upon leadership in the public, or political, sector. Each of the selections in this segment represents classic modes of challenge. Some, as we shall see, set forth theoretical justifications for resistance to authority; some suggest tactics of resistance; while still others represent calls from those actually oppressed. It is important to understand that those engaged in challenges to authority are themselves engaged in a form of leadership.

The first selection, by the French Huguenot Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, articulates a theory of resistance grounded in the contract theory of leadership and government (see the previous discussion of Locke). Duplessis-Mornay, writing in opposition to the oppression of the Huguenots by the French kings, does not oppose monarchy *per se* but suggests that even kings are constrained in their actions. This is due to a covenant

entered into in the distant past between the king and the people. According to this compact, the monarch agrees to rule justly, and the people agree to follow him if he does so. Under this theory, if the leader does not rule justly, there is an obligation to resist. If the people do not resist, Duplessis-Mornay states, 'wee may justly be accounted breakers of the Lawes, betrayers of our Countrey, and contemnors of Religion.'

If Duplessis-Mornay believes that resistance to authority could be justified by breach of an original compact, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels think it a necessary outcome of historical forces (although they urge workers to hasten the process by joining the cause). In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels lay out the doctrine of historical materialism and depict the sweep of history as a series of dialectical relations between various classes. In the current epoch (the 1840s), the bourgeoisie oppresses the proletarians, and the only resolution is through revolution. This, Marx and Engels say, is inevitable. 'But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons – the modern working-class – the proletarians.' The result – after a period of transition – will be an entire new relation of equality and a utopian society wherein 'we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.' In their peroration, the call is to action: 'The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries unite!' Although the political applications of Marxism have met with a certain discredit, Marx and Engels's indictment of capitalist society and the relations between superior and subordinate continues to motivate resistance to authority the world over.

David Walker gives another justification for resistance in his 1829 *Appeal* against slavery. Walker, a free black man, draws upon Christian biblical texts to argue that leaders and systems of government that are unjust stand at God's judgment. The time for 'repentance' is now. Although Walker stops short of advocating direct action, many viewed this as a call for slave insurrection. Be that as it may, it is certainly a call for justice and transformation in the face of unjust leadership. History is replete with such moral calls for reformed leadership. Whether joined by action or not, such appeals are often powerful catalysts for resistance to authority.

Henry David Thoreau joins a moral stance with specific resistance tactics in his famous essay *Civil Disobedience*. Thoreau disagrees with the policies of the national government during the Mexican War and its stance toward slavery. His uncompromising call to stand up to unjust governments and leadership and to be willing to accept the punishment for such heroic action has inspired resistance to injustice throughout the world ever since – from Martin Luther King, Jr., in the American civil rights movement to Mohandas Gandhi in his campaign against British imperialism.

In our final selection, we trace a more subtle, and perhaps more lasting, mode of resistance to unjust authority. W.E.B. Du Bois, a black American activist writing at the turn of the twentieth century, had ample evidence of the unjustness of the dominant white treatment of his race. In this selection from *The Souls of Black Folk*, Du Bois advocates the educated leadership of a select group of African Americans as a means of

resistance and overall transformation of the conditions and reality of African Americans. Through their actions, the entire race could be lifted from its oppressed state.

Taken together, the selections in this section set out a powerful tradition of resistance to unjust authority in our Western heritage. All are classics; many continue to inspire and motivate marginalized peoples the world over. In this sense, this set of readings is a fitting conclusion to our collection. Beginning with an exploration of the moral ends of leadership, continuing with models of ideal leadership, and concluding with several sections devoted to key leadership themes, this volume seeks to assemble in one place some of the greatest writings devoted to leadership in Western history. Of course this collection is designed to be a reference source for those interested in understanding more about the phenomenon of leadership. But the editors hope that this understanding will also serve as a call to action to those who have the capability – and who recognize the obligation – to make this world a better place. These readings suggest that the capability and the obligation are far more widely dispersed than is usually assumed.