"[An] insightful book . . . [one of the] leadership classics." —*CHICAGO TRIBUNE*

Leading Minds

An ANATOMY *of* LEADERSHIP

HOWARD GARDNER

with EMMA LASKIN

Leading Minds

An ANATOMY *of* LEADERSHIP

HOWARD GARDNER
in collaboration with EMMA LASKIN

BASIC BOOKS
A Member of the Perseus Books Group
New York

Table of Contents

PRAISE FOR HOWARD GARDNER'S

Leading Minds

"[Gardner's] books are lucid, cross-disciplinary examinations of heady topics: *Creating Minds* . . . and *Leading Minds* . . . are rarities, being academic studies that are as readable as they are compelling. (Indeed, *Leading Minds* was the No. 1 seller on the Globe's local best-seller list last week.)"

—*The Boston Globe*

"At the heart of Gardner's thesis is a simple but unfamiliar idea, which forms the epigraph to one of the chapters: 'All leadership takes place through the communication of ideas to the minds of others.' . . . Armed with this idea of leadership Gardner is able to bring together leaders from very different fields, such disparate figures as Churchill, Einstein, the anthropologist Margaret Mead and Pope John XXIII. When viewed through the lens of the cognitive psychologist, they are all doing the same thing: all are telling, and embodying, stories."

—*The Independent* (London)

"In general, business people should read a lot more. I find it dangerous that many CEOs have no idea of the historical context of what they do. One book I recommend is . . . *Leading Minds* by Howard Gardner, a psychologist who teaches at the Harvard School of Education. He looks at 11 great leaders throughout history, people like Martin Luther King Jr., Maggie Thatcher, Eleanor Roosevelt, Harriet Tubman and Gandhi."

—Warren Bennis, interviewed in the *Los Angeles Times*

"Well and clearly argued."

—*The Irish Times* (Dublin)

"Fascinating. . . . Gardner analyzes the life and times of 11 modern

leaders in search of how they managed to change our world."

—*The Gazette* (Montreal)

"A novel analysis of leadership.... The authors differentiate visionaries—leaders who create new stories, such as Gandhi and Jean Monnet, architect of a unified Europe—from such innovative leaders as Margaret Thatcher, who identify a theme latent in the population but neglected over the years and give it a new twist. Other leaders on whom they focus are George Marshall, Margaret Mead, J. Robert Oppenheimer, Pope John XXIII, former General Motors president Alfred P. Sloan Jr. and educator Robert Hutchins. This study will repay the close attention of aspiring leaders in many fields."

—Publishers Weekly

"A good test for me of a business book is whether I can remember anything important about it a couple of years after first reading it. . . . *Leading Minds* passes this test with flying colors. . . . Howard Gardner's striking insight, supported by his copious research, fed straight into my own thinking about brands."

—Hamish Pringle, *Marketing*

"[A] fascinating exploration . . . [*Leading Minds*] establishes a convincing middle ground between numbingly quantified studies and the unbounded impressionistic interview. . . . [It] illuminates the need for leaders to understand that part of the human psyche that holds on to the childish view of the world that yearns for certainty, and not to pander to it."

—*The Australian* (Sydney)

"The gamut of psycho-socio-scientific analysis applied to [leadership] routinely obscures its underlying diverse human dynamic. Making strides to reverse this state of affairs, Howard Gardner constructs a richly textured guide to the realm in which that dynamic plays out—within and between the minds of leaders and followers.... Supplemented with a treasure trove of appendices, Gardner's compelling portraits of leaders' minds offer an original framework for the understanding of the leadership process."

—Industry Week

"An imaginative book, filled with uncommon ideas."

—Booklist

"Howard Gardner has written another enthralling book. The eleven men and women he has chosen as his examples could hardly differ more widely, but Gardner has managed to define the common factors that made them all effective leaders."

—Anthony Storr, author of *Solitude*

"Immensely interesting, thought-provoking, and decidedly original. No one else could have written it."

—John Gardner, Stanford University

"Once again, Howard Gardner illuminates for us a crucial aspect of human behavior. If, as he claims, great leaders achieve power through the stories they tell, Gardner's own fascinating narratives of leadership show why he is one of the intellectual leaders of our times."

—Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, author of *Creativity*

"Once again, Gardner brings his brilliant intuition and analytic skills to the study of human excellence. His diagnoses are of particular value today, when great leaders are both badly needed and unaccountably scarce."

—Edward O. Wilson, Harvard University

OTHER BOOKS BY HOWARD GARDNER

The Quest for Mind (1973)
The Arts and Human Development (1973)
The Shattered Mind (1975)
Developmental Psychology (1978)
Artful Scribbles (1980)
Art, Mind, and Brain (1982)
Frames of Mind (1983)
The Mind's New Science (1985)
To Open Minds (1989)
The Unschooled Mind (1991)
Multiple Intelligences: Theory in Practice (1993)
Creating Minds (1993)
Extraordinary Minds (1997)
The Disciplined Mind (1999)
Intelligence Reframed (1999)
Good Work (with Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and William Damon) (2001)
Changing Minds (2004)
Multiple Intelligences: New Horizons (2006)
The Development and Education of the Mind (2006)
Five Minds for the Future (2007)
Truth, Beauty, and Goodness Reframed (2011)

In memory of Judith Krieger Gardner (1943–1994)
Who affected the thoughts, feelings,
and actions of everyone who knew her
and
Erik Homburger Erikson (1902–1994)
Teacher and friend
Who affected the thoughts, feelings,
and actions of a generation

PREFACE TO THE 2011 EDITION

BACKGROUND OF THIS BOOK

Of the many books that I've written during the past forty years, *Leading Minds* may seem to have involved the biggest leap. Before its publication, I saw myself, and was seen by others, as a psychologist studying human development, particularly in the cognitive sphere. I had written a dozen books about the human mind, more than half of them featuring the word "mind" in the title. Until the early 1980s, I was primarily a research psychologist, writing for other psychologists. But after the publication in 1983 of my book *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, I became more focused on issues of education; indeed, the topics I wrote about, and the audience I was addressing, were drawn from the education sector.

But then, seemingly suddenly, in 1995, with the able assistance of Emma Laskin, I published a book about leadership. In that book, whose preface you are now reading, I focused on an issue traditionally regarded as within the purview of political science or history. Not only was I writing about a topic that seems remote from cognitive development in the individual, I also was writing about leadership in a way that addressed the general reader rather than the specialist. To top it off, my conception of leadership appeared idiosyncratic: What were people such as the anthropologist Margaret Mead, the physicist J. Robert Oppenheimer, or the intellectual Robert Maynard Hutchins doing in the company of a pope, a prime minister, and an army general?

Indeed, *Leading Minds* did constitute a turning point for me, an opportunity to address new audiences in policy and in business, and to "sound off" on topics in current events. Yet with the benefit of hindsight it is easy—at least for me—to see why, very much at midlife, I chose to write and publish a book about leadership.

Ever since childhood, I have been fascinated with politics and history; I have devoured newspapers and news magazines and compulsively tuned into broadcast news. The decision to write about leadership enabled me to exploit my passions as a history and news junkie. In that subterranean sense, I had already been working on this book for several decades.

The book also can be readily seen as growing organically out of

my concerns in the immediately preceding years. Once I had published my book on different intelligences, I was frequently asked about whether there were different forms of creativity. I decided to focus on this issue in two ways: (1) formulating, with the help of colleagues Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and David Henry Feldman, a general framework for understanding the emergence of new ideas and practices; (2) carrying out intensive case studies of individuals who, I hypothesized, stood out in terms of their creativity in several intellectual realms. Just two years before the publication of *Leading Minds*, I issued a book about my conclusions.

In *Creating Minds: An Anatomy of Creativity Seen through the Lives of Freud, Einstein, Picasso, Stravinsky, Eliot, Graham, and Gandhi* (1993; new edition 2011), I studied seven exemplary creative individuals, each of whom achieved his or her most stunning breakthrough in the shadow of 1900. Among these creators, many striking similarities existed, as well as some startling differences. But it became apparent to me early on that Mahatma Gandhi diverged in essential ways from the other six individuals, who were leaders *within* established domains of accomplishment, such as physics or painting or poetry. In contrast, Gandhi was trying to inspire and change an entire nation—indeed, as it eventually turned out, all human beings. *Leading Minds* represents an effort to go beyond the first six creators just listed and to understand what is distinctive about those who presume to provide leadership across domains and interest groups.

While thinking about individuals who stood out in terms of their creative or their leadership capacities, I was continuing my investigations of how best to educate young people.

In *The Unschooled Mind: How Children Think, and How Schools Should Teach* (1991; new edition 2011), I sought to understand why children absorb experiences and acquire diverse facilities so readily in the earliest years of life, and yet have such difficulty mastering the disciplines that form the core of common schooling. My research convinced me that, by the age of five or so, human beings already have a well-formed "unschooled mind" that consists of simple theories about mind and matter. The theories may be charming, but they are all too often misguided or plainly false. Although formal education strives mightily to refashion the mind of the five-year-old into the mind of a more sophisticated conceptualizer, most schools in most locales fail in this mission. Indeed, except for individuals who become expert in specific domains and actually come to think in a fundamentally different way about the world, most adults continue to theorize much as they did

when they were young children.

The implications of this conclusion are startling from a scientific point of view and troubling from a societal perspective. If a leader presumes to speak to the masses of a nation or across the dialects of different domains, then, in effect, he or she must begin by addressing what I call "the five-year-old mind." The leader must either accept the mind of the child as given or, in the manner of a determined educator, try to remold that mind. As detailed in *The Unschooled Mind,* the task of guiding individuals beyond the purview of a preschool child's mind proves formidable.

THE ARGUMENT OF THE BOOK

Although I was initially unaware of it, the distinct lines of study I was pursuing almost simultaneously in *Creating Minds* and in *The Unschooled Mind* were destined to come together in *Leading Minds*. In this book I study a range of leaders from the last century in order to explicate what I see as the major facets of leadership, from the perspective of psychology. To summarize my formulation succinctly, a leader is an individual (or, rarely, a set of individuals) who significantly affects the thoughts, feelings, or behaviors of a significant number of individuals. Most acknowledged leaders—consider, for example, Franklin Roosevelt or Winston Churchill—are "direct"; they address their public face-to-face. But I have called attention to a hitherto unrecognized phenomenon—indirect leadership: In this variety of leading, individuals exert impact through the works they create.

Whether direct or indirect, leaders fashion stories—principally stories of identity. It is important that a leader be a good storyteller but equally crucial that the leader embody that story in his or her life. When a leader tells stories to experts, the stories can be quite sophisticated, but when the leader is addressing a diverse, heterogeneous group, the story must be sufficiently elementary to be understood by the untutored, or "unschooled," mind.

Far from being a motley crew, the leaders were carefully and strategically chosen in order to reinforce the argument of the book. I wanted to indicate through such examples that the gap between a prototypical indirect leader and a prototypical direct leader is not absolute; one can proceed in small steps from an Einstein or a Virginia Woolf all the way to a Margaret Thatcher or a Gandhi. What allows an Einstein or Picasso to affect others is less the words

that they utter in the presence of others, and more the ideas and works that they, often working alone, create and make public. Cases such as Margaret Mead, J. Robert Oppenheimer, and Robert Maynard Hutchins represent intriguing intermediate cases: They begin by creating works that influence their colleagues in their respective chosen fields of anthropology, physics, and law. But eventually, owing to the power of their ideas and their decision to enter the public arena, they come to take on at least some of the traits of direct leaders.

Through this gamut of illustrations, I wanted to show the ways in which stories must be altered, as one moves from addressing a small and relatively homogeneous group (such as a set of scholars in a discipline or at a university) to a large and quite heterogeneous population (such as a multitude of dispossessed individuals or the citizens of a nation). Though I could have chosen different instances of a category (Henry Ford instead of Alfred Sloan as the head of a corporation, Ronald Reagan instead of Margaret Thatcher as the leader of a nation), the categories, and the order in which they are presented, are integral to the points of the book.

Along with detailed portraits of eleven leaders, I also include a survey of ten important political and military leaders of the twentieth century. Moreover, the detailed information in the Appendixes allows comparisons between my eleven leaders and a relevant "control group."

QUESTIONS RAISED

Upon publication of the book, a number of questions arose that I did not treat, or did not treat adequately, in the first edition. To begin with, I was asked about whether the choice of leaders did not reflect, chiefly, individuals whom I liked or admired. Certainly I prefer certain leaders to others, and my sample may be slanted to some extent in favor of individuals whom I admire. It is crucial, however, not to confuse the descriptive and the normative. My goal in *Leading Minds* is to describe features of effective leadership, irrespective of whether I happen to admire the individuals in question or the policies they promoted. Indeed, the analysis would be unacceptable as scholarship if it applies only to individuals for whom I have positive feelings. One purpose of the survey in the Appendix is to extend the framework to individuals, many of whom I, along with the rest of the world, consider loathsome.

Another issue that arose was whether, in my studies of leadership (and in my studies of creativity), I was simply being elitist. Without question, I am writing about individuals who are extraordinary. I do this in part to repair an imbalance in the behavioral science literature. The assumption has reigned that, if we understand ordinary forms of creativity or leadership, we will better understand the heights of achievement. I believe that this argument needs to be inverted. It is far more likely that we will better understand garden-variety forms of leadership if we have a deeper understanding of unambiguous examples of powerful leadership.

But I want to make an additional point. Extraordinary individuals may be the product of accident, but their accomplishments—positive as well as negative—constitute an important part of human history. Think of the nineteenth century without Napoleon or Lincoln, the twentieth century without Stalin, Hitler, or the Roosevelt family. Indeed, to be a tad provocative, think of the first decade of the twenty-first century without considering Osama bin Laden. In the grip of an ideology, postmodern critiques of leadership—critiques that question the role of the leader or any claims of extraordinariness—risk obscuring a vital enduring fact of life.

What of my focus, both in education and in the study of leadership, on the power of the unschooled mind? My treatment raises the question of whether one can *ever* persuade the general public to adopt a more sophisticated position on any issue. Indeed, all of my studies reinforce the power of the initial theories formed by young children as well as the difficulty of introducing a more complex and differentiated way of thinking. I would be untrue to my own findings if I were to intimate that greater sophistication can be easily attained.

Nonetheless, despite the horrors of human history and the swings of the pendulum, one can point to the gradual emergence of more sophisticated ways of thinking in the areas of morality and civility. My personal heroes are such individuals as Mahatma Gandhi and Jean Monnet and Nelson Mandela, who worked for decades to develop in their constituencies a more complex way of thinking about human relations. I find myself in agreement with Freud, who once wrote: “The voice of the intellect is a soft one, but it does not rest until it has gained a hearing. Ultimately, after endless repeated rebuffs, it succeeds.” This is one of a few points in which one may be optimistic about the future of humankind.

REFLECTIONS ON THE PAST FIFTEEN YEARS

Though the topic of leadership and the field of "leadership studies" certainly existed in earlier times, few could have been prepared for the explosion of interest in the topic of leadership in recent years. In all probability, my book was a symptom of this new interest, rather than a prod to it. The contributions of certain key scholars—Warren Bennis, James McGregor Burns, John Gardner, and Barbara Kellerman—were one ingredient. The increasing dominance of the business sector in America and other developed countries, and the crucial role of the CEO and other members of the leadership team, doubtless contributed as well. Greater awareness of global problems—for example, poverty, climate change, the treatment of disease, and corruption—and the difficulties involved in tackling them also brought to the fore the need for skilled, informed, and fair-minded leaders. The various traumas of the period—the terrorist attacks of 9/11, the financial meltdowns of 2000 and 2008, the instability of large portions of Africa and the Middle East—all called attention to the costs of poor or ineffective leaders.

I am less certain about why, in the brochures and webpages of educational institutions, the training of leaders is so often featured. It is not clear to me to what extent the public is expecting our institutions to train leaders, as opposed to the institutions seeking to distinguish themselves by promising to cultivate an abundant supply, for which there may not be correlative demand. That said, it is difficult not to be struck by the near-universal claim, made by institutions from middle schools to graduate schools and across the globe, that they—and perhaps even they *alone*—have hit upon the magic formula for forging leadership.

The field—the collection of social institutions and gatekeepers concerned with the topic of leadership—has exploded. No one keeps up with the publications, journals, websites, institutions, organizations, and training programs that tackle leadership. The increase in knowledge—and in wisdom—about leadership is not nearly so striking, but I'd like to think that the avalanche of writings, including this book, may at least have sharpened and deepened our understanding of the nature of leadership, how best to cultivate it, and whether it is possible to prod leadership toward positive ends.

Having selected almost two decades ago eleven leaders on whom to focus, I think about whether I would today choose a somewhat different list. At least as examples of sectors, such as the military or

the clergy, I think that I made reasonable decisions. Some names, such as Martin Luther King, Jr., are as eminent as ever. Others, such as J. Robert Oppenheimer or Robert Maynard Hutchins or Alfred Sloan, are far less known—and could easily be replaced by more contemporary figures, such as scholar Noam Chomsky, or university president Derek Bok, or business leader Bill Gates. Very different from Pope John XXIII, Pope John Paul II is equally worthy of study.

The one person who surely should be added is Nelson Mandela, justifiably the most admired person of our time. And the enduring legacies of Martin Luther King, Jr., and Nelson Mandela—and, less prominently, of Chinese dissident Liu Xiaboa and of Burmese dissident Aung San Suu Kyi—testify to the incomparable significance of Mahatma Gandhi, who in my view is the most important human being of the past millennium.

There has been considerable scholarship about the leaders portrayed here. At the conclusion of this preface, I list some of the writings that have advanced our understanding of these individuals and their capacity for leadership.

LEADERSHIP IN THE ERA OF TRUTHINESS, TWADDLE, AND TWITTER

Just as the political and economic spheres have been convulsed in recent decades, so, too, our world has been altered by technological, cultural, and even epistemological changes. I capture these changes by the trio of concepts of "truthiness," twaddle, and Twitter.

The term "truthiness" was popularized by the American television wit Stephen Colbert. Traditionally, we apply the predicate "true" to statements for which reliable evidence can be accrued. (Conversely, if it is impossible to imagine a situation where the statement could be disproved, we consider the statement to be an item of faith, rather than of reason.) People have always lied, and leaders have scarcely been immune from that sin—indeed, Nazi propagandist Josef Goebbels famously and cynically declared, "The bigger the lie, the more people believe it."

What Colbert has added is that, nowadays, the simple declaration of a state of affair by a person who is known suffices to confer upon it *truth value*. So whether a Republican leader is called a "war criminal" by a member of the Democratic Party, or a discussion of

"end of life" procedures is called a "death panel" by a Republican spokesperson, these statements are deemed true simply because they have been repeatedly uttered in the public arena.

The cause of this state of affair is undoubtedly complex. In my *Truth, Beauty, and Goodness Reframed* (2011), I argue that the challenge to truth comes from three complementary sources: (l) increased knowledge about the wide range of cultures around the globe, many of which hold apparently incompatible views about the world; (2) the postmodern critique of such traditional notions as truth, according to which claims to truth are seen as simple assertions of power; and (3) the human tendency, particularly during adolescence and early adulthood, to adopt relativistic stances ("you've got the right to your opinion, just like I have the right to my opinion"). Whatever the relative contributions of these and other factors, it seems clear that leadership becomes more difficult when everyone's story is considered equally valid, independent of corroborating evidence.

Every observer of the contemporary scene notes the explosion of information, claims, and counterclaims in the air, or in its contemporary manifestation, cyberspace. No doubt at least some of that information is valuable, even invaluable. But much of what is available in the digital world is idle chatter, spreading of rumor, confusion of opinion with reason or evidence, and the like. I label this state of affair "twaddle." Ultimately, given enough time and investing enough due diligence, it is possible to arrive more reliably than before at the actual state of affairs. But for most of us, most of the time, we are drowning in twaddle.

Finally, as epitomized by the website Twitter, there is now a premium on messages that are brief, vivid, and memorable. Perhaps they need not be as brief as the 140 characters permitted in a tweet. But by virtue of the forces of advertising and entertainment on the one hand, and the unrelenting demands on time on the other, there is an enormous premium on getting to the point and avoiding complexity. Einstein famously quipped, "Everything should be as simple as possible but not simpler." Alas, the priority given to conceptualization of Twitter length makes the articulation of more complex stories, as well as less familiar stories, far more difficult.

No leader today can afford to ignore this powerful trio: the ease of promulgating false statements, the detritus that permeates the blogosphere, and the prominence of the ad line and the gag line. Indeed, the challenge to the leader is to counter these forces when they are inimical to his or her goals and to put forth a powerful counter-story that highlights truth against truthiness, clarity against

twaddle, and a developed and substantiated story as opposed to a Twitter-length teaser. As I write these words, U.S. president Barack Obama clearly understands these challenges, but it is uncertain whether he—or indeed any thoughtful leader capable of complex thought—can be heard and understood above the din.

At the very time that I was completing *Leading Minds*, I began to explore a set of issues that have occupied my thoughts and writing until today—a decade and a half later. In 1995, my colleagues Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, William Damon, and I launched the GoodWork Project (see goodworkproject.org, goodworktoolkit .org) —a study of professions in our time. We asked whether, and if so how, professions may endure at a time when markets are very powerful, our conceptions of time and space are changing at warp speed, and there are few forces in developed countries to temper the market forces, let alone to channel them in socially responsible ways, (Gardner, Csikszentmihalyi, and Damon, 2001).

Unless you believe in the innate goodness of human beings, the power of divine intervention, or the inherent wisdom of the market, there is no guarantee that human beings will use their skills and powers in positive ways. An emerging goal of the GoodWork Project is to familiarize individuals with what it means to use your capacities for goals that are larger than your own self-aggrandizement and that contribute to the broader welfare—and then to help these individuals move in that direction.

Some leaders seek power for its own sake; some leaders seek power in order to increase their own resources or those of family, friends, and close associates. Those are not the leaders whom I admire, nor are they the leaders that young people should emulate. As I make clear in the pages that follow, the key to effective leadership is amoral: The skills that I describe can be used for the ends of a Nelson Mandela, or for the ends of Osama bin Laden. But once we turn from description to prescription, it is clear that, as individuals and as members of broader communities, we should do all that we can to increase the incidence of good leaders—individuals who are engaged, excellent, and dedicated to the pursuit of ethical ends.

CONCLUSION

In writing *Leading Minds*, my primary aim was to obtain a better understanding of the features of effective leadership. I certainly do

not see the work as a guidebook that, once assimilated, will turn an ordinary citizen into a leader or an ordinary leader into an exceptional one.

That said, I believe that the cognitive view introduced here provides a fresh perspective on the nature of leadership. When one thinks of the leader as a storyteller whose newly fashioned stories must wrestle with those that are already operative in the minds of an audience, one obtains a powerful way of conceptualizing the work of leading. It is important for leaders to know their stories; to get them straight; to communicate them effectively, particularly to those who are in the thrall of rival stories; and, above all, to embody in their lives the stories that they tell.

At the conclusion of the book, I outline six constant features of leaders, as well as six features that have come to characterize leadership in our time. My hope is that the analysis will prove helpful to those who find themselves thrust into positions of leadership, and that it might also help those already in leadership positions obtain a better understanding of their task and, perhaps, suggest to them new ways in which to achieve success.

It is perhaps not surprising that we live in a time of disillusionment with our leaders. We are all too familiar with the evil that malevolent leaders can bring about, even as we are frustrated that individuals in whom we have placed hope so often disappoint. Many well-meaning individuals—both lay and scholarly—say that we have outlived the notion of leadership from the top and that we should embrace flattened or even leaderless institutions.

At such times, it is particularly important to return to fundamentals. Many assumptions about leadership in the political realm are superficial and unsubstantiated ; there is no need to guide one's policies by the results of the latest poll or to force every complex idea into a sound bite. Here one can take inspiration from those individuals who have not accepted the conventional wisdom, who have risked defeat, rejection, obscurity, even their lives, in order to pursue ideas in which they (and perhaps a few followers) believe. To put it simply: Leaders can actually lead. One of the important roles that elders can provide in a society is to call attention to those figures from whom one may learn, and by whose lives one may be guided. Individuals the world over can be enriched by the words of Europeanist Jean Monnet, who declared, "I regard every defeat as an opportunity." The individuals portrayed in *Leading Minds* certainly have their flaws, but I believe that both ordinary citizens and aspiring leaders can also draw inspiration

from their lives and from their stories.

REFERENCES

Cited in the Preface

Gardner, H. 1983/2011. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
Gardner, H. 1991/2011. *The Unschooled Mind: How Children Think and How Schools Should Teach*. New York: Basic Books.
Gardner, H. 1993/2011. *Creating Minds: An Anatomy of Creativity Seen through the Lives of Freud, Einstein, Picasso, Stravinsky, Eliot, Graham, and Gandhi*. New York: Basic Books.
Gardner, H., M. Csikszentmihalyi, and W. Damon. 2001. *Good Work: When Excellence and Ethics Meet*. New York Basic Books.
Gardner, H. 2011. *Truth, Beauty, and Goodness Reframed: Educating for the Virtues in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: Basic Books.

Further Reading

Note: This is by no means an exhaustive list of works about particular leaders or about leadership in general. Rather, it features works that I have found helpful in thinking about the persons and issues treated in this book. I have avoided literature reviews, encyclopedic works, edited papers and letters, potted biographies, and hagiographies.

Leadership

Bennis, W. 2009. *On Becoming a Leader*. 4th ed. New York: Basic Books.
Bennis, W., and P. Biederman. 2009. *The Essential Bennis.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Couto, R. 2010. *Political and Social Leadership: A Reference Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
George, Bill, with Peter Sims. 2007. *True North*. San Francisco:

Jossey Bass.
Gergen, David. 2000. *Eyewitness to Power: The Essence of Leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
Goleman, D., R. Boyatsis, and A. McKee. 2004. *Primal Leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
Kellerman, B. 2008. *Followership.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
———. 2004. *Bad Leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
Keohane, N. 2010. *Thinking about Leadership.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Wills, G. 1995. *Certain Trumpets: The Nature of Leadership.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Mahatma Gandhi

Andrews, C. F., and Arun Gandhi. 2003. *Mahatma Gandhi: His Life and Ideas.* Woodstock, VT: Skylight Paths. (In this book Gandhi's grandson updates a book by an associate of Gandhi's, looking at his ideas and their impact today.)
Lelyveld, J. 2011. *Great Soul: Mahatma Gandhi and His Struggle with India*. New York: Knopf.
von Tunzelmann, A. 2008. *Indian Summer: The Secret History of the End of an Empire.* New York: Picador.

Robert Maynard Hutchins

Hutchins, R. Maynard. 2007. *No Friendly Voice.* Hadamard Press. (This work is a collection of his talks.)

Pope John XXIII

Cahill, Thomas. 2001. *Pope John XXIII: A Penguin Life*. New York: Penguin.
Pope John XXIII. 2008. *Essential Writings*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

Frady, M. 2005 *Martin Luther King, Jr.: A Life.* New York: Penguin.
King, Martin Luther, Jr., and Clayborne Carson. 2001. *The Autobiography of Martin Luther King, Jr.* New York: Grand Central Publishers.

George C Marshall

Husted, Stewart. 2007. *George C. Marshall: The Rubrics of Leadership.* Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute.

Margaret Mead

Banner, Lois. 2004. *Intertwined Lives: Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, and Their Circle*. New York: Vintage.
Bowman-Kruhm, M. 2002. *Margaret Mead: A Biography.* Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
Lutkehaus, N. 2001. *Margaret Mead: The Making of an American Icon.* Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.

Jean Monnet

Fransen, Frederick. 2001. *The Supranational Politics of Jean Monnet: Ideas and Origins of the European Community.* Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Press.
Rousell, Eric. 1996. *Jean Monnet*. Paris: Fayard.

J. Robert Oppenheimer

Bird, Kai, and M. Sherwin. 2005. *American Prometheus: The Triumph and Tragedy of J. Robert Oppenheimer*. New York: Knopf.
Cassidy, David. 2009. *J. Robert Oppenheimer and the American Century*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Eleanor Roosevelt

Cook, Blanche Wiesen. 2000. *Eleanor Roosevelt: Volume 2, The Defining Years 1933–1938*. New York: Penguin.
Roosevelt, Eleanor. 2000. *Empty without You: The Intimate Letters of Eleanor Roosevelt and Lorena Hickock*. New York: Da Capo Press.
———. 2001. *My Day: The Best of Eleanor Roosevelt's Acclaimed Newspaper Columns, 1936–1962*. New York: Da Capo Press.

Alfred P. Sloan/General Motors

Farber, David. 2005. *Sloan Rules: Alfred Sloan and Triumph of General Motors.* Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
Freeman, Allyn. 2005. *The Leadership Genius of Alfred P. Sloan*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Margaret Thatcher

Berlinsky, Claire. 2010. *There Is No Alternative: Why Margaret Thatcher Matters*. New York: Basic Books.
Campbell, John. 2004. *Margaret Thatcher: The Iron Lady*. New York: Vintage.
———. 2008. *Margaret Thatcher: The Grocer's Daughter*. New York: Vintage.
Wapshott, N. 2008. *Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher: A Political Marriage*. New York: Sentinel Trade Books.

PART I

A FRAMEWORK FOR LEADERSHIP

1

INTRODUCTION

A Cognitive Approach to Leadership

With words we govern men.

—Benjamin Disraeli

Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist.

—John Maynard Keynes

EUREKA AND EINSTEIN

At the end of November 1943, three men, already figures of historical significance, met in Tehran, the capital of Iran. Now that the tide of the Second World War had finally turned in favor of the Allies, Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Great Britain, President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States, and Premier Josef Stalin of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics sat down together for the first time to address a number of crucial issues. During the four-day meeting that came to be called the Eureka Summit, they and their representatives tackled such topics as the opening of a second Western front against the Germans; the policies to be pursued with respect to Poland, France, Turkey, and China; the treatment of Germany's leaders after the conclusion of the war; and the prosecution of the war against Japan, the other major Axis enemy. In addition to reaching various military and diplomatic decisions, the trio of leaders became better acquainted and placed the Alliance on a firmer footing.

At the time of the Eureka Summit, Albert Einstein was living quietly in Princeton, New Jersey, continuing to work, as he had

been for over four decades, on fundamental questions about the nature of physical reality. In the early years of the century, Einstein had almost single-handedly brought about a revolution in physics, first with his special theory of relativity in 1905, and then with his general theory of relativity a decade later. When initially propounded, these theories had seemed primarily of scholarly interest, as Einstein was rethinking the nature of space, time, gravity, and other fundamental forces of the universe. But various implications of his work proved to be of the utmost practical consequence, as Einstein himself came to realize. In a 1939 letter to President Roosevelt, he called attention to the possibility that extremely powerful bombs might be constructed if one could set off nuclear chain reactions in a mass of uranium: Einstein's message proved a crucial factor in the authorization of work on nuclear weapons. By the end of 1943, work in Los Alamos, New Mexico, on the development of an atomic bomb had advanced to a crucial point; this work would have been inconceivable in the absence of Einstein's revolutionary insights about the relationship between matter and energy.

The leaders of the Allies at Tehran, 1943: (seated left to right) Stalin, Roosevelt, Churchill

When we think of leaders, we usually envision the political or military giants of an era—Alexander the Great, Napoléon Bonaparte, Abraham Lincoln, or the generals of the Civil War. The familiar photograph of Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill seated alongside one another on a veranda in Tehran epitomizes this common conception of what leaders look like, even as the agenda at the Eureka Summit reflected the kinds of strategic preoccupations that we attribute to those in leadership positions.

Albert Einstein/The Bettmann Archive

At first blush, few individuals could seem more remote from this conception than Einstein, who worked on issues so abstruse that, even today, few individuals understand them completely. In addition, he preferred to ponder issues in the laboratory of his own imagination, and then perhaps discuss them with one or two close associates. During the First World War, Einstein had been a pacifist; only because of Hitler's rise, and against his strong personal inclinations, had Einstein become drawn into political issues on the eve of the Second World War. When he was approached about becoming the first president of Israel, the armchair thinker was both amused and alarmed by the idea, and immediately declined—to the relief, it is said, of both parties.

In light of the deep differences among the Eureka Summit leaders, on the one hand, and Einstein, on the other, one may well ask whether it makes sense to contemplate these individuals in the same breath (or in the same prose passage). After all, one readily applies the name *leader* to Roosevelt or Churchill; to call Einstein a

leader seems a stretch, unless one adds a descriptor such as a "leading physicist."

In this book, I argue that we can understand the achievements of such figures as Churchill and Einstein better if, first, we recognize the ways in which they were similar and, second and more importantly, we survey strategic intermediate points between these such prototypical figures. To anticipate my argument very briefly, I see both Churchill and Einstein as leaders—as individuals who significantly influence the thoughts, behaviors, and/or feelings of others. Churchill exerted his influence in a direct way, through the stories he communicated to various audiences; hence, I term him a *direct* leader. Einstein exerted his influence in an *indirect* way, through the ideas he developed and the ways that those ideas were captured in some kind of a theory or treatise; hence, he qualifies as an *indirect* leader.

Einstein and Churchill mark two ends of a continuum that denotes the capacity of a person (or a group of persons) to *influence* other people. (Indeed, I could have termed this study "An Examination of Influence," but that lexical move would have undermined the reorientation in thinking about both creativity and leadership that is my goal.) One way to understand a continuum is by examining its poles; and, indeed, I return to Churchill and kindred leaders in chapter 13. However, we can gain a better understanding of the crucial phenomena of leadership if we instead scan a range of cases —a set of twentieth-century individuals who span the continuum from individuals whose leadership is primarily indirect (like Einstein or Virginia Woolf or Charles Darwin) to individuals whose leadership is unambiguously direct (like Josef Stalin or Margaret Thatcher or Erwin Rommel).

The individuals I have chosen are not all household names, but they effectively represent the central question that arises when one contrasts Einstein and the Eureka Summit leaders: Who ultimately had the greater influence—the three most powerful men of their time or a solitary thinker armed with only a succinct physics equation? This tantalizing question, reframed to encompass various leaders, is one I revisit throughout the book.

ELEVEN CHARACTERS IN SEARCH OF A LINK

In all likelihood, the eleven individuals whose leadership I probe have never before been linked. One might well ask a set of

enthusiastic parlor-game players (who had not read the opening pages of this book) to identify the features the following individuals have in common:

Margaret Mead (1901–1978), who was trained as a cultural anthropologist, became famous for both her pioneering studies of adolescence among islanders in the South Seas and her wide knowledge about changing mores in the twentieth century. Through tireless speech making and writing over a fifty-year period, she influenced views about childhood, family life, and society all over the world.

J. Robert Oppenheimer (1904–1967), the theoretical physicist, is best known for his scientific directorship of the Manhattan Project. From 1943 to 1945 he led an unprecedentedly large and diverse team of scientists involved with this project as they succeeded in constructing the first nuclear weapons. Entering after the war into the highly charged world of scientific politics, he was eventually judged a national security risk. Oppenheimer spent the last years of his life out of the public eye, as the esteemed director of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton.

Robert Maynard Hutchins (1899–1977) became the University of Chicago's president when he was thirty. He propounded an influential, tradition-based view of higher education rooted in the study of classical texts and the discussion of philosophical issues. Always a controversial figure, he became in his later years a foundation executive and the founding director of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

Alfred P. Sloan, Jr. (1875–1966) was one of the founders of the modern corporation. As the head of General Motors, he set up an organizational structure that exploited the strengths of both centralized and decentralized institutional arrangements. As a principal spokesman for American business, he encouraged the belief that America's strength emanated from its capitalistic system. In the latter years of his life, he became a major philanthropist.

George C. Marshall (1880–1959) was a highly effective chief of staff of the U.S. Army during the Second World War. After the war, as the secretary of state, he first called for and then helped to direct the recovery program in Western Europe. For many around the world, Marshall embodied the disinterested public servant. Nonetheless, he became, in the early 1950s, the subject of attack by Joseph McCarthy, the red-baiting

senator.

Pope John XXIII (1881–1963), born Angelo Giuseppe Roncalli, was one of the most important, and certainly one of the most popular, popes of modern times. Appointed at age seventy-seven as an interim pontiff, he surprised his colleagues by immediately announcing plans for a Vatican Council that would examine the Catholic Church's role in the modern world. He called for a return to the simple messages of early Christianity, instigated efforts to reduce tensions between the political superpowers, and built bridges that spanned many faiths, nations, and ideologies.

Eleanor Roosevelt (1884–1962), the niece of one U.S. president and the wife of another, was a leading advocate of liberal and humanitarian causes both in the United States and abroad. Often positioned politically to the left of her husband, Franklin D. Roosevelt, she became a lightning rod for criticism. A role model for many individuals, and particularly for American women, she was long touted as the "most admired woman in the world."

Martin Luther King, Jr. (1929–1968), who was trained as a minister, became the most articulate and successful advocate of the cause of African Americans in the middle years of the twentieth century. His massive 1963 March on Washington constituted a milestone in the history of the civil rights movement. In light of his decision to focus on broader domestic and international issues, his position as a black leader became more tenuous. His assassination by a rabid segregationist left a void in leadership that has yet to be filled.

Margaret Thatcher (1925–) rose from modest origins to become the Conservative prime minister of Great Britain from 1979 to 1990. As prime minister, she inspired a fundamental reconfiguration of social, economic, and political forces in her country. The defining moment of her tenure was her decisive leadership during the 1982 Falklands War. While resisting closer ties with Western Europe, she helped forge new relations with the Eastern bloc of nations.

Jean Monnet (1888–1979), a French economist and diplomat, played a crucial but largely behind-the-scenes role in the reconstruction of his country following both world wars. Well connected to business and political figures on both sides of the Atlantic, he was often cast in an oppositional "internationalist" role to the more nationalistically oriented

Charles de Gaulle. Because of his efforts over half a century to bring people and nations together, Monnet is generally credited with being the chief architect of a united Europe.

Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948) was the political and religious leader who guided his native India to independence in the first half of the twentieth century. He developed and practiced an ascetic philosophy of living, which many of his close associates also followed. His innovative approach to the resolution of conflict—*satyagraha,* or nonviolent resistance—rarely prevailed in India after his assassination, yet it has inspired political activists and dissidents throughout the world.

Coming from different countries and social backgrounds, and trained in a range of vocations, these eleven individuals all became leaders in the sense that I am using the term: *persons who, by word and/or personal example, markedly influence the behaviors, thoughts, and/or feelings of a significant number of their fellow human beings* (here termed *followers* or *audience members).* The leaders' voices affected their worlds, and, ultimately, our world.

The tension aroused in linking these individuals reflects the varying topographies of their major enterprises. Especially at the beginning of their careers, Mead and Oppenheimer worked chiefly within scholarly domains: they exerted influence largely by virtue of the quality of their research within those domains. They qualified, in the early years of their careers, as *indirect* leaders. Hutchins, Sloan, Marshall, and Pope John operated in increasingly comprehensive institutions, where they had to communicate with individuals of different backgrounds and perspectives. Yet, within a university, a business corporation, the military, or the church these leaders still could assume a certain commonality of interest among their respective constituents.

The remaining leaders addressed much wider constituencies. Roosevelt played a special role in the lives of women, a population that had been largely disenfranchised in the United States and throughout the rest of the world. King assumed a leadership role among African Americans, who had been subjected to unprecedented mistreatment over several centuries. Most ambitiously, leaders like Thatcher seek to provide direction for a whole nation, while visionaries like Gandhi and Monnet deliberately seek to encompass collections of nations, if not the whole world.

A word on exposition. Reflecting the movement from domain to nation, I devote separate chapters (4–12) to Mead, Oppenheimer,

Hutchins, Sloan, Marshall, Pope John XXIII, Roosevelt, King, and Thatcher, respectively. A brief reprise after chapter 11 allows me to review the argument. In chapter 13 I survey the activities of ten national leaders, each of whom played a decisive role on the world scene during the first half of the twentieth century. In chapter 14, moving beyond the nation-state as usually defined, I review the achievements of Jean Monnet and Mahatma Gandhi. Each of these men sought to provide leadership that spoke to the wider world.

RELATING AND EMBODYING STORIES

Leaders achieve their effectiveness chiefly through the stories they relate. Here, I use the term *relate* rather than *tell* because presenting a story in words is but one way to communicate. Leaders in the arts characteristically inspire others by the ways they use their chosen media of artistic expression, be they the phrases of a sonata or the gestures of a dance; scientists lead through the manipulation of the symbol systems favored in their domains, be they the mathematical equations of theoretical physicists or the anatomical models of neurophysiologists. In addition to communicating stories, leaders *embody* those stories. That is, without necessarily relating their stories in so many words or in a string of selected symbols, leaders such as Marshall convey their stories by the kinds of lives they themselves lead and, through example, seek to inspire in their followers.

The ways in which direct leaders conduct their lives—their embodiments—must be clearly perceptible by those whom they hope to influence. If a military leader like Stalin calls on his troops to be courageous, it matters whether he comports himself bravely. Similarly, if a religious leader like Pope John calls on Catholics to act generously toward those of other religious and ideological persuasions, his actual behavior toward Protestant pastors or Communist workers becomes significant. People who do not practice what they preach are hypocrites, and hypocrisy mutes the effectiveness of their stories.

In contrast, the personal lives of indirect leaders are not germane to their influence; strictly speaking, it did not matter to fellow scientists whether Einstein loved his wives, tormented his children, or never spoke to others. Nonetheless, the embodiments of an indirect leader are important. What matters to fellow physicists are the particular *approaches* to science embodied in Einstein's work.

Just as his successors have been influenced by the conclusions that he drew, they have also been affected by the ways that he posed questions and the ways that he formulated, approached, and solved problems. By the same token, the conceptions and methods created by Igor Stravinsky and Martha Graham have affected succeeding generations of creative composers and dancers, respectively. If such creators had achieved their products through illegitimate means—for example, through fudging of data or through plagiarism—their leadership status would have been challenged.

It proves useful to align leaders in terms of the innovativeness of their stories. The *ordinary* leader, by definition the most common one, simply relates the traditional story of his or her group as effectively as possible. An ordinary political leader like Gerald Ford or the French president Georges Pompidou or an ordinary business leader like Roger Smith of General Motors does not seek to stretch the consciousness of his contemporary audience. We can learn about the commonplace stories of a group by examining the words and the lives of ordinary leaders; we are unlikely to be able to anticipate the ways in which that group will evolve in the future. In this book I have not focused on ordinary leaders.

The *innovative* leader takes a story that has been latent in the population, or among the members of his or her chosen domain, and brings new attention or a fresh twist to that story. In recent world history, neither Thatcher nor de Gaulle nor Ronald Reagan created wholly novel stories. Rather, it was their particular genius to have identified stories or themes that already existed in the culture but had become muted or neglected over the years. In the arts, individuals who style themselves as neoclassicists, neoromantics, or even neomodernists are also attempting to revive themes and forms that have fallen into disuse. In trying to capture the glory or the innocence of an earlier era, in the face of rival contemporary currents and counterstories, these innovative leaders may succeed in reorienting their times.

By far the rarest individual is the *visionary* leader. Not content to relate a current story or to reactivate a story drawn from a remote or recent past, this individual actually creates a new story, one not known to most individuals before, and achieves at least a measure of success in conveying this story effectively to others. The great religious leaders of the past—Moses, Confucius, Jesus, Buddha, Mohammed—certainly qualify as visionary; on a more modest scale, I view individuals like Gandhi and Monnet as visionary leaders for our time.

The question of just where to draw the line between innovative

and visionary is not easy to determine and is not, in any case, crucial for this study. Readers may well quarrel with my suggestion that Thatcher is *innovative,* while Gandhi and Monnet earn the appellation *visionary.* Also, a story that appears visionary to most followers may strike the knowledgeable few as "merely innovative." What does emerge from this study is that visionary leadership is far more readily achieved in specific domains (like particular arts or sciences) or in specific institutions (like a university or a corporation) than in the guidance of an entire society. Indeed, in any century there may be only one or two effective political or religious leaders who are genuine visionaries.

LEADING A DOMAIN, LEADING A SOCIETY

The specter of the visionary leader touches on a fundamental distinction between leadership of a domain and leadership of a wider society, a distinction that I explore throughout this book. When it comes to providing leadership *within a traditional domain or discipline,* one can assume that one's audience is already sophisticated in the stories, the images, and the other embodiments of that domain. To put it simply, one is communicating with experts. Especially in the contemporary, "hungry" era, vision is at a premium within most domains. And so, while it is hardly an easy matter to become a visionary, such an individual stands at least a reasonable chance of successfully reorienting a domain.

Six of the individuals I studied in my 1993 book *Creating Minds* did in fact create a new story—one that eventually refashioned the domains in which they worked. Sigmund Freud showed his colleagues (and, ultimately, the world) a new way to understand normal and neurotic individuals; Einstein conceived of time and space in a way that was radically unfamiliar but scientifically productive; Stravinsky, Graham, Pablo Picasso, and T. S. Eliot reoriented their chosen art forms in ways that were initially startling but that ultimately affected numerous successors' practices. Both their actual works and their processes of creating proved influential. Quite possibly, their respective audiences were "primed" for their appearance; their revolutionary accomplishments in turn "primed" their audiences for yet further breakthroughs at their hands, or at the hands of those visionary creators who came after them.

These leaders of recognized domains need to be distinguished

sharply from individuals who would presume to *reorient* a political entity, like a nation, or a broadly based institution, like the church or the military. In the latter cases, the aspiring leader is dealing not with experts but with individuals who bring an ordinary, relatively undisciplined frame of mind to their audience membership. (Indeed, even if the audience member happens to be an expert in some domain, such incidental expertise does not ordinarily color his or her perceptions as a member of the nation or institution.) The voter Janet Q. Public is unlikely to be an expert in the domain of politics; neither were Freud, Picasso, or Graham when each was acting merely as a voting citizen. Accordingly, at least to begin with, the leader who would reorient an institution must be able to address a public in terms of the commonsense and commonplace notions that an ordinary inhabitant absorbs simply by virtue of living for some years within a society.

By and large, members of a society are not—except in times of crisis—searching for an unfamiliar story or a new form of understanding. Indeed, the situation is almost the opposite. As Richard Nixon once expressed it: "About the time you are writing a line you have written so often that you want to throw up, that is the time the American people will hear it." In this way, ordinary citizens differ markedly from experts in the arts and the sciences, who, at least in modern times, are ever on the lookout for new answers and, equally, for novel questions. And even at a time of crisis, a visionary leader rarely achieves his or her desired effect. Thus, while visionaries like Gandhi or Buddha or Christ prove fascinating to study, they are also extreme rarities—mutant leaders, one might say.

In *Creating Minds* I focused on those individuals who ushered in the major artistic and scientific breakthroughs of the twentieth century, rather than on their contemporaries who represented the status quo or whose reaches toward breakthroughs were not successful. In this book, as I have noted, I focus on leaders who may be termed innovative or visionary—leaders who profoundly affect other people. I strive to understand Hutchins instead of his Harvard counterpart Nathan Marsh Pusey; Sloan rather than his General Motors' successor Harlow Curtice; Thatcher in lieu of her fellow prime ministers Neville Chamberlain, James Callaghan, or John Major. Part of the difference clearly lies in the minds, personalities, and ambitions of the more successful leaders, whether they operated in traditional domains or sought to address diverse publics. However, the needs and demands of the audiences, and the nature of the times in which leaders and audience members live,

prove at least as important a factor in determining leaders' ultimate effectiveness.

As a rule of thumb, creative artists, scientists, and experts in various disciplines lead indirectly, through their work; effective leaders of institutions and nations lead directly, through the stories and acts they address to an audience. This distinction is not, however, rigid. A leader of a nation may lead indirectly; for example, de Gaulle's writings represented an important contribution to the French people. By the same token, a leader within a domain may lead his audience members directly—for example, by assuming the presidency of a professional organization. Note, however, that the leader within a domain is unlikely to be taken seriously by her colleagues unless she herself has created within that domain—and, preferably, has done so innovatively. Mead, for instance, could become an effective president of the American Anthropological Association because she was a widely esteemed practitioner of that discipline.

In addition to its focus on leaders with innovative messages, my sample is also distinctive in certain other ways. The leaders whom I study achieved their positions within democratic societies, largely because of their persuasive powers. I term them *leaders by choice.* Moreover, with certain noted exceptions, their view of their constituencies was typically *inclusive*—they sought to draw more people into their circle, rather than to denounce or to exclude others. By the same token, while they may have sought and enjoyed power, they were motivated in large measure by the desire to effect changes, rather than simply by a lust for more power. It is possible that the conclusions I draw about leadership might not apply in equal measure to individuals who, for example, achieved their positions by force or who were sustained chiefly by a hatred of others or by the thirst for absolute power. My review of the leaders of the Second World War helps to place in perspective the in-depth portraits of the eleven leaders I have selected; the survey in chapter 13 brings to the fore some characteristics of leaders who are obsessed with power or who gain advantage by setting groups against one another.

As with *Creating Minds,* I deliberately focus on individuals who have lived in the twentieth century. I sought individuals about whom biographical materials were readily available, whose claims to be influential were not controversial, and whose achievements and failures lay sufficiently in the past that historians have already attained distance from them. Because these individuals have lived roughly during the same epoch, I could be confident that

differences among them did not reflect their having been subjected to contrasting historical conditions. It remains to be seen whether the generalizations that emerge also apply to earlier direct leaders like Oliver Cromwell or Napoléon Bonaparte, or to earlier indirect leaders (or creators) like Albrecht Dürer or Jane Austen.

THE STORY AS CENTRAL

The ultimate impact of the leader depends most significantly on the particular story that he or she relates or embodies, and the receptions to that story on the part of audiences (or collaborators or followers). What links the eleven individuals with whom I lead off, and the score of others from this century whose names could readily have been substituted for them, is the fact that they arrived at a story that worked for them and, ultimately, for others as well. They told stories—in so many words—about themselves and their groups, about where they were coming from and where they were headed, about what was to be feared, struggled against, and dreamed about. My analysis of leadership comes to focus, therefore, on the stories conveyed by representative leaders.

The audience is not simply a blank slate, however, waiting for the first, or for the best, story to be etched on its virginal tablet. Rather, audience members come equipped with many stories that have already been told and retold in their homes, their societies, and their domains. The stories of the leader—be they traditional or novel—must compete with many other extant stories; and if the new stories are to succeed, they must transplant, suppress, complement, or in some measure outweigh the earlier stories, as well as contemporary oppositional "counterstories." In a Darwinian sense, the "memes"—a culture's versions of genes—called stories compete with one another for favor, and only the most robust stand a chance of gaining ascendancy. I focus here on stories that worked, but I do not neglect those narratives that proved less compelling.

I deliberately use the terms *story* and *narrative* rather than *message* or *theme.* In speaking of stories, I want to call attention to the fact that leaders present a *dynamic* perspective to their followers: not just a headline or snapshot, but a drama that unfolds over time, in which they—leader and followers—are the principal characters or heroes. Together, they have embarked on a journey in pursuit of certain goals, and along the way and into the future, they can expect to encounter certain obstacles or resistances that must

be overcome. Leaders and audiences traffic in many stories, but the most basic story has to do with issues of *identity.* And so it is the leader who succeeds in conveying a new version of a given group's story who is likely to be effective. Effectiveness here involves fit—the story needs to make sense to audience members at this particular historical moment, in terms of where they have been and where they would like to go. Consider the capsule version of Eleanor Roosevelt's story—that a woman who was at once ordinary in appearance and extraordinary in background and resources could improve the lot of disadvantaged people. Such a story was appropriate at mid-century; the same story might have seemed unrealistic fifty years earlier and patronizing a half-century later.

As one comes to focus more closely on individual examples of leadership—traditional or visionary, direct or indirect, inclusionary or exclusionary, successful or ineffectual—one must consider not only the particular stories that are already "in the air" but also the niche that the leader's set of stories ultimately occupies. By the same token, the particular embodiment in the life of the leader stands in competition with a myriad of earlier images and stereotypes that already stock the consciousness of audience members. Through her daily mode of existence, Roosevelt had to refute the notions that only men can lead, that persons of privilege are suspect, and that only persons of extraordinary appearance and talents can inspire a revolution. To prevail, stories need enough background, detail, and texture so that an audience member can travel comfortably within their contours; only when these accompanying features are already well known can the leader count on an audience to "fill in the text." In chapter 3, I more closely examine the nature of stories related by leaders and their various realizations and embodiments.

A COGNITIVE APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP

To summarize thus far: Our understanding of the nature and processes of leadership is most likely to be enhanced as we come to understand better the arena in which leadership necessarily occurs —namely, the *human mind.* Perhaps this characterization should be pluralized as *human minds,* since I am concerned equally with the mind of the leader and the minds of the followers (whom I sometimes refer to as *audience members* or *collaborators).* Accordingly, this book is a sustained examination, first, of the ways

in which leaders of different types achieve varying degrees of success in characterizing and resolving important life issues in their own minds and, second, of how, in parallel or in turn, they attempt to alter the minds of their various audiences to effect desired changes.

By focusing on the mind and invoking the word *cognitive,* I make deliberate contact with an approach to the study of mind that has developed rapidly in the last few decades. In contrast to the behaviorists, who have focused only on overt actions, and the psychoanalysts, whose interest has been directed chiefly at personality and motivation, cognitive psychologists examine how ideas (or thoughts or images or mental representations)[1] develop and how they are stored, accessed, combined, remembered, and (all too often) rearranged or distorted by the operations of the human mental apparatus. Many researchers in the cognitive tradition have studied relatively simple stimuli such as single words or simple geometric forms; yet the compleat cognitivist aspires as well to explain more complex and more highly meaningful forms of information, such as stories, scenarios, dreams, and visions.

Confronted with the phenomenon of leadership, a cognitively oriented scientist is likely to ask such questions as, What are the ideas (or stories) of the leader? How have they developed? How are they communicated, understood, and misunderstood? How do they interact with other stories, especially competing counterstories, that have already drenched the consciousness of audience members? How do key ideas (or stories) affect the thoughts, feelings, and behaviors of other individuals? Precisely such questions concern us in the pages that follow.

While I am comfortable in describing the approach as *cognitive,* I do not wish to raise certain expectations. My model is not the familiar information-processing approach in which the generation or comprehension of a story is traced on a step-by-step basis (input to output). Rather, the approach is cognitive in a generic sense: an active mind is comparing stories with one another and highlighting some features, while downplaying others. My cognitive approach to leadership emphasizes a set of considerations that has received short shrift in the otherwise-ample social-scientific literature on leadership. The bulk of this literature falls into four categories, each of which is worthy of consideration, but each of which can be enriched by a consideration of cognitive dimensions.

Some authorities approach leadership primarily in terms of the acquisition and utility of *power.* Every society requires a political apparatus, and certain individuals either choose or are selected to

direct the social and political structures. I do not for a moment underestimate the importance of power as a motivation or a force in its own right, but I insist that, of itself, power—as opposed to terror — cannot bring about significant changes. The vantage point of power, however achieved, needs to be yoked to specific messages—to stories—that can direct and guide an inner circle and a wider polity. This principle holds even with respect to individuals who gained enormous power in the twentieth century such as Stalin, Hitler, and Mao Zedong.

From a related perspective, others emphasize the role of specific *policies.* Recognizing that power must be used, proponents of this perspective focus on the decisions to be made about policy and the processes whereby the designated policies are more or less successfully implemented. At an extreme, such a policy orientation minimizes the role of a specific political leader; interest groups have their favored policies, and these groups will find instruments or vehicles to help institute those policies; decisions are made according to some kind of rational calculus.

While acknowledging the role of policies, I stress that the pursuit of certain practices or initiatives (promoted by certain societal events or certain interest groups), as opposed to others, is not a matter of chance; the articulation of policy alternatives by leaders proves a crucial element in determining the course of affairs that is ultimately pursued. Thus, Reagan may well have voiced the views of wealthy southern Californians who encouraged him to enter politics; but his own idiosyncratic skills, priorities, and persuasive powers left their marks on late-twentieth-century America. Reagan was not indistinguishable from the entrepreneur-politician Barry Goldwater or the actor-politician George Murphy.

Another perspective that calls into question the importance of the specific leader is one grounded in an examination of the *public,* or *audience.* Complementing those who see policies as having a life of their own, other authorities focus on the needs and fears of the general population, or of specific groups within the population. In this analysis, the mass of citizens senses, with some degree of precision, its most important goals, which could relate to policies or to grievances, goals, or anxieties. While the public may need ultimately to rally around some kind of a central figure, the choice of a specific leader is largely accidental. The leader who would succeed, then, is the one who best senses and delivers what an audience already desires.

I agree that at times the successful leader is the one who most keenly senses the wishes of a potential audience. But this act of

intuition does not relieve the leader of the need to articulate a message clearly and convincingly, and to combat other contrary themes reverberating in the culture. In the 1920s and early 1930s, Germany may have been searching desperately for a new order (and a newly ordered society), but the emergence of leaders other than Hitler most assuredly would have changed the course of world history.

A final viewpoint is distinctly psychological. Unlike the other perspectives, and closer to my own set forth here, this one acknowledges the central role played by leaders. In most psychological studies of leadership, however, researchers have focused on the *personality* of the leader: his or her personal needs, principal psycho-dynamic traits, early life experiences, and relationship to other individuals. In what follows I often use insights drawn from this complementary approach. Yet, as with the other approaches, the personality emphasis cannot explain the particular course called for by a leader and the degree of success achieved with various audiences. Here, again, a concern with cognition—with the mental structures activated in leaders and followers—constitutes the missing piece of the puzzle.

In this book I say relatively little about how other authorities have approached the issue of leadership. In no way is this limited discussion meant to question the importance of earlier contributions to this much-studied topic. Indeed, as made clear in the reference notes to this and many other passages, I have learned a great deal from those authorities who have probed the personal traits and personal histories of leaders, different forms of leadership, and the crucial roles of the audience. I owe a special debt to my own mentor, the late psychoanalyst Erik Erikson, who in many ways inspired this study. But the existence of many excellent compendia on leadership, and my own focus on the cognitive dimensions of leadership, relieves me of the need to review critically other scholarly traditions in this field.

One more word on the study of leadership. In one sense, my study is conservative; it builds on the assumptions that there are individuals called leaders, who have stories and goals, who strive to achieve them, and who are sometimes successful in this pursuit. This stance will perturb those of a more radical stripe, who question whether leaders actually influence events, whether leaders *should* actually be allowed to influence events, or whether the conception of leadership itself deserves to survive. While acknowledging the rhetorical appeal of such accounts, I find them unconvincing in the light of human biology and human history. I invite those who

question this enterprise to offer their own "leaderless" accounts of the success of the Manhattan Project, the early course of the civil rights movement, or the securing of independence for India.

THE PLAN OF THIS BOOK

In the concluding chapters of part I, I consider those components that make leadership possible. My analysis proceeds in two initially separate streams. In chapter 2, I review the features of human development that make possible the phenomena of leadership. In chapter 3, I consider the nature of the story making that leaders are engaged in and delineate the major kinds of stories that leaders have worked with over the centuries. A merging of these developmental and narrative streams facilitates an investigation of leadership as embodied in the lives of several influential twentieth-century leaders.

In the second and most extensive part of this book, I apply my framework by delineating the nature of leadership in varying domains. Proceeding from the most sharply delineated to the most expansive domains, I present a set of case studies, as well as some more general considerations of leadership processes associated with each kind of domain. First, I examine leadership within classic domains of scholarship, as represented by Mead's anthropology (chapter 4) and Oppenheimer's physics (chapter 5). At the start of their careers, these individuals exerted the kind of leadership that has traditionally been exercised by great artists like Picasso, Stravinsky, and Graham, or by exceptional scientists like Einstein or Darwin. Unlike these prototypical indirect leaders, however, Oppenheimer and Mead sought eventually to extend their influence, first by assuming direct leadership roles within their scholarly domains, and then by expanding beyond their scholarly domains, in the manner of a broad-gauged direct leader. They serve, accordingly, as exemplars of the central "Einstein-Eureka" tension being explored in this book.

In chapter 6, I begin my examination of leadership within institutions that pursue specific missions and that involve a set of interlocking constituencies. Institutions of this sort include schools, universities, and foundations. My chosen vehicle is Hutchins, who harbored awesome ambitions for the several institutions that he led but who ran into revealing difficulties as he attempted to implement his central ideas.

In chapters 7 through 9, still focusing on relatively circumscribed domains, I turn my attention to three classic institutions or "estates": the business corporation, the military, and the church. For many commentators, these organizations are synonymous with leadership; but as I try to show, the three estates exhibit interesting similarities with and differences from more narrowly, as well as more broadly, conceived institutions. My examples are Sloan (chapter 7), Marshall (chapter 8), and Pope John XXIII (chapter 9).

In chapters 10 and 11, I consider leadership for groups that have until now been considered nondominant, marginal, or "dissenting," to borrow the term created by the historian Bruce Miroff. In my study the two selected groups are women and African Americans. Both groups have spawned gifted leaders for at least a century, but no individual leader has successfully captured and held the national consciousness until the last half century. While the women's movement has lacked a single central figure, Roosevelt in many ways played a crucial role in the formation of feminine consciousness both in this country and abroad (see chapter 10). By nearly all accounts King has been the most important leader of the African American community (see chapter 11).

In chapter 12, following a brief reprise, I turn to what is generally considered the prototypical instance of leadership: the direction of a nation. This arena of leadership foregrounds the challenge a political leader faces in addressing a number of distinct constituencies while at the same time giving voice and direction to a recognized political entity. Epitomizing my argument that certain leaders must create and convey an innovative story to their constituencies is Thatcher.

Even more emblematic of political leadership are those individuals who preside over great nations during periods of crisis. A consideration of the individuals who led their respective nations during the Second World War provides an opportunity to comment on leadership at a time of "high stakes" and to consider the most malevolent, as well as the most heroic, forms of leadership. In chapter 13, I consider briefly not only the three Allied leaders at the Eureka Summit but also Chiang Kai-shek, de Gaulle, Hitler, Vladimir Lenin, Mao Zedong, Benito Mussolini, and Hideki Tojo. This survey gives me an opportunity to supplement knowledge of prototypical indirect leaders gained from the studies in *Creating Minds* with knowledge of prototypical direct leaders, who are drawn from the opposite end of the continuum. The review also provides a chance to revisit some of the hypotheses about leadership that have emerged from the earlier, more intensive case studies.

Part III extends the study in two ways. In chapter 14, I examine what may be the most important, but rarest and most elusive, variety of leadership: the form that goes beyond the nation-state and seeks to address all human beings. In recorded history, the chief epoch for such leadership occurred roughly two millennia ago, when a number of the major world religions were launched. Scattered attempts in more recent centuries have had relatively little long-term impact. For this reason, the case of Gandhi proves particularly telling—less, perhaps, because of its immediate success than because of the promise it may harbor for the coming centuries. On a somewhat more modest scale, the efforts of Monnet point to the kinds of leadership that may transcend national boundaries and rivalries.

In the concluding chapter 15, I take stock of the major findings that have resulted from the study. Included are a portrait of an exemplary leader, a survey of generalizations about leadership that have emerged, and a consideration of constants and new trends in the domain of leadership. In conclusion, I make some suggestions about how effective leadership might be facilitated.

A FEW WORDS ON METHOD

Let me comment on the methods I used in studying the individuals highlighted in this book and the kinds of conclusions that may accordingly be drawn. In general, I relied heavily on the published biographies of these individuals, as well as general histories of the period. Especially valuable were autobiographical accounts, which were available in nearly all cases. I also consulted, as needed, original documents—particularly speeches, popular writings, audiotapes, and videotapes—in which the protagonists have told their own stories in their own words. For better or for worse, Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and Gandhi's *Autobiography: The Story of My Experiments with Truth* are worth many secondary sources.

In much scholarly work, reports are written as if a study were primarily inductive (one reads many biographies of leaders and waits—with an innocent eye—for the proper generalizations to emerge) or as if it were an exercise in hypothesis testing (one proposes a model of a leader and then tests it systematically by examining "the data"). It would be misleading to absorb the present study into either camp. I began with some general ideas about leadership—in particular, with the notion that stories were

important for all leaders and that leaders who wanted to influence wide audiences would find themselves drawn to the enunciation of simple stories. Based on my earlier study of creative individuals, I also had in mind some factors to monitor: for example, the kinds of families from which the leaders came, the cognitive strengths or "intelligences" exhibited by leaders, the crucial role played by other supportive individuals, and the length of time that it takes to develop and disseminate novel ideas.

In the course of the study, however, some of these themes receded in importance, while others emerged as worthy of more extended consideration. For instance, before beginning the case studies, I had not thought much about the contribution to effective leadership of travel in one's youth, the capacity to challenge figures in authority, a focus in early life on moral and spiritual issues, or the ways in which public figures apportion their time.

While it is not easy (and perhaps not even wise) to attempt to capture this oscillation between expectations and surprises, I believe that some of my own process of discovery does come through in this book. In this chapter and in the remaining chapters of part I, I lay out enough of my general background thinking so that readers can approach the case studies with the same "frame of mind" that I brought to them. Then, in the concluding part of the book, I turn more explicitly to the patterns and generalizations that have emerged from the study.

In this and the next two chapters, I introduce a set of distinctions that figures in a cognitive approach to leadership: such factors as direct/indirect forms of leadership, leadership within and across domains, inclusionary/exclusionary kinds of stories, identity stories, the embodiment of stories, and resistances and counterstories. Some readers will ponder these categories critically, while others may become somewhat impatient with what may seem like nitpicking or the proliferation of social-scientific jargon. I sympathize with both kinds of readers, for I harbor each of them within my own mind. Sometimes, I like to read as an accountant would, keeping careful track of every entry in some kind of ledger. At other times, I prefer to take in information as an audience member at a concert would, allowing the analytic themes to operate as they play freely within my imagination.

I have sought to accommodate both perspectives. In part I, I describe my conceptual categories as clearly as possible. From then on, however, I focus on the creation of effective music, with only the occasional introduction of program notes. In order to satisfy my own accountant tendencies, and those among the readership who share

this actuarial proclivity, my collaborator and I have prepared appendices that delineate the key distinctions for each of the figures portrayed in this volume.

The world may continue to change rapidly, but we can expect to participate in that world as the same kinds of beings. Any psychologically informed discussion of human leadership should begin with a consideration of the nature and limitations of the species that encompasses leaders and followers.

2

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEADERSHIP

> *A leader is a man who has the ability to get other people to do what they don't want to do and like it.*
>
> —*Harry Truman*

Human beings are cultural creatures, growing up in societies formed over the centuries by other human beings, and participating more or less energetically in institutions that have evolved over equally long periods. For most of this book, I write within the cultural perspective, simply assuming that humans have been adequately socialized so that they can join these institutions, typically as followers but occasionally as leaders.

As noted in chapter 1, I apply a perspective that is cognitive as well as cultural. I view leadership as a process that occurs within the minds of individuals who live in a culture—a process that entails the capacities to create stories, to understand and evaluate these stories, and to appreciate the struggle among stories. Ultimately, certain kinds of stories will typically become predominant—in particular, stories that provide an adequate and timely sense of identity for individuals who live within a community or institution. This focus on stories presupposes that some individuals are in a position to convey these stories to others, that other individuals can identify with these stories, and that various individuals feel included or excluded once these stories have spread.

Just what kind of a creature can participate in such a community, enter into a world of narrative, and ultimately assume a position as follower, leader, or perhaps both? What sort of mind is needed to gain nurturance from at least certain kinds of stories told by certain kinds of people? I see at work four principal factors, outlined respectively in the next four sections. Two can be summarized briefly; two call for more extended discussion.

HUMANS' PRIMATE STATUS

The first factor is our *primate heritage.* In contrast with most other species, the order of primates is organized into hierarchies with *clear dominance relationships among its members.* Primates recognize individual members of their species from an early age, compete with one another for positions within the hierarchy, and ultimately assume specific relationships of dominance or submission to conspecifics.

These processes are most pronounced among males who live on savannah—at first during the rough play of childhood and later, during the serious competition for control of the colony, protection of offspring, and possession of the most desirable females. But dominance hierarchies are also found among female members of various primate species. In comparison with nondominant males, dominant males exhibit characteristic patterns of neurotransmitters (substances that transmit nerve impulses across synapses), such as a greater production of serotonin, and lower overall levels of stress. Intriguingly, when a male's position shifts in the hierarchy, so do these physiological markers. Primates often organize themselves into in-groups and out-groups; there may be an evolutionary advantage in remaining near those to whom one bears the greatest genetic similarity.

The second important component of our primate heritage is the *proclivity to imitate.* The decision about which model to imitate and when to imitate becomes crucial. Imitation is almost always unidirectional: that is, lower-status primates imitate the actions of higher-status conspecifics. However, the choices of behaviors to be imitated are made from a relatively narrow set of options; it would make little sense, for example, to speak of nonhuman primates as putting forth "stories" about their group that can lead other members of their species to develop a new sense of identity or a reconceptualization of the purpose of life.

While seemingly remote from the central topic of this book, our primate heritage is actually fundamental to an appreciation of leadership. For instance, the "dominance processes" observable in nonhuman primates are evident even among preschoolers. Dominant youngsters control toys, initiate and organize games, and help to keep the group together; less-dominant children orient themselves with reference to the more dominant ones and spend much of their time imitating and attempting to curry favor with the more dominant ones. Size, strength, skill, intelligence,

attractiveness, and gender all contribute to the determination of which organisms will occupy superior positions in the emerging social hierarchy.

More generally, as primates, we expect a leadership/followership social structure. We also expect struggles for positions of dominance, and we frequently compute our positions within various hierarchies. This is *not* to say that we are slaves of our species membership. Nondominant cooperative groupings are possible. But those who expect such uncontoured structures to arise easily or to remain unchallenged are innocent of human history as well as human biology.

EARLY SOCIALIZATION: SELF-DEFINITION AND GROUP IDENTIFICATION

The second of the four factors provides further clues about the origins of a sense of group identity. Researchers studying *early socialization of human children* have documented the importance of the establishment in early life of a strong and secure bond of attachment between infant and caretaker. Such an incipient sense of trust—or (less happily) of mistrust—colors the way that individuals react to authority. One's feeling of comfort in the presence of others or, correlatively, one's estrangement from others contributes powerfully to how one aligns oneself in later life with members of one's own group or with more remote groups.

Two other facets of early socialization are also crucial for understanding the processes and phenomena of leadership. One feature is the gradual emergence in the young child of a *sense of self.* As early as the age of eighteen months, young children have already become aware that they exist as separate entities. This awareness is revealed not only in a youngster's accurate use of names and other labels that refer to individuals, including herself, but also in her marvelous sense of affirmation when she peers into a mirror and notices that a mark placed surreptitiously on her face has marred her own appearance.

The other feature of critical importance in early socialization is the *appreciation of how one is similar to certain other individuals.* While youngsters naturally imitate a great deal of what they observe in the behavior of conspecifics who happen to be in their vicinity, this apprehension of similarity soon transcends sheer imitation. Indeed, since Sigmund Freud's time, researchers have

spoken about a more complex process called *identification:* a youngster goes well beyond merely recognizing certain properties in common with another and comes to feel akin *in general* to an older model or set of role models. The young child may well *imitate* a person on the street or a puppet on television; but the child *identifies* with an older sibling or with the parent of the same sex, to the extent that he or she internalizes crucial features of that "role model." (Less frequently, youngsters come to identify strongly with age-mates.)

Once such identification begins to consolidate, the child need not directly monitor every action of the model. Instead, he or she can begin to imagine what the model *would do* in a given situation; the identifier can gain pleasure, or suffer shame or guilt, to the extent that he or she succeeds in living up to the expectations—the ideals—of the role model. Ultimately, effective followers no longer require the regular presence of the leader; they can anticipate his or her stories and themselves inspire other potential audience members.

In general, youngsters identify with those in their immediate circle. It is therefore of great interest when a child comes to identify with someone more remote—for example, the leader of a political or religious group. A fascinating "marker" of many future leaders is their capacity to identify with a more distant authority figure. This identification manifests itself both in efforts to emulate the leader and in a willingness to challenge that leader under certain circumstances.

Two parallel social processes are at work during the early years. The child develops an increasingly complex and differentiated sense of self as an individual; and the child comes to feel an affinity to older individuals in particular, and to one or more social groups in general. These processes continue to unfold throughout childhood and, indeed, for much of the rest of life. In youth, they are often referred to as the formation of identity; in middle age, as components of citizenship; in old age, as a sense of responsibility to succeeding generations.

The end product of these processes of self-definition and identification is an individual as part of a group; as a holder of certain beliefs, attitudes, and values; and as a practitioner of certain behaviors. It is the particular burden of the leader to help other individuals determine their personal, social, and moral identities; more often than not, leaders inspire in part because of how they have resolved their own identity issues.

But role models obviously can exert a range of influences. The growing child may evolve thoughts and actions that are either

praiseworthy or undesirable or, as so often happens, simultaneously admirable and loathsome. Moreover, consequences ensue if role models worthy of emulation are not present, or if role models themselves exhibit inconstant or destructive behaviors. In these latter cases, the growing child will probably lack a coherent or integrated sense of self or a developed sense of group membership, and amoral or antisocial actions are likely to emerge. All too often, such an individual is likely to be attracted by demagogues rather than by saints.

THE MIND OF THE FIVE-YEAR-OLD

Courtesy of our primate heritage and the relatively predictable events of the first few years of life, one can anticipate the formation of the prototypical five-year-old child—someone who, amazingly enough, already possesses the basic ingredients necessary for entering into a leader-follower (or a peer-peer) relationship. That is to say, the five-year-old child already has a sense of himself and of other individuals, as persons and as members of the group. Children of this age can appreciate simple stories and, indeed, even create simple patterned narratives of their own. In addition, they already have assumed positions (still relatively flexible ones) within various dominance hierarchies and are becoming proficient at recognizing signals of leading, following, and relating as equals in peer-peer interactions.

Thanks to Sigmund Freud and his followers in the psychoanalytic movement, many observers have at least one relatively articulated view of the personality of the young child: an individual who is driven by strong urges, knows what she wants and will strive to get it, has a limited capacity to empathize with others, and exhibits rivalry with siblings as well as strong and often-contradictory "Oedipal" feelings toward her mother and her father. Thanks to the Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget and his fellow cognitive researchers, many observers also have a sense of the thought of the young child as an individual who sees the world largely from her own perspective and who knows the world chiefly through the operation of her sense organs and her motor systems.

Freud and Piaget introduced us to the third of the crucial basic ingredients of leadership—*the mind of the five-year-old child.* But these renowned authorities disagreed on a central point. While both theorists believed that children pass through "stages" in early

childhood, they viewed the nature of those stages differently. Freud's affective, or emotional, stages are cumulative. That is, even when a growing individual apparently advances beyond his Oedipal strivings, he continues to experience a similar ensemble of feelings in analogous situations. For example, as an adult, he may well relive his affects of early years when he encounters a demanding boss or a sympathetic therapist.

In contrast, Piaget held that once a child achieves a more advanced cognitive stage, she no longer retains access to the cognitions of an earlier stage. As an example, consider what happens once a child is able to achieve conservation—that state of mind where she appreciates that liquid does not change in amount just because it happens to be poured into a new and differently shaped vessel. According to Piaget, the "more-developed" child no longer retains access to the prior mental state wherein the amount of liquid was judged by its apparent height or width inside a clear container ("it's more because it looks taller"). In fact, the child becomes incredulous when confronted with evidence that she at one time denied the principle of conservation.

As it turns out, neither Freud nor Piaget, the two greatest scholars of human development of our century, had it completely right—or, to phrase it more generously, each was right about his principal concerns. As Freud thought, individuals never lose access to the emotional states and strivings of their childhood. Thus, even renowned and powerful world leaders can reactivate their own feelings of infantile omnipotence (or helplessness), even as they can play on or rekindle the euphoria or rage their followers experienced in early childhood.

By the same token, Piaget correctly described stage transformations in certain "universal" cognitive spheres. Achievements such as gaining an appreciation of the conservation of liquid are essentially permanent; barring dysfunction of the nervous system, individuals retain these more sophisticated belief structures indefinitely. Older persons experience great difficulty in acknowledging that they ever entertained different views about the objects or states of the world—and they cannot, as a rule, think of the world as a young child does.

But these two explorers of the child's mind failed to account adequately for another crucial set of phenomena. From early childhood, children exhibit a keen interest in understanding the world about them—the physical objects (entities ranging from atoms to cars to suns); the biological objects (entities that are alive and entities that move on the basis of their own metabolic energy); and

the mind (the existence of mental objects, like thoughts and dreams, as well as the mental receptacles that are metaphorically assumed to house them, like one's memory or one's imagination).

Even without formal instruction, youngsters develop quite powerful notions—often termed "theories"—about these several realms of existence. So, for example, children come to think that heavier objects fall more rapidly than lighter objects; that entities that move are alive, while those that do not, or cannot, move are dead; and that all individuals have minds, but that individuals share similar minds to the extent that they look alike, have the same name, or come from the same neighborhood.

It was to Piaget's great credit that he sensitized child-watchers to these incipient theories held by untutored children. Where Piaget fell short was in his assumption that such misconceptions would necessarily dissolve. By and large, it has now been established that youngsters' initial notions about the physical, biological, and psychological worlds are remarkably robust. Indeed, even students who have taken courses in the formal disciplines typically continue to believe—contrary to fact and contrary to teaching—that an object's mass determines its acceleration; that evolution leads to an optimal species; and that certain valued beliefs are a necessary correlate of membership in a particular family or community group. In fact, the only individuals who seem genuinely and comprehensively to change their views on such topics are the persons that we label as "experts." Only the physicists, biologists, and social analysts in our midst are apparently able to relinquish completely the astonishingly strong and enduring theories of early childhood.

Just as they develop "theories of the world," children also develop coherent notions about everyday activities. Children as young as two or three already have keen and reliable memories of series of events. By the age of four or five, most children have constructed a large number of "scripts" or "stereotypes" or "scenarios." These cognitive frames capture the regular features, as well as the optional ones, that come to mark such recurrences as birthday parties, trips to the supermarket, or dinner at a fast-food restaurant. In the face of much contradictory evidence, the "facts" of such scripts do change. One can come to accept—and even to expect—birthday parties that feature a dessert of fruit rather than cake or ice cream, or restaurant sequences where one pays upon ordering rather than after eating the meal. But by and large, early scripts, stereotypes, and scenarios prove surprisingly impervious to change.

In many ways, the mind of the five-year-old is wondrous, and it can be strikingly imaginative. It exhibits an adventurousness, a willingness to entertain new possibilities, and an openness to unfamiliar practices that is most attractive and that older individuals are well advised to try to maintain—in the way that the Pi-cassos and Einsteins among us seem able to do. At least at times, the young child probes to the essence of the matter in a way that eludes more jaundiced adults (in the phrase of an old radio program, "Kids say the darndest things"). Yet, in an uncomfortably large number of cases, one may say that the five-year-old has already made up his or her mind. The theories and scripts of the young child are already consolidated and, in the absence of compelling circumstances that are repeated frequently, the growing individual shows little inclination to change.

This state of affairs proves crucial for an investigation of leadership. When an individual provides leadership for a group of experts in his chosen domain, he typically does so by virtue of the work that he executes—thereby exemplifying *indirect* leadership. But even when the leadership takes place through the *direct* and explicit communication of a message, it is possible for that leader to address fellow members of the domain in a sophisticated way. A physicist talking to physicists can assume that his audience members understand the principles of gravity, acceleration, and relativity; a diplomat or a social analyst speaking to peers in her craft can assume that her audience members can transcend stereotypes associated with different national or cultural groups.

The case is completely different, however, for individuals who presume to provide leadership across domains. Those who address a more broad-based institution like the church or a large and heterogeneous group like the inhabitants of a nation must at least begin by assuming that most of their audience members have a well-stocked five-year-old mind. So long as one traffics chiefly with theories and views already possessed by the five-year-old, one should be able to bring about modest change. Thus, when a political leader stresses the importance of supporting one's own group, while another leader emphasizes the importance of helping others, both can expect to engage the five-year-old mind. But when a leader seeks to promulgate a story that is more sophisticated—that calls, for example, for a broader definition of one's social group—she can succeed only if she educates the unschooled minds of the audience. In what follows, my frequent references to the "unschooled mind" serve as an encapsulation of ideas that children develop in the opening years of life.

THE ATTAINMENT OF EXPERTISE IN DOMAINS

The five-year-old has advanced as far as she can on the basis of information that is readily accessible to her senses and her motor systems, as well as the set of concepts and theories that are most readily (and un-self-consciously) acquired by members of our symbol-using species. However, self-education can go only so far. It is not surprising that most societies initiate some kind of formal education in the years following the first half-decade of life. The results of this process of education—*the attainment of expertise in various domains*—constitutes the fourth ingredient crucial to the explication of leadership.

In preliterate or traditional societies, an apprenticeship is the preferred method of education. Youngsters are placed near "masters"; and through example, practice, and occasional explicit testing, they eventually attain the traits and practices associated with one or more varieties of expertise. In literate societies, those who are expected ultimately to attain influential positions almost invariably attend school. There they acquire the basic literacies, a certain mode of comportment, and, insofar as possible, the skills that allow them to pursue a vocation valued in the broader society. When youngsters work comfortably and productively with masters and teachers, they are likely to identify with them, to feel akin to them, and to anticipate that they may one day be able to fill their shoes.

Domains vary widely. Piaget specialized in the study of domains that are considered to be within the purview of every ordinary human being—such as an appreciation of how to classify objects or how to make inferences from a scene or story. Accomplishment in certain domains is considered virtually mandatory within a culture—for example, in a modern industrial society, it is expected that everyone will attend school and at least master the basic literacies.

But most cultures also feature a host of domains that are neither universally nor culturally mandated. Modern industrial cultures, for example, offer people the option of mastering domains that will lead to articulated career paths, such as those of a biologist, a lawyer, or an educator; and they also feature domains that call on idiosyncratic skills, such as chess or the cultivation of roses.

Just which domains or disciplines ought to be mastered by a particular individual turns out to be a complex issue. Some domains are mandated by an individual's culture or subculture. For example, most youngsters schooled in China are able to make ink-and-brush

paintings of flora and fauna, and most Russian Jewish boys were traditionally expected to play the violin and to be at least passable chess players. However, other domains are distinctly optional, depending on the given interests and tempos of the family, the moment at which one happens to be born, or the particular aptitudes, interests, and skills displayed by an individual.

Becoming a viable member of the adult culture involves the identification of domains in which one will achieve expertise. In most cultures throughout history, the decision has been made as a matter of course, either by the accident of birth or on the basis of a mandate issued by a parent or a chief. In modern circumstances, the selection of domains is more likely to be made by the individuals themselves, though often in consultation with (and perhaps in identification with) knowledgeable adults. As an individual becomes an expert, he becomes able to appreciate the accomplishments of the masters of his chosen domain, including feats sufficiently novel to change the topography of that domain. He has truly transcended the limits of the five-year-old mind.

However, in areas where he is not expert, or in areas where he is considered as part of a heterogeneous and largely unschooled group (and may be content to be so considered), he is likely to encounter (and to apprehend) messages that are much simpler. Most individuals today deal daily with two contrasting presentations: sophisticated indirect leadership in their domains of accomplishment; and relatively "unschooled" messages from direct leaders of large-scale institutions.

EXPERTISE IN THE REALM OF PERSONS

Until recently, observers have searched for early signs of gifts primarily in two sorts of domains. One group of youngsters is singled out as potentially accomplished in school activities; these are the culturally gifted children who are picked out by the schoolteacher or, more recently, identified by use of an intelligence test or some cognate measure of scholastic aptitude. Another group of youngsters comes to be identified because of a burgeoning talent in a specific domain, such as music, chess, sports, or mathematics. Because of acute pattern-detection capacities or mnemonic skills or physical dexterity in these domains, and often aided by parents or masters who are skilled in instruction and ambitious for their charges, these youngsters are deemed "at promise" for outstanding

achievement in these domains.

Certain societies may display comparable concern with individuals who have special gifts in the personal realm (which I have elsewhere termed the "personal intelligences"). I have in mind here individuals who are exquisitely sensitive to the needs and interests of others, and/or individuals who are correlatively sensitive to their own personal configuration of talents, needs, aspirations, and fears. One might assume, for example, that those societies which search among scores of youngsters for future religious or military or political leaders (a pertinent case being the selection in early childhood of the future Dalai Lama, the spiritual leader of Tibet) have become superbly attentive to telltale "markers" for these talents.

Many organizations in our contemporary society have the potential to pick out individuals who may ultimately provide leadership, either the indirect variety that operates chiefly within a domain (like a particular science, art, or craft) or the direct form that has the potential to cut across different skill and knowledge bases (such as leadership of a political entity). Athletic teams, scouting troops, religious groups, various kinds of extracurricular clubs, and even the regular classroom are breeding grounds for future leaders. Sometimes the search for future leaders is explicit; more frequently, leaders are allowed to emerge and are informally identified as such. And certainly, specific institutions—such as the elite independent schools in Great Britain—have long thought of themselves as trainers of future leaders: legend has it that the epochal Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton.

While most individuals clearly do not attain expertise across diverse disciplines and domains, perhaps they do become expert in the ability to understand other persons. After all, we all interact with others from an early age, and perhaps we all gain significant skills in the human realm. I think it is reasonable to conclude that, as we mature, nearly all of us become familiar with certain more complex scripts (such as those involving ambivalence or jealousy or altruism), and nearly all of us develop some capability in appreciating the minds and motivations of other people. Yet, a myriad of social-psychological studies have revealed that most of us are not very skilled at detecting deception or the underlying motivations for actions; perhaps even more troublingly, most of us are not nearly as good at such detection as we *think* we are. Apparently, not even social expertise can be attained in the absence of dedicated study.

But social expertise does appear to be achieved by certain

individuals. During the Florentine Renaissance, Lorenzo de Medici carried out a complex diplomatic negotiation at the age of fourteen. A readily recognizable example from recent American history is President Lyndon Johnson. Often called a legislative genius, he had an uncanny ability to put together unlikely coalitions that would support controversial bills. He once explained how he succeeded in securing passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act: "The challenge was to learn what it was that mattered to each of these men, understand which issues were critical to whom and why. Without that understanding nothing is possible. Knowing the leaders and understanding their organizational need let me shape my legislative program to fit both their needs and mine." Unfortunately, this skill did not help him in the prosecution of foreign policy.

THE ANTECEDENTS OF LEADING

Earlier in this chapter I reviewed four factors that make possible the phenomena of leading and following in our species. To my knowledge, however, few systematic efforts have been undertaken to pinpoint the early markers of leadership. Some of the leaders-to-be I studied were clearly popular among, and sought after by, their peers from an early age; but many others had childhoods that were marked by loneliness, isolation, or frankly antisocial (if not criminal) behavior. Churchill spent much of his time alone, and Mussolini was twice expelled from school for stabbing fellow students. Some future leaders within domains, like Freud, reported an early fascination with issues of power and strategy, while others, like Einstein, were essentially uninterested in the world of other human beings.

Still, a few promising generalizations have been proposed. Future leaders have often lost fathers at an early age. According to one study, over 60 percent of major British political leaders lost a parent in childhood, more often the father. It may be that children with surviving parents take their social cues from the behaviors and attitudes of their mothers and fathers, while those who have early been deprived of a parent are stimulated (or feel pressured) to formulate their own precepts and practices in the social and moral domains. Their precocious dependence on themselves may place them in a favorable position for directing the behaviors of others. The French philosopher and writer Jean-Paul Sartre claimed that in the absence of a father, an individual is forced to make his own

choices. However, the pain associated with the early loss seems to endure, and many of the once-bereaved leaders have reported never having lost a pervasive feeling of loneliness.

Another recurrent pattern among future leaders is a contrasting set of relations with their parents. According to the historian James McGregor Burns, Gandhi, Lenin, and Hitler each enjoyed a positive relationship with one parent and a negative relationship with the other. Stalin's mother doted on him, while his drunken father beat him savagely. Feelings of ambivalence accordingly predominate, and, it is conjectured, the impulse to wield power represents an attempt to resolve this anxiety-producing conflict. From all indications, President Bill Clinton's childhood was rife with parental tensions: he never knew his biological father, he did not get along at all with his violent stepfather, and he was called on increasingly to mediate among the adults in his household. He reportedly first began to consider a career in politics when he discovered, as a schoolchild, that he was able to resolve conflicts among his peers.

Some individuals have traits that make them stand out even at an early age. At least some charismatic leaders, such as Charles de Gaulle and John F. Kennedy, are blessed with a striking appearance that draws others to them. Others, like Gandhi or Hitler, are ordinary or even peculiar in appearance. Their charisma may stem from their unusual personalities or mien or from a remarkable life course. The psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi has pointed out that some leaders have distinguished themselves precisely because they have long spurned the socially accepted manner of achieving one's goals and yet—despite such defiance—have achieved success. These iconoclasts therefore strike observers as having privileged knowledge about the future, even though their stories may ultimately lead audience members down destructive pathways.

Scholars have discerned among leaders an inclination from early childhood for risk taking and a willingness to go to great lengths—often in defiance of others, including those in positions of authority—in order to achieve their ends. A motive to gain power—either for its own sake or in pursuit of a specific aim—is invariably present. The capacity to take risks speaks to a confidence that one will at least sometimes attain success; implacability in the face of opposition likewise reflects a willingness to rely on oneself and not to succumb to others' strictures and reservations.

Such toughness may be achieved by leaders at some considerable cost to themselves. Leaders often exhibit the wounds from their early losses and have a tenacity, even a ruthlessness, that may prove difficult for others to comprehend. In his biography of John

Churchill, Winston Churchill commented:

> Famous men are usually the product of an unhappy childhood. The stern compression of circumstances, the twinge of adversity, the spur of slights and taunts in early years are needed to evoke that ruthless fixity of purpose and tenacious mother-wit without which great actions are seldom accomplished.

Both the indirect and the direct leaders I studied seem from an early age to have stood apart from their contemporaries. They have felt that they were special and, at least in some cases, capable of feats beyond those achieved by normal individuals. In cases where this sense of specialness was not an early attribute, one can identify moments when the perception of being "chosen" was confirmed. For Martin Luther, it occurred when he became overwhelmed by especially flagrant abuses of the church; for Martin Luther King, Jr., it occurred when he discovered that he was capable of leading the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott. For creative individuals—indirect leaders who work in circumscribed domains of expertise—this feeling of "difference" need not pose any particular problem. Direct leaders, however, must feel simultaneously apart from yet constantly in touch with their contemporaries.

My theory of multiple intelligences points to a hitherto missing and possibly important piece of the puzzle. Most leaders obviously have gifts in the realm of personal intelligence—they know a lot about how to reach and affect other human beings. Such knowledge, however, stands in danger of being locked inside, in the absence of a way of expressing it. As I illustrate in subsequent chapters, nearly all leaders are eloquent in voice, and many are eloquent in writing as well. They do not merely have a promising story; they can tell it persuasively. A mark of the future leader is a generous degree of linguistic intelligence—the capacity and the inclination to use words well. When such linguistic intelligence is yoked to considerable personal intelligence, one has the makings of an effective communicator and, perhaps, a promising leader.

THE ANTECEDENTS OF FOLLOWING

Just as the origins of outstanding leadership have been little studied, the features of those who become followers remain shrouded in mystery. One might, of course, extend the term *follower*

to all individuals who are not formally designated as leaders, in which case the "problem" of followership per se evaporates. Accordingly, it is useful to distinguish between two groups: those who are especially prone to enlist as followers in a cause, and those who exhibit the proclivity to follow that exists, at least latently, in every human being.

All notable leaders have had their followers, of course; and in some cases, one can identify individuals who have devoted their lives—who have even given their lives—in support of the story propounded by "their" leaders. Napoléon attributed half of his genius as a general to the fact that he could inspire individuals to give up their lives to aid his cause; the other half, he is reputed to have said, lay in his ability to figure out with great accuracy just how long it would take to transport a herd of elephants from Paris to Cairo.

Two possibilities about the "gift" of followership merit consideration. On the one hand, it seems likely that followers are cut from a different cloth than leaders—that, for example, they are perennially searching for the very authority figure that the leader has spurned. Many "believers" migrate from one group to another, always in search of the perfect community, perhaps ever destined to be disappointed. However, chronic followers may share some important properties with leaders. Napoléon quipped that he had become a great leader because he had been an outstanding follower. A leader of the French Revolution echoed: "You know, I must follow the people; am I not their leader?" And many future leaders, like the young George Marshall and Angelo Roncalli (when he was a fledgling priest, long before his selection as the pope), gained inspiration from the model leaders whom they themselves "followed" or identified with during their formative years. What may bind "born" leaders and "born" followers together is their common need for a structure, a hierarchy, and a mission—needs stemming from a primate heritage that may be less binding in those who can "take or leave" membership in a group.

Followers may differ from one another in their attitudes toward power. Some, like the youthful Stalin or Mao Zedong, are attracted to movements that feature strong leaders because they themselves are ultimately (if still unconsciously) interested in achieving and deploying power. Others may prefer the role of a follower precisely because they wish to see (and to feel) the reins of power being held by someone else. The physicist-turned-anthropologist Richard Morris has indicated that most people do not attempt to attain leadership of a social group: "most individuals will placidly accept

whatever status they have attained . . . after they reach a certain age, most of them lose their drive to struggle upward." Both groups of followers probably differ from those who turn out to be "rescuers," such as the otherwise-unexceptional individuals who, during the Nazi era, risked severe penalties as they helped those whom they considered to be unfairly singled out for persecution.

While chronic followers may find themselves attracted to a parade of disparate leaders, most potential followers prove more discriminating. As for features that make certain leaders appealing, young children are attracted to the overt features of individuals: size, strength, physical attractiveness, and control of desired resources. By adolescence, additional features become important: the power of the individual's ideas (or stories), their coherence, and their appropriateness to a particular historical moment. And, equally, an ensemble of personal characteristics may enhance the leader's status: those leaders who exhibit charisma, spirituality, and an enigmatic blend of ordinariness and extraordinariness often appeal to others.

Two final points about followership: First, some followers are attracted to certain features (for example, perceived strength or power), while others are attracted to quite different features (for example, originality of ideas or spiritual luminosity). Physical charisma differs from intellectual or spiritual charisma. Second, effective leaders are often distinguished by the fact that they exhibit an ensemble of these traits (Robert Maynard Hutchins was both physically attractive and intellectually scintillating) or that they can appeal simultaneously to different kinds of people (Margaret Mead's lifestyle magnetized certain followers, while her ideas about cross-cultural investigations impressed others).

THE DEVELOPED LEADER

In considering the features that attract followers to leaders, I have touched on the "end state" of development—the question of what it means to be a full-blown leader. In one sense, this question may seem premature; after all, I am examining a range of leaders precisely so that I can extract the most important features. Also, no leader is ever fully realized; at most, one can observe individuals who are in the course of attaining greater skills and heightened effectiveness. Still, if one keeps in mind these reservations, one can identify four factors that appear crucial to the practice of effective

leadership.

1. *A Tie to the Community (or Audience).* It is a truism that a leader cannot exist without followers. What needs emphasis is that the relationship between the leader and the followers is typically ongoing, active, and dynamic. Each takes cues from the other; each is affected by the other. In the various case studies, we can observe the kinds of concerns, needs, and stories that animate members of the community; and we can note the way in which the leader may alter his stories to take these changing features into account. Such ongoing intercourse with members of one or more groups characterizes leaders as diverse as Robert Hutchins and Jean Monnet from an early age. Ultimately, if the tie is to endure, leaders and followers must work together to construct some kind of an institution or organization that embodies their common values.

2. *A Certain Rhythm of Life.* A leader must be in regular and constant contact with her community. At the same time, however, the leader must know her own mind, including her own changing thoughts, values, and strategies. For that reason, it is important that the leader find the time and the means for reflecting, for assuming distance from the battle or the mission. I term this tendency "going to the mountaintop," with the understanding that such a retreat (or advance) can occur literally—as in the case of Moses—or metaphorically, as in the case of de Gaulle and his daily walks. Periods of isolation—some daily, some extending for months or even years—are as crucial in the lives of leaders as are immersions in a crowd.

The relationship between isolation and immersion differs appreciably between two kinds of leaders. For the individual who leads indirectly through his work in a domain, most time is spent working alone or in small groups; only occasionally is it necessary, or advisable, for the individual to expose himself directly to the reactions of a larger and more diverse audience. In contrast, the individual who would directly lead a diverse and changing ensemble needs to spend considerable time in the company of her followers; but this individual requires time and space in which to reflect as well. When an individual like Clinton seemingly avoids opportunities for solitary reflection, there arises the possibility that he may not wish to know his own mind.

3. *An Evident Relation between Stories and Embodiments.*

Throughout this book, I argue that leaders exercise their influence in two principal, though contrasting, ways: through the stories or messages that they communicate, and through the traits that they embody. Sometimes, the single leader alternates in emphases. For example, as prime minister, Churchill first developed a story about the need to maintain the glory of Great Britain, and he then embodied a courageous stand through his activities during the Battle of Britain. Some leaders, like J. Robert Oppenheimer or Ronald Reagan, place a greater emphasis on the stories that they tell; others, like George C. Marshall or Pope John XXIII, are valued more for the traits that they embody than for the already established, though recently neglected, stories that they relate. Some features, such as an explanation of the factors leading to a current imbroglio or window of opportunity, lend themselves to the relating of stories, while others, such as the importance of courage or of innovation, are better conveyed through embodiment.

A tension may develop between stories and embodiments. Indeed, many political leaders have gotten into trouble when the facts of their own lives seemed to contradict the stories that they were conveying. For example, it became difficult for Richard Nixon to champion the theme of "law and order" when his own administration was under attack for lawless acts. But in the happier event, stories and embodiments reinforce one another. For example, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s story about the willingness to withstand pain and criticism was exemplified in his actions. Moreover, it is a stroke of leadership genius when stories and embodiments appear to fuse, or to coalesce, as in a dream—when, as the poet William Butler Yeats would have it, one cannot tell the dancer from the dance.

As for the possible interactions of stories and embodiments in the earlier lives of leaders, I must again speculate. Alas, this kind of information has not been highlighted in most biographical accounts. My expectation is that individuals' stories often grow out of life experiences and therefore come to be naturally embodied in the presentation of self. Moreover, at times when an individual's stories clearly clash with his or her embodied behaviors, a hostile response on the part of audience members is likely to discourage such blatant disjunctions.

4. *The Centrality of Choice.* Within a primate horde, an individual organism may prevail through brute force. An analogous instance exists among human beings when an individual finds himself in a leadership position because he has complete control over the

instruments of power and/or maintains his position through violence, terror, and total ruthlessness.

In this study my focus falls on those individuals who have attained positions of leadership in a situation where they and their followers exerted some kind of choice, and where a measure of stability exists, without the temptation or need to invoke instruments of terror. Only in such instances of "leadership-through-choice" does it make sense to think of stories being told, virtues being embodied, or opinions being changed through example and persuasion. Nonetheless, it is worth keeping in mind the Stalins and Saddams of the world, for they did pursue paths to their positions of authority that in some respects resembled those taken by less brutal leaders. They, too, had to persuade, to adjust, and to highlight or mute nuances, depending on the predilections and anxieties of those whom they aspired to lead. In their cases, however, attainment of absolute power ultimately corrupted them absolutely. And it is also worth noting that some individuals who remain in temporary or elective offices may come to think of themselves as omnipotent and then act accordingly. President Franklin D. Roosevelt pulled back (as in the case of the scheme to pack the Supreme Court) when he had gone too far; Margaret Thatcher (as in the case of an unpopular, regressive tax) did not.

SYMBOLS AND COMMUNICATION

During the first few years of life, an individual's knowledge is secured primarily through the operation of sensory and motor capacities—the only cognizing capacities available to other organisms, including nonhuman primates. What distinguishes us from all other creatures, of course, is our ability to deploy, understand, and even create whole ensembles of symbols and symbol systems.

By the age of five or so, most normal children have already become experts in "symbolizing." They have attained a distinct grasp of a whole gamut of symbol systems, including natural language; gestural language; and the symbolic systems involved in picturing, numeracy, music, and other means of communication favored in their society. Equally remarkably, they attain this "first-order" symbolic mastery with almost no formal tutelage. Indeed, as has often been pointed out, if we had to understand the nature and operation of natural language in order to teach youngsters to speak,

the species would long since have become extinct or at least mute.

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that, after the first few years of life, cognitive development becomes equivalent to symbolic development. Moreover, this process of ever-heightened symbol use continues unabated when the child enters school or other educational milieus. In any modern society, a primary burden of schools is to teach second-order symbol systems—those written notations that themselves refer to the first-order symbol systems like spoken language and number systems. More esoteric symbol systems, ranging from those employed in the physical sciences to those used in music or dance or football notations, may also be acquired. And whether she is enrolled in formal schooling or in some kind of apprenticeship, the student comes to learn the various moves entailed in the symbolic systems that she must master.

Symbol systems are means of thinking and categorizing; equally, they are means of communicating. Nonhuman primates lack these means and thus must achieve their influence largely through the exercise of brute power. Human beings, in contrast, have options for asserting leadership. As discussed later, the mastery of the linguistic symbol system is crucial for most direct leaders, since leadership is maintained largely through the creative use of stories. Many leaders—ones I term "linguistically intelligent"—are distinguished early on by the mastery of storytelling; and many others make the mastery of storytelling—whether through persuasive oratory or through well-crafted written documents—a primary goal. It was said of de Gaulle that his political destiny

> depended most constantly on words. The soldier—brought out of obscurity by writing a book; the rebel—made into the leader of a nation by a speech; the man in opposition—who survives politically because of a few interviews with the press; the President, ruling by radio and television; and finally, the lone wolf—in touch by words alone with the fickle mob.

In contrast, individuals working in traditional domains and disciplines need not be masters of natural language or prodigies of storytelling. It did not matter how well Einstein spoke German or English or how well Picasso wrote French or Spanish. What mattered for these indirect leaders was their mastery of the symbol systems of twentieth-century physics and painting, respectively. Such individuals might have eventually become known through their person; but they were already known, by proxy, because their thought processes and experiences were conveyed in the strings of symbols—more informally, the works—that they produced. They

were fortunate to live in cultures that have evolved several powerful modes of communication.

Leaders traffic as well in another kind of communication—communication through embodiment. Sometimes leaders communicate by the most elegant and simple of symbols—Gandhi nakedly facing his enemies, Churchill issuing a defiant sign for victory, Martin Luther King, Jr., standing resolutely behind bars. One may ask whether such symbolic communication, such embodiment of virtues, qualifies as a story. While the answer to this question is to a certain extent a semantic one, I suggest that these visual presentations, in and of themselves, cannot send an unambiguous message. It is only because these individuals are already recognized, and their causes already understood, that these images of embattlement can function in powerful ways. We might say that since the story has already been assimilated, an illustration of it suffices.

Any scholar who produces a work for publication is, however modestly, making a bid for indirect leadership. I would not have written this book if I did not want my words to affect the way that my colleagues—and the general public—think about phenomena of leadership. In particular, my decision to survey the continuum from indirect to direct leadership represents an effort to change conceptions of leadership, to bring out, through an ordered set of case studies, the array of stories and embodiments that link the accomplishments of an Einstein or a Picasso with the feats of a Thatcher or a Monnet, that give flesh to the words of Keynes at the head of chapter 1.

While I have resisted the temptation to propose a "model" of leadership, I have introduced a number of themes that have guided my thinking. In this chapter, I have reviewed those facets of human development that seem most germane to an understanding of leadership: humans' primate heritage; the early emergence of a sense of the self and of others; the development in early childhood of powerful theories or "scripts" about the world; the marks of emerging expertise in the domains valued in one's society; and the specific ensemble of traits that may mark the emerging leader and the emerging follower. We may think of these elements as basic ingredients out of which a comprehensive model of leadership can be constructed.

Whatever facets of leadership may be shared by humans and other primates, the importance of symbolic communication is essentially restricted to our own species. Only we humans spend the bulk of our time trafficking in symbols. While human cultures host a

variety of symbolic systems and messages, all place a special premium on those strings of words that we call stories. It is appropriate to turn at this point in “my story” to the compelling stories that lie at the heart of leadership.

3

THE LEADERS' STORIES

All leadership takes place through the communication of ideas to the minds of others.
—Charles Cooley

In a wonderfully evocative short story, the Chilean writer Isabel Allende relates the tale of Belisa Crepusculario, a beautiful young woman from a desperately poor background who makes a living by selling words. She sells memorized verses for five centavos, improves the quality of dreams for seven centavos, writes love letters for nine centavos, and, for twelve centavos, invents insults that can be directed toward mortal enemies.

Belisa's life changes dramatically when she is seized by a ferocious warrior known simply as "the Colonel." After his men rough her up and almost kill her, the Colonel explains the reason for this unwarranted and wanton treatment. "I want to be President," he declares. Moreover, he explains, he wants to become president not by seizing power but by gaining the majority of the popular vote —in my terms, he wants to become a leader, to gain authority by choice. "To do that I have to talk like a candidate. Can you sell me the words for a speech?" he implores.

Belisa creates a tapestry of words that promise to touch the minds of men and the intuitions of women. She then reads the speech aloud three times to the illiterate Colonel so he can memorize and deliver it. And deliver it he does, countless times during the election season, in an effort to convince citizens to vote for him. As Allende's narrator indicates: "They were dazzled by the clarity of the Colonel's proposals and the poetic lucidity of his arguments, infected by his powerful wish to right the wrongs of history, happy for the first time in their lives." In the canonically happy ending to this fable, the candidate wins the voters' support, and Belisa gains the Colonel's love.

Epitomizing this chapter's epigraph, from the American sociologist Charles Cooley, this brief story captures important truths about language and leadership. Through sheer physical power, one can gain—and maintain—a position of authority over other people. This is how the Colonel had proceeded in the past. If one wishes to persuade others, however, it is necessary to convince them of one's point of view. Illiterate and inarticulate ("War's what I know," he admits to Belisa), the Colonel finds himself at the mercy of a woman who knows how to string words together compellingly. By using her words, he gains legitimacy. Homer underscored these complementary strands when he said of the heroic warrior Achilles that he was trained as a doer of deeds and a maker of speeches.

In recent years, social scientists have come to appreciate what political, religious, and military figures have long known: that stories (narratives, myths, or fables) constitute a uniquely powerful currency in human relationships. Many scholars have pondered whether the essence of the story is the existence of a sympathetic protagonist, the positing of plans and goals, the onset of a crisis that must be resolved, the initial buildup and subsequent release of a feeling of tension in an audience member, or the creation of a distinctive narrational voice. Many have sought to identify the prototypical narrative—the hero's quest, the journey away from home followed by the ultimate return there, or the clash between good and evil. Some have looked at the means available to the storyteller: logic, rhetoric, characterization, humor, and manipulation of the audience's mood and expectations. And still others have investigated the primary purposes of stories—the binding together of a community, the tackling of basic philosophical or spiritual questions, the conferral of meaning on an otherwise chaotic existence.

A definitive account of the nature and purpose of stories, scripts, and/or narratives may prove elusive. As the British philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein showed in his analysis of the concept of "games," kinds of stories may bear at most a "family resemblance" to one another. For my purposes, this state of affairs is perfectly acceptable. In this study, I use the term *story* in a broad sense. While I focus on *narratives* in the linguistic sphere, I include *invented accounts* in any symbol system, ranging from a new form of explanation in the physical sciences to a novel mode of expression in dance or poetry. In addition, I span the poles introduced in chapter 2: the *overt* or *propositional account* communicated directly by the leader and the *vision of life that is embodied* in the actions and the life of the leader. True, I could