

CONVERSATIONS ON LEADERSHIP

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
LEADERSHIP ROUNDTABLE
2000 - 2001

C E N T E R F O R P U B L I C L E A D E R S H I P

JOHN F. KENNEDY
SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

CONVERSATIONS ON LEADERSHIP

Harvard University Leadership Roundtable

2000-2001

BY
Ellen Pruyne
Roundtable Rapporteur

Center for Public Leadership

John F. Kennedy School of Government

David Gergen, Director of the Center for Public Leadership
Barbara Kellerman, Executive Director

Copyright © 2002 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
All Rights Reserved.

Table of Contents

I.	Executive Summary	3
II.	Introduction	4
III.	Recurring Themes in the Leadership Roundtables	6
IV.	University Leadership Roundtable Events	20
	1. Philip Heymann and Ronald Heifetz	21
	2. Lee Kuan Yew	28
	3. Walter Fluker	35
	4. Joseph Badaracco	44
	5. Kim Campbell	51
	6. Fred Greenstein	56
	7. Robert Reich	62
V.	Conclusion	69
VI.	Speaker Biographies	70
VII.	Selected Bibliography	73
VIII.	List of Participants	77

Executive Summary

A grant from the Harvard University Provost's Fund for Interfaculty Collaboration (PFIC) was used to promote the creation of a community of Harvard faculty members who are interested in research and teaching relating to the topic of leadership. The Center for Public Leadership (CPL) at the John F. Kennedy School of Government used the PFIC grant—along with CPL funds—to host seven events during the 2000-2001 academic year. Collectively, the events and the community of scholars and educators who participated were known as the Harvard University Leadership Roundtable. Each event consisted of a lunch or dinner presentation by a Harvard faculty member or an invited guest speaker, followed either by a question-and-answer session, small group discussions at individual tables, or a large group discussion involving all participants. Harvard faculty members representing eight different schools/faculties attended the events. The level and intensity of participation in the Roundtable established that there is deep and abiding interest in the topic of leadership among faculty across the university. The proceedings of the 2000-2001 Harvard University Leadership Roundtable are documented in this publication. During the 2001-2002 academic year, the Roundtable continues under the principal sponsorship of the Center for Public Leadership.

Introduction

In May 2000, the Center for Public Leadership at the Kennedy School of Government was awarded a grant from the Harvard University Provost's Fund for Interfaculty Collaboration. The grant was intended to promote the creation of a community of Harvard faculty members—dubbed the University Leadership Roundtable—interested in research and education relating to the topic of leadership, broadly defined. To carry out the Roundtable's mandate, the Center for Public Leadership supplemented the money from the Provost's Fund with its own financial resources.

Awarding such a grant proved timely, even fortuitous, as these conversations occurred during the months leading up to September 11, 2001. To have captured the thinking of such a unique group of people seems even more enriching, and the questions raised herein even more urgent now, in early 2002, when the world is very different than when these Roundtable conversations began.

A total of seven University Leadership Roundtable events were held during the 2000-2001 academic year. (See Calendar of Events elsewhere in this publication.) Each event consisted of a lunch or dinner presentation by a Harvard faculty member or an invited guest speaker. The presenters for the seven events were: Philip Heymann and Ronald Heifetz; Lee Kuan Yew; Walter Fluker; Joseph Badaracco; Kim Campbell; Fred Greenstein; and Robert Reich. (Brief biographies of these speakers appear on page 70, and a select bibliography of their publications is on page 73.)

Each speaker presentation was followed by a question-and-answer session, small group discussions at individual tables, or a large group discussion involving all participants. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Dean of the Kennedy School of Government, hosted the events. Attendance at each event ranged from 15 to 40 persons.

Faculty from across Harvard University whose publications and/or course titles suggested that they would find organized discussions about leadership to be interesting were invited. Occasionally, students and non-

Harvard faculty involved in Leadership Studies were also issued invitations. (See page 77 for the complete list of participants.)

The 2000-2001 University Leadership Roundtable was an experiment. Who could say for certain whether faculty from across the university could successfully be assembled around a topic as ambiguous as leadership? Would they have anything of consequence to say to each other? Would the array of disciplinary backgrounds serve to illuminate discussions or obfuscate them?

We now know there to be keen interest among Harvard faculty in the study and teaching of leadership, and this is exciting. Assembling a diverse cast of faculty—from eight different schools/faculties and scores of different disciplines—was no small feat. Providing this same faculty with enough intellectual sustenance to convince a number of them to make time in their busy schedules to attend more than one Roundtable was an even more noteworthy accomplishment.

This document presents the proceedings of the Harvard University Leadership Roundtable during the 2000-2001 academic year. It is organized into two main sections. The first section provides an overview of six themes that recurred in the various Roundtable presentations and discussions, and serves as a summary of the second section: an in-depth report on the proceedings of the individual Roundtable events.

In addition to the Harvard University Provost's Office, Kennedy School Dean Joseph S. Nye, Jr., and the various Roundtable speakers (hitherto and hereafter mentioned), we also gratefully acknowledge and thank the following members of the Harvard community for their contributions to the 2000-2001 Harvard University Leadership Roundtable and/or for bringing this document to fruition: Barbara Barry; Ellen Flynn Bedrosian, Holly Taylor Sargent, Brad Voigt and the Kennedy School's External Affairs Office; Sheila Blake; Elise Ehrlich and the Harvard Faculty Club; Christine Izzo and Harvard Printing and Publications Office; Danielle Mancini; Jeannie Marasca; Samir Randolph; Daniel Schneider; Alec Solomita; Felicity Spector; Sarah Wald; and Dean Williams. Sarah Chace and Scott Webster served as editors for this document. Special thanks are extended to Ambassador Richard Fisher and Nancy Collins Fisher and their family, whose generosity in establishing the Collins Family International Fellowship at the Kennedy School made possible the visit of Lee Kuan Yew, Senior Minister of Singapore.

Recurring Themes in the Leadership Roundtables

Six significant themes recurred in the 2000-2001 Leadership Roundtables:

- Leadership definitions and semantics
- The role of context in leadership
- The normative dimension of leadership
- Leadership development
- The leadership curriculum
- Political leadership

A summary of the content of the Leadership Roundtables as it relates to each of these themes is presented below.

Theme 1: Leadership Definitions and Semantics

What is leadership? There is no precise definition or widely accepted vocabulary for describing and discussing this phenomenon. In fact, leadership is often confused and conflated with similar concepts, such as power, influence, and authority. The term has been used not only to characterize individuals, but groups, teams, organizations, and even countries. This smorgasbord of meanings has led, first, to the acceptance of semantic imprecision and contradiction (as in, “the leader isn’t exercising any leadership”), and second, to the vague but popular stance of “I’ll know it when I see it.”

How can leadership scholars and educators develop a common language? Speakers and participants offered a number of potential approaches. Ronald Heifetz, Founding Director of the Center for Public Leadership at the Kennedy School of Government, proposed that the Leadership Studies field follow in the footsteps of more established fields in coming to agreement on a precise technical vocabulary. An opposing viewpoint held that pursuing such agreement would be time-consuming and ultimately unsuccessful, and

that focus should instead be placed on articulating and testing theories and producing a taxonomy of leadership.

Participants made a variety of suggestions regarding how the categories in a leadership taxonomy might be constructed. One approach would be to define the different types of leadership (e.g., ethical, heroic, and political leadership as described by Roundtable speakers). A second approach would involve describing the distinct phenomena that characterize leadership, as in Heifetz's articulation of the concepts of "adaptive work" and "work avoidance." A third approach would require determining indicia of the presence or absence of leadership, such as the presence of followers or the existence of an inspiring vision. A fourth approach would be to define the expected outcomes of leadership, such as effective use of group resources, adaptation to change, or advances in welfare at the personal, group, or global levels.

Theme 2: The Role of Context in Leadership

To what extent does the behavior of leaders depend on the situation in which they operate? Ronald Heifetz and Philip Heymann, Harvard Law School professor and Faculty Chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition, agreed that leadership is highly contextual and that it is necessary to study leadership "where the tire hits the road." The challenge to leadership scholars, they contended, is determining how to abstract a set of leadership concepts that apply across contexts without sacrificing an understanding of how the conditions and qualities involved in leadership vary among those same contexts. In other words, leadership scholars must work from the concrete and specific to a higher level of abstraction, and in the process strive to distinguish the universal from the particular.

The fit between context and leader

Several speakers invoked vivid historical examples of the intimate and unpredictable relationship between specific circumstances and individual leadership characteristics. Joseph Nye, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government, pointed to former British Prime Minister Winston

Churchill. Considered a mediocre leader early in his career when domestic issues required negotiation among conflicting political interests, Churchill nonetheless went on to demonstrate remarkable success during World War II, when inspirational leadership was needed to mobilize broad-based action during an international crisis.

Another example, offered by Lee Kuan Yew, former Prime Minister (and current Senior Minister) of Singapore, is that of China's Mao Tse-Tung. In the 1930s and 1940s, said Lee, China required a leader willing to envision a new order, and able to clear the way for its introduction by destroying the old system: the "romanticist," Mao, fit the bill. Following the political revolution, however, when consolidation and stabilization of the newly created system was required, Mao remained a destroyer through his imposition of the Cultural Revolution. Ultimately, according to Lee, in the 1970s, the lack of sufficient national progress and the conceivable failure of the communist system fostered the emergence of Deng Xiao-Ping, the kind of pragmatic leader China needed to broker evolutionary, rather than revolutionary, change.

Fred Greenstein, Professor Emeritus of Politics at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, provided a third compelling example of the centrality of context. Greenstein described President Lyndon B. Johnson, a long-time member of the U.S. Congress, as a brilliant leader on the domestic front, as demonstrated by his success in pushing landmark civil rights legislation through Congress. His deployment of the same political skills in foreign affairs, however, proved to be his undoing as a national leader. Johnson quietly maneuvered to escalate U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War without seeking the approbation of the American public. The exorbitant rise in public expense and the questionable legality of U.S. involvement helped to fuel the emergence of a grassroots anti-war movement that led to political division and violence nationwide. Johnson's long and impressive political career ended when he suddenly decided not to seek re-election in 1968. In Greenstein's view, the Johnson case is a prime example of how presidential effectiveness

is dependent upon the congruence between the qualities of the Oval Office occupant and the demands of the time in which he endeavors to lead.

The “culture of power”

Kim Campbell, former Prime Minister of Canada, expanded the discussion of context by introducing another potential factor, what she dubbed “the culture of power.” Campbell argued that leaders’ success is often a consequence of the extent to which they adhere to and indeed reflect any number of cultural idiosyncrasies. Such idiosyncrasies are often in the form of values and characteristics—frequently implicit—that leaders are expected to possess. For example, Campbell noted the dramatic differences in the types of national leaders that predominate in Canada and the United States. In Canada the typical prime minister might be described as a bachelor from the province of Quebec whose religious observance is not considered particularly relevant; in the United States the president has almost always been a married man with children and a strong religious affiliation. Campbell suggested that a national culture of power significantly influences who is allowed to lead in a particular country. If true, then cultural context is a significant determinant of national leadership.

Campbell observed that critical masses of women moving into national leadership positions can redefine the cultural definitions of a capable and credible leader and hence bring about substantial change in a particular culture of power. Individuals can also have a significant impact on a culture of power by acquiring an understanding of the culture’s values and attempting to ameliorate, influence, or even change them. Campbell pointed to former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher as an exemplar of this approach, citing her ability to assume the qualities associated with male leaders and deploy her strengths to cancel out gender expectations. Thatcher was able to redefine the expectations she faced as a woman leader, and, although she didn’t succeed in changing Britain’s culture of power, she nevertheless had an important influence on the expectations placed on women leaders in other parts of the world. Campbell hypothesized that knowledge about cultures of power will illuminate the pressure

points for change and enable leaders to hasten democratization and women's advancement.

When contexts change

While Campbell noted leaders' potential to influence and alter their political and cultural contexts, other speakers summoned evidence of the reverse effect—changing contexts that transform the ways in which leaders are expected to behave. Greenstein argued that U.S. presidents over the past 30 years have faced a very different milieu than their predecessors earlier in the century because of the Vietnam War and the Watergate scandal. Post-Nixon presidents, he said, are expected to conduct an exemplary private life and are subject to intense media scrutiny of both their public and their private lives. The spotlight focused on President Bill Clinton's sexual escapades in the 1990s was not used by the news media in the early 1960s to expose John F. Kennedy's similarly adventurous lifestyle.

Robert Reich, Maurice B. Hexter Professor of Social and Economic Policy at Brandeis University, observed that changes in context in the new economy of the 1990s have also transformed leaders' behavior in important ways. Reich labels these changes "extreme choice" and "easy exit." "Extreme choice" refers to the far greater number of options available to individuals in terms of products, investments, and institutions, and "easy exit" refers to the decline in the personal costs involved in moving between these options. These phenomena have produced a decline in loyalty to institutions and the people who lead them, and, in Reich's view, penalize institutional leaders who fail to pander to people and give them exactly what they want. Thus, institutional authority figures no longer have the freedom of speech and action necessary to exercise leadership to the extent that their forebears did. The result, Reich argued, is an increasing tension between formal institutional authority and leadership.

Responding to Reich's comments, Kennedy School Dean Joseph Nye reminded his colleagues that past decades have witnessed a general decline in the respect accorded authorities in all kinds of institutions, and hence a disappearance of the base of authority that formerly protected such leaders. Harvard Business School Professor Rosabeth Moss Kanter argued that

there is “less authority in authority” because of more economic checks and balances, more activist stakeholders, and more forces to which institutional leaders must attend in order to survive. In the past, Kanter averred, loyalty occurred by default because people did not have extreme choice or easy exit. Loyalty is now earned by those institutions and leaders that behave courageously and test the limits of what’s possible. Ira Jackson, Director of the Kennedy School’s Center for Business and Government, suggested that formal authorities gain loyalty by differentiating their institutions and exercising leadership, and therefore, in his opinion, institutional authorities today are actually exercising more—not less—leadership than their forebears. David Gergen, Director of the Center for Public Leadership, observed that people are now so used to and fed up with pandering that they value those institutional leaders who speak truthfully. This led Gergen to wonder if the United States may have already moved beyond the trend described by Reich.

Theme 3: The Normative Dimension of Leadership

Is the word “leadership” descriptive and value-free, or does it inherently connote goodness and morality? Must a good leader necessarily be a good person? Ronald Heifetz noted that Richard Neustadt defined leadership in *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents*¹ as simply an influence relationship between leaders or followers, whereas many other scholars include a normative dimension in their definitions and theories of leadership.

Whether the word is taken to be descriptive or normative, it is also important to ask who determines the criteria to be used in evaluating what constitutes “good” leadership. Participants suggested that the criteria that end up being applied depend on the outcomes expected to result from the exercise of leadership. These outcomes could include reaching a goal, achieving something significant, making a difference, bringing about change, or reaching a better place. Even with consensus about outcome,

¹ New York: The Free Press, 1960/1990.

there may still exist a need to reach agreement on what is meant by “difference,” “change,” and other qualitative descriptors.

The heroic model

Joseph Badaracco, John Shad Professor of Business Ethics at Harvard Business School, has discovered that his students prefer a normative view of leadership. Specifically, they want their leaders cut from heroic cloth, i.e., noble, principled, and willing to sacrifice themselves for a higher cause. Both popular culture and academia also demonstrate this proclivity. Popular movies, books, and games are rife with action heroes, while in academia theories with heroic individuals at their core—such as the charismatic, transformational, and “great man/woman” theories—continue to be in fashion. The heroic model of leadership is in fact a widespread and deep-seated one; as Badaracco pointed out, it has appeared in almost every era and culture. Its endurance, some posit, comes from its evolutionary role in helping human beings survive. Heroic myths and fables help pass on the supreme cultural values, entertain people and distract them from their ongoing hardships, and inspire them to achieve their dreams and be their “highest selves.”

Despite its pervasive influence, Badaracco observed that the heroic model fails to exert a significant impact on the behavior and lives of most people. He faults the model in two ways. First, it offers little guidance to ordinary people living everyday lives, in effect suggesting that if they’re not a Superman, they’re simply an ineffectual Clark Kent living in a “murky moral limbo.” Second, the model offers a very circumscribed description of what leaders actually do. The quiet and patient efforts that one or more people make to effect change behind the scenes, in uncertain circumstances, and over extended periods of time, often accompanied by significant moral confusion and doubt, are ignored in favor of bold, decisive, and high-profile actions in which an individual—typically male—single-mindedly and single-handedly saves the day or slays the proverbial dragon. The heroic model may entertain and inspire people, but, in Badaracco’s view, its track record in producing leaders and effecting positive change is suspect.

Ethical leadership

Walter Fluker, Professor of Philosophy and Religion and Executive Director of the Leadership Center at Morehouse College, argued that ethical leadership, not heroic leadership, is a more satisfying model. Fluker defines ethical leaders as those leaders “whose characters have been shaped by the wisdom, habits, and practices of particular traditions, often more than one, yet they tend to be identified with a particular ethos and cultural narrative.”² Ethical leaders appropriate and embody the moral beliefs and practices of their adopted traditions in their desire to serve the collective good and explore the question of supreme values and “ultimate concern.” Ethical leaders are characterized by three qualities—character, civility, and community—and by their special facility in using narrative, or the “power of story,” to influence the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others. Fluker cited U.S. civil rights leaders Martin Luther King, Jr. and Howard Thurman as two examples of such ethical leaders.

Roundtable participants responded variously to Fluker’s argument. Leaders, some said, are most potent when they can understand and appeal to the ethical frames of reference of different traditions, not when they recite from one particular religious or spiritual tradition. Participants averred that religion and spirituality should not be used to define ethical leadership but, instead, should be viewed as resources that can provide energy, courage, strength, and inspiration to the leader and his or her followers. They noted that a religious or spiritual tradition can also proffer images, stories, and symbols that give meaning to everyday worlds and practical acts and provoke the commitment and action of others. And such a tradition can serve as one source informing the leader’s thinking in terms of what is right and true. Some participants contended that the real issue in effective leadership is not whether leaders possess spiritual values, but what kinds of values they have and whether these are open and inclusive or narrow and exclusive. Effective leaders, in this view, work to foster the development of a cross-cutting identity that allows people to find common ground while staying root-

² Walter Fluker, *The Stones That the Builders Rejected* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press 1998), p. 11

ed in, and expressing themselves through, their own unique traditions. In other words, effective leaders bring about unity through diversity.

Theme 4: Leadership Development

Are leaders born or made? Both, said Lee Kuan Yew. People must be born with the potential to lead; otherwise, Lee is skeptical that they can be transformed into leaders. He pointed to his own experience in Singapore, where he had to sort through hundreds of candidates to find a few potential leaders for cabinet and ministerial positions. He found many articulate, effervescent, and energetic people who were, nevertheless, incapable of handling the responsibility required of a leader. A natural process for eliminating non-leaders and identifying those with the “right stuff,” according to a communist belief with which Lee agrees, is the “crucible of struggle.” Non-leaders are melted in this crucible; leaders emerge from it. Lee claims that these emergent leaders can then be made into better leaders, and eventually into great leaders, by teaching them standard leadership lessons, particularly about what mistakes to avoid.

Example of a leader born and made

Lee points to his successor as prime minister of Singapore, Goh Chok Tong, as an example of an individual born with leadership potential and made into a leader through both struggle and training. Goh, said Lee, grew up in a very poor family and suffered a hard life in his early years. He nevertheless managed to win a scholarship to Singapore’s national university where he excelled in economics, and then pursued further education in the United States. Following his return to Singapore, the Finance Minister put Goh in charge of a shipping company that had been operating in the red for several years. Goh turned it around within three years, noted Lee, and without succumbing to the tempting bribes offered by wealthy ship owners in Hong Kong and Tokyo. The retiring Finance Minister then chose Goh to be his successor, and in 1988 the leading contenders for prime minister selected Goh from among themselves to succeed Lee Kuan Yew. Goh knew he was not ready to assume national leadership, and therefore asked

Lee to stay on for two more years and help him learn the ropes. Lee advised him to focus on developing his ability to communicate, because Goh's English was halting and his Mandarin, the language of the educated, non-existent. Through applying himself to language lessons over the next 11 years, Goh became more fluent in English and significantly improved his communication skills. Lee now gives him high marks in his performance as prime minister. Lee concludes that Goh became a successful leader, not because he had a desire to make himself a great man, but because he had a determination to succeed and a desire to serve his country and people.

Formative lifeworlds

Walter Fluker would likely reach the same conclusion about U.S. civil rights leaders Martin Luther King Jr. and Howard Thurman, the two leaders he has studied extensively in his research on black congregations. Fluker believes that proper training and guidance is a necessary element in the making of a leader, and that the southern black church has been instrumental in cultivating well-known leaders such as King and Thurman, as well as many unrecognized leaders, such as the numerous women in informal positions of church leadership. Whereas Lee argued that the fire of the crucible and training in how to achieve success and avoid failure are the prerequisites of great leadership, Fluker contended that formative lifeworlds that transmit values and provide norms for moral and ethical behavior are the critical ingredient. King and Thurman were the products of a well-established religious tradition that functioned as such a formative lifeworld.

Roundtable participants suggested that formative lifeworlds in today's societies are often communities and families rather than religious traditions. In fact, leaders often arise not from, but in reaction to, religious traditions whose values and worldviews are experienced as limiting or debilitating to particular individuals or groups. The knotty question is whether such leadership is an outcome of cultivation and training in that particular tradition or an entirely creative act because it involves rejection of that tradition. Participants pointed out that lifeworlds can produce a range of leadership outcomes, from formal authority to dissent and revolt, and

from enlightened and inspiring leaders to leaders with small minds and enormous feet of clay. A prime example is the southern Baptist tradition, which has produced U.S. President and humanitarian Jimmy Carter as well as individuals leading the fight against rights for women and gays.

Theme 5: The Leadership Curriculum

What should Harvard teach students about leadership, and how should it approach the challenge of developing leaders?

Roundtable participants agreed that there would necessarily be similarities and differences among the diverse Harvard faculties in their approaches to this challenge. In general, leadership knowledge and skills that transcend context should be taught in all faculties, while those specific to a particular sector of society or profession should be taught in the relevant discipline. For example, creating a vision and managing the fear and anxiety elicited by organizational change are two skills required in any leadership context, and could therefore be taught in leadership courses university-wide. On the other hand, leadership topics unique to health maintenance organizations or churches would most likely be taught in the Medical School and Divinity School respectively.

Leadership models

Regarding leadership models that are taught to students, participants advocated for an approach that emphasizes how leaders function rather than their grand acts. Badaracco's experience in teaching a Harvard Business School course called "The Moral Leader" appeared to persuade many participants that the heroic model of leadership, in which larger-than-life heroes perform awe-inspiring feats, is unrealistic and misleading to students. A preferable model, one that would have greater relevance to students in their future leadership roles, is one that would focus on the small acts of leadership and heroism performed in everyday life. A curriculum based on this model would disabuse students of the notion that only great achievements constitute leadership, and would provide useful examples of everyday heroes. Such examples would be offered in the form of applied cases rather

than hero leader stories. Students would also be provided with a “toolbox” and skills that equip them to become “ordinary” everyday leaders. And they would likely be encouraged to re-examine their perception of their own capacity to lead in any circumstance in which they find themselves, whether at home or work or in the broader community or society.

Leadership knowledge and skills

What specific knowledge and skills should Harvard impart to aspiring leaders? Fluker believes that spirituality grounded in a significant ethical tradition is increasingly being utilized as an authoritative resource for public decision-making; as such, spirituality should and will play a more prominent role in leadership development in the future. Many Roundtable participants were wary of bringing spirituality into the classroom, however, even as they acknowledged that it can play a number of important roles vis-a-vis leadership. Several participants favored ethical thinking, or the critical analysis of morality, as a more appropriate skill to promote in the leadership curriculum; they argued that language and frameworks based in ethics, and not spirituality or religion, produce stronger leadership. Participants generally agreed that the ideal leadership development curriculum would teach students how to combine spiritual passion and commitment with the ability to step outside their spiritual frameworks and think critically. It would further teach them how to synthesize different value traditions and develop cohesion among them, much as gifted leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. were able to do.

But should particular values be taught in leadership courses? And if so, what values? Participants pondered whether Harvard should knowingly train what some would call a “terrorist” or “freedom fighter” to be a better leader. Or, for that matter, whether Harvard should train an autocrat or dictator. How should Harvard teach about the role of dissent in organizations and societies? Is dissent in itself a form of leadership, or simply a challenge to which those in formal and elected positions of leadership must learn to respond?

Does teaching students how to lead from formal positions of authority require a qualitatively different curriculum or different topics from teach-

ing students about leadership in general or about leading without formal authority? Lee Kuan Yew and Fred Greenstein both believe that learning how to communicate is critical to formal leaders' effectiveness. Lee further believes that the study of political leaders is highly instructive, pointing out that there are many 20th century leaders—Winston Churchill, Charles de Gaulle, Deng Xiao-Ping foremost among them—whose successes and failures are grist for the leadership studies mill.

Theme 6: Political Leadership

Are special skills needed for political leadership? Fred Greenstein, who has spent his career studying the U.S. presidents, observed that organization is critical inside the White House, while the ability to communicate effectively is essential for the public face of the presidency. He pointed to Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, and George H.W. Bush as the presidents most instructive in terms of how effectively they organized and operated their administrations. Disorganized presidencies, he said, often become exposed through public fiascos, such as the Watergate scandal and the Iran-Contra operation in the Nixon and Reagan presidencies respectively.

Greenstein rated Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Kennedy, and Reagan as the great presidential communicators of the 20th century, and graded Bill Clinton as uneven and Harry S. Truman and George W. Bush as poor. Greenstein underscored the fact that, while written communication was more important in the 19th century for chief executives, oral communication has become increasingly crucial over the course of the 20th (and now 21st) century. Singapore's Senior Minister Lee Kuan Yew, a long-time observer of the American presidency, noted that the United States in fact has a new generation of politicians who depend on media specialists to help them craft effective oral communications and create a positive public image.

In Lee's view, the United States is a nation "on autopilot" when compared to other countries around the world. It therefore requires a leader who, with the right helpers, knows how to run the machine and handle any emergencies that arise. Lee does not believe the United States needs a leader with a mission. Greenstein observed that presidential flaws, partic-

ularly those of an emotional nature, can seriously undermine presidential effectiveness and take the country off-course. Prime examples include Lyndon Johnson's truculence and insecurity, Richard Nixon's paranoia, Jimmy Carter's inflexibility, and Bill Clinton's sexual indiscretion. Greenstein believes that the perfect candidate for running the United States would offer a potent combination of Eisenhower's organizational ability, Johnson's political skill, and Roosevelt's rhetorical flair.

Based on his personal experience in Singapore, Lee believes that the skills involved in leading an anti-colonial struggle are simple—enormous charisma and exuberance combined with an ability to command followers' trust and belief that they will be given a better life. The skills involved in gaining national leadership in an electoral system are not so different, in Lee's view. The candidate must convince citizens that he or she has a natural urge and interest in taking actions to better their lives, and the capacity and will to accomplish those actions once in office. Lee considers political leadership, with its requisite skill in empathy and persuasion, to be an entirely different animal from military or corporate leadership. Lee characterized political leadership as a very tough job that individuals should not pursue if they simply wish to become a great leader and lack the desire to help others.

University Leadership Roundtable Events

Seven University Leadership Roundtable events were sponsored by the Center for Public Leadership during the 2000-2001 academic year. These events were characterized by a diversity of speakers and topics:

ROUNDTABLE 1

Philip Heymann and Ronald Heifetz,
“The Intellectual Architecture of ‘Leadership’”

ROUNDTABLE 2

Lee Kuan Yew
“Personal Reflections on Leadership”

ROUNDTABLE 3

Walter Fluker
“Ethics and Leadership”

ROUNDTABLE 4

Joseph Badaracco
“Beyond Heroic Moral Leadership”

ROUNDTABLE 5

Kim Campbell
“The Culture of Power”

ROUNDTABLE 6

Fred Greenstein
“The Leadership Qualities of Effective Presidents:
FDR to George W. Bush”

ROUNDTABLE 7

Robert Reich
“Leading When Everyone’s A Free Agent”

ROUNDTABLE 1:

Philip Heymann and Ronald Heifetz “The Intellectual Architecture of ‘Leadership’”

“What leaders know, and what leaders say, and what leaders try to communicate is situationally dependent, and what you want from them is situationally dependent.”

—Philip Heymann

“We might want to wrestle with this normative dimension, because I just don’t think it’s escapable. [Leadership] is not a neutral term like ‘chair’ or ‘electron.’”

—Ronald Heifetz

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Harvard Law School Professor Philip Heymann was the first speaker at the initial Roundtable event. Leading the university-wide Project on Justice in Times of Transition, Heymann has had ample cause to reflect upon and practice leadership, both in terms of his own position directing this important initiative, and in terms of bringing about just results in diverse and changing societies around the world.

Challenges in understanding leadership

Heymann pointed out that there is substantial confusion regarding the meaning of the word *leadership*, and suggested four possible meanings. First, leadership can be defined as a formal position with a concrete set of goals, such as Heymann’s own position as Faculty Chair of the Project on Justice in Times of Transition. Second, it can be defined as broad approval and commendation for success in accomplishing societal, organizational, or personal goals, as accorded such great political figures as Mahatma Gandhi and business titans like Jack Welch of General Electric. Third, leadership can be defined in terms of a set of characteristics (e.g., vision, integrity, drive) commonly held by individuals who serve as role models in setting and accomplishing important goals. Finally, the concept can be

described as a course of action or a way of behaving when defined in terms of *leading*, rather than in terms of the condition or state of being implied by the nouns *leader* or *leadership*.

Heymann observed that what leaders know, do, and say depends on the situation in which they operate. In other words, leadership is highly contextual. He suggested that the study of leadership, to be useful in informing and not just describing a practice, requires moving from the concrete and specific to a higher level of abstraction. The drawback to this approach, however, is the loss of information valuable to an enhanced understanding of the conditions and qualities required for leadership. Addressing this paradox is one of the challenges with which leadership scholars must currently grapple.

Participants gave voice to the same dilemma as the speakers regarding the use of the terms *leader* and *leadership*.

Another challenge—one faced by leadership educators as well as scholars—is how to evaluate the outcomes of leadership. Should emphasis be placed on how the resources of the group are being used, or on advances in personal, group, and global welfare? Should moral evaluations be involved—and if so, from people outside of as well as within the group?

The call to leadership scholars

Ronald Heifetz, Founding Director of the Center for Public Leadership at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and long-time teacher of a popular course on leadership, was the second speaker at this first Roundtable. Heifetz expressed his hope that the University Leadership Roundtable would begin to address many of the concerns raised by Heymann by fostering collaboration across the professional, disciplinary, and philosophical divides that characterize Harvard University in particular, and the field of Leadership Studies in general.

Heifetz expressed a desire to see the leadership field follow in the footsteps of other fields by agreeing on a more precise technical vocabulary, one

that would allow scholars, educators, and practitioners to know that they are indeed talking about the same phenomenon. The current confusion surrounding leadership terminology in both the popular and academic realms is aptly demonstrated in the phrase “The leader isn’t exercising any leadership,” which, as Heifetz pointed out, we all readily understand but which conflates the concepts of leadership, power, authority, and influence.

A second area of confusion and disagreement in the leadership field revolves around the normative nature of leadership. Heifetz noted that Richard Neustadt in his acclaimed book *Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents*³ defined leadership in a non-normative sense as strictly a relationship of influence between leaders and followers, whereas many other authors include a moral or ethical dimension in their definitions of leadership.

Heifetz echoed Heymann in underscoring the contextual nature of leadership, or what he called leadership “where the tire hits the road.” He suggested that—despite the drawback cited by Heymann—leadership scholars must develop a common set of leadership concepts that apply across contexts if understanding and practice of this elusive phenomenon is to be advanced.

Discussion among the Roundtable participants revolved around three broad themes articulated by Heymann and Heifetz: the definitions or meanings of leadership; the contextual variable or variables; and the normative dimension.

The definition of leadership

Participants gave voice to the same dilemma as the speakers regarding the use of the terms *leader* and *leadership*. One suggestion was to forget about definitions and focus instead on the articulation and testing of theories, theories that might converge to form a commonly accepted taxonomy of leadership.

³ New York: The Free Press, 1960/1990.

A second suggestion was to identify and describe the distinct phenomena involved in leadership, rather than to define the term itself. Participants suggested a number of such phenomena:

- *Functionality* – measures of leadership effectiveness or success
- *Authority* – the use of positional power and of actions beyond one’s authorization
- *Ambition* – the desire to achieve
- *Virtue* – the “moral” or the “good,” in terms of leadership behaviors or outcomes
- *Context* – the role of time and place
- *Followership and influence* – the presence of followers, and the nature of the influence relationship between followers and leaders

A third suggestion was to focus on indicators that signal the presence of leadership. Such indices might include the existence of followers or the attainment of organizational goals. This suggestion begged the question posed by one participant: How should the lack of shared criteria for assessing the existence and success of leadership be approached?

Participants raised several other concerns around leadership definitions and semantics. One question that reflected a current controversy raging in the field of leadership studies had to do with whether leadership is about a single leader or about a multiplicity of leaders playing a multiplicity of roles. Another query concerned how leadership scholars and educators should respond to a persistent attitude toward leadership—the attitude of “I’ll know it when I see it.” The pervasiveness of this attitude suggests that recent leadership theory and research are making few inroads into popular culture and general practice.

The role of context

A number of issues were raised during the discussion about the role of context in leadership. One of these issues was whether a fit between the characteristics of the individual leader and the specific situation is required in order to attain positive leadership outcomes. British prime

minister Winston Churchill, for example, demonstrated remarkable success during a time of international crisis (World War II) that required inspirational leadership to mobilize broad-based action. By contrast, he produced only mediocre results earlier in his career when domestic issues largely demanded the ability to negotiate among conflicting political interests. The example of Churchill suggests, first, that good leadership requires the capacity to diagnose the demands and problems of the particular situation, and second, that the ability to act in accordance with the structural elements that become apparent in this diagnosis is crucial.

The issue of “fit” between leader and situation prompted a question about whether leadership varies across the different sectors of society and the diverse professions and thus requires each Harvard faculty member to teach roles and tasks unique to its particular discipline. This question elicited the obvious counter-question: Aren’t there leadership characteristics that transcend context and should be taught to all students?

The normative dimension

The discussion regarding the normative dimension of leadership centered on whether the word “leadership” is descriptive and value-free or whether it inherently contains the idea of goodness or morality. A closely related question is whether a good leader must necessarily be a good person—or, to put it another way, whether character is a necessary element of leadership. Perhaps, as one participant suggested, the word “leadership” is both descriptive *and* normative.

Whether or not the idea of goodness is considered to be implicit in the word “leadership,” the next obvious question is, “Who determines the criteria to be used in evaluating what constitutes good leadership?” The criteria that end up being applied, according to participants, depend on whether leadership is considered to be about getting to a better place,

Is dissent itself a form of leadership, and how should people in positions of authority respond to it?

reaching a goal, achieving something significant, moving forward, making a difference, bringing about change, maintaining group unity and identity, or some other desired outcome. One participant noted that even when there is agreement about outcomes, a shared understanding of such descriptors as “better,” “forward,” “difference,” and “change” may be lacking. For example, does “better” refer to just the “in” group or to everyone in any way affected?

The dilemmas for Harvard faculty and other educators around the question of normative leadership are not trivial. Should values be taught as part of leadership courses, and if so, what values? Should Harvard train a known terrorist, a resistance fighter, an autocrat, or a dictator to be a better leader? What should Harvard teach about the role of dissent in a democratic society? Is dissent in itself a form of leadership, and how should people in positions of authority respond to it?

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

One of the most critical issues in the Leadership Studies field is how to deal with the semantic diversity and confusion surrounding the use of the terms *leader* and *leadership*. Should the field attempt to agree on a precise technical vocabulary, as other fields have done? Or should it eschew definitions and instead focus on developing theories, indicators, and/or a taxonomy of leadership?

A second important issue is determining the role of context. Does leadership vary across the different sectors of society and the diverse professions, suggesting that Harvard faculties should teach students the leadership roles and tasks unique to their particular disciplines? Are there also leadership characteristics that transcend context and should therefore be taught to all students? In generating answers to these questions, what is the most effective way for leadership scholars to abstract a common set of leadership concepts that apply across contexts and still retain an understanding of how the conditions and qualities required for leadership vary among these contexts?

A third important issue is contending with the normative dimension of leadership. Is the word “leadership” descriptive and value-free, or does it

inherently contain the idea of goodness or morality? Must a good leader necessarily be a good person, i.e., is character a necessary element of leadership? Who determines the criteria for judging or evaluating “good” or “effective” or “successful” leadership? Should values be taught as part of leadership courses, and if so, what values? Should Harvard train individuals whose character or actions are morally suspect, such as known terrorists? What should Harvard teach about the role of dissent in leadership?

CONCLUSIONS

At this time there is no agreement among leadership scholars and educators, at Harvard and elsewhere, as to how to approach the semantic confusion surrounding leadership terminology. Agreement is also lacking in terms of defining the normative nature of leadership. There does appear to be at least some consensus that general and contextual factors both play a role in the effective exercise of leadership. Further research will be necessary in order to gain a more precise understanding of the nature of, and relationship between, the roles that these two factors play.

ROUNDTABLE 2:

Lee Kuan Yew

“Personal Reflections on Leadership”*

“No one picked me out as a leader. It just happened in the process of natural elimination. Or as the communists used to tell us, they emerge through struggle. If you didn’t have it, you got melted in the crucible.”

—Lee Kuan Yew

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Lee Kuan Yew was elected Prime Minister of Singapore for a staggering eight terms, and has served in the position of Senior Minister since 1990. To a capacity audience at the second Leadership Roundtable, Lee recounted stories and shared his perspectives on leadership. Below is a faithful reporting, in his own words, of Lee Kuan Yew’s fascinating and often surprising reminiscences.

On identifying potential leaders

I’m somewhat skeptical about making a leader out of a non-leader. I tried hard to look for successes in the last 30 years. I meet lots of people with effervescence, energy, who speak well, but you put responsibility on them and it isn’t done.

I visited a sheep farm near Canberra during a meeting of Commonwealth leaders. The farm had 10,000 sheep and six to eight dogs. The dogs brought all the sheep into the pen in 10 minutes with just whistles and signals. The farmer told me that if you get the right dog, training them only takes two or three months. The question is how to get the right dog. Some litters only produce one to two, some none. I found out that a sheepdog must have strong eyes, so when the dog looks at the sheep, they quail and follow him. I’m not sure humans need stronger eyes, but there

* Lee Kuan Yew’s visit was made possible through the generosity of Ambassador Richard Fisher and Nancy Collins Fisher and the Collins Family International Fellowship.

may be some measure of truth here. I had to run through hundreds of potential candidates to find a few potential leaders.

On making great leaders

It's a somewhat pessimistic view on making great leaders, but if you identify someone who's got the potential, all lessons can be taught. The lessons are standard lessons—what mistakes to avoid. They'll become better leaders in a shorter time and make fewer mistakes.

I was in New York in the 1970s and Isaac Singer, the Nobel Prize winner in literature, was asked if he taught writing and he said yes. He was asked, can you make a great writer? Can you teach great writing? He said "Yes, if he's got it in him, then I can bring it out faster and I can teach him how to do it better. But he's got to have a big story inside here or here [the head or the heart]. If you ain't got that, then all you've got are words or phrases and a lot of fluff in between, and you get a nasty review, and it ends up in the remainder bookshop."

On his experience leading an anti-colonial struggle

The skills required to be a leader in an anti-colonial struggle are simple: enormous charisma and exuberance, and you've got to command the trust and belief of your followers that you're going to give them the better life. And most of them say, "Look at all those fine big houses and big white farms. Now that we are in charge, you will have those." That's what I did, too. I said "Look at all those big offices and stores. They're all British and we're in charge. You will be running those big stores."

By the time I got in charge—we started in 1950, we got in office in 1959, and so in nine learning years we knew that wasn't true. We did a quiet U-turn. I said, of course, if you get rid of them too quickly, there'll be an empty store. Better go slow and make sure of this, that, and the other. If we hadn't done that and we chased the British out, we would have collapsed. I wouldn't have been re-elected. As it was, we decided this wasn't going to work, so let's figure out how we're going to give them something without ruining the economy. So we figured out a new strategy, a joined militia. That would fix the communists. Then we'd have a bigger resource base—

rubber, tin, palm oil—so that we'd have a better economy. So we joined militia. Then I found that we got captured by Malay extremists, Muslim extremists. So we got out of that one and were independent on our own in 1965. By then we had learned enough of what didn't work.

By that time we'd seen India and we'd seen the British, and Indonesia was a mess. So we concluded that you have to create wealth before you distribute it. A large part of the survival of my party and me was our ability to convince our people and our unions and our union leaders that we had to work with management, and produce good products at low prices that will sell worldwide. Then we'd share the profits. Had we failed in that, we would have gone down. We succeeded. Thereafter we just improved upon it election after election, and we produced result after result. And so they decided we had the secret formula, the touch of Midas. They re-elected me leading the party eight times, and my successor twice already. Without that U-turn and without teaching them the facts of life, we would have been finished.

On political leadership

It's a very tough job, especially in political leadership. Being a CEO or the general of an army is different. You don't have to persuade people who can say 'Boo' to you to get them on your side. When campaigning, no one has to listen to you at all. And when the campaign is over, people have to believe that you've got something for them that you can do that will make them cast their vote for you. It requires a totally different set of skills. Those skills can only be developed if you have a natural urge, a natural interest in people, in wanting to do something for them, which they can sense and feel. If you haven't got that and you just want to be a great leader, try some other profession.

On leading a change in the national language

English was the language of an elite minority that the British nurtured. So with the surge of independence movements and nationalism, when we first became self-governing we made Malay our national language.

The Chinese Chamber of Commerce was very hot on the Chinese language. If you remember, China was supposed to be a very powerful nation, getting rapidly industrialized, and Chinese would be a great language. So they insisted that we should make Chinese the national language. I called them up and I called other chambers up and said “Do you want riots? Because if you make Chinese the national language, all of the Malays and the Indians and others will be disadvantaged and that will be the end of us. And moreover, who are we going to trade with—China? What do they have to trade with us, or buy or sell from us?” So I didn’t make English the national language [at that time].

I knew it was an emotional subject, so I said, “Let’s leave things alone and let events decide what language is our working language.” So I introduced English as a second language into the Chinese schools and into the Malay schools, as well as the Tamil schools. And into the English schools we introduced Chinese, Malay, and Tamil for those whose mother tongues are those languages. Then I allowed year by year the graduates from these schools to show the parents who got the best jobs. That settled it after 20 years. But it took 20 years.

On the issue of leadership succession

I found eight to ten possible successors. And in 1988 when I fought my last election at the age of 65, I called them up and said, “Now you choose [among yourselves] your leader and I’ll hand over.” I didn’t want to appoint him because I’ve seen how things can go wrong. If I appointed a leader and the others didn’t agree, they would withhold their cooperation and he wouldn’t succeed. So I threw the onus onto them. There was no outstanding person who obviously could be superior to anybody else. So they chose Goh Chok Tong, and I said “Fine.” Goh is a very able person, but he lacks communicative skills. He used to speak haltingly in English because his first

If I appointed a leader and the others didn’t agree, they would withhold their cooperation and he wouldn’t succeed.

language was Hokkien, and his English had this Hokkien lilt, which was a disadvantage. Nor did he know Mandarin, which is the language of the educated. But nonetheless I said, “Alright, you’ll take over.” And he said “No, no. Please stay on for two years while I find my feet and get to know my neighbors.” So he took over in 1990, and I advised him. I said, “Brush up your lan-

guages and your ability to communicate. So we found him teachers in English and Malay and he applied himself. And I must say that in the 10 years since then, he has improved his communication skills considerably, and his English is now more fluent. For this he deserves high marks.

What he had is a certain determination to succeed. And that determination came not from a desire to be a great man, but to do something for

Mao Tse-Tung could
not have become
Deng Xiao-Ping, and
vice versa. . . .
He had a different
temperament. He was
a romanticist.

Singapore and the people. He came from a very poor family and a hard life. He won a scholarship and took a first in economics at our university. He then went to Williams College, and when he came back the Finance Minister, who knew him well, who was a very good assessor of people, put him in charge of an ailing shipping company called Neptune Orient Lines. It was in the red, and had been so for several years. He turned it around in three years. When dealing with wealthy shipowners in Hong Kong and Tokyo, where gifts are not golf balls but sachets of gold, diamonds, and other things in the golf bags, he kept himself above all that. And when my Finance Minister wanted to retire, I said to him, “No, you will not leave me in the lurch. You find me a successor.” He produced Goh Chok Tong, and made him a Finance Minister. Then the others chose him, and he is a success.

On the importance of context

Different situations call for different types of leaders. The same country, China in the 1930s and 1940s, required a Mao Tse-Tung. But China in the

1970s did not require a Mao Tse-Tung. It needed a Deng Xiao-Ping. One was a destroyer of the old system, a visionary. And he kept on wanting to destroy the system that he had created with a cultural revolution. The other was a pragmatist who saw that the communist system wasn't working long before the Soviet Union imploded, and said, "Change." And he had the courage to do that.

Mao Tse-Tung could not have become Deng Xiao-Ping, and vice versa. He couldn't have done it. He had a different temperament. He was a romanticist.

On the three leaders of the 20th century he would recommend teaching to Harvard students

I would teach them Winston Churchill, because I admired him. He changed the course of history when it easily could have been lost if the British hadn't stood up to the Germans and sought some peace, which wouldn't have lasted. His good fortune lay in having Franklin Roosevelt on the other side and in the stupidity of the Japanese attacking Pearl Harbor. That saved the world. So I would say Winston Churchill, yes, for one.

Second I would study [French president Charles] de Gaulle. I think he's a cussed difficult man, but I think he's a very great man. He's a Frenchman, and he's a proud one. Without him France today would have lost its self-respect. He gave back to the French a sense of *amour-propre* and then revived their ideas of grandeur, which nobody else would have been capable of doing. But he was also a realist and he knew he had to come to terms with Germany. It's difficult to be a great man without power, but he was a great man. I loved and savored his audacity. When he went to North Africa and walked up to [Henri] Giraud, who was a French governor there, and he found American guards protecting Giraud, he said "Giraud, you ought to be ashamed of yourself, American guards defending a general of France!" What impudence! But he had that dare. "To hell with the Americans! We are French! We demand it, we run this country! This is Algiers, France!" You need a certain megalomania. It appeared he had it.

It goes without saying I would also study Deng Xiao-Ping. I think he's a very big man. He's very realistic. Without him there would be no China.

Who else? Quite a few. But if you say three, I would pick those three.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Is Lee Kuan Yew's suspicion correct that not everyone has the innate potential to become a leader? (Or is he referring specifically to political leadership?) For those who indeed possess leadership potential, what are the lessons they need to be taught, and are these lessons standard ones, as Lee claims? Given Lee's belief that political leaders require a very different set of skills from military and business leaders, do the lessons differ according to type of leadership? And if different situations call for different types of political leaders, as Lee points out, should the lessons taught to potential political leaders be differentiated even further according to the type of political context or circumstance (e.g., anti-colonial struggle vs. established democracy)?

CONCLUSIONS

Almost half a century of experience and observation have shaped Lee Kuan Yew's perspectives on political leadership. He has concluded that few have the potential to become the leaders of a country, but those who do can acquire all the knowledge and skills they need through direct experience and training. Political leadership in his experience is enormously challenging and requires a very different set of skills from military or business leadership. He has further observed that different political circumstances require different types of leaders. Whatever the circumstance, Lee believes that a political leader must possess a natural interest in creating a better life for the citizens of his or her nation. Without this interest, and with only a desire to become a great leader, an individual is unlikely to succeed in commanding the trust and belief of the citizenry necessary to grasp and retain the elusive reins of national power.

ROUNDTABLE 3:

Walter Fluker “Ethics and Leadership”

“Leadership asks the question of values in reference to ultimate concern—what is my highest hope, my highest value, my highest aspiration?”

—Walter Fluker

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

A visiting professor at the Harvard Divinity School in the 2000-2001 academic year, Walter Fluker is also Director of the Leadership Center at Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia. The focus of this center will not be to employ the great man or woman approach, according to Fluker, but rather to research the ways that people relate to both “the other” and “the Holy Other.”

The leadership challenge

Fluker believes that the five most important challenges facing leaders today are as follows:

1) the disparity between rich and poor; 2) the Balkanization of the world; 3) the creation of community and civic responsibility; 4) the ethical utilization of science, technology, and business to promote human development; and 5) the respect and protection of life.

The kind of leadership needed to address these challenges, in Fluker’s view, will involve negotiating the traffic at the dangerous intersection of “lifeworlds” and “systemworlds.” Lifeworlds are the everyday worlds in which people live and work, while systemworlds are the worlds of politics, economics, and other broad systems of human activity.

Developing leaders

How do we develop leaders with the competencies and skills to conduct this negotiation? Fluker believes that such leaders must be spiritually

disciplined, intellectually astute, and morally anchored. Fluker is particularly concerned with conceptualizing the relationship among spirituality, ethics, and leadership. This concern is rooted in the discovery he made, researching black congregations, that U.S. civil rights leaders Martin Luther King, Jr. and Howard Thurman were both storied preachers and the products of important religious traditions.

Spirituality is
important because
it is increasingly
being utilized as an
authoritative
resource for public
decision-making.

Fluker defined spirituality as the way or ways in which people seek to form a relationship with “the Other” or an “Ideal” that they believe to be worthy of devotion and reverence. He has identified three forms of spirituality that people commonly demonstrate. One is the formal beliefs and practices espoused by established religions. An informal type of spirituality defined and actualized by an individual or a small group associated with an estab-

lished religious institution is the second. The third form is philosophical or ethical beliefs related to an individual’s values and perceived “goods,” such as beauty and justice.

Spirituality is important, in Fluker’s view, because it is increasingly being utilized as an authoritative resource for public decision-making and hence will hence play a more prominent role in leadership development in the future. He believes that public leaders who depend upon their spirituality as a resource in making decisions should be guided by a significant ethical tradition.

The ethical leader

Fluker favors the definition of a leader articulated by Howard Gardner in his book *Leading Minds*⁴—that of an individual or set of individuals who succeed in affecting the thoughts, emotions, and actions of a significant number of people in a significant way. He builds upon Gardner’s definition in defining *ethical* leaders as those leaders “whose characters have

been shaped by the wisdom, habits, and practices of particular traditions, often more than one, yet they tend to be identified with a particular ethos and cultural narrative.”⁵

Ethical leadership, according to this definition, has a number of characteristics. It arises from the lifeworlds of particular traditions. It involves the appropriation and embodiment of the moral beliefs and practices that have influenced the *ethos*, or character and shared meanings, of the people engaged in those traditions. It also aims to serve the collective good through authoritative speech and responsible action. Finally, it explores the question of which values are supreme by referring to what Fluker terms (borrowing a phrase from theologian Paul Tillich) “ultimate concern”— i.e., people’s highest hopes and aspirations.

Fluker proposes a model of ethical leadership with three components—character, civility, and community. Character is identified by the core philosophies, narrative scripts, and life stories that define an individual, and is embodied in ethical leaders as hope, empathy, and integrity. Civility refers to an individual’s understanding of how his personal character relates to his place within a democratic social system, and is expressed by ethical leaders as reverence, respect, and recognition. Community is exemplified by compassion, justice, and courage—all within the context of the cooperative and mutually responsible ventures in which human beings voluntarily engage.

Fluker posed three questions: 1) What does it mean to negotiate traffic where lifeworlds and systemworlds collide? 2) What resources are needed to develop leaders who are morally anchored and spiritually connected? 3) What do we need to do differently?

Negotiating the traffic where lifeworlds and systemworlds collide

Roundtable participants suggested that the real leadership challenge in negotiating the intersection of lifeworlds and systemworlds lies in the conflict among diverse priorities, claims, perspectives, values, and beliefs.

⁴ New York: Basic Books, 1995.

⁵ *The Stones That the Builders Rejected* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 1998), p. 11.

Participants pointed out that it is difficult to establish and apply a standard of virtue in a secular society because everyone has a different idea about what constitutes moral and immoral action. Even when there is a common set of priorities and values, there are different ideas about how these should play out in public policies.

Beyond such conflicts in values and viewpoints, a further challenge exists in the realm of language. It is difficult to settle a case of moral claims using a systemworld language of utility and rights. And the existence of unique languages for understanding issues of morality and ethics in the various traditions serves as a significant obstacle to achieving common discourse and consensus.

Participants suggested that the inherent commonality of spirituality could be used to bridge the language divide and the conflict among perspectives, values, and beliefs. Surveys show that, in addition to those who follow distinct religious traditions, a majority of Americans consider themselves to be spiritual. People are searching for meaning beyond economics and are drawn to ideas that are spiritually or ethically based. Religious and spiritual traditions offer the opportunity to discuss what defines the good and moral person that public life currently does not.

The use of moral authority as the basis for public decision-making is another matter altogether, according to participants. It poses unique opportunities and dangers for leaders given that religious and spiritual citations can be persuasive or threatening. Many people are comfortable discussing personal morality but not social morality. The application of religion and spirituality to ethics in the public realm in fact violates the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, and historically has been identified with some of the most tragic outcomes in human history, such as the Nazi Holocaust and the Christian Crusades.

Participants observed that leaders are the most powerful not when they cite passages from a particular religious or spiritual tradition, but rather when they understand and appeal to the ethical frames of reference comprising different traditions. They listen with the heart as well as the mind, and heed the voices of those at the margins and not just in the mainstream

of society. These leaders speak to people's current reality, and encourage them to open up to "the other." They work to foster the development of a cross-cutting identity that allows people to find common ground while staying rooted in, and expressing themselves through, their own unique languages and traditions. In other words, they focus their efforts on bringing about unity through diversity.

Ethical leadership

Roundtable participants worried about conflating ethics with either spirituality or leadership. In terms of ethics and spirituality, they observed, the values of compassion, tolerance, and justice can define ethics from a normative standpoint without being based in any religious or spiritual traditions. Many examples illustrate that spiritual people can be evil while atheists can be ethical. In terms of ethics and leadership, both spiritual leaders and secular leaders can be ethical or unethical and produce positive or negative ends. As one participant observed, leaders in the United States represent at least two often conflicting sets of ethics: the liberal Democratic ethic focused on tolerance and compassion, and the conservative Republican ethic emphasizing personal rights and responsibility. Leaders in either ethical tradition can successfully call upon spiritual and religious values in order to justify their positions.

Rather than defining ethical leadership, religion and spirituality are best viewed as resources. Each can serve as a source to inform a leader's thinking about what is good and right and in determining an appropriate direction. They can serve as sources of energy, courage, strength, and inspiration. Through their images, stories, and symbols, they can attach meaning to practical acts and engage the commitment and action of others. And they can provide a leader with substantial cultural resources.

The real issue in effective leadership, according to participants, is not the possession of specifically "spiritual" values, but rather values that are open

Spiritual people can be evil while atheists can be ethical.

and inclusive instead of narrow and exclusive. For the participants, the key question, in the final analysis, is not how to develop ethical leaders, but rather how to attain a good society.

Lifeworlds that cultivate leaders

Fluker's model is based on the southern black church, which cultivated leaders in its own moral tradition. Great leaders like Martin Luther King, Jr. emanated from this training ground, as did many women in informal church leadership positions. Participants asked: are there still such formative lifeworlds that transmit values and provide norms for ethical and moral behavior in leaders?

The dominant culture in the United States does not encourage moral sensibility, in some participants' view. Instead, other life settings such as communities and families often assume this important role. A given training ground, however, "may," in the words of one participant, "reap poison ivy as well as strawberries." For example, the southern Baptist tradition produced leaders such as Jimmy Carter, who embodies tolerance and respect for others, but that same tradition has also been associated with bigotry and misogyny.

Leaders can arise not only out of religious and spiritual traditions but also in reaction to them. Leadership can be the act of challenging the spiritual values and paradigms that serve to limit, define, and debilitate particular individuals and groups by keeping them prisoners of the past. In this sense, leadership can be interpreted as an entirely creative act rather than the outcome of cultivation by a particular tradition.

The curriculum for leadership development

Participants suggested that leadership development should involve teaching people how to "deconstruct" spirituality in order to understand its role and how it can be deployed as a valuable leadership asset. Some believed that spirituality can play a number of important roles in leadership. It can, for example, allow leaders to take more risks in public life, as many spiritual traditions stress forgiveness for failures. It can build the spiritual discipline necessary to resist the temptations and hungers that

frequently confront leaders, and thus help them to maintain the moral authority required by constituents. It can serve as mutual ground for constructing a shared and fundamental sense of reality independent of people's various traditions. And the language of spirituality can resonate with people and play a key role in bringing them together. Participants stressed that emerging leaders must learn how to deconstruct spirituality without surrendering their critical rational faculties.

Other participants considered skill in ethical thinking, or the critical analysis of morality, more appropriate to leadership development. Language and frameworks based on ethics, not spirituality or religion, produce stronger leadership, in their opinion. They pointed out that spiritual backgrounds can cause much controversy when they become the basis for policy decisions, and monotheistic traditions can create division between individuals and groups in their creation of "the other," who must be proselytized in order to be redeemed. These participants believed that ethical values such as empathy, tolerance, and justice are less dangerous sources of leadership than spirituality.

The ideal curriculum for leadership development, participants agreed, would teach people how to combine spiritual passion and commitment with the ability to step outside their spiritual frameworks to think in a critical and analytical manner. It would also teach them how to synthesize different value traditions and develop cohesion among them, similar to the way in which Martin Luther King, Jr. integrated other systems of thought and other meanings into his leadership repertoire. The challenge for a leader embedded in a single tradition, therefore, is to appropriate meanings for the task at hand without being fixed in that tradition and while maintaining a sense of the multiple traditions in the world at large. Striking this balance between the particular and the universal is a skill that

Leaders can arise not only out of religious and spiritual traditions but also in reaction to them.

should be taught to emerging leaders who already possess a distinct moral or ethical sensibility.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

How do we develop leaders with the competencies and skills to negotiate traffic at the dangerous intersection of lifeworlds—the everyday worlds in which people live and work—and systemworlds—the worlds of politics, economics, and other broad systems of human activity? What does it mean to negotiate such traffic, and does it require leaders who are morally anchored and spiritually connected, as Fluker believes? If it does, what resources are needed to develop these leaders? Do formative lifeworlds still exist that serve to transmit values and provide norms for ethical and moral behavior in leaders? And what do we, as leadership educators, need to do differently?

CONCLUSIONS

Having studied the leadership careers of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Howard Thurman, Fluker has concluded that formative lifeworlds, such as the southern black Baptist church, play an important role in communicating the values and norms expected of ethical leaders arising from those traditions. Fluker believes that leaders should be spiritually disciplined and morally anchored in a significant ethical tradition if they are to succeed in negotiating the traffic between everyday worlds and the larger systems of human activity.

Participants appeared to share Fluker's conclusion that so-called lifeworlds can have a formative influence on the values and behavior of leaders. They were wary, however, of ethical leadership that is based in a particular religious or spiritual tradition and that calls upon that tradition for moral authority in public decision-making. Participants expressed a preference for leaders who view their religion or spirituality as one resource among others in their exercise of leadership, and who understand and appeal to the ethical frames of reference of not one but many different traditions. They suggested that leadership development should involve teach-

ing people how to combine their spiritual passion and commitment with an ability to think about the various value systems and traditions in a critical and analytical manner.

ROUNDTABLE 4:

Joseph Badaracco “Beyond Heroic Moral Leadership”

“I think if I did a survey, Dr. King would be, far and away, judging from students’ comments, their exemplar of a moral leader.”

—Joseph Badaracco

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

The hero as moral leader

Harvard Business School Professor Joseph Badaracco has discovered that students like their leaders cut from heroic cloth; that is, with high principles, noble behavior, and acts of self-sacrifice that inspire a legion of followers. They view Martin Luther King, Jr. as the supreme example of this heroic model of leadership. Students tend to get confused, and even upset, when they read that Abraham Lincoln was actually an ambitious politician who equivocated on the issue of slavery throughout his career, finally justifying the Emancipation Proclamation as a military (as opposed to a moral) imperative.

Badaracco’s course, “The Moral Leader,” is unusual at Harvard Business School in that it uses works of literature and history as readings rather than the ubiquitous case studies of managers. A popular class (about 25 percent of the students take it in their second year as an elective), it is, moreover, a course that provokes Badaracco himself to wrestle with the utility of the heroic model as a means for teaching future managers about leadership.

The heroic model, as Badaracco pointed out, has appeared in almost every era and culture, and it may have once served some powerful biological or evolutionary role. Even today, through its stories of human triumph and tragedy, the model provides people with momentary escape from the routines of everyday life and, on occasion, the inspiration necessary to transcend circumstances and perform unexpected acts of greatness. Heroic stories have long been recognized as a means by which to pass on

society's values and, in particular, to transmit the communal standards for judging people who occupy visible positions of power.

The failure of the heroic model

The heroic model both inspires and influences the beliefs of Badaracco's students, who resonate with its call to courage, dedication, and self-sacrifice. Considering the model hierarchically, they place a handful of individuals such as Martin Luther King, Jr., and Mother Teresa at the top of a "moral leadership" pyramid, and the majority of people, whom they consider to be fearful, impotent, lazy and self-interested, at the bottom. And yet, despite such beliefs, the model fails, at least outwardly, to have any significant impact on the students' behavior. Even as they admire the Mother Teresa's and the Mahatma Gandhi's of the world, they continue to measure success not by moral victories but by material success. Why, as Badaracco observes, does the model have so little real effect?

The heroic leadership model . . . is irrelevant to most people's lives.

These business school students are not alone. The heroic leadership model, in Badaracco's reckoning, is irrelevant to most people's lives. Its failure to exercise an important influence over individual behavior is due, at least in part, to two serious shortcomings. First, the model offers little guidance to ordinary people living everyday lives—i.e., the vast majority of humanity. Instead, it suggests that such individuals conduct their affairs in what Badaracco terms "a murky, moral limbo," and that if they don't aspire to be Superman, they have essentially consigned themselves to being an ineffectual Clark Kent.

Second, the model offers a limited description of what moral leaders do. Extraordinary courage and bold, decisive action in the face of a dramatic moral challenge epitomize the typical tale of moral leadership. Historical realities tend to be ignored—particularly the quiet moral efforts (requiring patience, subtlety, and persistence in uncertain circumstances over prolonged periods of time) that often occur behind the scenes. Badaracco believes that the heroic model's limited description of leadership in action

offers individuals working in today's complex organizational and institutional structures little valuable guidance about how to address the perplexing moral dilemmas that regularly confront them.

The prevalence of the heroic model

The heroic model is alive and well—thriving, in fact—in popular culture today, as is evident by the number of movies, books, and games depicting action heroes. It is flourishing in academia as well, as is clearly illustrated by the number of theories that emphasize extraordinary moral leadership. Badaracco points out that these theories often diminish “managers” while praising or romanticizing “leaders.” One example Badaracco offered is the popular theory of leadership introduced by James MacGregor Burns in his award-winning book *Leadership*⁶—a theory in which transformational leaders (those who inspire and transform the lives of their followers) are distinguished from transactional leaders (those who merely negotiate transactions that provide mutual benefit to themselves and followers). Another example is that of the charismatic model of leadership, a model that focuses on the traits and behaviors of highly inspirational leaders and ignores the efforts of the many individuals who have been equally invaluable to organizational or group success.

The heroic model, in Badaracco's view, may have a pernicious effect on people's conceptions of leadership by suggesting that pragmatism is tainted and unqualified as a form of moral leadership, and that vision is necessary, when in reality leaders are often simply reacting to circumstances. It does this as well by failing to recognize that optimal ends may stem from mixed motives, and by not according value to the use of compromise or the process of learning from one's own mistakes. And, finally, it does this by denying the existence and importance of quiet moral leadership.

Badaracco admitted he might be oversimplifying the heroic model and exaggerating its influence. But he also asked: Does our teaching and thinking about leadership today overemphasize the heroic model? Or is leadership in everyday situations just a miniature version of heroic leadership? If

⁶ New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

the heroic model doesn't fit everyday ethical situations, what sorts of models do? And, if there are important alternative models, how should we think and teach about them?

Definitions and origins of heroic leadership

Participants responded to Badaracco's presentation by offering their own interpretations of heroic leadership, defining it as the paradigm of the great military leader who stands up against an oppressor, as well as the neighborhood mom who leads a crusade against drunken drivers. Heroic leaders may be charismatic, but they don't have to be. A sub-set of heroic leadership, said one participant, is moral leadership, because it requires both courage and strength. Moral leadership can be private and ordinary, but the subconscious model most people carry around in their minds is the heroic variety.

In participants' reckoning, there are several significant explanations for the existence of heroic leadership. There may be a genetic or evolutionary biology argument: Following a heroic leader helps human beings survive. Indeed, prominent leaders performing heroic acts appear to have an important effect on followers. People exhibit a deep psychological need for a strong, powerful leader who takes charge and seizes their imaginations. Stories of heroic leaders, such as those found in fables and myths, inspire people to reach their highest selves and help societies teach their children what they deem to be supreme cultural values. The heroic archetype has been demonstrated to be a deep-seated model in cultures around the world. Citing the work of mythology scholar Joseph Campbell and psychologist Carl Jung, one participant described the heroic journey of the individual who leaves the safety of home to embark on an arduous quest, endures substantial suffering, and returns to the community with a compelling new vision for its future. Images of such heroic leadership signify how power and authority are expected to be legitimately exercised in society—in general, authorities are moral and serve a God or gods who are powerful yet good.

The “chink” in the heroic armor

Participants found much to criticize in the heroic model. Its suggestion that heroic leadership is synonymous with moral leadership conflates courage with ethics. Moral leaders do not necessarily demonstrate heroic

leadership, as seen, said one participant, in the U.S. presidency of Jimmy Carter. Heroic leaders, on the other hand, can be deeply flawed. The fuel for their achievement of noble aspirations can be self-interest and ambition rather than an ethical or moral impetus. Or it can be an internal “churning complexity” composed of guilt, a feeling of being deprived, or the desire to prove one’s self-worth. One such example offered by a participant was Steve Jobs, a juvenile delinquent who

The heroic model fails, essentially, because it idealizes people and ignores the fact that human beings are inherently flawed.

later became the founder of Apple Computer.

The heroic model fails, essentially, because it idealizes people and ignores the fact that human beings are inherently flawed. It eschews the struggles of leadership and suggests that leaders have to be superhuman. It also presents a monolithic view of experience that is primarily male and for the most part aligned with the military model, according to one participant. Further, it tends to confuse heroes with high-level authorities and fails to consider ordinary people performing heroic deeds. For these reasons it is disillusioning and disempowering to people in their everyday lives. It inappropriately emphasizes “who” rather than “how,” so that the products and answers of leadership take precedence over the more critical processes and questions.

A better leadership model

How leaders function, as opposed to their grand acts, should be the emphasis of leadership models, participants claimed. A better leadership

model would focus on the “blocking and tackling” that occurs in everyday life as people size up the moral and ethical dimensions of the organizational and personal situations they encounter. Such a model would emphasize the minor acts of heroism that take place during the mundane functions of life, not larger-than-life “heroes.” It would distinguish authority from leadership and prescribe *moral* rather than *heroic* leadership.

A curriculum based on this superior model would distinguish between leadership and grand heroism, and discourage students from assuming the “master of the universe” complex implicit in the heroic model. It would provide examples of pragmatic moral leaders and everyday heroes, and offer these in the form of applied cases as opposed to hero-leader stories. Students would receive guidance in considering the lens through which they view leadership and in developing new perspectives, particularly in terms of their own capacity for exercising leadership on an everyday basis. They would be provided with a toolbox and skills to equip them in this new role as “ordinary,” everyday leaders.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Joseph Badaracco posed the following queries: Does our teaching and thinking about leadership today overemphasize the heroic model? Or should we instead view leadership in everyday situations as simply a miniature version of heroic leadership? If we find that the heroic model doesn’t fit into everyday situations, what sorts of models do? Finally, if there are important alternative models, how should we think and teach about them?

CONCLUSIONS

In his experience teaching a course called “The Moral Leader,” Badaracco has observed that students like their leaders “cut from heroic cloth,” as do academics and the producers and consumers of popular culture. The heroic model of leadership clearly has long-lasting and universal appeal, and serves as a potent source of inspiration and belief. Yet the model appears relatively ineffective in changing people’s behavior, at least outwardly. Badaracco suggests that the model fails on at least two counts:

First, in its irrelevance to people's lives, and secondly, in its circumscribed definition and descriptions of leadership. Badaracco and the Roundtable participants maintained that a better leadership model would focus on small acts of heroism performed by ordinary people living everyday lives. The jury is still out, however, on whether the heroic model should be altogether discarded. It has existed for thousands of years, it doesn't seem to be losing steam, and it appears to be fulfilling at least one—and possibly more than one—important social function. The evidence against this quintessential model will not be conclusive until the lack of a causal relationship between this model and the ways in which people actually think and behave can be proven.

ROUNDTABLE 5:

Kim Campbell “The Culture of Power”

“[There are] suggestions that even in non-human species you have aspects of culture that have an impact on the way power is distributed in a society.”

—Kim Campbell

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

A new leadership hypothesis

While participating in the G-7 summit as Canadian prime minister, Kim Campbell was struck by the remarkable differences among the seven national leaders in attendance. This observation sparked Campbell’s thinking about who gets to lead countries and what forces allow these people rather than others to emerge as leaders. Campbell began to speculate on the existence of a “culture of power.”

Campbell has had ample opportunity to gather first-hand evidence for such a culture of power. Prior to becoming prime minister, Campbell served as Canada’s first female defense minister and minister of justice. She currently serves as chairwoman of the Council of Women World Leaders, an organization that brings together women who have led their countries in order to share and learn from their experiences.

At the fifth Roundtable on Leadership, Campbell hypothesized that a national culture of power determines who is allowed the opportunity to lead in a particular country. She had not yet begun to collect empirical evidence, but outlined some informal observations that led her to this hypothesis.

Evidence for a culture of power

Campbell began by describing the notable and enduring differences in leadership that continue to exist between Canada and the U.S. Most of the leaders in Canada since World War II, she observed, have come from the

province of Quebec, whereas U.S. leaders have come from all over the country—a fact that suggests that geographical issues and language differences have a greater influence on who is allowed to rise to national leadership in Canada. Canada’s two longest-serving prime ministers were bachelors when they took office, whereas U.S. leaders typically have a solid family

structure in place to support them when they run for national office. Religious belief and observance in a leader is much less significant in Canada than in the United States. The prime minister of Canada, on the other hand, has more effect on actual outcomes than the U.S. president, or what Campbell terms “effective” as opposed to “affective” power. Finally, political dynasties such as those that exist in the United States are not com-

Political dynasties
such as those that
exist in the United
States are not
common in Canada
—perhaps because it
is a monarchy.

mon in Canada—perhaps because it is a monarchy. Campbell speculated on whether this dynastic element is the result of a desire for continuity, a reflection of values, or simply the result of the utility of name recognition in a large, complex society.

Around the world there are obvious differences in the national cultures of power. Societies operate according to different paradigms and world-views, which are reflected in their national political systems and structures. Democracies tend to be decentralized, in direct contrast to the centralized communist model. Top-down systems of leadership involve classic hand-offs of power, as when Boris Yeltsin passed the reins to Vladimir Putin in Russia, whereas bottom-up systems allow leaders to rise through appeal to the grassroots electorate. Campaign finance laws differ substantially from one culture to another and greatly influence who has the financial means to assume national leadership. Campbell noted that the gender composition in most national legislatures and parliaments favors men, whereas gender parity has been instituted in Scotland’s parliament, suggesting that Scotland has an atypical culture of power.

Campbell also observed that critical masses of women moving into leadership positions can bring about substantial change in a particular culture of power. Members of the news media, on the other hand, appear to actively resist changes in the culture of power—due, perhaps, to the investment they have as “insiders” in the current system.

Conceptual framework and semantics

Is there an analytical framework in the concept of “a culture of power”? Campbell noted that some non-human species appear to have cultures of power as well—as seen, for example, in the differences in behavioral norms between chimpanzees and bonobos. Such animal cultures of power imply that the concept is not simply equivalent to notions of human political cultures. Campbell suggested the use of comparative analysis across countries as a possible methodological approach for testing her hypothesis—i.e., that national cultures of power determine the individuals who obtain the opportunity and power to lead.

There is very little in the current leadership literature on this precise topic, as one participant stated in response to Campbell’s presentation. An important task at the outset would be to sort out the vocabulary and semantics. The word “power” may not be best; perhaps “leadership” or “authority” would be better, as in a “culture of leadership” that encompasses the values governing who is empowered to lead. Campbell noted that there is a body of literature on culture, and specifically on political culture, that will help her to determine whether or not she is framing an entirely new concept or whether, indeed, it is a sub-set of a concept that already exists.

Context and the culture of power

One participant noted that leadership scholars tend to be obsessed with personality and to ignore the importance of context, when in reality context often proves more important in determining who assumes positions of leadership. The participant pointed to the Harvard University presidencies of Derek Bok and Neil Rudenstine as instructive examples. Bok was “fashioned” by his background to be president and expected authoriza-

tion, but he would not have been given the position if Harvard had been situated in, say, Japan. Rudenstine, on the other hand, worked his way up through university administrative hierarchies to the position of president. He would not necessarily have been given the position in an earlier era in the university's history, when experience managing a university was not a

determining factor in choosing Harvard's president.

Who gets to lead
countries, and what
forces allow these
particular people
to lead rather than
others?

As the Rudenstine example illustrates, individuals may have to change the implicit cultural expectations that define who is considered credible and capable as a leader. Campbell believes that individuals can either change the culture or, alternatively, gain an understanding of the hierarchy of values and attempt to affect those open to influ-

ence. Margaret Thatcher, former Prime Minister of Britain, serves as an example of the latter course. Thatcher adopted many of the qualities associated with British (male) leaders and proved particularly effective in deploying certain of her strengths to cancel out gender and redefine the expectations placed upon her as a woman leader. Although she didn't change the culture of power in Britain, her example exerted a salutary influence on the expectations placed on women leaders elsewhere in the world.

Campbell's quest

It is the prospect of being able to effect positive and lasting change, such as that which was inadvertently achieved by Thatcher, that appears to drive Campbell in her quest to understand the "culture of power." Campbell suspects that knowledge about individual cultures of power will enable people to pinpoint the pressure points for change, whether these reside in institutional structures, public attitudes and expectations, or cultural symbols and myths. The process of democratization and the advancement of women, Campbell suggests, may depend on it.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Kim Campbell asks: Who gets to lead countries, and what forces allow these particular people to lead (rather than others)? Is there, as she surmises, a “culture of power” in every country that determines the explicit and implicit requirements for national leadership? And is “culture of power” really the right term to capture and describe this phenomenon, or would “culture of leadership” or “culture of authority” be better?

CONCLUSIONS

Campbell has met and observed many national leaders in her positions as both Prime Minister of Canada and chairwoman of the Council of Women World Leaders. Through this experience she has acquired a substantial amount of informal evidence on the obvious and not-so-obvious differences among national leaders—differences that have struck her as meaningful as well as noteworthy. Campbell believes that these differences cannot be explained simply as variations in personalities.

Rather, she suspects that their primary cause is the existence of a “culture of power” in each country that determines who gets to lead. Putting forth a provocative hypothesis as she has, Campbell intends to pursue it more rigorously as she continues to study the literature on political culture.

ROUNDTABLE 6:

Fred Greenstein

“The Leadership Qualities of Effective Presidents: FDR to George W. Bush”

“If you had some Platonic grid, some Lego block way of putting your ideal presidency together, I guess it would be FDR’s rhetoric, Eisenhower’s organization, and Johnson’s skill.”

—Fred Greenstein

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Fred Greenstein is not interested in presidential greatness. Professor Emeritus of Politics and Director of the Research Program in Leadership Studies at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, he is, rather, interested in human beings doing a complex job under demanding conditions. This is why he studies the qualities of effective and ineffective U.S. presidents.

Presidents as public communicators

One of the presidential qualities Greenstein has spent his career studying is public communication. While written communication was more important for chief executives in the 19th century, effective oral communication has become an increasingly important element in presidential effectiveness over the course of the 20th (and now the 21st) century. In the course of his research, Greenstein has found vast differences in the ability of individual presidents to communicate.

Woodrow Wilson, for example, possessed rhetorical skill unexpected in a president at the time, which was vividly apparent in his introduction of a new tradition—the State of the Union address—when he first appeared before Congress to propose a “New Freedom” program for the country.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) surpassed Wilson by setting a new and enduring standard for public communication in his extraordinary capacity to inspire the American public during the Great Depression and

World War II. Wunderkind actor-director Orson Welles called him “the second-best actor in America.” Earlier in his political career, however, prior to becoming president, FDR wasn’t much of a communicator, and he struggled to master this skill over the ensuing decades. His wife Eleanor, for example, was struck by what a poor speaker he was when he campaigned for the New York State Senate in 1910, and testified to the obsession he displayed over the text of his Pearl Harbor speech and other public addresses he gave during his presidential tenure.

In contrast to FDR, Harry Truman never managed to improve his poor speaking ability. He relied on teleprompters and had difficulty navigating the text of a prepared speech. Truman fared better when speaking extemporaneously, but his generally flawed communication consigned him to low public approval rating (20-30 percent) for a significant portion of his presidential career.

John F. Kennedy followed a similar trajectory to that of FDR, beginning as an awkward speaker in the U.S. House of Representatives, but, through speech and coaching lessons, developing into a superlative public communicator. According to Greenstein, Kennedy also succeeded in gaining support for his programs and actions because of his partnership with speechwriter Theodore Sorenson, who composed his inaugural address, famously exhorting Americans to “ask what you can do for your country.” Whereas FDR set the standard for radio broadcasts, Kennedy was the first president to fully exploit the medium of television.

The third great presidential communicator, according to Greenstein, was Ronald Reagan, who earned a reputation as the “Teflon president” for his ability to escape sticky situations unscathed. Reagan gained valuable self-presentation skills during a successful radio and movie career, and yet, like fellow standard-setters FDR and Kennedy, was not an immediate master at the podium. He himself would wonder how anyone could be an effective president without training as an actor.

Wunderkind actor-director Orson Welles called FDR “the second-best actor in America.”

With regard to more recent U.S. presidents, Greenstein considered Bill Clinton uneven and George W. Bush poor in terms of communication. Clinton's speech after the Oklahoma City bombing was eloquent and moving, but at other times he was "off" in his communication, claimed Greenstein. Bush, on the other hand, appears to suffer from a lack of intellectual curiosity and play of mind, so that he relies on aides to summarize issues for him and enters public discourse with flimsy information about the subject at hand. Nonetheless, the rhetorical idiosyncrasies attributed to Bush in parodies on *Saturday Night Live*, for example, such as the mispronunciation of common words, are not, according to Greenstein, an accurate representation of his communication skill.

The importance of context

Greenstein considers the nexus that exists between the personal qualities of U.S. presidents and the demands of the times in which they lead to be central to their effectiveness. Presidential leadership is, in his view, contextual and multi-faceted.

As a prime example, Lyndon B. Johnson (LBJ) was naturally gifted with regard to domestic affairs but ill-equipped for foreign policy, which proved to be his undoing. Johnson possessed an unparalleled ability to master legislative provisions and assess them against votes, building the coalitions he needed and ending up on the winning side of a political battle. On the foreign front, while he skillfully involved the United States in an open-ended military intervention in Vietnam in 1965 (avoiding the controversy that would have arisen if he had made his purpose clear to the nation), the enduring effect of his decision was to enmesh the nation in a military stalemate. By 1968 there were a half-million American troops in Vietnam and the Johnson presidency was on the rocks. As Greenstein pointed out, one of LBJ's predecessors, Dwight D. Eisenhower, demonstrated considerably broader vision than Johnson when he eschewed committing military forces to the Vietnamese jungles.

More recent presidents have faced a very different context from that of Lyndon Johnson and his predecessors as a direct result of the presidential lies and misrepresentations that surfaced during the Vietnam War, and

later, throughout the investigation of the Watergate break-in. The presidency became less sequestered and more exposed as it became subject to increasingly intense media scrutiny, a scrutiny that was spawned (at least in part) by investigative journalists Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein of the *Washington Post* who broke the Watergate story. Greenstein noted that Kennedy's "hedonistic lifestyle," discovered by journalist David Halberstam in the course of conducting interviews for his book on the Kennedy Administration, *The Best and the Brightest*,⁷ was discreetly ignored rather than brought to public attention, as it surely would have been in the post-Watergate era of the 1970s and beyond. Greenstein contrasted this "discretion" with the intense spotlight focused on Bill Clinton's private life following the revelations of his sexual escapades in the Oval Office.

The emotional flaws of presidents

Clinton's sexual indiscretions are also a perfect example of the tendency of emotional flaws to undermine presidential performance. According to Greenstein, a number of presidents revealed a flawed ability to manage and channel their emotions in a manner appropriate to the symbolic and strategic importance of the office. Richard Nixon engaged in dark, devious, and paranoid activities that eventually forced him from the presidency. Lyndon Johnson demonstrated truculence, arrogance, insecurity, and intimidation of subordinates and advisors. And Jimmy Carter showed an inherent inflexibility, reinforced by his identification with his role as a born-again Christian and his early professional training as an engineer.

The importance of support systems

Greenstein believes that there is one important way in which presidents can mitigate their weaknesses and enhance their strengths—by establishing an effective support system within the White House. Richard Nixon is an example of a president who amplified his weaknesses by surrounding himself with people who intensified rather than defused his suspicion and

⁷ Greenwich, CT: Fawcett, 1973.

paranoia. George W. Bush, on the other hand, has offset his own intellectual laziness by choosing the competent Dick Cheney as his vice president and hiring highly qualified aides who keep him well informed in key policy areas.

The perfect president

Rhetoric is the outer face of the presidency, while organization is the inner face. Americans don't choose their presidents for their organization-

Rhetoric is the outer
face of the presidency,
while organization is
the inner face.

skills, but examples of disorganization such as that which characterized the Bay of Pigs fiasco and the Iran-Contra operation demonstrate the costs of failure in this arena. Eisenhower was a model president in terms of how to structure and organize the White House, whereas Kennedy

and, more so, Clinton provide examples of how not to organize the presidency.

We will never have a perfect president, according to Greenstein, but if we had one, he or she would combine Eisenhower's organizational ability, Johnson's political skill, and FDR's mastery of public communication.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Fred Greenstein's presentation raised several provocative questions. If the U.S. presidency requires consummate skill in both organization and rhetoric, how likely are there to be a multitude of qualified political candidates? And, given the electoral system, what are the odds that those candidates will actually be nominated and attain the Oval Office? If presidential leadership is so contextual and multi-faceted, are these skills—organizational and rhetorical—the ones that will serve best under *all* circumstances?

Is Lee Kuan Yew, then, correct in observing that the United States is currently on autopilot and merely needs a leader with good helpers who can run "the machine"? Are "good helpers" becoming increasingly important

as they compensate for the organizational and communication skills that a president lacks? And, finally, is there a way to manage or compensate for emotional flaws that threaten to eviscerate a president's effectiveness?

CONCLUSIONS

Greenstein made an excellent case for viewing the U.S. presidency as a complex job conducted under demanding circumstances. He provided compelling evidence for the importance of certain skills, particularly those related to communication and organization, in achieving improved presidential performance. He illuminated the strengths and weaknesses of individual 20th century presidents, arguing convincingly that the establishment of a personalized support system for each president can be immensely effective in enhancing strengths and mitigating weaknesses throughout their tenure in the White House.

ROUNDTABLE 7:

Robert Reich

“Leading When Everyone’s a Free Agent”

“It may be that there is something about formal authority that makes it not just different from leadership, but actually makes it harder to exert leadership.”

—*Robert Reich*

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

The final Roundtable on Leadership featured Robert Reich discussing his latest research and thinking on trends in the exercise of formal authority and leadership. Reich, who is Maurice B. Hexter Professor of Social and Economic Policy at Brandeis University, emphasized that he was offering not a formal hypothesis or collection of data, but rather a set of thoughts in process based on interview findings that seemed paradoxical to him. After making an informal presentation, Reich opened the floor to questions, as well as alternative explanations of his findings—a move that sparked a vigorous exchange among Reich and Roundtable participants.

The tension between leadership and authority

Reich began his presentation by describing conversations he’d had with people in high positions of formal authority who shared a common lament—that their forebears were blessed with a great deal more freedom in speech and action than were they. A university president, for example, told Reich that he enjoyed his job but that he felt unable to say what he wanted to say or to give the speeches he wanted to give, as past university presidents such as James Conant and Robert Maynard Hutchins were able to do. A foundation president expressed a desire for more freedom to say what she believes and to push the envelope as past foundation heads had done. A publisher bemoaned his inability to publish the hard-hitting material that used to be an easy sell. A network executive wished he could produce documentaries in the style of Edward Murrow and Eric Sevareid.

A CEO felt constrained from speaking out, while a politician felt tied to the polls and unable to take an unpopular stand.

Reich was struck, he said, by the cadences and wistfulness of these common laments and acknowledged that they reflect a shared nostalgia for a past that appears rosier through the distance of many decades. But he sensed that something else of significance was occurring as well. Reich cited the distinction between positions of formal authority and acts of genuine leadership as outlined in Ronald Heifetz's book, *Leadership Without Easy Answers*.⁸ Heifetz defined formal authority as the occupation of a position with a title, well-defined responsibilities, and the authorization to act accordingly. Leadership, by contrast, involves helping people to end their engagement in escapism and denial, face the realities of their lives, and deal with the specific issues standing in the way of their long-term well-being. Formal authority is not only distinct from leadership, but it also makes it more difficult to exercise leadership because of the attendant constraints it places upon speech and action. Reich posited that there is an increasing tension between formal authority and leadership in the world today.

He then posed the following question: What characterizes our current society and economy—the basic ways in which Americans have organized themselves—that can explain this increasing tension? In answering his own question, Reich returned to the literature and interviews comprising his research to find additional examples that seemed instructive. The head of the New Museum of Contemporary Art in New York, he discovered, had claimed that directing an institution today requires opportunism and the use of every occasion to cultivate contacts. The president of Bard College averred that college presidents must become beggars, flatterers, sycophants, and court jesters on behalf of their institutions. Mayors stated that an important part of their job had become courting capital and companies.

⁸ Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1994.

The penalty for leadership

Such examples led Reich to his hypothesis—which, he admitted, was based more on conjecture and inference at this juncture than on sufficient empirical evidence. He suggested that formal authorities who attempt to

exercise leadership now face a near-certain penalty in the loss of resources and authority. Reich has discovered two factors in the new economy that appear to be responsible for this penalty, factors he sets forth in his latest book, *The Future of Success*.⁹ “extreme choice” and “easy exit.” As the result of technology advances, consumers, donors, and investors now face a far greater array of options in terms of

Comfort zones effectively remove the “sandpaper” that forces individuals and groups to examine their assumptions.

products, institutions, and places to put their dollars—combined with quick-and-easy information and better deals. In addition to this “extreme choice,” people face far fewer costs in moving between options, or seeking “easy exit,” which has resulted in a private economy characterized by resources in constant, rapid motion.

Taken together, these two factors have produced a decline in loyalty to products as well as institutions and the people who lead them, and hence the disappearance of the social “glue” that gave authority figures the license to be provocative and exercise leadership. Instead, institutional and political leaders must compete much more intensely for money, attention, and constituents. They need to give people what they want and tell them what they want to hear, or face the prospect of institutional demise and career suicide. Their limited time and attention is increasingly consumed by the demands of “narrowcasting,” or courting particular sets of recipients for money or votes. In Reich’s view, this constitutes a trend away from the exercise of leadership from positions of formal authority and toward

⁹ New York: Knopf, 2001.

giving people what they want. The responsibility of formal authorities has degenerated to the level of “pandering,” rather than doing the more difficult work of helping people face the problematic situations that stand in the way of positive change.

Decline in respect for authority

Following this provocative statement, Reich opened the floor to comments and questions. Participants proceeded to offer a variety of alternative hypotheses and explanations for the trend described by Reich. Joseph Nye observed that the past decades have witnessed a general decline in the respect accorded authorities in all kinds of institutions, leading to a concomitant decline in levels of trust and the disappearance of the base of authority that had formerly protected formal leaders. Reich responded that Nye’s hypothesis dovetailed nicely with his own—that the erosion of authority has occurred because people don’t need authority anymore and don’t have to tolerate it as they were earlier required to do.

Leadership = courage

Harvard Business School Professor Rosabeth Moss Kanter argued that there is “less authority in authority” as the result of more economic checks and balances, more activist stakeholders, and more forces to which institutional leaders must pay attention in order to survive. The climate of extreme choice, combined with the uncoupling of title from power, is responsible for the observed reticence on the part of formal authorities to exercise true leadership. Kanter noted that loyalty occurred by default in the past, because people did not have extreme choices or easy exit; loyalty is now earned by leaders and institutions that behave courageously and refuse to stay within the boundaries and constraints imposed by society. Leadership now occurs in great acts of courage that involve testing the limits of what’s possible, the kind of leadership that was rarely exhibited in earlier times that demanded institutional loyalty from constituents and authority figures alike. Reich agreed that courageous institutional leadership may end up keeping people and attracting resources, but suggested that people in positions of formal authority may not realize that this kind

of leadership opportunity exists, and may in fact be subject to many deterrents operating to impede such bold acts of leadership.

“Comfort zones”

Walter Fluker hypothesized that there is a decline in prophetic leadership in the sense that institutions and their leaders are no longer needed to reassure individuals that they are okay or legitimate. Reich responded with his observation that it’s much easier for individuals today to find and remain within the confines of their comfort zones, where they can engage in denial and escapism, and avoid the unpleasant realities of life. Examples of such comfort zones are gated communities, webzines (online magazines) that cater to particular tastes and beliefs, games that create alternative universes, and communities whose members share a narrow and exclusive ideology. Reich expressed his belief that such comfort zones effectively remove the “sandpaper” that forces individuals and groups to examine their assumptions. Thus, many institutions can survive only if they focus their efforts on soliciting and keeping constituents, and risk declining membership if they provoke attention to problematic situations and challenge established beliefs and assumptions. The existence of these comfort zones in effect creates a tension between formal authority and leadership that institutional leaders ignore at their peril.

Are we beyond Reich’s trend?

David Gergen, Director of the Center for Public Leadership, adviser to four U.S. presidents, suggested that the United States may already be moving beyond the trend Reich is describing. He observed that people are so inured to pandering that they now place greater value on leaders who speak truthfully. He offered four concrete examples: The campaign of presidential candidate John McCain; the success of a particular university president in raising more money by being truthful; the distrustful public response to the tax cuts proposed by the Republican Administration; and the unmatched number of enlistments achieved by the Marine Corps when recruitment advertisements began to emphasize rather than down-

play its legendary toughness. Although interesting, this evidence offered by Gergen did not (in Reich's view) necessarily indicate support for the trend Reich had described. He responded to Gergen's point by emphasizing the distinction between an institutional leader who must maintain a resource base and a base of constituent support, as he was describing, and Gergen's examples of politicians like John McCain and Minnesota governor Jesse Ventura, who are celebrated and elected precisely because they are mavericks and anti-political leaders.

Counterexamples

The final comment came from Ira Jackson, Director of the Kennedy School's Center for Business and Government, who offered counterexamples to the trend hypothesized by Reich. Jackson pointed out that the period when exit costs were the greatest was the 1950s, a period defined not by the freedom and courage of institutional leaders, as would be expected if the hypothesis were true, but rather by extreme conformity and lack of creativity. Jackson cited evidence to support his contention that institutional authorities are exercising more compelling leadership today: The Pope of the Catholic Church has taken on the issue of reducing Third World debt. The president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Charles Vest, has made the bold move of putting course content on the Internet. Tommy Thompson, the governor of Wisconsin, has pursued a less than popular path in his reform of welfare. And Bill Ford has introduced a focus on environmental sustainability at Ford Motor Company. In light of these examples, Jackson offered a counter-hypothesis—that formal authorities gain loyalty by distinguishing their institutions and exercising leadership. Reich responded, as he had to Gergen, by making a distinction between “boldness” and Heifetz's definition of leadership as the activity involved in convincing people to face the issues standing in the way of their long-term well-being.

Formal authorities gain loyalty by distinguishing their institutions and exercising leadership.

QUESTIONS AND ISSUES

Robert Reich posed the following question: Is there an increasing tension between formal authority and leadership in the world today, and if so, what is it about our current society and economy that can explain this increasing tension? Are the two factors he identifies—the options of “extreme choice” and “easy exit” in the new economy—in fact responsible for eroding loyalty to, and hence the authority of, institutions and their leaders?

Or are there other explanations, such as those offered by Roundtable participants? Has respect for institutional authority in general been eroding for decades, as Joseph Nye believes? Do people no longer need the kiss of acceptance or legitimacy bestowed by institutions, as Walter Fluker suggests? Is loyalty in the new economy earned not by pandering to interests but rather by behaving courageously and breaking through the boundaries and constraints imposed by society, as Rosabeth Moss Kanter contends? Are people so used to pandering that they now value leaders and institutions that simply speak truthfully, as David Gergen, Director of the Center for Public Leadership, observes? Or are institutional leaders in fact gaining loyalty today by differentiating their institutions and exercising more compelling leadership, as Ira Jackson suggests?

CONCLUSIONS

Through interviews and conversations, Robert Reich has discovered that many institutional leaders believe they have less freedom than their predecessors to speak and act as they choose. Reich has generated an informal hypothesis that he admits is based more on conjecture and inference than on rigorous empirical evidence. The crux of his hypothesis is that the conditions of the new economy are making it increasingly difficult for people in positions of formal authority to exercise leadership in the Heifetzian sense—namely, in helping people to face the problematic situations that stand in the way of positive change. Several Roundtable members argued the opposite—that the new economy actually encourages formal authorities in institutions to exercise more leadership. Reich’s hypothesis, and the counter-hypotheses, remain speculative until further data is collected and analyzed.

Conclusion

The Harvard University Leadership Roundtable in the 2000-2001 academic year perhaps raised more issues and questions than it solved or answered. But according to a number of leadership scholars and educators, this is in fact what leadership is all about—posing the challenging questions, not peddling the easy or favored answers. The Roundtable demonstrated the deep and abiding interest in the topic of leadership among faculty across the university. It also confirmed within Harvard what we already know to be characteristic of the field of leadership studies in general—that no consensus exists concerning the way in which the leadership phenomenon should be defined and described and, in particular, how university faculty should research and teach it. The silver lining in this cloud of contention is the discovery that rich dialogue on leadership issues can be successfully brokered across the philosophical and disciplinary divides that characterize the broader Harvard community.

Speaker Biographies

Joseph L. Badaracco, Jr., is the John Shad Professor of Business Ethics at Harvard Business School. He teaches a second-year elective course called “The Moral Leader,” and serves as Faculty Chair for the MBA Elective Curriculum. His most recent books are *Business Ethics: Roles and Responsibilities* (Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1994); *Defining Moments: When Managers Must Choose Between Right and Right* (Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1997), and *Leading Quietly: An Unorthodox Guide to Doing the Right Thing* (Harvard Business School Press, 2002).

Kim Campbell served as Canada’s 19th, and first female, Prime Minister. She was also the first woman to serve as Canada’s Minister of Justice and Attorney General and Minister of National Defense and Veterans’ Affairs, and as Defense Minister of a NATO country. She occupied the post of Consul General of Canada in Los Angeles until recently, and was a Fellow at the Center for Public Leadership in spring 2001. During the 2001-2002 academic year, she is Visiting Professor of Practice at the Kennedy School of Government, with an office in the Center for Public Leadership. She is also a Senior Fellow of the Gorbachev Foundation of North America and Chair of the Council of Women World Leaders. She is the author of *Time and Chance: A Political Memoir of Canada’s First Woman Prime Minister* (Doubleday, 1996).

Walter E. Fluker was Visiting Professor of African-American Religious Traditions at the Harvard Divinity School during the 2000-2001 academic year. He serves as a Professor of Philosophy and Religion and the Executive Director of the Leadership Center at Morehouse College in Atlanta. His latest book is *The Stones That the Builders Rejected: Essays on Ethical Leadership from the Black Church Tradition* (Trinity Press International, 1998). He is currently working on a manuscript titled *The*

Ground Has Shifted: Visions of National Community from the African-American Christian Tradition.

Fred I. Greenstein is Professor Emeritus of Political Science and Director of the Research Program in Leadership Studies at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University. He has authored or edited eight books on the U.S. presidency, of which *The Hidden-Hand Presidency: Eisenhower as Leader* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994 , 2nd edition) and *The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to Clinton* (The Free Press, 2000) are the best-known.

Ronald A. Heifetz is Founding Director of the Center for Public Leadership at the Kennedy School of Government. He is also Lecturer in Public Policy and the developer of several courses on exercising leadership and authority, which he has taught for the past 18 years. His book, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1994) is a required text in many leadership courses across the United States. His new book, *Leadership on the Line* (Harvard Business School Press), co-authored with Marty Linsky, will be forthcoming in 2002.

Philip B. Heymann is the James Barr Ames Professor of Law at Harvard Law School and the Faculty Chair of the university-wide Project on Justice in Times of Transition. Heymann began his law career by clerking for U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Harlan, and served as Deputy U.S. Attorney General from 1993 to 1994. His last book, co-authored with W.N. Brownsberger, is *Drug Addiction and Drug Policy: The Struggle to Control Dependence* (Harvard University Press, 2001).

Robert B. Reich, formerly on the Kennedy School of Government faculty, is a University Professor and the Maurice B. Hexter Professor of Social and Economic Policy at Brandeis University's Heller Graduate School. He served as Secretary of Labor in the Clinton Administration and has

authored eight books, including his latest, titled *The Future of Success* (Knopf, 2001).

Lee Kuan Yew led Singapore's independence movement and is considered the founding father of modern Singapore. He was the founder and Secretary General of the People's Action Party, entering politics as a Legislative Assemblyman in 1955. He became his country's first Prime Minister when he led his party to victory in the Legislative Assembly elections of 1959. He continued in this position through seven successful general elections until his resignation in 1990. His predecessor promptly appointed him as Senior Minister, a post he still holds.

Selected Bibliography

What follows are selected recent publications by speakers at the 2000-2001 University Leadership Roundtable.

JOSEPH L. BADARACCO

Badaracco, J.L., Jr. 1991. *The Knowledge Link*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Badaracco, J.L., Jr. 1994. *Business Ethics: Roles and Responsibilities*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin Inc.

Badaracco, J.L., Jr. 1997. *Defining Moments: When Managers Must Choose Between Right and Right*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Badaracco, J.L., Jr. 1998. "The Discipline of Building Character." *Harvard Business Review* 76(2), March-April 1998.

Badaracco, J.L., Jr. 2002 (forthcoming). *Leading Quietly: An Unorthodox Guide to Doing the Right Thing*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Badaracco, J.L., Jr., and R.R. Ellsworth. 1993. *Leadership and the Quest for Integrity*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Badaracco, J.L., Jr., and A.P. Webb. 1995. "Business Ethics: The View from the Trenches." *California Management Review*, Winter 1995.

KIM CAMPBELL

Campbell, K. 1996. *Time and Chance: A Political Memoir of Canada's First Woman Prime Minister*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada.

Campbell, K. 2001. "Women and Leadership: Looking Back, Looking Forward." *Building Leadership Bridges 2001*. College Park, MD: The James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership.

WALTER E. FLUKER

Fluker, W.E. 1989. *They Looked for a City: A Comparative Analysis of the Ideal Community in the Thought of Howard Thurman and Martin Luther King, Jr.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Fluker, W.E. (Ed.). 1998. *The Stones That the Builders Rejected: Essays on Ethical Leadership from the Black Church Tradition.* Norcross, GA: Trinity Press International.

Fluker, W.E. (n.d). *The Ground Has Shifted: Visions of National Community from the African-American Christian Tradition.*

W.E. Fluker (Ed.). (Forthcoming). *The Sound of the Genuine: The Papers of Howard Thurman.* (3 volumes). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Tumber, C. and W.E. Fluker (Eds.). 1999. *A Strange Freedom: The Best of Howard Thurman on Religious Experience and Public Life.* Boston: Beacon Press.

FRED I. GREENSTEIN

Burke, J.P. and F.I. Greenstein. 1989. *How Presidents Test Reality: Decisions on Vietnam, 1954 and 1965.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Greenstein, F.I. (Ed.). 1989. *Leadership in the Modern Presidency.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Greenstein, F.I. and W.C. Wohlforth. (Eds.). 1994. *Cold War Endgame.* (Center of International Studies Monograph Series, Number 10). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Greenstein, F.I. 1994. *The Hidden-Hand Presidency: Eisenhower as Leader.* (2nd edition). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Greenstein, F.I. 2000. *The Presidential Difference: Leadership Style from FDR to Clinton.* New York: The Free Press.

RONALD A. HEIFETZ

Heifetz, R.A. and R.M. Sinder. 1988. "Political Leadership: Managing the Public's Problem Solving." In R.B. Reich (Ed.). *The Power of Public Ideas*. Cambridge: Ballinger, 1988; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Heifetz, R.A. 1994. *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, R.A. 1994. "Strategic Implications of Clinton's Strengths and Weaknesses." *Political Psychology* (15), December 1994.

Heifetz, R.A. and D.L. Laurie. 1997. "The Work of Leadership." *Harvard Business Review*, January-February 1997.

Heifetz, R.A. and D.L. Laurie. 1999. "Mobilizing Adaptive Work: Beyond Visionary Leadership." In Conger, Spreitzer, and Lawler (Eds.). *The Leader's Change Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heifetz, R.A. and M. Linsky. (In press). *Leadership on the Line*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

PHILIP B. HEYMANN

Heymann, P.B. 1988. *The Politics of Public Management*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Heymann, P.B. and L.M. Liebman. 1988. *The Social Responsibilities of Lawyers: Case Studies*. (University Casebook Series). New York: Foundation Press.

Heymann, P.B. 1993. *Lessons of Waco: Proposed Changes in Federal Law Enforcement* (The Waco, Texas Affair). Collingdale, PA: DIANE Publishing Co.

Heymann, P.B. 1996. "Essay: The Fate of Public Debate in the United States." *Harvard Journal on Legislation*.

Heymann, P.B. and M.H. Moore. 1996. "The Federal Role in Dealing with

Violent Street Crime: Principles, Questions, and Cautions.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 543.

Heymann, P.B. 1998. *Terrorism and America: A Commonsense Strategy for a Democratic Society*. (BCSIA Studies in International Security). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Heymann, P.B. and W.N. Brownsberger. 2001. *Drug Addiction and Drug Policy: The Struggle to Control Dependence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

LEE KUAN YEW

Lee, K.Y. 1999. *The Singapore Story: Memoirs of Lee Kuan Yew*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Lee, K.Y. 2000. *From Third World to First: The Singapore Story: 1965-2000*. New York: HarperCollins.

ROBERT B. REICH

Reich, R.B. 1988. *Tales of a New America: The Anxious Liberal's Guide to the Future*. Newbury Park, CA: Vintage Press.

Reich, R.B. Ed.. 1990. *The Power of Public Ideas*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Reich, R.B. 1991. *The Resurgent Liberal and Other Unfashionable Prophecies*. Newbury Park, CA: Vintage Press.

Reich, R.B. 1991. *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*. Newbury Park, CA: Vintage Press.

Reich, R.B. 1997. *Locked in the Cabinet*. Newbury Park, CA: Vintage Press.

Reich, R.B. 2001. *The Future of Success*. New York: Knopf.

List of Participants

FAS = Faculty of Arts & Sciences
 HBS = Harvard Business School
 HDS = Harvard Divinity School
 HGSE = Harvard Graduate School of Education
 HLS = Harvard Law School
 HMS = Harvard Medical School
 HSPH = Harvard School of Public Health
 KSG = Kennedy School of Government
 NHV = Non-Harvard Visitor

Graham Allison, KSG	Marshall Ganz, KSG
Alan Altshuler, KSG	Howard Gardner, HGSE
Arthur Applbaum, KSG	David Gergen, KSG
Geri Augusto, KSG	Peter Gibbon, HGSE
Joseph Badaracco, HBS	Patricia Graham, HGSE
Michael Beer, HBS	Fred Greenstein, NHV
Robert Behn, KSG	Richard Hackman, FAS
Warren Bennis, NHV	Ronald Heifetz, KSG
Kim Campbell, KSG	Philip Heymann, HLS
Richard Chait, HGSE	Douglas Hicks, NHV
Debashis Chatterjee, KSG	Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, FAS
John Church, NHV	Richard Hunt, FAS
Brent Coffin, HDS	Swanee Hunt, KSG
Lizabeth Cohen, FAS	Ira Jackson, KSG
Deborah Donahue-Keegan, HGSE	Spencer Johnson, NHV
Karin Dumbaugh, HSPH	Alex Jones, KSG
Mickey Edwards, KSG	Rosabeth Moss Kanter, HBS
Walter Fluker, HDS	Morton Keller, NHV
Peter Frumkin, KSG	Barbara Kellerman, KSG

Steven Kelman, KSG	Roger Porter, KSG
Christiane Lemke, FAS	Ellen Pruyne, HBS & HGSE
Christine Letts, KSG	Robert Reich, NHV
Herman “Dutch” Leonard, KSG	Louise Richardson, FAS
Martin Linsky, KSG	Robert Rotberg, KSG
Ariel Lublin, HGSE	Daniel Schneider, KSG
Jamil Mahuad, KSG	Philip Sharp, KSG
Jane Mansbridge, KSG	Miles Shore, HMS, KSG
Harvey Mansfield, FAS	Riley Sinder, KSG
Bruce Mazlish, NHV	Felicity Spector, KSG
Judith McLaughlin, HGSE	Bernard Steinberg, Harvard Hillel
Brendan Miller, KSG	Jessica Stern, KSG
John D. Montgomery, FAS	Ronald Thiemann, HDS
Mark Moore, KSG	John Thomas, KSG
Jerome T. Murphy, HGSE	Cathy Ann Trower, HGSE
Laura Nash, HDS, HBS	Scott Webster, KSG
Joseph Nye, KSG	Dean Williams, KSG
Hugh O’Doherty, KSG	Preston Williams, HDS
Thomas Patterson, KSG	Kenneth Winston, KSG
Susan Pharr, FAS	Lee Kuan Yew, NHV
	Peter Zimmerman, KSG

CONVERSATIONS ON LEADERSHIP



CENTER FOR PUBLIC LEADERSHIP

John F. Kennedy School of Government
79 JFK Street, Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138

Office Location:

124 Mt. Auburn Street, #165

Phone: (617) 496-8866

Fax: (617) 496-3337

cpl@ksg.harvard.edu

www.ksg.harvard.edu/leadership