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OVERVIEW OF NEW MEXICO FIRST

What Is New Mexico First?

New Mexico First is a major private non-profit, non-partisan public policy organization which was founded in 1986 by our two United States Senators from New Mexico, Pete Domenici and Jeff Bingaman. The purpose of the organization is to provide a forum for citizens representing all segments of the state’s population to come together, deliberate, debate and come to consensus on public policy issues vital to moving the state forward. New Mexico First is an open membership organization.

What is New Mexico First’s Mission?

New Mexico First’s mission is to effect positive change in our State. We effect change by addressing fundamental policy issues through the Town Hall consensus process, creating a statewide network of informed and caring citizens, and leading New Mexicans to take action.

How Does New Mexico First Accomplish Its Mission?

The Town Hall model was chosen and modified by New Mexico First. The Town Hall process takes three days and is designed specifically to allow the citizens in attendance to come to consensus and make direct recommendations for policy change based on the outcome of the Town Hall. To that end, the Town hall participants author their own consensus report which is published at the conclusion of the Town Hall.

What Happens To The Town Hall Report after the Town Hall?

The Town Hall report is broadly distributed to the policy makers of the state. The Town Hall participants form Implementation Teams which spend a minimum of one year and often much longer meeting with policy makers at all levels of government and with the private sector in order to achieve positive change.

The diagram on the next page illustrates the Town Hall process.
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Introduction

More than 70 participants gathered at the historic Montezuma Castle at the United World College USA near Las Vegas, New Mexico, for New Mexico First’s 30th Town Hall, on the subject: “Leading with Integrity: Advancing New Mexico.” For four days, in small groups and larger plenary sessions, the participants explored the essence of leadership and integrity and how those subjective yet essential qualities can be developed to improve the health and well-being of New Mexico’s population, economy and environment.

The spectacular setting in the hills above Las Vegas inspired the Town Hall participants, a large number of them attending their first New Mexico First Town Hall. Central to the mission of the United World College is building relationships among future generations of international leaders.

A positive and thought-provoking tone was set for the participants by New Mexico Lieutenant Governor Diane Denish, a founder and board member emerita of New Mexico First, and a panel comprising Paul Shirley, chairman and CEO of Qynergy Corporation, Roger Kennedy, author and former director of the National Park Service and the National Museum of American History, and LaDonna Harris, president of Americans for Indian Opportunity.

Why should New Mexico pay attention to leadership now?

The participants overwhelmingly agreed that New Mexico is at a crossroads. Now is the time to focus urgent attention on the development of effective, principle-centered leadership in order to address the challenges of today and to realize a positive future. The participants of the Town Hall achieved consensus on the following statements and recommendations.

New Mexico faces many challenges – social, economic and political. For years it has lingered near the bottom of many national lists that track positive attributes and at the top of lists that register deficiencies. New Mexico’s human and natural resources are at risk, reflected, for example, in the number of young people, including those who secure their degrees and education, who leave the state and do not return due to the lack of employment and professional opportunities. In addition, there is an increased disparity in income distribution within our state.

Effective, visionary leadership to protect and preserve those resources needs to be developed and/or strengthened. This new leadership must face the realities of New Mexico’s current situation and refuse to accept mediocrity.

However, the Town Hall also recognized that New Mexico is at a unique time in its history. The new leadership and cooperative attitude have infused a sense of vigor and enthusiasm based on the recognition that leadership can positively impact government, business and community arenas. The citizens of New Mexico are ready to seize the opportunity to address problems in need of immediate attention. We will nurture and increase pride in New Mexico. We will do this through improved government services, economic development and individual community success. In short, we will define ourselves as leaders within the state and on national rankings.
The Town Hall identified many assets that should be preserved to maintain New Mexico’s unique character. Four were highlighted as so essential that they must not be compromised through the lack of leadership: the cultural, historical, environmental and rural attributes that have attracted settlers, visitors and admirers to New Mexico for millennia.

Cultural diversity, including cultural retention – from the unique, sovereign status of Indian tribes to the acequia tradition brought from 15th-century Spain – sets New Mexico apart as a tolerant society that values inclusion and openness.

Equally important is New Mexico’s natural environment: a semi-arid landscape of openness, color and ecological diversity coupled with the rugged majesty of our mountain ranges.

Intertwined within these irreplaceable assets are the diverse human activities that contribute to New Mexico’s singularity: a blend of traditional ways and modern technology, the proximity of modern cities and rural communities and extensive public land access for a wide range of outdoor activities.

What is good leadership?

Many styles of leadership exist, and different situations call for different types of leadership. While the Town Hall identified numerous personal and learned characteristics of good leadership, consensus emerged around the following themes, not prioritized:

- The long run. Good leaders are not only committed to ensuring sustained leadership, but are focused on the global perspective and New Mexico’s place within it.
- Collaboration-minded. Good leaders build alliances and teams within, across and among organizations. They pull people together and encourage participation.
- Principles. Good leaders follow ethical and moral-based principles and values; they act with integrity, courage and dedication to their mission. They are trustworthy and accept accountability for their decisions and organizations.
- Vision. Good leaders share a vision of a better future and a willingness to take the risks necessary to achieve it. They inspire others to do the same. They remain focused and keep others focused on the vision.
- Role model and mentor. Good leaders lead by example and model competent, ethical behavior as standards for others. They encourage, identify and develop emerging leaders and contribute to their community.
- Passion. Good leaders are motivated to take action. They are persistent, dedicated and take personal responsibility for their decisions.
- Communication. Good leaders inform and articulate a vision that inspires others to enthusiastically pursue the group’s objectives. They are open to other people and ideas.

Where does good leadership come from?

Great leadership comes from people whose great desire, preparation and integrity intersect with society’s great desires, needs and opportunities. Leaders emerge from every type of family and socio-economic background. Today, the emphasis on collaboration has expanded the potential for leadership to many more people through the creation of teams and stakeholder groups to address community concerns and projects.

Commonly cited opportunities for developing leadership are informal relationships: families, friends, volunteer and extracurricular activities, work experience, peer groups and meaningful experiences of life. Each has its role in the development of leadership, from serving as examples to setting expectations, building high self-esteem and building social skills.

More formal vehicles for developing leadership include clubs, schools and civic and religious organizations, which demonstrate and teach the value of community. Also available are leadership organizations, career planning programs, internships, job shadowing, mentoring and formal education. The military and public safety professions are common opportunities for formal leadership development. In fact, one of New Mexico’s 17 public post-secondary
two-year schools is New Mexico Military Institute, which provides a model for developing leadership skills in the youth of New Mexico. Election to public office is an opportunity for individuals to enhance leadership skills. Unforeseen political events and personal tragedies, job changes and disasters create opportunities for people to rise to leadership. Organizations and communities can build upon the leaders who emerge in this way.

Effective methods of developing leadership include formal leadership training or curriculum and practical experiences, as well as appropriate feedback, self-reflection, understanding one’s own strengths and weaknesses, and listening.

While placing a person in a position of authority provides a base of responsibility, it does not always ensure success. Continued development of leadership skills is an important ingredient in forming an effective leader.

Many programs exist to expose potential leaders to the skills that are most useful in leading an organization or becoming a civic leader. These programs may lack coordination and formal connections that would make them more effective.

What are the incentives and disincentives to lead?

One benefit of living in New Mexico is that its relatively small population provides an opportunity to make a difference. Prominent officials and leaders are largely accessible, and leaders can quickly emerge when problems need to be resolved.

As an appealing place to live, New Mexico attracts people with a wide range of skills and experiences, who can be called upon to participate in organizations and offer innovative ideas to address issues.

The Town Hall identified incentives and disincentives for the emergence of leadership. (See table below.)

What does it mean to lead with integrity?

In addition to the qualities desired of a leader listed in the previous section, leading with integrity has distinctive qualities. It begins with intention, personal responsibility, preparation and competence: a clear sense of personal identity, capacity and values and taking action without regard to personal gain or glory. Leadership with integrity requires personal and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Disincentives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to effect positive change in community</td>
<td>Costs in time and personal stamina, stress and health consequences. It is a burden and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased visibility</td>
<td>Scrutiny and personal attacks, loss of privacy, public abuse, lack of respect. Low opinion of public officials. Media attacks and untruths must be endured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Risk / fear of failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased confidence and personal development on career path</td>
<td>Risk that failure will take you away from career path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to develop networks that result in increased financial ability</td>
<td>High cost of running for public office and loss of income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building loyalty, alliances, followers and supporters</td>
<td>Resentment from others who are not participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to people and building relationships with agencies and resources</td>
<td>Learning how to deal with bureaucracy and red tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in potential for increased earnings along with credibility and respect</td>
<td>Lack of tangible rewards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collective accountability and responsibility, which begins with reflection and results in correcting the gaps between what we say and what we do. It includes positive, value-based decision making which considers all perspectives. The ongoing cycle of leadership is summarized in diagram on Page 10.

What does it mean to follow with integrity?

Leadership requires followers. Followers must be informed and loyal. They provide support for the leader and develop their own skills to assume leadership positions as the opportunities arise. Followers participate in many ways. Perhaps the most obvious is voting, which must be encouraged at every opportunity, including time off for workers and educational activities for students. Losing followers, particularly in the electoral system, reflects an apathetic public that does not articulate issues of importance, causes leaders to miss opportunities and results in disillusionment. Followers are essential in the private and non-profit sectors as well as in the public realm. Followers are invested in the cause and work for it, trusting in their leaders' ability to direct the overall effort.

Recommendations for Advancing New Mexico through Development of Leadership with Integrity

The Town Hall recommends the following programs and actions to enhance the development of integrity-based leadership skills aimed at impacting New Mexico's critical issues.

A Center for Leadership in New Mexico

Many of the functions could be performed through collaboration among organizations that already exist or would be created to focus attention on leadership. The New Mexico First Implementation Team would have a role in identifying or creating the organization, which could carry one of these suggested names: the “Center for the Advancement of Leadership in New Mexico” or the “New Mexico Leadership Development Institute.” A specific mission with supporting objectives and tasks was enumerated as follows:

Mission: Provide leadership skills workshops and training opportunities that are accessible by New Mexicans from all regions and sectors. This includes offering life-long
leadership skills development, leadership internships and certification programs.

Objective: Provide a forum for a New Mexico-based information exchange process that examines best practices in leadership. This forum provides the opportunity to share and distribute successful leadership practices utilizing a formal and methodical systematic approach. Such an approach would include elements of assessment, planning, prioritization, implementation, evaluation and feedback. The Town Hall also acknowledges the importance of continuing to recognize and encourage ethical behavior. Programs such as “The Samaritan Counseling Center’s Ethics in Business Awards” and the “Governor’s Distinguished Public Service Awards” should be examined as potential role models for expansion.

Promotion: The institute would promote excellence in leadership with integrity and ethics in business, government and community through programs that recognize success. The organization would partner with media to market the advancement of leadership in New Mexico. It would support existing programs, encourage professional and community organizations to implement recognition programs and publish a leadership magazine for education and recognition of leaders.

Networks: The organization would identify and catalogue leadership programs that serve adults and youth with descriptions of the programs. It would establish and gather data using evaluative criteria for outcomes such as basic leadership skills, goal setting, problem solving, decision making, strategic planning, character development, parenting skills, conflict resolution, civic responsibility and role modeling. The institute would facilitate leveraging of existing programs and resources using systems alignment. The institute also would establish links with educational institutions and community programs through modern communication technologies to allow distance-learning methods that engage the broader community. These activities would develop the basis for a statewide outreach and education effort: a virtual leadership development institute.

Education: The teaching of leadership, ethics and integrity to all students at all levels of education should be integrated through curriculum and classroom management. All teachers should be prepared to exemplify and model leadership behavior for their students.

State Employee Leadership Development Programs

The governor’s office should conduct an inventory of existing state government leadership training resources and should coordinate these state programs with existing external leadership development programs, including those developed by the institute. In addition to those programs, the Town Hall recommends the following actions to promote leadership and integrity in New Mexico.

Strategic Planning

The Town Hall believes that leaders emerge to address important issues and to propose solutions. A strategic plan is a necessary catalyst to focus the efforts of New Mexico’s current and new leaders. New Mexico must restart its strategic planning efforts. The Governor’s Office should take the lead in proposing a process to create the New Mexico Strategic Plan. The plan would address the state’s most pressing problems and would provide a blueprint for strategic planning at all levels of government. The Strategic Planning Town Hall’s implementation team should re-engage the state executive and legislative branches to promote the plan. We request that the Governor’s Office include in the strategic plan for New Mexico a commitment to the leadership development of state employees, which could include re-starting and expanding the state’s public servant leadership program.

New Mexico should also consider adding evaluation criteria covering community leadership and public service to competitively awarded state contracts.

Ethical Standards and Leadership

The Town Hall recommends a partnership between citizens and government to form an Ethics Initiative Committee responsible for the following items:

• The adoption of and support for a model statewide code of ethics.

• review of existing statutes, regulations and codes and an examination of potential opportunities to determine...
whether adequate safeguards are in place to ensure ethical behavior in all branches of government.

- Recommendations for measures needed to fill any gaps, including enforcement gaps.

- Studying and considering other state models for monitoring compliance with established ethical and leadership standards.

Vote

All New Mexicans should exercise their right to vote, as this is fundamental to the democratic process. The Town Hall acknowledges that with the “Help America Vote 2002” act, positive changes are under way. These changes are supported by the Town Hall. Towards this end, the state should assist by enhanced use of electronic technologies that increase and simplify access to voters’ manuals and other election materials. Also, the concept of “vote-where-you-congregate” by expanding polling locations should be considered along with Internet voting. A curriculum to educate all students in voter and civic responsibilities should be become standard in New Mexico’s schools.

Mini Town Halls

The New Mexico First Implementation Team should consider developing a partnership with the Children’s Cabinet to conduct a pilot mini town hall that would focus on issues of importance to a community. Support for this pilot would be based on a public-private partnership.

Conclusion

New Mexico over the years has benefited from hard-working and dedicated leaders. Leadership continues to be a complex concept to define and requires different skills in different situations. Leadership requires passion, modeling ethical and moral behavior, accountability and a commitment for the common good. New Mexico is blessed with a rich multi-cultural history and a diverse and enthusiastic citizenry. It is up to all of us to encourage good leadership, become leaders ourselves and use the diversity of our state to grow new leaders for the future. This will preserve the quality of life and environment we know as the “land of enchantment.”
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DISCUSSION OUTLINE

Friday 8 a.m. – 12 noon

1. Why should New Mexico pay attention to leadership now?
   a. What are additional needs/gaps/opportunities that call for leadership in New Mexico?
   b. Leaders change things. What do you want to make certain is not changed or jeopardized by the exercise of leadership? Is there anything about the status quo that should be protected at all costs?

Friday 1:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.

2. What is good leadership?
   a. Who is someone (or even a team) you know personally who is a leader? What distinguishes the leadership?
   b. Who is someone (or a group) others think is a leader, but you do not? Why don't you consider them a leader?
   c. What are potential actions that New Mexico should take to advance leadership?

Saturday 8 a.m. – 12 noon

3. Where does good leadership come from?
   a. How are people prepared to become leaders?
      (i) What are the “vehicles” for preparing leaders? How is it done formally? Informally? Situationally?
      (ii) What has been most formative in influencing your exercise of leadership?
      (iii) When it comes to preparing someone to lead, what works? What doesn’t work?
   b. What are the incentives and disincentives to lead?
   c. What does it mean to lead with integrity?
      (i) What is your favorite story illustrating someone leading with integrity? What principals are inferred?
      (ii) What could be done to encourage people to lead with integrity?
   d. What is the responsibility of a follower?
      (i) Can you think of good examples where following made a difference?
      (ii) Can you think of negative examples where an opportunity was lost due at least in part to followers?
      (iii) What do the examples suggest could be done to encourage following that is helpful to leaders?

Continued on next page
DISCUSSION OUTLINE

Saturday 1:30 p.m. – 5 p.m.

1. How could you help the people you identified as being good leaders?

2. What could you do to make available to the community the leadership (or followership) you can offer?

3. Based on our discussions over the past day and a half and your own personal experiences, what are the four recommendations you would make to advance New Mexico?

TOWN HALL 30 ROSTER

Diane Albert — Los Alamos. Councilor, Los Alamos County, Materials Scientist at Los Alamos National Laboratories and Personal Trainer for YMCA.

Thomas Atkins — Santa Fe. President and Managing Partner, Thomas Atkins & Associates.


Elizabeth Best — Los Alamos. Chairman, Sustainability Committee, League of Women Voters Los Alamos.

Mary-Dale Bolson — Santa Fe. Cabinet Secretary, Children, Youth & Families Department.

Paul Campos — Santa Fe. County Commissioner, Santa Fe County.

Kelly Carpenter — Los Alamos. Community Development Director, Los Alamos County.

Frank Cerno — Casa Blanca. Council Representative, Pueblo of Laguna.

Amber Chavez — Albuquerque. Student, University of New Mexico.
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If you are a veteran of New Mexico First Town Halls, you’ve already figured out that something is going on. This background-document format is different from those you have received before other Town Halls.

Whether you’re an old-timer or a new-timer, we want to offer a little advice about how to read this magazine.

It is organized around six broad questions:

1) What is leadership?
2) How are people prepared to become leaders?
3) What does it mean to lead with integrity?
4) What is the responsibility of a follower?
5) Why should New Mexico pay attention to leadership now?
6) What can be done to advance New Mexico?

By the last question, we mean, how can we meet and talk about “Leading with Integrity” in a way that results in recommendations to advance New Mexico?

Everyone attending the Town Hall should read the article by Bruce Adams, the first reading in Section One. There are lots of wonderful readings, so we hope you read more than that, but at least read the piece by Adams. Then dip into whichever readings interest you.

The magazine includes quotes and quizzes and worksheets. If you do these, you will be better prepared to participate!

What is most important is that you enjoy the magazine and come to the Town Hall ready to discuss what we can do to advance New Mexico.
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Dear Town Hall Participants:

It is timely to be discussing leadership in New Mexico.

When campaigning this past year, I personally witnessed challenges that must be addressed: poverty, failing schools, inadequate healthcare and poor housing. We heard the justified frustration with bureaucratic inefficiency. We listened to the people’s yearnings for leadership and for initiative and for hope from their next governor.

As you know, we are hard at work on all of these issues. But we—government—cannot do it alone. The challenge to create good, high wage jobs while protecting our state’s precious natural resources must be done with private business. If New Mexico is to inherit a different future, it will require talents from all sectors—public, private, non-profit, foundations, media, churches, synagogues and mosques.

As I said in my inaugural address, the campaign is over. Now’s the time for the energy, commitment and leadership. You demonstrate that commitment by participating in one of New Mexico’s real treasures—a New Mexico First Town Hall. Come together and imagine what can be done to grow the leadership we deserve and to support the wonderful leaders we already have.

I wish you a rich and successful discussion.

Governor Bill Richardson
You have lots of people who have power and lots of people who have ideas, but almost never in the same room. The people who have power are too busy to learn anything and the people who have ideas are too busy to get power. The result is that you have uninformed power and irrelevant ideas.

Newt Gingrich, Wilson Quarterly Winter 2000

Paul Krugman, a Princeton professor writing in the New York Times Magazine (Oct. 20, 2002), said in the United States today we are “living in a new Gilded Age, as extravagant as the original.” His argument is that “the New Deal imposed norms of relative equality in pay that...[created] a broadly middle-class society. ... What happened in the 1980s and 1990s was that those norms unraveled, replaced by an ethos of ‘anything goes.’ ” Executives were not paid lavishly 30 years ago — “fear of outrage kept executive salaries in check. Now the outrage is gone.” “Since the 1980s there has been ever more emphasis on the importance of ‘leadership’ – meaning personal, charismatic leadership... ...once it was considered normal, even necessary for a CEO to be famous, it also became easier to make him rich.”

You have lots of people who have power and lots of people who have ideas, but almost never in the same room. The people who have power are too busy to learn anything and the people who have ideas are too busy to get power. The result is that you have uninformed power and irrelevant ideas.

Newt Gingrich, Wilson Quarterly Winter 2000

Drawing upon his many experiences in the White House, David Gergen, advisor to many presidents, offers seven key lessons for leaders of the future. What they must have, he says, are: inner mastery; a central, compelling purpose rooted in moral values; a capacity to persuade; skills in working within the system; a fast start; a strong, effective team; and a passion that inspires others to keep the flame alive.

Eyewitness to Power: The Essence of Leadership Nixon to Clinton

Of the best rulers, the people only know that they exist; the next best they love and praise. The next they fear; and the next they revile. When they do not command the people’s faith, some will lose faith in them, and then they resort to oaths! But of the best when their task is accomplished, their work done, the people all remark, “We have done it ourselves.”

La-Tzu

All of the great leaders have had one characteristic in common: It was the willingness to confront unequivocally the major anxiety of their people in their time.

John Kenneth Galbraith U.S. Economist
Section 1
What is Leadership?

READINGS

‘Who Said It’ quiz?

Bruce Adams — Leadership For Change

Dee Hock — The Art of Chaordic Leadership

Rosabeth Moss Kanter — The Enduring Skills of Change Leaders

Ronald A. Heifitz & Riley M. Sinder — Political Leadership: Managing the Public’s Problem Solving
Put the letter of “who said it” in the space provided. The correct answers are below. (We know you have the character to not look at the answers until you are done!)

1. _____ A leader is a dealer in hope.
2. _____ Every generation needs a new revolution.
3. _____ He who has never learned to obey cannot be a good commander.
4. _____ If the blind lead the blind, both shall fall in the ditch.
5. _____ Great leaders are almost always great simplifiers, who can cut through argument, debate, and doubt to offer a solution everybody can understand.
6. _____ Men make history and not the other way around. In periods where there is no leadership, society stands still. Progress occurs when courageous, skillful leaders seize the opportunity to change things for the better.
7. _____ You cannot be a leader, and ask others to follow you, unless you know how to follow, too.
8. _____ The very essence of leadership is [that] you have a vision. It’s got to be a vision you articulate clearly and forcefully on every occasion. You can’t blow an uncertain trumpet.
9. _____ Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man’s character, give him power.
10. _____ If you tell the truth you don’t have to remember anything.
11. _____ I am a leader by default, only because nature does not allow a vacuum.
12. _____ Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men.
13. _____ It’s hard to lead a cavalry charge if you think you look funny on a horse.
14. _____ Inventories can be managed, but people must be led.

ANSWERS
a) Mark Twain
b) H. Ross Perot
c) Napoleon Bonaparte
d) Colin Powell
e) Sam Rayburn
f) Adlai Stevenson
g) Thomas Jefferson
h) Abraham Lincoln
i) Harry Truman
j) Jesus Christ
k) Rev. Theodore Hesburgh
l) Bishop Desmond Tutu
m) Lord Acton
n) Aristotle
Leading with Integrity

By Bruce Adams

The leadership challenge

Leadership is not an act limited to presidents and generals or even mayors and legislators. The traditional portrayal of heroic leaders distracts us from a clear understanding that the health and strength of our communities rests with the development of broad-based community leadership. In a healthy society, leadership is exercised by countless individuals and groups at all levels of government and in all sectors of society. Our democratic system is built on a foundation of community leadership.

Americans have long had a love/hate relationship with power, politics, and leadership. Ever since King George III, Americans have been wary of leaders, yet have longed for creative and effective leadership. Political scientist Thomas E. Cronin notes the paradoxes that lie at the heart of our understanding of the leadership challenge. We want, Cronin says, leaders who are independent and uncompromising — and who get things done. The reality, of course, is that to get things done one must often compromise. The public's image of a leader as strong, independent, outspoken, and uncompromising is increasingly at odds with the qualities leaders need to be effective in our complex and diverse world. More and more, the table-pounding, do-it-now leader finds that no amount of pounding will make things happen.

Americans are tough on leaders. What author John Steinbeck said of our presidents, we might say of public leaders generally: “We abuse him often and rarely praise him. We wear him out, use him up, eat him up... and we exercise the right to destroy him.” We give our leaders little room to lead. We criticize them for pandering to the public, but at the same time we demand that they do.

Many people still wonder aloud, “Where have all the great leaders gone?” This despite the fact that there are examples of great leadership in every community across our country — building partnerships to serve the homeless, turning around previously neglected downtowns, bringing arts to children who might not otherwise have the opportunity to be inspired by elegance.

Americans like to roll up their sleeves and solve problems. The leadership challenge is not that kind of problem. No stirring speech, no major law, no 14-point plan will “solve” the leadership dilemma. We cannot hold out hope for a wonder drug as we might in the fight against a disease. Making headway requires subtle but significant changes in the attitudes of millions of Americans over a long period of time.

To understand the leadership challenges and opportunities of today, we have to work hard to get past the exclusive vision of heroic presidents and prime ministers, generals and athletes that is drummed into our heads in elementary school. In community after community across the country, we need to build a new leadership culture based on inclusion, trusteeship, and collaboration.

Old and new ways of thinking about leadership

Leadership Theory in 1,000 Words or Less

Leadership is a much talked-about but little understood phenomenon. Enormous amounts of material have been written about it. Libraries are stuffed with volumes on it. Leadership scholar Joseph C. Rost, after poring over 587 books and articles written on leadership this century, concludes that leadership scholars and practitioners of leadership are no more sure of what leadership is today than they were 60 years ago. It is no wonder that community activists often find it a bewildering concept.

The theories and definitions of leadership are too numerous and too arcane to interest any but the most avid students of the topic. Just a few should suffice to suggest the range of views:

- Leaders are forceful advocates and initiators of social change.
- Leaders help people clarify choices.
- Leaders interact with followers to solve problems.

The leadership question is as old as scholarship. All of the great political philosophers since Socrates have wrestled with it — from Plato and Aristotle, to Machiavelli, and...
on into modern times. Leadership was at the core of the conversations among Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison as they invented our country.

Perhaps the most well-known school of thought focuses on the great person theory of leadership. According to this theory, leadership is explained by qualities of personality and character. The skills and courage of great leaders can change the course of history. The superior qualities of charismatic leaders — George Washington and Abraham Lincoln, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Martin Luther King, Jr. — allowed them to rise from the pack and drive the wheels of history.

The chief rival in the literature to the great person theory of leadership suggests that the great leader emerges from situations — time, place, and circumstances create environments for leadership. Times of crisis, stress, and change — American Revolution, Civil War, Depression, and World War II — draw out great leaders. The wave of history, not individuals, is what really matters.

More recently, theorists have recognized that the factors of personality and situation interact. A more comprehensive and realistic understanding of leadership has begun to emerge. The limitations of the exclusive theories became clear — the great leader can be blocked by an intransigent interest group or the situation cries out for leadership that never emerges. “Political leadership,” according to James MacGregor Burns in his treatise Leadership, “is a product of personal drives, social influences, political motivations, job skills, the structure of career possibilities... Leadership is fired in the forge of ambition and opportunity.”

A debate rages among theorists over the role of leaders and followers and the interaction between the two. James MacGregor Burns has helped to resolve this debate by describing what he calls “webs of collective leadership.” According to Burns: “To see leadership as interplay among a collectivity of initiators, partners, opponents, and passives, rather than simply a division between leaders and followers, may open up new possibilities for understanding moral and ethical aspects of change.”

Scholar and theologian Cornell West, in his book Race Matters, speaks directly to the nation’s leadership challenge: “Quality leadership is neither the product of one great individual nor the result of odd historical accidents. Rather, it comes from deeply bred traditions and communities that shape and mold talented and gifted persons. Without a vibrant tradition of resistance passed on to new generations, there can be no nurturing of a collective and critical consciousness — only professional conscientiousness survives. Where there is no vital community to hold up precious ethical and religious ideals, there can be no coming to a moral commitment — only personal accomplishment is applauded.”

“Leadership for what?” asks many students of leadership. Leadership scholar Burns contrasts transactional and transforming leadership. Transactional leadership involves a series of exchanges in the classic “you-do-this-for-me and I’ll-do-that-for-you school of politics.” A deal between the automobile manufacturers and the auto workers might not, however, represent the broader public interests of consumers and environmentalists. Transforming leadership raises both leaders and constituents to higher and higher levels of motivation and morality in pursuit of the common good.

The new realities of 21st century leadership

The old theories of leadership developed for the industrial era seem increasingly irrelevant to the challenges of 21st century leadership. Top down leadership made sense in a manufacturing based economy. It makes far less sense in the information age. Bureaucracies have flattened. Information flows faster and further. More responsibility has been pushed lower down the governmental food chain. Citizens know more and are less content to defer to business and political bosses. Our communities are increasingly diverse.

The fundamental shift of our time, according to Douglas Henton of Collaborative Economics, is “from the centralized, vertically integrated model of business and government dominant in the New Deal and Cold War eras toward a more decentralized, horizontal, and networked regional model.”

William R. Dodge, Executive Director of the National Association of Regional Councils, points out the serious mismatch between how we live our lives and the way our governments are organized to serve us. According to Dodge, we live our lives at the...
global, regional, and neighborhood levels. Our governments are organized at the national, state, and local levels. There is a disconnect at every level.

It is not enough to reinvent government. Our task is to reinvent community. Bill Bradley, former United States Senator, has spoken eloquently on the need to build a strong community based movement across America. Traditionally, reformers have focused their attention on business and government. Bradley describes our democratic experiment as a three legged stool. The private market leg is long and well developed as is the government leg. But the civic leg is short and less developed. “Without the third leg of civil society,” Bradley explains, “the stool is not stable and cannot provide support for a vital America.”

Of course, our democratic process is more organic than a stool, but Bradley’s point is sound. Twenty-first century leadership places responsibility directly on the shoulders of individual citizens. The government continues to have a substantial role, but our success in strengthening our civic capacity and stabilizing our democracy rests with us. A more positive civic culture could engage more citizens in the task of community building. We should not expect the politicians on the inside to lead in this essential effort. As journalist Neal Peirce has said, “If you don’t have courage on the outside, don’t expect courage on the inside.”

If we have a limited, Mt. Rushmore vision of leadership, we are robbing the nation of the great bulk of its potential leaders. If we believe General George S. Patton, Jr. should be our model for leadership, few need apply. We need to envision a democratic leadership — with hundreds of thousands of leaders at all levels of government and in all segments of society — capable of invigorating our civic culture.

### Why things don’t work better

Why does it often seem that getting something done is harder and takes longer than it should? Community leadership in a totally different social, economic, and technological age is more complex than in the past. Journalists, interest groups, and politicians have done much to fuel public cynicism and make effective community leadership difficult. The negative cumulative effect of these forces creates a vicious cycle that undermines healthy communities. Our ability to frustrate each other and tie the political process in knots has increased dramatically in recent decades. Conflict and righteous indignation can be healthy, but exaggerated conflict for the sake of conflict can tear a community apart.

Conflict and controversy sell newspapers and attract viewers. In many communities, gotcha journalism reigns. All too often, our journalism emphasizes personality over policy, conflict over consensus, strategy and sensation over substance, and error over achievement. Instead of illuminating community convergence, news accounts too often polarize difficult situations.

The notion that the public interest will emerge from a healthy clash of interest groups has been a false hope. Organizational imperatives lead interest groups to overstate their criticisms, adding to the overheated political rhetoric of our times. By zapping the emotions of those at the extremes of the ideological spectrum, interest groups polarize and paralyze the political process, fueling negative public attitudes.

In this atmosphere, it is not surprising that politicians seeking elective office play to the worst aspects of these negative public attitudes. As our political rhetoric becomes more simplistic, our community problems become more intransigent. Each extreme political statement is topped by the next.
escalating the rhetoric and further debasing the political process. Too often, in this environment, what candidates feel they have to say to get elected, directly conflicts with what they need to do to govern effectively in the public interest.

The problem is not that nothing is working. The problem is that reading the morning paper and watching the nightly news makes it seem that nothing is working. In fact, there is considerable reason for hope. While our interest groups have tied our politics in knots, techniques for collaborative problem solving based on a commitment to the common interest are emerging. David Chrislip and Carl Larson have documented how community leaders using collaborative practices are making a positive difference in communities across the country. According to Chrislip and Larson: “In every arena, there is a powerful drive to overcome gridlock and to allow the broader interests of the organization or community to prevail over the parochial interests that currently dominate efforts to renew and change.”

Organizational development expert Peter Vaill describes the challenge facing leaders as like being in permanent white water with unexpected things happening on a regular basis. Vaill says: “This means that beyond all of the other new skills and attitudes that permanent white water requires, people have to be (or become) extremely effective learners.”

John McKnight and John Kretzmann have developed a tool kit for community builders that encourages local leaders to focus not on a community’s problems but on its assets. It begins with a “capacity inventory” to show the community it has far more going for it than it ever imagined. Building relationships and organizing collaborations are the next steps in an asset based community development strategy.

Joan Walsh has reported for the Rockefeller Foundation on the growing community building movement across the country. Community building, according to Walsh, “rejects a programmatic approach to poverty, in favor of efforts that catalyze personal relationships and social networks to improve community life. Community building initiatives are therefore diverse and locally tailored.” Ralph Smith of the Annie E. Casey Foundation notes that “this work is possible, and crucial — and far more difficult than we talk like it is.”

Community journalism has developed a following in recent years in response to the public’s dismay over the negative approach of the mainstream press. Community journalism — many think it should be called simply “good journalism” — is an attempt on the part of the media to report the news in ways that help engage the public in public life. The community journalist’s work helps to ensure a vibrant community culture. It is not enough to publish a six-part series on some important public topic. According to New York University’s Jay Rosen, “a public requires more than that. As soon as we get journalists interested in what the ‘something more’ was, we were on our way.”

Foundations of Community Leadership

In the opening scene of Winnie-the-Pooh, Christopher Robin drags Winnie down the stairs behind him, “bump, bump, bump on the back of his head... It is, as far as he knows, the only way of coming downstairs, but sometimes he feels there really is another way, if only he could stop bumping for a moment and think of it.”

Many communities are just like Winnie. They know there must be a better way, but they just don’t have the will or the inclination to figure it out and make the needed changes. They just keep bump, bumping along.

There is a better way. The communities that find it and work hard at it are the communities that are going to flourish in the 21st century. Strong, healthy communities have three leadership attributes as the foundation of their success:

- **INCLUSION.** Healthy communities involve the full diversity of the community in their work.
- **TRUSTEESHIP.** Healthy communities place a high value on service in the broad public interest.
- **COLLABORATION.** Healthy communities work together.

Inclusion: A Regional Council of Everybody — The old way of making major decisions about a community’s future was pretty simple — a small circle of usually all-white business and political power brokers would meet behind closed doors and decide
where economic revitalization would take place, where the roads would go, and who would get the contracts. It was efficient, and implementation usually was prompt. But it wasn’t very democratic, and, now, it doesn’t even work. Citizens have access to the information needed to form their own opinions. In the fast-paced and diverse global marketplace of today, clashing interest groups tie communities in knots. In most places, the result is a political gridlock that blocks action for the long term public interest.

Looking at the vast complexity of decision-making in our communities today, former National Civic League president John Parr has suggested: “to make things happen, you need a regional council of everybody.” As Parr explains: “No successful initiative can be undertaken without consulting others; and no program can flourish without the understanding and acceptance of many groups.” According to Suzanne W. Morse of the Pew Partnership for Civic Change: “No longer is it desirable or even practical to build leadership pyramids — those closed, hierarchical structures of traditional organizational charts. Rather the task facing organizations and communities is to build leadership plazas — open and inviting places that draw together a diverse citizenry.”

The table must get larger and rounder to be able to break political gridlocks and take action in the public interest, according to Neal Peirce and Curtis Johnson in Boundary Crossers: Community Leadership for a Global Age. “As democratic expectations rise, as America becomes ever more multi-cultural, the early 21st century is guaranteed to see demands for bringing multiple groups of the disenfranchised and the merely-not-noticed into leadership circles,” write Peirce and Johnson. “The trick will be to maintain the interest and commitment of traditional business and civic forces, even while new voices are heard and power broadens. Communities appear to function best when each sector is strong — and learning to pay attention to others and collaborate.”

**Trusteeship: Servant Leadership** — “The heart of community leadership is trusteeship,” according to the National Association for Community Leadership. When the young French philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville visited America in the first half of the nineteenth century, he was most struck by our propensity to organize community based associations to deal with every manner of public problem. It is on this legacy of volunteerism and community service that our notion of trusteeship rests.

Too often today the missing ingredient in leadership is trust. Skepticism, suspicion, and corruption undermine trust. In many relationships and in many communities, it takes time to build enough trust to allow fruitful community collaboration.

Community trusteeship expands the caring we have for family and friends to the community as a whole. We cannot have a healthy political process when everyone is preoccupied with self-interest. The new style community leader must have a spirit of involving people based on a motivation of public service rather than self-aggrandizement.

**What is Community?**

Traditionally, the word community has referred to an interdependent group of people who live in close proximity to one another and rely on each other to provide essential goods and services. This is how villages, our original ideal of community leadership, were formed.

Just as the ideal has changed over time, so has the definition of community. With evolving communication technologies, community no longer requires geographic proximity.

We have virtual communities.

People belong to many communities, including the neighborhoods where they live, their city and county, their state and region. And they are members of a community at work, in their family, in cyberspace, at their place of worship, and in their organizations from the PTA to Crime Watch. All of these communities depend on the trusteeship of their members for effective leadership. An important step toward effective leadership is recognizing all the communities to which one belongs.
According to the National Association for Community Leadership, community trusteeship requires holding the entire community in trust. It requires us to take responsibility for acting on behalf of the community’s common good. It means serving as a good steward, protecting and enhancing community resources as a legacy for the future.

Becoming a community trustee is not a specific skill to be mastered like fundraising or press relations. It is the acceptance and active pursuit of a new way of interacting with community. It means consciously seeking a wider community awareness and taking the personal risk of trying to see things as a whole.

The notion of community trusteeship is most powerfully developed in Robert K. Greenleaf’s important essay, “The Servant as Leader.” Greenleaf explains that his idea came out of reading Herman Hesse’s Journey to the East. In the story, Leo accompanies a band of men on a journey. Leo is their servant, doing menial chores, but also sustaining the group with his spirit and song. When Leo disappears, the group falls into disarray and abandons the journey. Years later, the story’s narrator finds that Leo, whom he had known as servant, was in fact the great and noble leader of the Order that had sponsored the original journey. Greenleaf explains: “To me, the story clearly says — the great leader is seen as servant first, and that simple fact is the key to his greatness.”

To be a servant leader requires certain skills not always associated with the old model of leadership — the ability to listen, the capacity to facilitate a discussion, the ability to avoid taking sides prematurely, the ability to admit you don’t have all the answers, the patience to avoid quick answers, humility, the willingness to let others take credit, a capacity to take criticism and blame, an ability to think out loud creatively, and the willingness to compromise. These are not the skills we tend to reward with our votes for public office, but they are the essential leadership skills of our time.

Collaboration — Too many communities still play politics as a zero sum game. If the city wins, the suburbs lose. If business interests win, environmentalists lose. If whites win, blacks and Latinos lose. This tired, outdated interest group model of parochial politics is being rejected by successful regions across the country and around the world.

Today, in these communities, diverse segments and sectors of the community are working together in new patterns of collaboration and partnership. Real progress has been made in answering Harlan Cleveland’s classic question: “How do you get everyone in on the act and still get anything done?”

According to David Chrislip and Carl Larson: “There is a fundamental premise — we call it the collaborative premise — that undergirds these efforts: there is a belief that if you bring the appropriate people together

### Ten Lessons for Community Builders

In Boundary Crossers: Community Leadership for a Global Age, Neal Peirce and Curtis Johnson vividly describe the complex leadership challenges that face communities as we enter the 21st century. From their study of successful regions around the country, Peirce and Johnson have developed ten important lessons for 21st century community builders:

**Lesson 1: The table gets larger — and rounder.** The old style top-down management style doesn’t work much any more. We are in a transition to a new leadership culture where citizens insist on having a place at the table.

**Lesson 2: The only thing more challenging than a crisis may be its absence.** Complacency may lead to unattended problems. Smart cities solve problems before they loom large.

**Lesson 3: The agenda gets tougher.** Revitalization of downtowns is easy compared to the more difficult work of improving the lives of people caught in cycles of poverty and hopelessness.

**Lesson 4: There is no magical leadership structure — just people and relationships.** More than governance structure, it is relationships between people that gets things done.
in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the shared concerns of the organization or community.

According to Peter M. Senge: “We often forget that great teams rarely start off as great. Usually, they start as a group of individuals. It takes time to develop the knowledge of working as a whole, just as it takes time to develop knowledge of walking or riding a bicycle. In other words, great teams are learning organizations — groups of people who, over time, enhance their capacity to create what they truly desire to create.”

The key is to get people talking and working together across the boundary lines that traditionally divide and diminish a community — the lines of race and income, sector and ideology, jurisdiction and politics. People from government, business, unions, ethnic groups, and neighborhoods usually have little experience in talking with each other, much less collaborating.

Building healthy communities is less about government structure and more about building relationships. Relationship building across boundaries and barriers is the key to breaking political gridlocks and being able to take action in the public interest. According to “Connecting Citizens and Their Government,” a report from the National League of Cities: “A challenge for local elected officials is to begin to redefine their role in the community, as well as the role of government, and to recognize that success in local politics today often requires new approaches to community problem-solving.”

Our natural tendency is to spend time with people who think and act pretty much the way we do. Relationship building across traditional boundaries is by definition an unnatural act. It has to be learned. It requires constant, hard work. Success occurs in communities where there is communication, coordination, and collaborative action by many entities, institutions, organizations, agencies, and individuals. On specific issues, successful communities have the ability to see the connections and act on them.

“The harder we work, the luckier we get.” That seems to be the wisdom of a report by The Harwood Group on the projects of the Pew Partnership for Civic Change. The Pew Partners used “luck,” “fate,” “perfect timing,” and “miracle” in describing their successes. The Harwood Group explained: “the Pew Partners were not talking about their collaborations as a sequence of random happenstance; instead, these collaborations literally made their own magic. They sometimes, even often, did not set out intentionally to create the right conditions for such magic to occur; but, in retrospect, they could identify what made it happen. We call the ability to create such magic through your own actions planned serendipity.” According to The Harwood Group, this planned serendipity comes with strong leadership, appropriate community timing, and ideas that capture}

Ten Lessons, continued

Lesson 5: No one’s excused. Universities, professions, faith communities, and the media are top candidates to enrich the community leadership mix.

Lesson 6: Sometimes the old ways still work. Individual leaders still can make things happen. Respect and welcome civic-minded leaders who can make a difference.

Lesson 7: Collaboration is messy, frustrating and indispensable. Today, cities and regions are fumbling toward collaboration, making mistakes, and beginning to form new, inclusive institutions that can solve problems and strengthen communities.

Lesson 8: Government always needs reforming, but all the reforms need government. Governments are playing new roles as civic bridge-builders. In all its myriad forms and despite all its inefficiencies and shortcomings, government is still an essential partner for real, lasting, long term change.

Lesson 9: Place matters. Despite the Internet, place still matters. The places that matter the most today are regions, center cities, and neighborhoods.

Lesson 10: It’s never over. No success is ever final. No community, no matter how successful, can ever rest on its laurels.
the public’s imagination.

"We do not say that a person who takes no interest in politics is one who minds his own business; we say that he has no business here at all."

Pericles, Funeral Oration

The point of collaborative leadership is not to try to abolish conflict. A healthy community acknowledges conflict and resolves it. The problem is not that we have conflict. The problem is that we often manufacture conflict and exaggerate differences. For some it is sport. For some it is a way of earning a living. But for citizens, the political gridlock that results is a bad deal. So, disagree, but don’t tear the community apart as you do.

What are we prepared to do?

“Public life is like air,” according to Kettering Foundation president David Mathews. “We all depend upon it, but no one worries about it until it goes bad.”

How we think about community leadership and civic responsibility affects the kind of political and community leaders we get. Each community needs a fundamentally new way of thinking about how it does its public business. Each community needs to make a commitment to build a new community leadership culture based on inclusion, trusteeship, and collaboration. A different, more positive political culture will attract more positive, public spirited citizens to community life.

“Instead of looking for saviors, we should be calling for leadership that will challenge us to face problems for which there are no simple, painless solutions — problems that require us to learn new ways,” according to Harvard University leadership scholar Ronald A. Heifetz. “Making progress on these problems demands not just someone who provides answers from on high but changes in our attitudes, behavior, and values... We need to reconceive and revitalize our civic life and the meaning of citizenship.”

Daniel Kemmis, the former mayor of Missoula, Montana, says it was a sense of personal responsibility for something larger than ourselves that was the key to the extraordinary success of the Athenian democracy. The Athenians disagreed fiercely about all kinds of issues, both domestic and foreign, according to Kemmis. “Democracy took root in Athens because, on most issues, citizens taught themselves to act and speak ‘as if they cared more about Athens than they cared about winning.’”

The pledge taken by the young people of Athens on becoming citizens more than 2,000 years ago speaks directly to the leadership challenge of our time: “… in all these ways we will transmit this City, not only not less, but greater and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us.”

Community building is not a spectator sport. Nothing could do more to invigorate community and political life in America than to have tens of thousands of community leaders across the nation take the pledge the young people of Athens took upon becoming citizens to transmit their city to the next generation greater and more beautiful than it was transmitted to them.

Restoring hope and building stronger communities takes a lot more than talk. It takes the civic will of hard work. Learning to work together across the boundaries and barriers that divide us is the essential leadership task of the 21st century. In The Quickening of America, Francis Moore Lappé and Paul Martin Du Bois observe: “Across virtually every dimension of our society — from the classroom to the community, from the workplace to city hall — Americans are giving shape to a profound new understanding of the role of everyday people in solving public problems.”

We all have the capacity to make a contribution to the leadership of our communities. We all have and we all should. “You don’t need an elevated position or a title of great importance to assume a leadership role,” explains Larraine R. Matusak, the former director of the Kellogg National Fellowship/Leadership Program. “You do need to discover your own passion and to fit leadership opportunities to your specific talents.”

◆

A Starfish

A woman walking along the beach comes upon thousands of starfish washed up in a storm stranded and dying. One by one, the woman picks up the starfish and tosses them back into the ocean. A passer-by stops and asks, “Why are you doing this? There are thousands of starfish on the beach. You’ll only get to a few. You couldn’t possibly make a difference.”

The woman smiles, picks up another, and tosses it into the ocean. “Made a difference to that one.”
There was a time a few years back when for one brief moment the essence of leadership was crystal clear to me. Strangely, it was after leaving Visa and moving to a small, isolated ranch for a life of study and contemplation, raising a few cattle. I was attending to chores in the barn, comfortable and secure from the wind howling about the eaves and the roar of torrential rain on the tin roof. Through the din, I became aware of the faint, persistent bellowing of one of the cows. Awareness gradually rose that the bellowing was unusual.

Flashlight in hand, I plunged into the storm and worked my way across the pasture in the direction of the sound. On the far side, in the circle of light from the flash, I could make out Eunice, the huge, one-horned mother cow. Sheltered in the corral to await the imminent birth of her calf, she had somehow gotten out and sought a private place to give birth — unfortunately, on the brink of a steep bank fifteen feet above a flooded creek which raged through a ravine choked with poison oak and wild blackberry vines.

I raced to the spot and saw from trampled ground and smashed bushes what had happened. She had given birth. The calf, struggling to gain its feet, had slipped over the edge and plunged down the bank into the creek, then desperately tried to climb the sheer bank to get free of the water. Eunice had done all that she could, racing up and down the bank, bellowing and searching in vain for a way down. By the time I responded to her cries, the calf had been swept downstream beneath tangled vines and brambles.

Grabbing at limbs and bushes, I half fell, half stumbled down the sheer bank into the creek. Pushed by the rushing, icy water, I worked my way under and through the thickets and brambles. In a bend of the creek a hundred feet downstream, I spotted the exhausted calf fighting to keep its head above water. By the time I arrived, it had given up and was submerged. I pulled it onto a shelf of rocks beneath the mass of tangled growth and began pumping its ribs trying to eject water and assist its breathing. It was a magnificent, dark-red, bull calf, the hair on its flank a mass of curls, its soft hoofs torn and bleeding from efforts to climb the bank. It revived a little and began to kick and struggle. Pocketing the flashlight I managed to heave it across my shoulders and began a struggle upstream to the place where I had entered, and might have a chance to climb out.

What does a one-horned mother cow have to do with leadership? The answer requires a bit of reflection. Let’s begin with a few words about words. Words are only secondarily the means by which we communicate; they’re primarily the means by which we think. One can scarcely think or talk of organizations or management these days without coming across what leading thinkers from many disciplines believe will be the principal science of the next century: the understanding of autocatalytic, nonlinear, complex, adaptive systems, usually referred to as “complexity.” The word is much too vague to describe such systems. After searching various lexicons in vain for a more suitable word, it seemed simpler to construct one. Since such systems, perhaps even life itself, are believed to arise and thrive on the edge of chaos with just enough order to give them pattern, I borrowed the first syllable of each, combined them and chaord (kayord) emerged.

By chaord, I mean any self-organizing, self-governing, adaptive, nonlinear, complex organism, organization, community or system, whether physical, biological or social, the behavior of which harmoniously blends characteristics of both chaos and order. Loosely translated to business, it can be thought of as an organization that harmoniously blends characteristics of competition and cooperation; or from the perspective of education, an organization that seamlessly blends theoretical and experiential learning. As I learned from the formation and operation of Visa, an early archetype of such organizations, they require a much different consciousness about the leader/follower dichotomy.
On Chaordic Leadership

Many convictions about leadership have served me well over the years. Although each of these few examples could benefit from pages of explication, a few words may provide insight to chaordic leadership.

- **Power**: True power is never used. If you use power, you never really had it.

- **Human Relations**: First, last, and only principle — when dealing with subordinates, repeat silently to yourself, “You are as great to you as I am to me, therefore, we are equal.” When dealing with superiors, repeat silently to yourself, “I am as great to me as you are to you, therefore we are equal.”

- **Criticism**: Active critics are a great asset. Without the slightest expenditure of time or effort, we have our weakness and error made apparent and alternatives proposed. We need only listen carefully, dismiss that which arises from ignorance, ignore that which arises from envy or malice, and embrace that which has merit.

- **Compensation**: Money motivates neither the best people, nor the best in people. It can rent the body and influence the mind but it cannot touch the heart or move the spirit; that is reserved for belief, principle, and ethics.

- **Ego, Envy, Avarice, and Ambition**: Four beasts that inevitably devour their keeper. Harbor them at your peril, for although you expect to ride on their back, you will end up in their belly.

- **Position**: Subordinates may owe a measure of obedience by virtue of your position, but they owe no respect save that which you earn by your daily conduct. Without their respect, your authority is destructive.
purpose, values and beliefs to emerge and
be transmitted. A true leader’s behavior is
induced by the behavior of every individual
choosing where to be led.

The important thing to remember is
that true leadership and induced behavior
have an inherent tendency to the good,
while tyranny (dominator management)
and compelled behavior have an inherent
tendency to evil.

Over the years, I have had long discus-
sions with thousands of people throughout
many different organizations about manage-
ment: aspirations to it, dissatisfaction with
it, or confusion about it. To avoid ambigu-
ity, I always ask each person to describe the
single most important responsibility of any
manager. The incredibly diverse responses
always have one thing in common: they are
downward-looking. Management inevitably
is viewed as exercise of authority — with
selecting employees, motivating them,
training them, appraising them, organizing
them, directing them, controlling them.
That perception is mistaken.

The first and paramount responsibility of
anyone who purports to manage is to
manage self: one’s own integrity, character,
ethics, knowledge, wisdom, temperament,
words, and acts. It is a complex, unending,
incredibly difficult, oft-shunned task. We
spend little time and rarely excel at manage-
ment of self precisely because it is so much
more difficult than prescribing and control-
ling the behavior of others. However,
without management of self no one is fit for
authority no matter how much they acquire,
for the more authority they acquire the
more dangerous they become. It is the
management of self that should occupy 50
percent of our time and the best of our
ability. And when we do that, the ethical,
moral and spiritual elements of management
are inescapable.

Asked to identify the second responsibil-
ity of any manager, again people produce a
bewildering variety of opinions, again
downward-looking. Another mistake. The
second responsibility is to manage those who
have authority over us: bosses, supervisors,

**Mistakes:** Toothless little things, providing you can recognize them, admit them, correct
them, learn from them, and rise above them. If not, they grow fangs and strike.

**Accomplishment:** Never confuse activity with productivity. It is not what goes in your end
of the pipe that matters, but what comes out the other end. Everything but intense
thought, judgment, and action is infected to some degree with meaningless activity. Think!
Judge! Act! Free others to do the same!

**Hiring:** Never hire or promote in your own image. It is foolish to replicate your strength. It
is stupid to replicate your weakness. Employ, trust, and reward those whose perspective,
ability and judgment are radically different from your own and recognize that it requires
uncommon humility, tolerance, and wisdom.

**Creativity:** The problem is never how to get new, innovative thoughts into your mind, but
how to get old ones out. Every mind is a building filled with archaic furniture. Clean out a
corner of your mind and creativity will instantly fill it.

**Listening:** While you can learn much by listening carefully to what people say, a great
deal more is revealed by what they do not say. Listen as carefully to silence as to sound.

**Judgment:** Judgment is a muscle of the mind developed by use. You lose nothing by
trusting it. If you trust it and it is bad, you will know quickly and can improve it. If you
trust it and it is consistently good, you will succeed, and the sooner the better. If it is
consistently good and you don’t trust it, you will become the saddest of all creatures; one
who could have succeeded but followed the poor judgment of others to failure.

**Leadership:** Lead yourself, lead your superiors, lead your peers and free your people to do
the same. All else is trivial.
 directors, regulators, ad infinitum. Without their consent and support, how can we follow conviction, exercise judgment, use creative ability, achieve constructive results or create conditions by which others can do the same? Managing superiors is essential. Devoting 25 percent of our time and ability to that effort is not too much.

...Without management

how much they acquire,

dangerous they become.

...Without management

of self no one is fit

for authority no matter

how much they acquire,

for the more authority

they acquire the more

dangerous they become.

The obvious question then always erupts. How do you manage superiors, bosses, regulators, associates, customers? The answer is equally obvious. You cannot. But can you understand them? Can you persuade them? Can you motivate them? Can you disturb them, influence them, forgive them? Can you set them an example?

Eventually the proper word emerges. Can you lead them?

Of course you can, provided only that you have properly led yourself. There are no rules and regulations so rigorous, no organization so hierarchical, no bosses so abusive that they can prevent us from behaving this way. No individual and no organization, short of killing us, can prevent such use of our energy, ability, and ingenuity. They may make it more difficult, but they can’t prevent it. The real power is ours, not theirs, provided only that we can work our way around the killing.

It is easy to test this chaordic concept of leadership. Reflect a moment on group endeavors of which you are an observer rather than participant. If your interest runs to ballet, you can undoubtedly recall when the corps seemed to rise above the individual ability of each dancer and achieve a magical, seemingly effortless performance.

Every choreographer, conductor, and coach — or for that matter, corporation president — has tried to distill the essence of such performance. Countless others have tried to explain and produce a mechanistic, measurably controlled process that will cause the phenomenon. It has never been done and it never will be. It is easily observed, universally admired, and occasionally experienced. It happens, but cannot be deliberately done. It is rarely long sustained but can be repeated. It arises from the relationships and interaction of those from which it is composed. Some organizations seem consistently able to do so, just as some leaders seem able to cause it to happen with consistency, even within different organizations.

To be precise, one cannot speak of leaders who cause organizations to achieve superlative performance, for no one can cause it to happen. Leaders can only recognize and modify conditions which prevent it; perceive and articulate a sense of community, a vision of the future, a body of principle to which people can become passionately committed, then encourage and enable them to discover and bring forth
Leading with Integrity

the extraordinary capabilities that lie trapped in everyone struggling to get out.

Without question, the most abundant, least expensive, most under-utilized, and constantly abused resource in the world is human ingenuity. The source of that abuse is mechanistic, Industrial Age, dominator concepts of organization and the management practices they spawn.

In the deepest sense, distinction between leaders and followers is meaningless. In every moment of life, we are simultaneously leading and following. There is never a time when our knowledge, judgment and wisdom are not more useful and applicable than that of another. There is never a time when the knowledge, judgment and wisdom of another are not more useful and applicable than ours. At any time that “other” may be superior, subordinate, or peer.

Everyone was born a leader. Who can deny that from the moment of birth they were leading parents, siblings, and companions? Watch a baby cry and the parents jump. We were all born leaders; that is, until we were sent to school and taught to be managed and to manage. People are not “things” to be manipulated, labeled, boxed, bought, and sold. Above all else, they are not “human resources.” We are entire human beings, containing the whole of the evolving universe, limitless until we are limited, whether by self or others. We must examine the concept of leading and following with new eyes. We must examine the concept of superior and subordinate with increasing skepticism. We must examine the concept of management and labor with new beliefs. And we must examine the nature of organizations that demand such distinctions with an entirely different consciousness.

It is true leadership — leadership by everyone — chaordic leadership, in, up, around, and down that this world so badly needs, and industrial age, dominator management that it so sadly gets.

But what about Eunice, the one-horned cow? A frantic thirty minutes after shoulderering the calf, I arrived, shaking, bruised and bleeding from cuts and scratches, at the bottom of the cut bank where the calf had tumbled in. Legs braced against the force of the rushing water, I paused to recover breath and strength before trying to clamber out. Suddenly, over the sound of pulse pounding in my ears, the rushing water, shrieking wind and pelting rain, from directly overhead came a furious, heart-stopping roar. In stark terror, I let go the calf’s front legs and fumbled for the flashlight. Another earth-shaking roar, then another. The light came on as I swung the beam in the direction of the sound.

Exhausted, thigh deep in swirling, icy water with sixty pounds of kicking calf draped around its neck, 175 pounds of Homo Sapiens stared in pure panic directly up into the blood-red eyes of three quarters of a ton of frantic mother cow convinced I was butchering her baby and a ton of enraged bull determined to save his family. In that brief instant, eye-to-eye with nearly two tons of bovine fury, the essence of management was simple and clear. First: manage myself and get mind, body, and emotions under control before they ceased to exist. Second: manage two tons of enraged, bovine superiors who most certainly had power over me. Third: manage my environment and find a way out of the ravine. Fourth, and by far the least important, manage my only subordinate, the kicking calf. And, oh, how I wished the calf knew the theory and had managed himself, his superiors and his environment, and not put the whole outfit into such an unholy mess in the first place.

What then happened in the middle of the night to Eunice, her calf and a panic stricken Homo Sapiens in a ditch need not be told, for that is not the point of the story. But for those who must find a moral in every story it is simply this: If your keep your wits about you, you can learn everything you need to know about leadership from a one-horned cow.

As I stood eye-to-eye with two tons of bovine fury, the essence of management was clear.
The Enduring Skills of Change Leaders

By Rosabeth Moss Kanter

Hundreds of books and millions of dollars in consulting fees have been devoted to leadership and organizational change. No issue of the past 15 years has concerned more managers or a wider spectrum of organizations. Yet, for all the attention the subject merits, we see every day that certain kinds of change are simple. If you’re a senior executive, you can order budget reductions, buy or sell a division, form a strategic alliance or arrange a merger.

Such bold strokes do produce fast change, but they do not necessarily build the long-term capabilities of the organization. Indeed, these leadership actions often are defensive, the result of a flawed strategy or a failure to adapt to changing market conditions. They sometimes mask the need for a deeper change in strategy, structure, or operations, and they contribute to the anxiety that accompanies sudden change.

Years of study and experience show that the things that sustain change are not bold strokes but long marches — the independent, discretionary, and ongoing efforts of people throughout the organization. Real change requires people to adjust their behavior, and that behavior is often beyond the control of top management. Yes, as a senior executive, you can allocate resources for new product development or reorganize a unit, but you cannot order people to use their imaginations or to work collaboratively. That’s why, in difficult situations, leaders who have neglected the long march often fall back on the bold stroke. It feels good (at least to the boss) to shake things up, but it exacts a toll on the organization.

**Forces for Change**

Organizational change has become a way of life as a result of three forces: globalization, information technology, and industry consolidation. In today’s world, all organizations, from the Fortune 500 to the local nonprofit agency, need greater reach. They need to be in more places, to be more aware of regional and cultural differences, and to integrate into coherent strategies the work occurring in different markets and communities.

The first two forces for change — globalization and technology — will inevitably grow. But it’s not enough for organizations to simply “go international” or “get networked.” In a global, high-tech world, organizations need to be more fluid, inclusive, and responsive. They need to manage complex information flows, grasp new ideas quickly, and spread those ideas throughout the enterprise. What counts is not whether everybody uses e-mail but whether people quickly absorb the impact of information and respond to opportunity.

Industry consolidation, the business story of 1998-99, has a less certain future. But even if that trend abates, the impact of mergers, acquisitions, and strategic alliances will be felt for years. Mergers and acquisitions bring both dangers and benefits to organizations. Partnerships, joint ventures, and strategic alliances can be a less dramatic but more highly evolved vehicle for innovation. However, you must not starve an alliance or a partnership. You have to invest the time and resources to work out differences in culture, strategy, processes, or policies.

You also have to bring together people at many levels to talk about shared goals and the future of the alliance in general, not just their small functional tasks. Many alliances unravel because, while there is support at the top of the organization, departments at lower levels are left to resolve tensions, answer questions, or fill gaps on their own. The conflicts and wasted efforts that result can end up destroying value instead of creating it. You have to make sure that the goals of people at many levels of the organizations are aligned, and that people get to know each other, before you can expect them to build trust.

**Keys to Mastering Change**

Change is created constantly and at many levels in an organization. There is the
occasional earthshaking event, often induced by outside forces; there are also the everyday actions of people engaged in their work. In change-adept organizations, people simply respond to customers and move on to the next project or opportunity. They do not necessarily change their assumptions about how the organization operates, but they continuously learn and adapt, spread knowledge, share ideas. By making change a way of life people are, in the best sense, “just doing their jobs.”

Change — adept organizations share three key attributes, each associated with a particular role for leaders:

1) The imagination to innovate. To encourage innovation, effective leaders help develop new concepts — the ideas, models, and applications of technology that set an organization apart.

2) The professionalism to perform. Leaders provide personal and organizational competence, supported by workforce training and development, to execute flawlessly and deliver value to ever more demanding customers.

3) The openness to collaborate. Leaders make connections with partners who can extend the organization’s reach, enhance its offerings, or energize its practices. These intangible assets — concepts, competence, and connections — accrue naturally to successful organizations, just as they do to successful individuals. They reflect habits, not programs — personal skills, behavior, and relationships. When they are deeply engrained in an organization, change is so natural that resistance is usually low. But lacking these organizational assets, leaders tend to react to change defensively and ineffectively. Change propelled by crisis is usually seen as a threat, not an opportunity.

Mastering deep change — being first with the best service, anticipating and then meeting new customer requirements, applying new technology — requires organizations to do more than adapt to changes already in progress. It requires them to be fast, agile, intuitive, and innovative. Strengthening relationships with customers in the midst of market upheaval can help organizations avoid cataclysmic change — the kind that costs jobs and jolts communities. To do that, effective leaders reconceive their role — from monitors of the organization to monitors of external reality. They become idea scouts, attentive to early signs of discontinuity, disruption, threat, or opportunity in the marketplace and the community. And they create channels for senior managers, salespeople, service reps, or receptionists to share what customers are saying about products.

Classic Skills for Leaders

The most important things a leader can bring to a changing organization are passion, conviction, and confidence in others. Too often executives announce a plan, launch a task force, and then simply hope that people find the answers — instead of offering a dream, stretching their horizons, and encouraging people to do the same. That is why we say, “leaders go first.”

However, given that passion, conviction, and confidence, leaders can use several techniques to take charge of change rather than simply react to it. In nearly 20 years working with leaders I have found the following classic skills to be equally useful to CEOs, senior executives, or middle managers who want to move an idea forward.

1. Tuning in to the environment As a leader you can’t possibly know enough, or be in enough places, to understand everything happening inside — and more importantly outside — your organization. But you can actively collect information that suggests...
new approaches. You can create a network of listening posts — a satellite office, a joint venture, a community service. Rubbermaid operates its own stores, for instance, even though it sells mostly to Wal-Mart and other big chains. These stores allow the company to listen to and learn from customers.

Likewise, partnerships and alliances not only help you accomplish particular tasks; they also provide knowledge about things happening in the world that you wouldn’t see otherwise.

Look not just at how the pieces of your business model fit together but for what doesn’t fit. For instance, pay special attention to customer complaints, which are often your best source of information about an operational weakness or unmet need. Also search out broader signs of change — a competitor doing something differently or a customer using your product or service in unexpected ways.

2. Challenging the prevailing organizational wisdom. Leaders need to develop what I call kaleidoscope thinking — a way of constructing patterns from the fragments of data available, and then manipulating them to form different patterns. They must question their assumptions about how pieces of the organization, the marketplace, or the community fit together. Change leaders remember that there are many solutions to a problem and that by looking through a different lens somebody is going to invent, for instance, a new way to deliver health care.

There are lots of ways to promote kaleidoscopic thinking. Send people outside the company — not just on field trips, but “far afield trips.” Go outside your industry and return with fresh ideas. Rotate job assignments and create interdisciplinary project teams to give people fresh ideas and opportunities to test their assumptions. For instance, one innovative department of a U.S. oil company regularly invites people from many different departments to attend large brainstorming sessions. These allow interested outsiders to ask questions, make suggestions, and trigger new ideas.

3. Communicating a compelling aspiration. You cannot sell change, or anything else, without genuine conviction, because there are so many sources of resistance to overcome: “We’ve never done it before; we tried it before and it didn’t work.” “Things are OK now, so why should we change?” Especially when you are pursuing a true innovation as opposed to responding to a crisis, you’ve got to make a compelling case. Leaders talk about communicating a vision as an instrument of change, but I prefer the notion of communicating an aspiration. It’s not just a picture of what could be; it is an appeal to our better selves, a call to become something more. It reminds us that the future does not just descend like a stage set; we construct the future from our own history, desires, and decisions.

4. Building coalitions. Change leaders need the involvement of people who have the resources, the knowledge, and the political clout to make things happen. You want the opinion shapers, the experts in the field, the values leaders. That sounds obvious, but coalition building is probably the most neglected step in the change process.

In the early stages of planning change, leaders must identify key supporters and sell their dream with the same passion and deliberation as the entrepreneur. You may have to reach deep into, across, and outside the organization to find key influencers, but you first must be willing to reveal an idea or proposal before it's ready. Secrecy denies you the opportunity to get feedback, and when things are sprung on people with no warning, the easiest answer is always no. Coalition building requires an understanding of the politics of change, and in any organization those politics are formidable.

When building coalitions, however, it's a mistake to try to recruit everybody at once. Think of innovation as a venture. You want the minimum number of investors necessary to launch a new venture, and to champion it when you need help later.

5. Transferring ownership to a working team. Once a coalition is in place, you can enlist others in implementation. You must remain involved — the leader’s job is to support the team, provide coaching and resources, and patrol the boundaries within which the team can freely operate. But you cannot simply ask managers to execute a fully formed change agenda; you might instead develop a broad outline, informed by your environmental scan and lots of good questions, from which people can conduct a series of small experiments. That approach not only confers team
ownership, but allows people to explore new possibilities in ways that don’t bet the company or your budget.

6. Resist the temptation to pile responsibility on team members. As psychologist Richard Hackman has found, it is not just the personalities or the team process that determine success; it’s whether or not the team is linked appropriately to the resources they need in the organization. In addition, leaders can allow teams to forge their own identity, build a sense of membership, and enjoy the protection they need to implement changes. One of the temptations leaders must resist is to simply pile responsibility on team members. While it is fashionable to have people wear many hats, people must be given the responsibility — and the time — to focus on the tasks of change.

7. Learning to persevere. My personal law of management, if not of life, is that everything can look like a failure in the middle. One of the mistakes leaders make in change processes is to launch them and leave them. There are many ways a change initiative can get derailed. But stop it too soon and, by definition it will be a failure; stay with it through its initial hurdles and good things may happen. Of course, if a change process takes long enough you have to return to the beginning — monitor the environment again, recheck your assumptions, reconsider whether the proposed change is still the right one. Abdicating your role undermines the effort because, unlike bold strokes, long marches need ongoing leadership. Most people get excited about things in the beginning, and everybody loves endings, especially happy endings. It’s the hard work in between that demands the attention and effort of savvy leaders.

8. Making everyone a hero. Remembering to recognize, reward, and celebrate accomplishments is a critical leadership skill. And it is probably the most underutilized motivational tool in organizations. There is no limit to how much recognition you can provide, and it is often free. Recognition brings the change cycle to its logical conclusion, but it also motivates people to attempt change again. So many people get involved in and contribute to changing the way an organization does things that it’s important to share the credit. Change is an ongoing issue, and you can’t afford to lose the talents, skills, or energies of those who can help make it happen.

Today’s organizations have come to expect bold strokes from their leaders. Sometimes these are appropriate and effective — as when a project or product that no longer works is put to rest. But bold strokes can also disrupt and distract organizations. They often happen too quickly to facilitate real learning, and they can impede the instructive long marches that ultimately carry an organization forward. That is why imagination, professionalism, and openness are essential to leadership, not just to leading change. They give organizations the tools to absorb and apply the lessons of the moment.

Likewise, techniques that facilitate change within organizations — creating listening posts, opening lines of communication, articulating a set of explicit, shared goals, building coalitions, acknowledging others — are key to creating effective partnerships and sustaining high performance, not just to managing change. They build the trust and commitment necessary to succeed in good times or in bad. Even periods of relative stability (unusual for most organizations) require such skills.

Change has become a major theme of leadership literature for a good reason. Leaders set the direction, define the context, and help produce coherence for their organizations. Leaders manage the culture, or at least the vehicles through which that culture is expressed. They set the boundaries for collaboration, autonomy, and the sharing of knowledge and ideas, and give meaning to events that otherwise appear random and chaotic. And they inspire voluntary behavior — the degree of effort, innovation, and entrepreneurship with which employees serve customers and seek opportunities.

Increasingly, the assets that cannot be controlled by rule are most critical to success. People’s ideas or concepts, their commitment to high standards of competence, and their connections of trust with partners are what set apart great organizations. All these requirements can be enhanced by leaders, but none can be mandated. For all of the upheaval of the past 15 years, that may be the biggest change of all.

◆
...The current view restricts and diminishes the public's capacity to address the complex problem situations of public policy. And when he does find it necessary to take an unpopular stand, he has an obligation to explain it to the people, solicit their support, and win their approval.”

Nixon articulated the task of leadership as it is generally understood in the public sector. First, a leader identifies himself by taking stands, even unpopular stands. The assumption is that a leader must have an agenda, even if it is controversial. Second, to implement his agenda, a leader is expected to reach out to the people, explain his position, solicit the support of the people, and gain their acceptance. The mark of leadership is to succeed in carrying out one’s stand; the means of succeeding involve skilfully interacting with the people.

Many scholars have also attempted to define leadership. Kellerman’s recent study describes the task of presidential leadership in terms similar to Nixon’s:

“Since directive presidential leadership is an interactive process heavily dependent on the informal use of sources of power ... a president must have (1) the vision and motivation to define and articulate his agenda so as to broaden his base of support; and (2) some considerable ability to perform effectively in those interpersonal transactions necessary for bringing about his most important goals.”

Although Kellerman makes the important tactical point that presidential leadership requires the skillful use of informal sources of power, leadership is again defined as having a vision or agenda of one’s own, coupled with the ability to articulate one’s message, gain support through transactional means, and bring one’s own goals to fruition. The same idea of leadership appears to prevail in the private sector. In a recent study of ninety leaders, Bennis and Nanus summarized the conventional wisdom in this way:

“Leadership is what gives an organization its vision and its ability to translate that vision into reality. The leader, as social architect, must be part artist, part designer, part master craftsman, facing the challenge...
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of aligning the elements of the social architecture so that, like an ideal building, it becomes a creative synthesis uniquely suited to realizing the guiding vision of the leader.... The effective leader needs to articulate new values and norms, offer new visions, and use a variety of tools in order to transform, support, and institutionalize new meanings and directions.”

Here again, the task of leadership consists of providing a vision and taking action to realize that vision through the medium of an organization. Leaders in corporations, like leaders in the public sector, are often expected to “offer new visions” and bring in “new values and norms.” They must project their idea of the future, their vision, their values and norms in a way that institutionalizes what they see. The mark of leadership, once more, is the leader’s success in realizing his guiding vision; the means of implementation are interactive. In a similar vein, organization and group theorists typically describe a leader as an individual who has the authority to decide, direct, and represent the objectives and functions of an organization.

Most notions of leadership share certain basic assumptions. The preceding descriptions are illustrative in that they emphasize (1) providing vision or taking stands, and (2) interacting effectively when managing power and authority in order to generate sufficient organizational and political alignment to realize the leader’s intentions. These common assumptions form a prevailing underlying theory or idea of leadership.

The Demand for Leadership

Governments, corporations, and individuals spend a great deal of time and money training people in leadership. Programs in leadership are sprouting up in cities, consulting firms, and schools all over the country. The frequently expressed concern that the United States is undergoing a “crisis in leadership” and the emphasis placed on judging President Reagan’s leadership qualities (as opposed to President Carter’s) suggest that people are looking to leadership for answers. It is as if many of us are swept up in a groundswell of excitement, even a clamoring, for effective leadership.

The prevailing idea of leadership, then, may be important to investigate, not only for its intrinsic interest but because the kind of leadership we praise, teach, and operate with may shape the futures of many people. The idea itself may affect the realities we live with and make.

But it would be a mistake to suggest that our interest in leadership is something new. We can certainly see a clamoring for leadership as far back as the days of the prophet Samuel, who pondered with God how to answer the people’s curious longing and demand for a king. Neither Samuel nor God could see the reason for it. God, having just saved the Hebrew tribes from attack by the Philistines, interpreted the yearning for a king as a rejection of His authority and guidance, according to Samuel. The prophet tried to dissuade the people.

But the people refused to hearken unto the voice of Samuel; and they said: “Nay; but there shall be a king over us; that we may be like all the nations; and that our king may judge us, and go out before us, and fight out battles.”

The inclination of people to look to leaders for answers may well go back as far as the first agricultural societies with complex economies. The yearning for leadership is an ancient phenomenon. And like any demand that finds its way into the marketplace, this yearning has been met with a supply. Leaders have appeared, or were chosen.

The supply of leadership seems to have been shaped by the character of the demand for it. People facing complex and frustrating situations wanted answers, protection, and order. Those who came forward to supply those demands were called leaders. Different styles of leadership were called forth depending on the particular situation and the norms of society, yet these styles were variations on a common theme. The basic idea of leadership remained fairly constant.
The Character of the Demand and How It Has Shaped the Conventional Wisdom

“What do your constituents expect or demand of you as a leader?” We posed this question to hundreds of executive and midcareer students at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. The group included elected, appointed, and career officials from federal, state, and local governments; civil servants from many foreign lands; and corporate executives responsible for business-government relations. There were mayors, top- and middle-level managers in government agencies and private corporations, entry-level public servants, members of Congress, congressional staff, diplomats, all levels of military officers, foreign ministers, and heads of banks. Their responses were remarkably consistent.

Constituents expect them to provide solutions, security, and meaning. Constituents also demand many variations on these themes: answers, vision, inspiration, hope, consistency, order, direction, and “just tell me what to do.” The officials in turn believe that these expectations are the norm and that their task as leaders is to fulfill them.

The prevailing conception of leadership seems to conform to the laws of supply and demand, in that leaders and theorists of the subject have adopted an idea of leadership that follows from what “followers” are asking for. Constituents appear to want answers to their questions, solutions to their problems, security in their surroundings, and a sense that their individual activities are connected to larger purposes and thus are meaningful. And leaders have viewed leadership accordingly: taking stands, providing solutions, having a vision, and interacting with constituents by explaining, supporting, and ordering so that they feel part of the vision and secure in knowing what to do.

The Traps Inherent in the Conventional Wisdom

Of course, no leader can consistently provide constituents with solutions, security, or meaning. Perhaps all that a leader can reliably provide, given such expectations, is failed expectations. Although individuals are generally more sensible than to expect leaders to provide all those things, cultural norms and public ideas are not formed simply by individuals. They are formed by group systems of political, organizational, and social interaction. (Group is used generically in this chapter to include each of these systems.) Public ideas arise when individuals repeatedly base decisions on their perceptions of what most other people think the norms and public procedures are. For example, if people think that nearly everybody around them understands an issue in a certain way, they will be inclined to act in agreement with that prevailing understanding. Even authority figures, although they may not agree with the prevailing understanding, will have to base their actions on how they think their public will view events, if they are to achieve practical results.

Public ideas and conventional wisdom take on a life of their own, quite apart from anyone’s private sensibilities.

The conventional wisdom on leadership does not dictate that a leader fulfill all the specific expectations of the constituents. As Nixon suggested, a leader’s solution may run contrary to the trends in the group. Still, the conventional view requires that a leader design and implement some solution. He must have some agenda to call his own. Although a leader may have the leeway to innovate by coming up with new solutions, it would be quite unleaderlike, according to conventional wisdom, not to come up with any solution at all.

Theorists have invested great effort in discovering and assessing the means by which a leader can provide and implement solutions, as well as the special personal qualities needed to implement his solutions. Many recent writers have attempted to transcend making value judgments of a leader’s particular solution or vision, focusing instead on the strategic and tactical means by which a leader can accomplish his aims—whether through a better understanding of political interchange and the mechanisms for managing power and influence, practical insights into the design and behavior of organizations, or effective communication, the development of trust, and efforts to empower others. In effect, scholars and theorists have based their work on the popular understanding of leadership, which is left unquestioned.

There are dangers in using the expectations of the group to define the idea of...
leadership. The group insists that the leader provide solutions. Yet only a very limited number of problematic situations can be resolved by a leader providing solutions; and therein lies the trap. Even in situations where solutions can be given, the act of providing them will reinforce the group's presumption that leaders can be relied upon to find solutions and should be expected to do so. The trap has two victims: the leader and the group. When the leader is successful in providing solutions, the group will probably expect more of him in the future. Conventional success in leadership will prompt the group to "up the ante." Although this response may flatter a leader's vanity, it is full of peril. It is possible that success will establish a track record that buys the leader some latitude and time to have failures, perhaps even enough time for him to die a natural death while remaining a hero to his people. But if the problems are great, the group's rising expectations may eventually surpass the leader's magical powers, causing his downfall. The twentieth century is full of such leaders (Ferdinand Marcos, Lyndon Johnson, Indira Gandhi, Benito Mussolini) whose early successes fostered unrealistic expectations, both within themselves and in their constituents.

The trap is equally dangerous for the group. First, conventional success in leadership may decrease the group's own adaptive capacity. Repeated success, just as it increases dependency on the leader, may weaken the constituents' ability to face, define, and solve problems. The danger for the group could be reduced if the leader took steps, during and after success, to discourage the predilection to look to him for more answers in the future. Of course, leaders, operating by the conventional wisdom, usually do just the opposite when they meet with success; they bolster the group's inflated expectations.

Second, and perhaps more telling, conventional leadership operates with a basic misconception regarding how a society succeeds in addressing complex public problems. Difficult public policy situations are hard to define and resolve precisely because they demand the work and responsibility of the constituents. Thus many complex problems are not amenable to solutions provided by leaders; their solutions require that constituents address the problematic situations that face them.

A Typology of Situations

By way of analogy, consider the job of a physician. Patients and their families routinely come to physicians expecting solutions, and physicians, like leaders, try to provide them. The role of the physician and the conventional wisdom that reinforces it having been shaped by the group's demand. Physicians define their job in terms of providing solutions; they diagnose, treat, and try to cure illness.

This characterization of the doctor's job is perfectly adequate in some situations. To a patient with an infection, for example, the physician can sometimes say, "I have an antibiotic medication that will almost definitely cure you without any effort or life adjustment needed on your part. The medication is virtually harmless. I can give you one shot, or a week of pills, whichever you prefer." We can call this a Type I situation - one in which the patient's expectations that the doctor can provide a solution are realistic and the problem situation can be defined, treated, and cured using the doctor's expertise and requiring very little work on the part of the patient. These are the straightforward mechanical situations in which one can go to somebody and "get it fixed." And from the doctor's point of view, these are those gratifying moments when he can actually solve a patient's problem. Although the patient's cooperation will be crucial in Type I situations, the weight of problem defining and problem solving falls on the physician.

Type II situations are far more common. Here the problem is definable but no clear-cut technical solution is available; the doctor can offer some remedies but no cures. Heart disease sometimes presents a Type II situation. The patient can be restored to more or less full operating capacity, but only if he takes responsibility for his health.

Did you know...?

The exercise of leadership revolves around the dynamic of work: how work is both accomplished and avoided by social systems. Leadership mobilizes groups to do work.

In Type III situations, the problem definition is not clear-cut, and no technical fixes are available. Chronic disability or impending death from any cause fits this category. In these situations, the doctor can continue to operate in a mechanical mode by diagnosing and prescribing remedies (and a remedy of some sort can usually be found). But if he does so, the problem-defining and -solving work of both doctor and patient will be avoided. In these situations, treating the illness is too narrow a way to define the physician’s task. The problem, and consequently the required work, have to be understood more broadly than the particular diagnosis. When critical aspects of the situation are probably unchangeable, the problem must be distinguished from the medical condition - the diagnosis. For example, if the patient’s diagnosis is an advanced stage of cancer in which the likelihood of cure is remote, it may be useless - indeed, a denial of reality - to define the primary problem as cancer. Cancer, in this case, is a condition. To the limited extent it can be treated at all, it is only part of the problem. To define cancer as the primary problem leads everyone involved to concentrate on finding solutions to the cancer, thus diverting their attention from the work at hand. The patient’s work consists of facing and making adjustments to harsh realities that go beyond his health condition and that include several possible problems: making the most out of life; considering what the children may need after he is gone; preparing a spouse, parents, loved ones, and friends; completing important tasks, and so forth.

Table 8.1 (Page 33) summarizes the characteristics of the three types of situations.

In Type III situations, and often in Type II, the physician can help the patient face the situation, define problems, and develop solutions, but he cannot “fix it.” Therefore it is counterproductive for the doctor to define his task within a framework based on patients’ expectations (i.e., to provide solutions, to diagnose and treat illness).

An alternative definition of the physician’s job—“helping the patient do his work”—would serve well in each of these situations. If the problem definition and treatment are clear-cut (Type I), then helping the patient face and adjust to his problematic reality will consist of telling him he has a certain problem and recommending the appropriate treatment. If the problem definition is clear-cut but the treatment is not purely technical (Type II), so that the patient must evaluate and make life adjustments, then education and persuasion may be needed to mobilize the patient’s resources to do that work. And if the problem situation is complex and the treatment unclear (Type III), then the treatment will require the patient’s participation in defining the specific problems within the overall situation and devising solutions for each. The doctor cannot do this work; only the patient and his family can determine how the problems should be defined in the first place, let alone treated. Although the particular style of the physician will have to change depending on the type of situation, the basic stance of the physician—to help the patient do his work—will remain constant.

The Realm of Public Policy

Many important problems in any realm are of Type II and Type III. Public policy is no exception. The problems are messy. Many people are involved, and many of them disagree on the definition as well as the treatment of the problem. With poverty, crime, international disputes, pollution, education policy, and so forth, much of the work consists of defining the problem, not just solving it. Furthermore, in public policy situations of Types II and III, the defining and solving comprise significant political and social learning processes as the various constituencies involved sort out their orientation, values, and potential tradeoffs. No “leader” can magically do this work.

Only the group - the relevant community of interests - can do this work. It must do the sorting and learning necessary to define what constitutes a problem. It must make the adaptations and adjustments...
to the problem situation that most solutions require. Solutions in public policy generally consist of adjustments in the community’s attitudes and actions. Who else but those with stakes in the situation can make the necessary adjustments? For example, for a nation to successfully go to war, the constituents will have to join the effort and make adjustments in their lives accordingly. In Churchill’s first major statement as prime minister—“I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat” - he referred to the group’s work, not merely his own. For a community to improve public education, constituents will have to make schools a high priority and then evaluate and choose among numerous alternatives, such as setting higher performance standards, upgrading curricula, spending more money on teachers, addressing local poverty, and increasing parent involvement.

To illustrate further, consider the situation of drug abuse. If the supply of drugs is driven primarily by the demand, and if the demand is a product of economic, social, and psychological forces, then defining the problem as drug supply, as is often done, avoids the reality of demand. Unrealistic definitions may mislead the public by directing its attention to an unrealistic set of solutions. More accurate definitions of the problem include drug-related crime and the self-destructive demand for drugs. Parts of these problems appear to have technical solutions. Many people suggest that drug-related crime would be solved in large part by making drugs legal — that the motives for crime would disappear by making access to drugs cheap. Others argue, however, that this way of defining the problem is too narrow because it fails to address costly tradeoffs regarding social values and responsibility.

In either case, the problem of crime is only one aspect of the drug situation. The problem of people wanting drugs and using them in ways that are personally harmful will not be solved by legalizing drugs or by any other technical remedy. Any solution to this problem will have to consist of adjustments on the part of the community. The elimination of self-destructive drug use may require public education, altering family structures, diminishing unemployment, and changing the ways in which people derive meaning from life.

Upon entering into a problem-solving process, a public official cannot be sure which type of situation he and his constituents face. If he begins with the common assumption of constituents - that problematic situations are of Type I and that the public official can and should “fix them” - he is likely to accept unwittingly a problem definition and a routine of action that neglects important parts of the situation. In the case of drug abuse, he may view the problem as drug supply. On the other hand, if he starts with the assumption that most situations are of Type II or Type III, then he will be ready when necessary to help constituents confront those aspects of the situation that are not clearly defined or solved, and that require their work.

As work on issues advances, Type III situations can be broken down partially into Type II and Type I components. As with the drug abuse situation, when conditions are distinguished from problems, and alternative problem definitions are created and sorted through, policy makers and constituents will generate a series of discrete frames for the problem. The point for the policy maker is not to lock any situation into a particular category, but to establish an approach that routinely steers the community toward addressing the essential but frequently most difficult and ignored aspects of a problematic reality - for

Table 8.1 — Situational Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Definition</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Primary Locus of Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Clear, Physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Unclear, Physician and patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Unclear, Patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A leader becomes a guide, interpreter, and stimulus of engagement, rather than a source of answers.
example, that the demand for drugs may originate within the community itself.

Because constituents may cling rigidly to one way of viewing the situation, the work of defining and solving problems must provoke learning. The act of sorting out their values and points of view on a complex issue, of debating the merits of various competing frames for the problem, is itself part of the adjustment process by which constituents achieve solutions.

An expert at leadership must manage the means, pace, authority, structures, and other devices for containing the turbulent process of putting people's problems back in their own laps without abandoning them.

Inventive people have sometimes been able to turn Type II and Type III situations into Type I; they find a cure. With advances in natural or social scientific understanding, we occasionally convert messy situations into clear-cut ones. The discovery of penicillin transformed most cases of pneumonia into situations of Type I. Many of us no longer have to live with the uncontrollable flooding of rivers because thousands of years ago some people invented the dam.

Few if any public policy problems are clear-cut, however. Even the building of a dam has problematic side effects. Dams require resources that might be applied to other efforts; they change the demography, ecology, and social structure of an area, with mixed consequences for social values, norms, and behavior. They can burst open with catastrophic results downstream.

Though flooding may appear to be a Type I situation, a problem that can be solved by a dam, evidently it is not. Policy makers will be faced with questions like: who is to know how broadly or narrowly to define the problem for which building a dam then becomes the solution? Who is to determine which technical solution to choose among several alternatives, each with a different set of side effects?

Since most situations are of types II and III, the expert in public policy has to become expert, not in providing answers, but in managing the dynamics of the group struggling with its work. In the case of the president, this entails managing Congress, the press, his own agencies, interested parties, and anyone else whose involvement is required for progress in a particular problematic situation. In the case of the middle manager, this involves managing his superiors, subordinates, lateral colleagues, outside parties, and anyone else whose participation is needed to frame and resolve a problematic situation. In the case of the general citizen, this demands engaging organizations, interested parties, the press, political representatives, other citizens - whoever has to be involved in the process by which a group learns its way from a current state of affairs to one that is better.

This job challenges even the most courageous. There is enormous pressure on public officials, like doctors, to maintain the narrow, answer-giving conception of their jobs. Constituents want solutions, particularly when they confront harsh realities. The task of helping them take responsibility for their work becomes daunting. First, it means going against their expectation that the leader can fix things for them - frustrating them in their initial desires. Second, it means holding steady as constituents, overtime, begin to face their situation - maintaining one's poise, resolve, and capacity to listen when under attack. Third, it means helping constituents carve out of their messy situations discrete problems needing their attention and work - challenging their assumptions regarding the situation and provoking the discovery of alternative problem definitions. Finally, it necessitates managing the iterative process of devising solutions, making adjustments, and redefining problems as the situation changes and as constituents reorder their priorities along the way.

In all of this, the task of pacing the work is crucial. It takes time for any group to face, assess, and change or adapt to tough situations. Leadership, in this sense, requires expertise. In addition to solving well-defined problems, the public official has to manage the deliberative process by which constituents accomplish work. Beyond technical know-how, he needs the improvisational flexibility and insight to manage others in doing work on frustrating situations where the definition of the problem, let alone the solution, is not clear.

Rather than posing as a wizard who can always pull the right rabbit out of the hat at the right time, a leader must be wary of ever pulling out rabbits. Such feats tend to create solutions with unintended and unforeseen side effects; worse, they reinforce the conventional wisdom that tough problems require wizards. And everyone knows what happens to wizards when they run into situations for which they have no rabbit.
The Conventional Wisdom as a Paradigm of Authority

As we have seen, the conventional wisdom regarding leadership has been shaped by people's demands that someone come up with solutions to their problems. If the problem is malaise, then people will demand something to believe in. He who provides something to believe in - regardless, too often, of what that something is - will be chosen as leader.

The demand for solutions in group settings leads to a shift in the locus of work from those facing the problem situation to someone else, usually someone in authority. This does not mean that every organization or social system is structured to pass the buck. It suggests that every social system finds ways to distribute and sometimes avoid work by establishing systems of authorization.

Perhaps no social system can remain viable without some system of authorization by which labor is distributed and oriented to a task, channels of communication and command are established, and structures of empowerment are set in place. Systems of authorization are not only formalized arrangements with set positions; they are, in large part, informal arrangements. The office, the formal authorization, is rarely a sufficient source of leverage by itself to provide power. A high office holder has to gain informal authorization (i.e., respect, trust, fear, bargaining advantages, admiration) if he is to increase his authority, his power to influence. He does so by fulfilling the expectations for which the group informally confers authority.

The conventional idea of leadership describes which expectations an office holder has to promise to fulfill in order to obtain the group's formal and informal authorization. The group authorizes a leader to provide solutions, meaning, and security — in the words of the Bible, to go out before us, and fight our battles.” To gain authority, that is what he must do, promise to do, or appear to do. But in doing so, thus fulfilling his authorization, is he exercising leadership or authority? The two may be very different matters. Because the expectations associated with authority impose sharp limits on behavior, having authority constrains leadership. Stepping across the line jeopardizes one’s authority.

Furthermore, since groups will tend to pressure authority figures for simple remedies as a way to avoid harsh and complex problems, shouldn’t we expect them to collude routinely and even unwittingly in the avoidance of work?

The person with authority in a given setting and situation may not even be in the appropriate role to exercise leadership. Rather than lead people to come to terms with difficult realities, authority figures have often been expected to give, and have given, tranquilizing but fake remedies. Adolf Hitler’s use of scapegoating and delusions of grandeur provides an extreme example.

The conventional wisdom blurs this distinction. The tendency is both to equate authority and leadership, and to use the expectations of the group as the frame of reference for defining leadership. When someone gains high office (formal authority), or trust, admiration, and a following (informal authority) - that is what traditionally passes for leadership. But if leadership and authority are distinguished, one sees that the demands of the group provide a frame of reference only for authority. From this perspective, “doing what is expected” outlines the exercise of formal and informal authority, but not leadership.

Proper management of the functions of authority - providing an orienting vision, hope, security, “doing battle for”, and so forth - is crucial. Indeed, to go back to the medical analogy, the physician’s capacity to lead (i.e., to help the patient do his work) virtually depends upon meeting enough of the patient’s expectations to gain his attention and trust. Authority, both formal and informal, is a primary tool for exercising leadership. By fulfilling the functions of authority, one establishes a secure relationship with constituents, making it possible to contain and pace their conflicts and stress in doing problem-defining and problem-solving work. Like the walls and valve of a pressure-cooker, authority can provide the instruments, the power, to hold together and harness the conflictive process of doing work.

If we release the idea of leadership from its mooring as a product of group expectations, what shall we use as a reference point in its stead? Authority and leadership can be seen as two sets of functions that sometimes
leadership is a function distinct from authority, and therefore that it lacks positionality, has numerous implications.

The idea that leadership is a function around the dynamic of work: how work is both accomplished and avoided by social systems. Leadership mobilizes groups to do work. Often this demands innovation in defining problems, generating solutions, and, perhaps foremost, locating responsibility for defining and solving problems. Power and work provide the axes that orient authority and leadership. They often go hand in hand, but they function distinctly.

The functions of authority are associated with specific formal and informal positions in a social system. The functions of leadership, in contrast, are never defined by a position. For example, the position of assistant secretary in the Department of Transportation will be defined by a series of authorizations - to oversee specific departmental activities, direct particular projects, manage certain people's access to the secretary, and so forth. Similarly the informal position of “devil's advocate” will often be defined by a series of informal authorizations - to question current assumptions, provide deviant ideas, but yet remain a congenial member of the group by knowing when to stop being troublesome. The authorization simultaneously creates a discrete position and enables a set of functions.

Yet one might exercise leadership from any position. Indeed, as soon as one's leadership actions become associated with a specific position, they would merge with the general system of expectations, becoming authority as well as leadership. Thereafter a leader would have to consider carefully both the power and constraints inherent in his authorization. He would be exercising the functions of leadership with both the resources and the extra baggage of an authority position, which carries a host of expectations and its own set of functions. In other words, whereas authority can be described in the domains of both function and position, leadership can be described only within the domain of function. To equate leadership with a position is once again to equate leadership with authority.

A Concept of Leadership

The common thread between authority and leadership appears to lie in the concept of work. People authorize other people, by and large, because they think they will do some piece of work. And in certain clear-cut situations where technical expertise can provide solutions, authorizing others to do one's work will succeed. But in situations where the group's values are unclear, the shapes of problems are indistinct, and solutions have yet to be fashioned, success requires shifting the primary locus of work back to the group. To do this demands leadership that goes beyond or against the expectations inherent in one's authority. In other words, a person is rarely, if ever, authorized to exercise leadership.

The idea that leadership is a function distinct from authority, and therefore that it lacks positionality, has numerous implications. First, leadership can be exercised at once by several people from varying positions of authority. One organization may exercise leadership vis-à-vis other organizations. Second, there may be no such thing as “seizing leadership,” since leadership is not a position but an activity. How can one seize an activity? Third, although some will gain high position and enormous informal authority, they may never exercise leadership. Those whom we call leaders may not be leaders at all, simply figures of authority. From a functional point of view, a leader is anybody who serves the functions of leadership, however he may be perceived by others.

If leadership is the mobilization of a group's resources to do work, and if many situations in the realm of public policy are of Types II and III, then the exercise of leadership will require devising policies or taking actions that serve as catalysts of work, rather than solutions to problems. For example, when Mohandas Gandhi set out on a hunger fast, he did so not to solve the problems of his day, but to engage people in the problems of his day. Fasting was no solution. Fasting aimed to provoke questions, involvement, and responsibility.

Similarly, if the task of the middle manager as leader is to mobilize the resources of the group (superiors, subordinates, lateral colleagues, the press, outside parties) to do
work (come to terms with problematic situations), then the task will generally consist of capturing and directing attention to the problem situation, containing the stress and frustration that inevitably come from facing tough situations, corralling the various constituents into working relationships with one another, and managing that work process (defining, refining, and resolving problems) over time. A leader becomes a guide, interpreter, and stimulus of engagement, rather than a source of answers.

This kind of leadership isn’t easy. Particularly in group settings, people develop ingenious patterns for avoiding work. These patterns are often accepted as normal and go unnoticed. People in positions of authority, like doctors, are quite vulnerable to being drawn into those work-avoidance patterns. For example, physicians are often tempted to provide false information and to cooperate in the denial of seriously ill patients. People who are overweight easily find physicians who prescribe diet pills rather than help their patients do work (gain self-acceptance, change their self-image, control their diet, exercise routinely). Similarly, a nation facing a perilous situation may generate a demagogue, complete with “evil” scapegoats, to provide the illusion of a Type I situation and thus a false sense of security. It is extremely difficult (and risky) for an authority figure to present constituents with the reality they face and the work that is theirs. Taking pride in the authorized and conventional view of oneself as a problem solver may compound the difficulty.

In the realm of public policy, citizens, interest groups, executive agencies, the press, and Congress turn to those they have authorized as problem solvers to take care of problem situations on their behalf. Each level seeks out an authority figure in the next echelon up, until often the president becomes the physician of last resort. And, as we have discussed, as long as those situations are easily defined and technically remediable (Type I), work does indeed get done. But when the situation calls for leadership and not simply the fulfilling of one’s authority - that is, when the situation calls for mobilizing the group’s resources to face, define and resolve its problems - then a leader, a person trying to get work done, will come up against the group’s natural inclination to avoid taking the work back onto its own shoulders. In these situations leadership often requires going against the patterns of constituents, beyond their expectations, and thus outside of one’s authority, to get work done. But unlike Richard Nixon’s idea of leadership - which assumes that a stand is a policy answer, and answers are to be explained so that the people are won over - this view of leadership sees a stand as a tool for engaging the people in doing work, and sees popular approval as a possible indication of work avoidance within the group.

Of course, it isn’t that the person exercising leadership knows what the work is. It isn’t that he knows “what to do.” The need for leadership arises precisely because there are many highly problematic situations in which no one knows what to do. If the direction were clear, the solution available through technical expertise, then an authority in that field would suffice; one could presumably bring him in, or elect him.

In the conventional wisdom, effective political leadership is defined as the capacity to achieve one’s declared goals, to get one’s program enacted. The emphasis is not only on having a program one can call one’s own, but on being able to manage one’s influence to achieve it. This perspective, even in what appear to be Type I situations, may be a trap for those in authority who want to exercise leadership. As a simple example, consider the authority figure who thinks he has a solution and whose primary stake is to enact a specific policy - say a president who passionately believes in a particular energy policy. As Kellerman describes in The Political Presidency, the primary requirement for success, even here, will be the president’s capacity to engage the relevant community of interests (Congress, press, interest groups, public, cabinet) in the work of facing, assessing, and creating terms for resolving the problematic situation. This leadership process demands continuous engagement and intent listening so that the president can include in his definition of the problem and its policy solutions as much of the political landscape as he can. Getting a program enacted will require incorporating the...
various points of view represented in the community of interests — a process of learning and compromise that will tend to produce a program no longer one’s own. Clinging to a specific policy as “one’s own” will often lead to failure because it is essentially an apolitical policy formulation and implementation strategy. That is, the work has been conceived as the individual’s rather than the group’s. The fundamental error lies in dealing with Type II and Type III situations as if they were Type I.

Many leadership theorists and practitioners have fallen into the same trap as have “followers.” They identify the primary locus of work with the individual authority rather than with the community of interests that has the problem. Societies that operate according to the conventional wisdom tend to produce “leaders” who perpetuate the mistake of misidentifying the primary locus of work and thus fail to engage the problem-defining and problem-solving resources of the group. Individual efforts remain unintegrated with a systemic solution. John Stuart Mill describes this dynamic.

“…The mischief begins when, instead of calling forth the activity and powers of individuals and bodies, [a government] substitutes its own activity for theirs; when instead of informing, advising, and upon occasion, denouncing, it makes them work in fetters, or bids them stand aside and does their work instead of them. The worth of a state, in the long run, is the worth of the individuals composing it ... a State which dwarfs its men, in order that they may be more docile instruments in its hands even for beneficial purposes - will find that with small men no great thing can really be accomplished.”

Leadership and Public Problem Solving as Group Phenomena

No situation can be described, a priori, as a problem. Situations seem problematic because people value one state of affairs over another. People would rather not be poor, for example, so joblessness is deemed a problem. In the public realm, the kinds of situations we define as problematic often change. For example, inequality of opportunity is defined as a problem today, but at times in the past it was simply a generally accepted condition sustained by a set of prevailing understandings.

Work on any large-scale problem situation may be impossible without first shifting the prevailing understanding so that the situation is seen as problematic. Advocates of various public concerns and causes often serve this function by bringing what they think is a problem or opportunity to general attention. In this way, a vision of the future acts as a stimulus, rather than an answer. It is the grain of sand in the oyster, not the pearl.

The work process moves forward as competing frames for the problem are carved out from the overall problematic landscape. This process will require that the various components of the relevant community, each representing a different perspective on the problem situation, engage one another. Ways to test the parameters of the situation must be developed and implemented. Problems have to be distinguished from conditions. As suggested before, problems are those aspects of a situation that potentially can be resolved, while conditions are those aspects that are probably unchangeable. To fail in this distinction is usually to mistake illusion for reality. For example, in U.S.-Soviet relations, each nation’s vulnerability to the other’s weapons (nuclear, chemical, biological) is a condition central to a problematic situation. Although many might like to view this condition as the crux of the problem and then imagine a technical Type I cure for it - a perfect “Star Wars” defense, for example - such a vision denies essential aspects of reality. Few people actually suppose that we can make ourselves invulnerable, not only to nuclear weapons, but to biological and chemical weapons as well. Defining “mutual vulnerability” as a problem rather than a condition is thus inaccurate. Alternative problem definitions are: improving security within the condition of mutual vulnerability by improving U.S.-Soviet relations, crisis prevention and management, strengthening deterrence through arms control, diminishing the displacement of Third World tensions into the U.S.-Soviet relationship, and so forth. To produce work, a vision needs to be rooted in reality; it has to have accuracy, and not simply imagination and appeal.

Most situations policy makers face involve a multitude of related problems at varying stages of definition and develop-
ment. Some facets of the situation are just beginning to be perceived by the community as problematic, others have long been seen as problems but remain unsolved and appear unremitting, while perhaps a few problems are near resolution. A policy to address one problem will often affect not only the way other problems are defined but also the resources available to address them. As time passes, work in one problem area may stimulate insights that lead to problem redefinition in other areas, and in turn to changes in policy and resource allocation. Indeed, since situations and resources are overlapping, many such insights may be possible. For example, our investigation of the 1986 explosion of the space shuttle Challenger should yield insight into the mismanagement of organizations in general, not just the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Furthermore, we may discover something about the impact of rapid privatization on the management systems of public agencies and the danger of seeing such a policy as a mechanical cure-all for the ills of government, society, and other nations. Although the privatization of public bus systems may constitute good policy in some cities, pushing NASA to act like a profit-making business with rigid production deadlines evidently was not.

In this complex and somewhat fluid environment, the public official is faced with the challenge of managing the discovery, shaping, and rediscovery of each step in the problem-defining and -solving process over time. He must be able to lead the relevant community of interests in facing unwanted situations, investigating what can be changed and what cannot discovering what it is willing to define as a problem, applying insights from other areas, and fashioning the life adjustments that will constitute the material of any solution.

This expertise operates on a razor’s edge. An expert at leadership has to manage the means, pace, authority structures, and other devices for containing and focusing the usually turbulent process of putting people’s problems back in their own laps without abandoning them. A leader is likely to encounter plenty of frustration, conflict, and anger as he challenges the community to tolerate the confusion and discomfort of learning. Success will depend on (1) identifying the problem situations that the community indicates are ripe for its attention, (2) determining the composition of the relevant community of interests, (3) designing positions and policies to address the ripe situations so that the relevant community learns its way to a solution, and (4) implementing and assessing actions according to their effects on the community’s work process.

Franklin Roosevelt’s management of leadership illustrates this expertise quite well. Especially before the 1937 court-packing fiasco, Roosevelt routinely left the various communities of interest in confusion until policy directions emerged from their struggle with their uncertainty, values, and doubt. “Situations had to be permitted to develop, to crystallize, to clarify; the competing forces had to vindicate themselves in the actual pull and tug of conflict; public opinion had to face the question, consider it, pronounce upon it - only then, at the long frazzled end, would the President’s intuitions consolidate and precipitate a results.”

For example, during the depth of the Depression, rather than establish an official economic policy, Roosevelt avoided becoming attached to any particular strategy, economic theory, or solution. Of course, he had his own preferences. The point, however, was not primarily to implement his preferences. The point was to track the trends in the group for clues to the issues that were ripe for its attention and for which he could use his formal authority and personal power to provoke its work. Roosevelt’s expertise did not lie in inventing solutions and implementing them, but in improvising temporary catalysts of work in the form of policies and positions, depending on the way the work was progressing, or being avoided, in the group at the time.

Yet Roosevelt saw himself in a favorite simile as a quarterback in a football game. He could not say what the play after next was going to be until the next play was completed. “If the play makes ten yards,” he told a press conference in April 1933, “the succeeding play will be different from what it would have been if they had been thrown for a loss. I think that’s the easiest way to explain it.” And, from his point of view, the Frankfurters and the Tugwells, the Johnson’s and the Hulls represented alternative plays, not alternative strategies. Each ideological system, as he must have felt it,
described certain aspects of American reality, each missed out on certain vital features, and effectiveness might therefore most probably lie not in taking one or the other but in combining and applying both to meet the needs of a particular situation.

Sometimes, for purely tactical reasons, a leader will indeed take clear stands or put his full weight behind a specific policy. Taking such a position, even if it does not conform to his personal values and may serve as a heuristic device to stimulate and guide the conflictive and deliberative work of problem defining and problem. Stands and policies are thus designed both to generate work and to test the waters (i.e., gather more information). Based upon his analysis of how and which issues are ripening in the relevant community, a leader may well shift his weight or change his stance over time. For example, to prevent premature closure on an argument when the point of view represented by the weakening side is not being faced by the larger community of interests, a leader might find ways to reinforce the weaker side, even if he himself is ideologically opposed to it, so as to keep the process sufficiently fluid for the work to continue. In this regard, a leader is like a midwife trying to keep the mother from pushing the baby out too soon.

A leader may have to gauge, interpret, and manage not only which situations or issues are ripe for attention, but also the vicissitudes any hard work is bound to encounter.

A leader may have to gauge, interpret, and manage not only which situations or issues are ripe for attention, but also the vicissitudes any hard work is bound to encounter. As suggested earlier, when the work itself requires that the community wrestle with its conflicting points of view, there are bound to be many diversions and other mechanisms of work avoidance.

Chief among these mechanisms is the penchant for looking to the person in authority for answers. Thus to exercise leadership, the authority figure may have to pace the rate at which he fails the demand for answers, perhaps very slowly. He may have a “honeymoon period,” but if he does not act carefully in giving the work back to the group at a rate it can manage, the community in its frustration may well scapegoat its authority figure by pulling him down and replacing him—all in the belief that—if only we had the right leader our problems would be solved.”

Alternatively, the community may avoid taking responsibility for a difficult situation by defining the problem so narrowly that it appears amenable to a technical solution. Or the community and its authorities may create a diversion by producing a new situation - for example, a war. Rather than telling the people what they want to hear, leadership involves telling the people over time what they need to hear to get them to face and solve their problems.

In managing the identification and resolution of difficult issues, a leader will be managing community processes of learning: assessing current situations, questioning previous assumptions, learning the different points of view embodied by opposing interests, inventing frames for defining problems that take in a sufficient breadth of those interests, implementing solutions by adjusting actions and attitudes as a community, and redefining problems and solutions as the situation changes and as various points of view change. Each of these tasks consists of learning.

Learning processes may be more successful in the long run than seductively narrow problem definitions and easily administered technical solutions. But learning is difficult, conflictive, and takes time. “Learning its way there” may also be the only way a society progresses from one level of success to another. Schlesinger describes Roosevelt’s presidency this way: “If politics was essentially an educational process, deeds, of course, were the most important teacher. The New Deal itself became a great schoolhouse, compelling Americans to a greater knowledge of their country and its problems.”

Learning processes are difficult to gauge. The bottom line may be long in coming. Perhaps the best index a leader may have to gauge his success in the short run is simply the extent to which the community is thinking in the right direction. As Roosevelt wrote to H.C. Wells in 1935, “I believe our biggest success is making people think during these past two years. They may not think straight but they are thinking in the right direction.”

Democracy

Democracy is often seen as a means to protect individual and inalienable rights and freedom. From the perspective outlined in this chapter, however, democracy appears to be a system for turning the work of the
community back over to the community. As suggested by others in this volume, these two ideas of democracy may be complementary.

Thus democracy is not primarily a political structure, but a shared set of attitudes by which the community itself takes responsibility for work rather than pushing the work onto the shoulders of its authorities. Democracy might flourish within many kinds of political structures (such as monarchy or socialism) as long as the community effectively takes responsibility for work. Conversely, efforts to institute a democratic political structure in a community that does not take responsibility for its own work will not necessarily produce democracy. Eugene Debs went to the heart of this distinction: “Too long have the workers of the world waited for some Moses to lead them out of bondage. He has not come; he will never come. I would not lead you out if I could; for if you could be led out, you could be led back again.”

Perhaps democracy as a political structure owes its success as a problem-defining and problem-solving apparatus not simply to the mortality protecting and distributing “rights and privileges,” but to its capacity, within a group structure and as a community set of attitudes, to distribute the responsibility for work in the only place where the work can be done.

Further Inquiry

The alternative conception of leadership and public policy suggested in this chapter and by this volume will require more analysis and testing. Readers will undoubtedly find they have many important and unresolved questions. In the spirit of the ideas presented here, we have intended to stimulate thinking on such questions, not to answer them definitively. These questions might include:

- How can one analyze the trends in a society to gauge when an issue is ripe for the group's attention?
- Is the current “crisis in leadership” a sign of growing frustration with complex situations, evidence of a work-avoidance mechanism, or an indication that work is getting done?
- What interpretive frameworks can be used to help communities define and solve the problems they face?
- How does one exercise leadership at times of crisis, when there is apparently little or no time to shift the locus of work back to the relevant community?
- What is the difference between policy designed as a heuristic device and policy designed as a solution?
- What are the implications of this concept of leadership for developing political strategy and tactics to get work done?
- Which political structures might be appropriate for promoting democracy as a value system and in which settings?
- What knowledge and training would a leader need?
The Center for Public Leadership at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University hosted seven events involving eight different departments at the University. The Harvard University Leadership Roundtable, as it came to be called, came to one final conclusion:

“...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.”

“Conversations on Leadership”
Harvard University Leadership Roundtable, 2001-2002

Jim Heskert, a professor writing in “Working Knowledge,” the web page for the Harvard Business School, asked, “Why the bull market in leadership books?” People responded to his question, outlining a spectrum of reasons for paying attention to leadership:

• Economic and national insecurity has us searching for leaders who will show us a way of regaining what we have lost.

• Our natural tendency to look for a “silver bullet” solution.

• The books make leadership accessible to a wider range of people.

• Books on how to lead are needed as long as self-interest continues to drive human conduct.

• There is a need for people with leadership skills to replace the wave of managers who were hired at fast growing startups into leadership positions that they were not qualified to occupy.

• Our culture is changing. The general business leadership principles are out-dated and don’t work any longer. These books reflect the “self-help” world meeting business leadership.
Section 2

How are people prepared to become leaders?

READINGS
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Preparing ‘Civic Trustees’: The Role of Community Leadership Programs
Community Leadership Programs in New Mexico
What is your “personal best” leadership experience?

You have been involved in many experiences in your career. For this exercise, focus on only those in which you were the leader. You might use these criteria to select your leadership experience:

- Your experience does not need to be restricted to a time when you were an appointed or selected leader. It can be either a time when you emerged as the informal leader or manager.
- It can be in any functional area, in a service or manufacturing organization, in a public or private institution, in a staff or line position.
- It can be the start up of a new business, a new product or service development program, a quality or productivity improvement project, and so on.
- The experience does not need to have occurred in your present organization; it could be a past work experience. It could also have occurred in a club, a professional organization, a school, or any other setting. Let it be any time when you felt that you performed at your very best as a leader.

Leadership Lessons

1) What did you learn about leadership style and practice from this “personal best” leadership experience?

2) If you were going to teach someone else about leadership on the basis of your own personal best experience, what morals and lessons about leadership would you pass along? What would you tell others to do to be an effective leader?

3) Of all the things that contributed to the success of your leadership experience—whether actions that you took or other factors—what was the most important contributor to the experience’s success? What action, attribute, and so on, made the most difference?

4) What prepared you to lead in this experience? Is there something about your family life, schooling, or professional experiences or training that helps explain how you were a leader in this instance?

5) If you were going to contribute one quotation of you own, one personal saying, to this magazine about leadership, what would that quotation be?
A new generation of programs seeks to cultivate charity leaders

By Heather Joslyn

Four years ago, Donele J. Wilkins was leading a brand-new nonprofit organization, Detroiters Working for Environmental Justice. The group was tiny — just Ms. Wilkins and a part-time intern, with no money budgeted for programs — but she had big plans for it. She wanted to find more funds and strengthen her group's ability to lobby against environmental policies that harm minorities.

Enter Eureka Communities, an 11-year-old program that offers two-year fellowships to nurture nonprofit leaders in five U.S. cities, including Detroit. In addition to requiring her to meet with other Eureka Detroit fellows once a month, the program paid for Ms. Wilkins to visit two nonprofit organizations in New York and Washington. At the West Harlem Environmental Action Team, she says, she learned how collaborating with universities on research projects can produce money for staffing and programs. At the Preamble Center, a Washington think tank, she got firsthand experience in leading meetings with grassroots groups and sat in when the center's advocates testified at a Senate hearing.

Her experiences, she says, helped her set realistic goals and get more creative about gathering resources. Her group now has 12 employees, including four whose salaries are paid by the University of Michigan, the state, or the federal AmeriCorps program. The group has also begun to develop leaders itself, helping citizens prepare to appear at public hearings on transportation issues. “Eureka gave me an opportunity to think long term,” she says, “to strategize about how we want to do our work.”

Nonprofit leadership programs have proliferated over the past decade, an echo of the emphasis on leadership development in the for-profit field. Most of these programs can boast of their alumni's accomplishments and point to successful collaborations between program participants, but none claim to have the perfect formula for cultivating leaders — or, for that matter, agree on what leadership is, or where leaders come from. What's more, while most evaluate participants' experience, none have figured out how to measure definitively whether their programs can turn potential into greatness. As a result, nonprofit leadership programs differ widely in structure, philosophy, and goals.

Cynthia A. Chavez, executive director of Eureka San Francisco, who formerly helped oversee the W.K. Kellogg Foundation's National Leadership Program, says she and her colleagues "often asked themselves, 'Leadership for what?'" she says. "The field of nonprofit leadership is still in this stage —"
‘Leadership for what?’ Once that question is answered, there will be greater clarity about meeting the need.”

Regardless, nonprofit leaders appear to be clamoring for leadership guidance, say those who operate these programs. “It’s so clear that the demand far outstrips the supply,” says Cheryl L. Dorsey, president of the Echoing Green Foundation, in New York, which gives fellowships to individuals who create public-service projects. Her organization, she says, receives 1,100 applications for only 10 slots per year. Other programs report similar ratios: The Ford Foundation’s Leadership for a Changing World program, whose admission process is by nomination, received 3,000 nominations last year for 20 slots.

While hundreds of leadership programs operate across the country, some grant makers have only joined the field in the last few years — and some longtime sponsors of such programs are rethinking them. Among the most prominent developments:

- The Ford Foundation started its $4.5 million New Voices fellowship for emerging leaders three years ago and its $3.8 million Leadership for a Changing World program for midcareer leaders two years ago.

- The Ford Motor Company two years ago began sponsoring a $289,000 program for nonprofit leaders from abroad through New York’s 92nd St Y.

- Ashoka, a 22-year-old international organization that gives fellowships to “social entrepreneurs”—creators of public-service projects—started a fellowship program in the United States two years ago and one in Canada this past spring, the cost of the programs set at $5 million.

- The Pew Partnership for Civic Change and the W.K. Kellogg Foundation both ended leadership programs last year and are replacing them this summer with new efforts, Pew’s $250,000 LeadershipPlenty and Kellogg’s $1.2 million Leadership for Community Change Series.

- Eureka is considering expanding its $3 million program to include a partnership with a leadership program in Seattle, along with similar arrangements in seven other American cities and in Wales, says Steve Vetter, the organization’s executive director.

Some charities, such as Rebuilding Together, a national volunteer group in Washington that rehabilitates homes for needy homeowners, are starting to groom their own leaders through programs tailored to their needs. Rebuilding Together collaborated in June with the University of Pennsylvania’s College of General Studies on its first five-day “boot camp,” an intensive training program for staff members of the charity’s affiliates that emphasized leadership skills.

Interest in non-profit leadership programs among grant makers is growing because of expanding needs in the non-profit field, says Philip Li, executive director of the Coro New York Leadership Center. “As government plays a diminishing role in providing services,” he says, “there’s a greater interest in making sure that the opportunities and creative juices of individuals who work in the nonprofit sector are able to be tapped and realized.”

Differing Definitions

Where leadership begins, ends, and overlaps with management skills can be difficult to define in the world of charities, where leaders often grapple with many roles at once. “There’s a reason there are 2,700 different definitions of leadership — leadership changes every day,” says Rick Foster, vice president for programs at the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, in Battle Creek, Mich.

Most leadership educators say that the key element of leadership is the ability to negotiate relationships — with colleagues, constituents, and even oneself. “Leadership development, at its deepest essence, is addressing how do we relate to others,” says Ms. Chavez.

How leadership is developed, and which leaders are being developed, however, depends upon the philosophy and means of those who are financing the programs. Some efforts focus on midcareer professionals, while others cultivate emerging leaders — and many programs mix nonprofit workers with those from the for-profit field and government, or even those who have been excluded from the world of working professionals. Some programs focus on practical
skill development, such as honing communication abilities, while others may provide money for travel and study, facilitate mentor relationships, or offer support to a particular organization or project.

The programs can vary widely too in the extent of the commitment they require from participants. At one end of the spectrum sits the Annie E. Casey Children and Family Fellowships, which take a very intensive and hands-on approach, requiring fellows to work and study full time for 11 months at the Casey Foundation’s Baltimore Headquarters and at other Casey-financed organizations nationwide.

By contrast, the Echoing Green Foundation guides nonprofit leaders with a lighter touch, and takes a venture-capital approach to supporting them. Although the foundation offers its fellows management support and opportunities to meet each other, its chief assistance is the money it awards for specific public-service projects.

Even those who sponsor leadership programs, however, question to what degree leadership can be taught. “Some people say great leaders are born not made — the best you can do is find them and put them in right slot,” says Steven A. Schroeder, president of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, whose Community Health Leadership Program has operated for a decade. “The other side says that there’s an awful lot of coaching that can transform people. I think the truth is somewhere in the middle: people who are genuinely motivated and altruistic — it’s awfully hard to teach that. On the other hand, there are leadership skills of how to communicate, how to use time wisely, how engender trust, how to help your subordinates to do better. I think all of these are teachable skills and can help make a good leader great.

“TThe question is, how much did you help them, and how much did you just pick good people? It’s an imponderable,” he says.

Although she says that some of her program’s participants have benefited from skills coaching, Catherine M. Dunham, director of the Community Health Leadership Program, has operated for a decade. “The other side says that there’s an awful lot of coaching that can transform people. I think the truth is somewhere in the middle: people who are genuinely motivated and altruistic — it’s awfully hard to teach that. On the other hand, there are leadership skills of how to communicate, how to use time wisely, how engender trust, how to help your subordinates to do better. I think all of these are teachable skills and can help make a good leader great.

Striving for Inclusion

Leadership programs grapple with many questions, but one way in which their proponents say they have contributed answers to the nonprofit field is in the way they provide new paths to power for minorities and others who may feel excluded from charities’ upper echelons.

As survey after survey shows that nonprofit management overall includes a small percentage of minorities, and that women are less likely than men to lead large charities, leadership programs often effect efforts to redress that imbalance. About 70 percent of all Eureka Communities fellows, for example, are members of minority groups.
Some programs are designed to focus on minorities or women, such as Women's Health Leadership, an eight-year-old California program that boasts 300 alumnae. The program has produced many alumnae of note in the nonprofit world: Seventy-five percent of program graduates go on to lead women’s health projects or other charities, says a program director, Connie Chan Robison. However, while its new alumni network has found support, the leadership program itself is on hiatus due to insufficient donations. Ms. Chan Robison says the program has fallen prey to a common problem in the nonprofit world: foundations losing enthusiasm for an aging program, however successful it might be. “Right now, we’re challenged with creating the opportunity for people to come into the door,” she says. “And the fact of the matter is, I don’t think we’re done yet.”

Leadership programs that recruit ethnically diverse participants can help those participants try out different styles of communication and resolving conflict, says Chet P. Hewitt, director of the Alameda County Social Service Agency, in California. Mr. Hewitt, who is black, says his experience as a Casey Foundation Children and Family fellow helped him learn to calibrate his communication skills when working with people from other backgrounds: “Being a leader in a diverse, urban environment requires that you understand how cultural attributes, cultural norms, work or don’t work in environments that are diverse.”

‘The Fellowship Syndrome’

Ethnicity and gender aren’t the only obstacles to attaining leadership in the nonprofit field, and some programs look to cultivate nontraditional leaders who may lack access to coaching and support from peers. Echoing Green’s Ms. Dorsey says programs like hers, which recognize emerging leaders, can combat what she calls “the fellowship syndrome — where the same people are recognized over and over.”

Some programs concentrate on breaking down other barriers imposed by leaders’ educational or socioeconomic backgrounds. In Jersey City, the recently ended Pew Civic Entrepreneur Initiative — financed by the Pew Partnership for Civic Change, and run by a coalition of local nonprofit organizations — nurtured leaders ranging in age from their 20’s to their 60’s, and drew many who might fall through the cracks of other leadership programs, such as those who don’t speak much English, or who lack high-school diplomas. “Some are unemployed,” says Jill Lewis, director of the Henry J. Raimondo Institute for Urban Research and Public Policy at New Jersey City University, who coordinated the program locally. “They might spend all their time doing community work or helping to raise their grandchildren.”

Despite the obstacles so many participants face, Pew’s Jersey City effort has borne fruit: Some participants have started their own nonprofit organizations, Ms. Lewis says, with one group of alumnae creating the city’s first shelter for women with the virus that causes AIDS.

Measuring Results

The nonprofit-leadership education field is relatively young and its programs varied. But all of the attempts to cultivate leadership must eventually seek to answer the ultimate question: Do they make a difference?

Several programs can point to the results from surveys of their alumni evidence that their programs have impact: A 1999 survey of Eureka fellows, for example, found that 98 percent of respondents reported that they had enhanced their leadership and management skills during their participation in Eureka, that 75 percent of their charities now serve more people, and that 83 percent of them reported that they had joined in new collaborations with other organizations since starting their fellowships.

But some data suggest that leadership programs’ significance may fade as their participants’ careers continue: A longitudinal study of the Kellogg National Fellowship Program, released last year, found that while 71 percent of alumni who had been out of the program for no more than five years reported that it had been “one of the most significant positive experiences” of their lives, only 27 percent of alumni who had been out at least 12 years said the same.

Some grant makers have built evaluation components into their leadership programs. Leadership for a Changing World, for example, is working with the OMG Center for Collabora-
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A Sampling of Non-Profit Leadership Programs

From the Chronicle of Philanthropy—September 19, 2002

Here are some of the most popular and prestigious leadership programs that include participants from the nonprofit world:

- **Ashoka Fellows**—Ashoka, an international organization with American offices in Arlington, Va., offers up to 25 three-year fellowships for “social entrepreneurs” — individuals who wish to create or expand public-service projects — that include stipends based on financial need (up to $55,000 per year) and access to pro bono management and leadership assistance. Ashoka also facilitates international collaborations among its fellows. Fellows are chosen by nomination.
  http://www.ashoka.org/us-canada/selection/nominate.cfm

- **Annie E. Casey Foundation Children and Family Fellowships**—The Casey Foundation, in Baltimore, offers 10 fellowships to midcareer individuals who work in the field of children and family. The fellowships include stipends roughly equivalent to each fellow’s salary or 11 months, health benefits, and the travel and housing costs incurred by the fellows’ work assignments in the foundation’s headquarters and at other organizations around the country. The Foundation anticipates setting a deadline for nominations for its next class of fellows in early 2004.
  http://www.aecf.org/fellowship/experience.htm

- **Coro Fellows Program in Public Affairs**—Coro, with offices in Los Angeles, New York, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and St. Louis, offers 4 full-time, nine-month fellowships that include field assignments, individual and group projects, and a formal relationship with a mentor. Tuition is $3,500, though scholarships and living-expenses assistance are available on a case-by-case basis. Applications are due January 3, 2003.
  http://www.coro.org/how_to_apply/how_to_apply.html#fellows

  Coro also offers a number of part-time leadership programs.
  http://www.coro.org/programs/programs.html

- **Echoing Green Fellowships**—Each year, the Echoing Green Foundation, in New York, offers 10 “social entrepreneurs” $60,000 stipends over two years (or $90,000 over the same period split between two partners), health benefits, and management support to complete or expand public-service projects. Applications are due January 6, 2003.
  http://www.echoinggreen.org/become/index.htm

- **Eureka Fellowships**—Eureka Communities, located in Boston, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Diego, and San Francisco, each offer seven two-year fellowships to nonprofit leaders that provide two trips to other U.S. charities to study best practices, along with monthly fellows meetings and occasional workshops. Application deadlines vary by city.
  http://eureka-communities.org/how.html

- **Ford Motor Company International Fellowship Program**—of the 2nd Street Y. The Ford Motor Company, in Dearborn, Mich., offers up to 25 fellowships a year through New York’s 92nd Street Y to emerging nonprofit leaders who live outside the United States. The fellowship is a two-week program that includes a small stipend and all expenses paid, classes in nonprofit management at Columbia University, visits to New...
York charities, and a visit to Ford’s corporate headquarters in Michigan. Applications for the 2003 fellowships are due October 29.

http://www.92ndsty.org/content/ford_fellowship.asp

- **Frances Hesselbein Community Innovation Fellows Program**—The Peter F. Drucker Foundation for Nonprofit Management, in New York, offers five one-year fellowships to midcareer nonprofit managers that include workshops and conferences, formal mentor relationships, and access to the foundation’s educational resources. Applications are not yet being accepted for 2003 fellowships but are usually due in May of each year.

http://pfdf.org/fellows/apply.html

- **Robert Wood Johnson Community Health Leadership Program**—The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, in Princeton, N.J., offers 10 wards of $120,000 per year (a $15,000 personal stipend plus $105,000 for the program where the award recipient works) to recognize midcareer community health-care providers and advocates and their programs. The nomination process begins with a letter of intent, which must be received by September 30.

http://www.communityhealthleaders.org/nom.cfm

- **Kellogg Leadership for Community Change**—The W.K. Kellogg Foundation is beginning this program next month for community activists in six U.S. cities and rural towns.

- **Leadership for a Changing World**—The Ford Foundation provides 20 awards per year, which include $100,000 over two years for the awardees’ programs, $30,000 for individual learning opportunities such as skills coaching or travel, and participation in group meetings and in research on leadership. Nominations will be accepted for the next group of award recipients beginning in October.

http://leadershipforchange.org/nomination

- **The Ford Foundation also sponsors New Voices**, which provides grants to nonprofit organizations to allow them to hire entry-level staff members.

http://newvoices.aed.org

- **LeadershipPlenty**—The Pew Partnership for Civic Change began this program last July in five U.S. locations, with plans to expand to 150 cities and towns over the next three years. The series will offer workshops and other activities, such as group projects, on a part-time basis to 25 participants per place. Nonprofit organizations can apply to be LeadershipPlenty partners, which will be selected annually. Selections will be made by December 31. For information, contact the Pew Partnership at mail@Pew-partnership.org.

- **Reinhard Mohn Fellowships**—The media company Bertelsmann AG, in Gutersloh, Germany, offers up to seven year-long fellowships to public-service innovators that include $53,000 annual stipends and work assignments at Bertelsmann companies and programs around the world. Applications will be accepted beginning January 1, 2003.

http://www.reinhard-mohn-fellowship.com/index_txt_bruecke.php3

- **Next Generation Leadership**—The Rockefeller Foundation, in New York, offers 24 two-year fellowships for studies and travel for participants to learn more about democracy in the program’s first year and to work at broadening their constituencies in the second, for which grants are available through the program’s “solutions fund.” Admission to the program begins with a closed nomination process. For information, http://www.nglnet.org
PREPARING “CIVIC TRUSTEES”

The Role of Community Leadership Programs

Leadership Development Conference—Cleveland, Ohio, 1989.

What is a “civic trustee” and what does it take to be an effective one? About 30 people met under the auspices of the Lilly Endowment and Cleveland State University Urban Center in the spring of 1988 to explore the concept and the role of Community Leadership Programs (CLP’s) as they existed at that time.

The group concluded that there are various types of “trustees,” from the kind that oversee the policies of organizations in a board, to those people who might see themselves in a similar role but in relation to their community; perhaps they could be called “community trustees.” They would be people who are active in their communities, public servants, activists for community services and programs, as well as those who serve on boards of nonprofit organizations.

The discussion centered on three basic concepts: First, the theory of community change and the changing expectations of community trustees. Second, what an individual needs to know in order to be an effective community trustee and how they are raised and prepared to take on that role. And third, whether CLP’s are uniquely able to contribute to the education and development of effective community trustees.

Changing Communities and Roles of Community Trustees

In the 19th Century, a community leader was one who was raised to take on the role largely through the position of his family. Usually an Anglo male, his family was wealthy due to business success and establishment of philanthropic organizations. These men exercised local leadership in a holistic sense: prominent in many sectors simultaneously – business, government, charity and church. These are the traditional “town fathers” who set community norms, provided stability and continuity and supported community welfare institutions.

The underbelly of those seemingly halcyon days was occupied by racial and gender discrimination.

In the late 19th and early 20th Century, with industrialization and the growth of a working class, people began to specialize and engage in professions that placed more emphasis on career success rather than community improvement. People became more geographically mobile, weakening their ties to a location and eroding the strength of their communities.

As more people moved into the cities that grew through industrialization, local and state governments were called upon to provide services and regulations to guarantee the safety, health and welfare of their citizens. Thus were born government programs and a new order known as the “politics of interest.” In recent years, these politics have led to greater equity for women and minorities, workplace safety laws, protections for the elderly and subsidies for business, all of which contributed to the relatively wealthy, safe pluralistic society that characterized the United States.

The dark side of the politics of interest emerged in the latter half of the 20th Century in the evolution from pluralism to “hyperpluralism.” In this evolution of the social order, interest groups are so powerful that they can command public policy decisions to their favor. Designated or elected leaders are prone to “give away” public decisions to powerful groups, while the fragmentation of interests makes it enormously difficult to arrive at important choices needed to set public standards.

Through a new order of civic pluralism, perhaps with the development of civic trustees and CLP’s, some of the service orientation and commitment to community may be restored. Civic pluralism would recognize hard-won rights and diversity, but recognize and foster ways to
integrate, rather than fragment, the community.

What Trustees Need to Know and How They Learn It

People are not born knowing how to be good trustees of their communities or their institutions. There may have been a time when “civic trustees” were “bred” for the role by their upbringing. But times have changed and civic trustees face entirely new challenges than did their forebears.

Some companies and civic organizations do a better job of grooming community leaders by encouraging them to serve on nonprofit boards. But mostly recruitment and training of trustees is informal, occurring in the vast ranks of volunteers.

A community is only as good as its appointed, elected and volunteer public servants, and others in the private and nonprofit sectors. Many institutions do not function as well as they could, or should, and perhaps that is the result of trustees not knowing what they should do to be good civic trustees.

What would a “good” civic trustee need to know? Three broad areas were identified:

1) The organization he or she operates in and the community it serves. Knowledge about an organization’s history, mission and values usually is transmitted superficially, if at all. However this information reveals the agency’s potential and limitations and trustees that do not have this information are ill-equipped to make wise decisions about its future. Organizations do not exist in a vacuum. Trustees need to know their community well enough to know how the agency fits into the fabric of community services.

2) The roles and responsibilities of a trustee. While diversity and bringing in “new blood” are important goals, it is not enough. Trustees should know what is expected of them in their new role as community and agency trustees. Ideal trustees should have some proficiency in a range of tasks, including reading a budget, hiring a chief executive and fundraising. But while trustees are often recruited for their specific skills in law, marketing or accounting, which an organization would like to have access to for free, they often lack knowledge of how their organization can be managed to work for the community good.

3) The skills that would enable a trustee to function effectively in a decision-making group. In recent years, it has become essential for trustees to know how to work within groups to achieve decisions. Within the context of the “politics of interest,” decision-making is not left to any one sector or individual but must be done in an environment where widely divergent interests come to the table as legitimate stakeholders in their community’s future. Skills including negotiation and collaborative problem solving are needed for an organization to achieve consensus on its mission, goals and strategies.

Then, what would a civic trustee or community leader look like in a city that practices civic pluralism? He or she would be a person adept at finding ways to help diverse groups, especially those that are typically marginalized or who bring difficult conflicts to the table, to begin honest dialogue about the issues that separate them and the possibilities for common solutions.

The leader would also know when to expand participation in decision making, and when difficult decisions need to be made by the leader.

Finally, the leader would have a special feel for his or her community, would be especially skilled at leading discussions and take into account the special needs of the community as a whole. The leader would also be able to reflect on his or her career and leadership and understand how they serve active engagement in civic life.

“If people are too intimidated or too reluctant to help their leaders lead, their leaders will fail.”

The Role of Community Leadership Programs

A primary goal of most Community Leadership Programs (CLP’s) is to prepare citizens to function as civic trustees. Programs identify prospective trustees and those who are already serving in a trustee capacity, then place them in a program that offers them the skills that would allow them to function effectively in a leadership position for the benefit of their community. This is done primarily by grouping prospective trustees in classes with other prospects, giving them an opportunity to know each other, learn from each other and course alumni, and develop skills in community leadership.

CLP’s provide participants with broad general knowledge about their community and the people who live and work in it. This overview is invaluable in helping participants understand how a community works so they can begin to visualize and create opportunities for partnerships and initiatives. Similarly, the participants have an opportunity to reflect on their values and responsibilities as members of a democratic society. A CLP can introduce class members to the wide range of volunteer and professional opportunities that exist within their communities.

Most CLP’s train their participants in group process skills. Beginning with communication with their fellow participants, the class experiences communication among a diverse cross-section of their community and can develop their listening, framing, questioning and consensus building skills.

By their nature, CLP’s tend to support and encourage the values that most communities seek and need to achieve their goals: an expanded capacity and respect for diversity, comfort with change and ambiguity, belief in the importance of service, and a vision of the future.

Ultimately, CLP’s have a role in preparing civic trustees for leadership, however the majority of them focus on the “big picture,” while leaving detailed training for other programs. Every CLP must evaluate its program to determine whether it is doing enough or could do better. In any case, CLP’s are perhaps the most effective tool that exists to help nurture the next generation of leaders in an era of civic pluralism.

Edited February 2003 by Ed Moreno for New Mexico First.
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LEADERSHIP NEW MEXICO
Founded to identify current and emerging leaders throughout New Mexico, enhance their leadership skills, and deepen their knowledge of the challenges and opportunities facing our state.

Patty Komko, Executive Director
320 Gold SW, Suite 221
Albuquerque, NM 87102
505-241-4800
505-241-4801
patty@leadershipnm.org

Leadership Alamogordo
Ed Carr, Executive Director
Alamogordo Chamber of Commerce
1301 North White Sands Blvd.
Alamogordo, NM 88310-6659
505-437-6120
505-437-6334 (fax)
800-826-0294
ed@alamogordo.com
www.alamogordo.com

Leadership Albuquerque
Janice Honeycutt, Vice President
Leadership and Work Force
Development
Greater Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Box 25100
Albuquerque, NM 87125
505-764-3733
505-764-3714 (fax)
jhoneycutt@gacc.org
www.gaac.org

Leadership Carlsbad
Mark Maciha, Chief Ranger – Carlsbad Caverns National Park/
Cavern City Rotary Club
3225 National Parks Hwy
Carlsbad, NM 88220
505-785-3035
505-785-2133 (fax)
mark_maciha@nps.gov

Leadership Clovis
Ernie Kos, Executive Director
Clovis/Curry County Chamber of Commerce
215 North Main Street
Clovis, NM 88101
505-763-3435
505-763-7266 (fax)
800-261-7656
clovisnm@clovisnm.org
www.clovisnm.org

Leadership Hobbs
Raymond Battaglini, Executive Director
Hobbs Chamber of Commerce
400 North Marland
Hobbs, NM 88240
505-397-3202
505-397-1689 (fax)
800-658-6291
hobbschamber@leaconet.com
www.hobbschamber.org

Leadership Las Cruces
Dora Dominguez, President and CEO
Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Drawer 519
Las Cruces, NM 88004-0519
505-524-1968
505-527-5546 (fax)
doraal@htg.net
www.lascruces.org

Leadership Roswell
Rick Craft or Shawn Hughes
Roswell Chamber of Commerce
P.O. Drawer 70
131 West Second Street
Roswell, NM 88202-0070
505-623-5695
505-624-6870 (fax)
shawnhuges@roswellnm.org

Leadership San Juan
Nancy Shepherd
Assistant VP/Continuing Education
San Juan College
4601 College Blvd.
Farmington, NM 87402
505-566-3264
505-566-3687 (fax)
shepherd@sjc.cc.nm.us

Leadership Sandoval County
Debbi Moore, Executive Director
Rio Rancho Chamber of Commerce
1781 Rio Rancho Drive SE
Rio Rancho, NM 87124-1052
505-892-1533
505-892-6157 (fax)
dmoore@rrchamber.org
jdonovan@rrchamber.org

Leadership Santa Fe
Michele Lowrance, Vice President
336 Don Cubero Place
Santa Fe, NM 87505-1655
505-982-5030
505-986-0509 (fax)
mflowrance@aol.com

Leadership Los Alamos
Chuck Pacheco; Office Leader — Univ. of California Northern NM Office
1350 Central Avenue, Suite 101
Los Alamos, NM 87544
505-667-3232
800-985-7232

Leadership Lincoln
Joan Zagone
PO Box 2902
Ruidoso, NM 88355
505-336-1095
505-257-6162 (fax)
joanzagone@zianet.com

COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS IN NEW MEXICO
Beware the leader who bangs the drums of war in order to whip the citizenry into a patriotic fervor, for patriotism is indeed a double-edged sword. It both emboldens the blood, just as it narrows the mind...

And when the drums of war have reached a fever pitch and the blood boils with hate and the mind has closed, the leader will have no need in seizing the rights of the citizenry. Rather, the citizenry, infused with fear and blinded with patriotism, will offer up all of their rights unto the leader, and gladly do so.

How do I know? For this is what I have done. And I am Caesar.

William Shakespeare
SECTION 3

What Does it Mean to Lead with Integrity?

READINGS

Stephen L. Carter — The Power of Integrity
By Stephen L. Carter

We, the people of the United States who a little over 200 years ago ordained and established the Constitution, have a serious problem: Too many of us nowadays neither mean what we say nor say what we mean. Moreover, we hardly expect anybody else to mean what they say either. What we lack is integrity, a virtue that demands of each and every one of us that we discern what is right and what is wrong; that we act on what we have discerned, even at personal cost, and that we say openly that we are acting on our understanding of right from wrong. The eight principles that follow point toward a politics of integrity.

1. The nation exists for its people. Integrity requires that we try to live our ideals. What is foremost in the rhetoric of liberal democracy is the importance of the individual—not simply as a possessor of rights but as a full participant in the process of governance. Thus, the first principle of an integral politics is to remember our Kant: People are ends, not means. People, and people alone, are the reason there is a United States of America.

One of the reasons for the growing national disgust with politics, I suspect, is precisely that politicians (along with the activists who feed them money and position papers) tend to forget this. To them, people are means, not to be listened to but to be manipulated-persuaded to change their minds if possible, or controlled if not. This vision of the people of the United States as the clay rather than the potters is not unique to left or right in America; it is, rather, an elite mentality, the shared vision of people who have in common their certainty that they know all the answers, if they could but get those pig-headed American voters to come along.

2. Some things are more important than others. A politics of integrity is a politics that sets priorities, that does not tell the self-serving lie that every program preferred by a particular political movement is of equal value. In the political world toward which we are moving, priorities are essential. Ever since the 1970s voters have been electing presidents who promise a government that is smaller and, in the public mind (I suspect), more controllable. That is, the American people quite sensibly see government size as related to government accountability. Many elections that seem to be about something else are probably about this: People want a government they feel is reachable.

For this reason, the debate over the proper relative roles of the federal and state sovereignties—a debate that conservatives keep promising and liberals keep resisting—is actually a very useful one to have. As a nation, we have good historical reasons to be leery of the phrase “states rights” for it has been used both to permit and to mask racial oppressions that are intolerable. But that is not the same as saying that it is obvious that anything worth doing well is worth doing only at the federal level. To the citizen, democracy most feels like democracy when the apparatus of government is something that he or she feels capable of affecting.

Any political movement that expects to survive into the next century must make its peace with what a strong majority of voters seem to believe: The federal government (or government generally) cannot do everything that happens to be a good idea. Justifications, no matter how thoughtful, will no longer suffice as substitutes for the setting of priorities. Here, integrity becomes crucial because it is folly to pretend that all programs are equally important. Liberals (like everybody else) must begin to draw distinctions. One might say that federal funding for both the arts and school lunches is important, but is funding for the arts as important as funding for school lunches? I don’t think so. Others might strike the balance the other way. The point is that in an era that demands priorities, balances of this kind must be struck.

3. Consistency matters. A politics of integrity requires that the principles for which our parties and institutions stand truly be treated as principles. Consider as an example the current assault on some aspects of the “welfare state.” A central theme of the argument against treating government...
assistance as an entitlement is that reliance on aid supposedly cripples self-reliance. Perhaps it does. But integrity requires that the principles on which the government operates be applied consistently. If welfare programs have bad effects on individuals, they must also have bad effects on corporations, and corporate welfare should receive the same scrutiny - and be subject to the same dismissive rhetoric - as welfare for individuals.

The Progressive Policy Institute has pointed out that corporate subsidies are deeply regressive, providing benefits to a relatively small group of upper-income Americans, largely with money taxed from those earning far less. In other words, corporate welfare programs are like individual welfare programs, except that they transfer tax dollars from low- and middle-income people to upper-income people.

4. Everybody gets to play. A politics of integrity does not draw arbitrary boundaries around the public square, screening out some citizens whose political views have been formed in ways of which various elites disapprove. A particular problem of our age has been the astonishing effort to craft a vision of public life in which America’s religious traditions play no important roles, by ruling out of bounds political (and sometimes moral) arguments that rest on explicitly religious bases. Nowadays, one hears quite commonly the argument that it is morally wrong —perhaps even constitutionally wrong—for you to try to ‘impose’ on me your religiously based moral understanding. Usually this argument is made in the context of the abortion battle. Of course, had this ever been a seriously defended principle of American public life, we would never have had the abolitionist or civil rights movements, to name only the most obvious two.

When I make this point in lecturing about politics and religion, I often get an answer that goes something like this: “But nobody can reason with these religionists. They say that so-and-so is God’s will, and what can you say in return?” I am always saddened by this answer, because, as a university professor, I run into many closed-minded people. But nobody tries to ban them from public debate for their closed-mindedness. Besides this vision of how religious people reason is a caricature. That there are some who cannot be reached by reason is doubtless true. The notion that most religious people are that way seems to me a quite unfounded insult.

I am not suggesting that the pro-life religionists who demand access to the public square deserve to prevail. But I do believe in fair procedures. A politics of integrity must be consistent in its rules instead of fixing...
the rules so that one side gets to win. If religious advocacy in the public square is bad, then this is as true of the Reverend Martin Luther King Jr. as it is of the Reverend Pat Robertson.

Ultimately, it doesn’t matter how many thoughtful scholars and journalists argue that religious rhetoric is out of place in the public square. It is simply there. Millions of American citizens seem to have decided that the language of their faith is the language with which they feel most comfortable, and so we must, under our first principle of integral politics, take them as they are rather than commanding them to become something else.

5. We must be willing to talk about right and wrong without mentioning the Constitution. I say this as a longtime teacher of constitutional law and as one who truly loves our foundational document. A politics of integrity must certainly respect citizens’ fundamental rights, and must be vigilant in protecting those rights even when they are exercised by those we disdain: Nazis for example. But we must never make the moral mistake of supposing that because I have the right to do something, you lack the right to criticize me for doing it.

Individual rights are a good thing, but to make a cult of individualism can lead to social disaster. It is no accident that the United States has among the highest rates of abortion and the highest rate of private ownership of firearms in the world. Our well-known national inability to engage in moral conversation means that once a right exists, nobody seems to feel comfortable urging that it not be exercised. Whatever the source of the moral critique of how we use our freedom, the existence of the Constitution should not be treated as a moral shield. For the Constitution is but a reminder that we possess freedom to choose; it does not tell us which choices are best.

6. Our politics must call us to our higher selves. The debasement of political language is particularly embarrassing when the negativity is being spread by our elected representatives. The matter is only made worse when we think that even the polite ones seem too often to be calling us to selfishness. In a politics of integrity, we must try to respond to politicians who call us to our highest rather than our lowest selves; in particular, we must respond to politicians who talk of the national interest and our shared obligations, not merely those who promise to enrich us.

The wealth with which politicians make their electoral purchases comes in a variety of forms, but nearly all of them play to our selfish instincts. Conservatives tend to promise tax cuts, which translate into more money for good, honest, hardworking Americans, and less for the despicable them, who may be demonized bureaucrats or welfare cheats, according to one’s taste. Liberals promise entitlements and, better yet, constitutional rights, which translate into more freedoms for good, honest, hardworking Americans against the despicable them, who nowadays are likely to be what wealthy fat cats and liberals sadly persist in labeling the ‘religious right.’ Neither promise offers the vision of a better nation, except in the narrow sense that the nation is better when it gives us precisely what we desire. In other words, neither calls us to duty.

7. We must listen to one another. A politics of integrity is a politics in which all of us are willing to do the hard work of discernment, to test our views to be sure that we are right. As we have already seen, this in turn implies a dialogue, for in the course of our reflections, especially in a democracy, it is vital to listen to the views of our fellow citizens. If our discernment is genuine, then so must our listening be.

People on the right seem to think that the nastiness of our public discussions is the fault of people on the left; people on the left seem to think that it is the fault of people on the right. But there is plenty of blame for all of us. When we are told, as we often are, that affirmative action is as bad as Jim Crow, we are facing a cruel absurdity; when we are told, as we often are, that only a racist could be troubled by affirmative action, we are facing another. I struggle, hard, with my own habit of concluding that people who disagree with me on the important public issues of the day are obviously deserving of my condemnation. I struggle to understand their points of view—even, as Martin Buber urged us to do, to search for empathy. I do not claim to do it very well. What is depressing is how solidly that failure places me in the American mainstream.
8. Sometimes the other side wins. This is, perhaps, the most important principle of an integral democratic politics, yet little need be said about it. The point is simple: In the end, politics comes down to votes. Somebody wins and somebody loses. In practical terms, that means that the people have picked one and rejected the other. Integrity requires us to admit the possibility (indeed, the likelihood) that we lost not because of some shameless manipulation by our villainous opponents, and not because of some failure to get our message across, but because our fellow citizens, a basically rational bunch, considered both our views and those of the other side and decided that they liked the other side’s better.

Still, the final truth bears repeating: We cannot expect our politicians to create a politics that is better than we are. If we the citizens think only of our own narrow interests, whether they are expressed in terms of “our” tax dollars or “our” constitutional rights, we can hardly expect to find a government, at any level, that operates with a vision of national purpose. Instead, we will find a politics as parochial and selfish as we are. In a democracy, it is not only true that people tend to get the government they deserve; it is also true that people tend to get the politics they deserve.

A politics of integrity requires that the principles for which our parties and institutions stand truly be treated as principles.

The root of the word character is the Greek word for engraving. As applied to human beings it refers to the enduring marks left by life that set one apart as an individual. Character is a perceived combination of those traits—together with the values he or she represents—that set a person apart and motivate his or her behavior.

Commonly, distinctive marks or character are carved in by parental and religious imprinting, by a child’s early interactions with siblings, peers at school, and authority figures. The manners of one’s social class and the soil in which one grows up often remains indelible, and certain teachers and coaches or books and ideas may leave a lasting impression. Character is also marked by where a person stood at great divides in his or her nation’s history. But what matters even more, particularly in a would-be leader, is how many of the passages of adult life have been met and mastered, and what he or she has done with the life accidents dealt by fate.

To be sure, inborn temperament also influences the way people turn out. Certain broad characteristics of one’s temperament — the tendency to be sociable or withdrawn, optimistic or depressive, open to change and risk or given to following rules and staying within safe bounds—are profoundly influenced by heredity.

Character has been an important consideration in our selection of national leaders since the time of George Washington. Even our first president—by nature a retiring man—drew on the reserves of respect and trust he had stored up among the people as he campaigned in the churches of Philadelphia to secure the passage of the Constitution. Nor was he free of ‘negative campaigning’. His detractors sought to degrade him as a dolt, thief, and philanderer. Rumors were spread that General Washington used his beautiful slave women to entertain visitors to Mount Vernon. In the end, however, people discounted such reports and decided to entrust the destiny of their nascent nation to a man whose character reflected their noblest aspirations.

Gail Sheehy,
Character: America’s Search for Leadership

“You know what I think, folks? Improving technology isn’t important. Increased profits aren’t important. What’s important is to be warm, decent human beings.”
Section 4

What is the Responsibility of a Follower?

READINGS

WORKSHEET: Characteristics of an Admired Leader

Gary Wills — Certain Trumpets: The Nature of Leadership
We look for some special qualities in our leaders. In our studies of leadership qualities, we’ve found that the attributes listed below account for most of the qualities we admire or respect in leaders. From this list of 20, please select the seven (7) you most admire or look for in a leader, someone whose direction you would willingly follow.

____ Ambitious (hard working, aspiring)
____ Broad-minded (open-minded, flexible, receptive)
____ Caring (sensitive, appreciative, concerned, loving)
____ Competent (capable, productive, effective, efficient, thorough)
____ Cooperative (friendly, team player, available, responsive)
____ Courageous (daring, stands up for own beliefs)
____ Dependable (hard-working, persistent, purposeful, steadfast)
____ Fair minded (objective, forgiving, willing to pardon others, consistent)
____ Forward Looking (visionary, foresighted, concerned about the future, sense of direction)
____ Honest (truthful, has integrity, trustworthy, has character)
____ Imaginative (creative, innovative, curious)
____ Independent (self reliant, self-sufficient, self-confident)
____ Inspiring (uplifting, enthusiastic, energetic, humorous, cheerful, positive about future)
____ Intelligent (bright, thoughtful, intellectual, reflective, logical)
____ Loyal (obedient, dutiful, respectful, committed to company)
____ Mature (experienced, wise, has depth)
____ Self-controlled (restrained, self-disciplined)
____ Straightforward (direct, candid, forthright)
____ Supportive (understanding, helpful)

*(Please select your seven choices, then turn to Page 73 to see what most people select!)*
THE NATURE OF LEADERSHIP


By Gary Wills

Introduction

I had just turned seventeen, did not know Los Angeles, had never even driven in a big city. I had certainly never backed a swivel trailer up to a loading dock. But my father gave me a map, marked a warehouse’s location, and told me to deliver a refrigerator there. I would have to get someone to help me unload it when I arrived. It was very clever of him. I knew what he was doing. But I complied anyway.

I had a chip on my shoulder, since my father had left my mother to marry a (much younger) Hollywood model. While I was in California for a high school contest, he asked me to work at his nascent business for the rest of the summer. But for that offer, I would not have stayed - I needed a job in any event. He knew that the way to recruit a resisting son-employee was to give me independence - not only in things like deliveries, but in sales and purchasing of household equipment. If I failed, that might break down my resistance. If I didn’t, pride in the work might renew a bond that had been broken.

Paradoxically, by giving me independence he got me to do his will. That is the way leadership works, reciprocally engaging two wills, one leading (often in disguised ways), the other following (often while resisting). Leadership is always a struggle, often a feud.

Why, after all, should one person do another person’s will? The answer that used to be given is simple: the leader is a superior person, to whom inferiors should submit. But modern democracies are as little sympathetic to this scheme as I was to the authority of my father. Patriarchal society, it is true, was rooted in a radical inequality between leaders and followers. Even ancient Athens, the first western democracy, submitted to “the best man,” according to Thucydides:

“[Pericles], a man clearly above corruption, was enabled, by the respect others had for him and his own wise policy, to hold the multitude in a voluntary restraint. He led them, not they him; and since he did not win his power on compromising terms, he could say not only what pleased others but what displeased them, relying on their respect.” (Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War)

Some still subscribe to that notion of leadership. How often have we heard that we lack great leaders now, the clearly virtuous kind, men like George Washington and Abraham Lincoln? The implication is that we could become great again with a great man to guide us. We would not mind submitting to anyone that good. (Of others we continue to be wary).

I shall be arguing in this book that the Periclean type of leadership rarely occurs in history, if at all. Scholars have questioned Thucydides’ description of Pericles’ position: Athenians seemed quicker than most to ostracize leaders who thought themselves above the people. Why should people immolate their own needs and desires to the vision of some superior being? That has happened in some theocratic societies—but then people were obeying God in his representative; and it was their own belief in God’s will that constrained them.

In a democracy, supposedly, the leader does not pronounce God’s will to the people but carries out what is decided by the people. Some might object that the leader is, in that case, mainly a follower - he or she does what the community says when it “speaks” through elections, through polls, through constituent pressure. Such leaders are not, like the Pericles of Thucydides, able to displease their followers. They compromise their principles. They are bribed, if not with money, then with acceptance, or office, or ego satisfaction.

We seem stuck, then, between two unacceptable alternatives – the leader who dictates to others, or the one who truckles to them. If leaders dictate, by what authority do they take away people’s right to direct their own lives? If, on the contrary, they truckle, who needs or respects such weathervanes?

Most of the how-to manuals on leadership assume one or the other models—or, inconsistently, both. The superior-person
The leader most needs followers. When those are lacking, the best ideas, the strongest will, the most wonderful smile have no effect.

We have long lists of the leader’s requisites - he or she needs determination, focus, a clear goal, a sense of priorities, and so on. We easily forget the first and all-encompassing need. The leader most needs followers. When those are lacking, the best ideas, the strongest will, the most wonderful smile have no effect. When Shakespeare’s Welsh seer, Owen Glendower, boasts that “I can call spirits from the vasty deep,” Hotspur deflates him with the commonsense answer: “Why, so can I, or so can anyone. But will they come when you do call them?” (Shakespeare, Henry IV, Part I) It is not the noblest call that gets answered but the answerable call.

Abraham Lincoln did not have the highest vision of human equality in his day. Many abolitionists went farther than he did in recognizing the moral claims of slaves to instant freedom and something approaching a recognition of their human dignity. Lincoln had limited political goals, and he was willing to compromise even those. He knew that no one could be elected in or from Illinois if he espoused full equality for blacks and so he unequivocally renounced that position:

“I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about, in any way, the social and political equality of the white and black races...I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor of intermarrying with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of political and social equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior; and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race.” (A. Lincoln, Speeches and Writings)

But for that pledge, Lincoln had no hope of winning office. The followers were setting the terms of acceptance for their leader. He could not issue calls they were unprepared to hear. (He could do it, of course — as Owen Glendower can shout summmonses down into the deep. But it would be a waste of time.) This Lincoln has disappointed people who think followers should submit to a leader’s superior vision, those who want the leader to be active, the followers passive. Lincoln’s career shows response from both sides of the process. His leadership was a matter of mutually determinative activity, on the part of the leader and the followers. Followers “have a say” in what they are being led to. A leader who neglects that fact soon finds himself without followers. To sound a certain trumpet does not mean just trumpeting one’s own certitudes. It means sounding a specific call to specific people capable of response.

Does this remove or reduce the heroic note from Lincoln’s leadership — as if he were only allowed to lead, by followers who could withhold their response? Well, what is the alternative - people who cannot refuse to follow? If that were the case, the leader would be marshaling automatons, not voluntary respondents.

It is odd that resentment should be felt...
toward the demands of followers when the limiting power of circumstance is so readily accepted. Even the most ardent hero worshipers of Winston Churchill admit that he needed an occasion for the exercise of his skills. But for World War II, we would never have known what he could do in the way of rallying English spirit. Yet the followers are even more intimate in their cooperation with the leader than are external circumstances. The leader can have the skill for his or her role, the occasion for its use, and still lack followers who will respond to the person or the moment.

So much for the idea that a leader's skills can be applied to all occasions, that they can be taught outside a historical context, learned as a “secret” of control in every situation. A leader whose qualities do not match those of potential followers is simply irrelevant. The world is not playing his or her game. My favorite example of this is the leadership of Syrian holy men in the fifth century of the Common Era. Those men, who made policy for whole communities, were revered for their self-ravaging austerity. The man who had starved himself most spectacularly was thought the best equipped to advise pious consultants. So delegations went to consult Simeon the “Stylite” (Pillar Man), perched in his midair hermitage. Leadership was entirely conditioned by the attitudes of contemporary followership. Who would now write a manual called The Leadership Secrets of Simeon Stylites, telling people to starve and whip and torture themselves into command positions?

Closer to our time, Thomas Jefferson thought the French Revolution had been less successful than the American one, not because the French lacked leadership but because they lacked discerning followers. A corrupt people is not responsive to virtuous leadership. The French spirit had been sapped, he claimed, by superstition (Catholicism) and despotism (monarchy). Napoleon, to retain the people’s allegiance, had to revert to both, calling on the pope to crown him emperor.

It may seem that the Lincoln example has moved us too far from the Periclean “best man” toward the Dale Carnegie accommodator. If the leader is just an expediter of what other people want, a “resource” for their use, the people are not being led but served.

Lincoln had no clear expression of popular will to implement. He had to elicit the program he wanted to serve, and that always involves affecting the views one is consulting. Even pollsters, seeking to understand what is on the minds of people, affect the outcome by their mode of questioning. In Lincoln’s constituency were some abolitionists, many defenders of slavery, many more who wanted to avoid facing the issue of slavery. Unlike the abolitionists, who were leaders of a small elite putting pressure on the government from outside, Lincoln had to forge a combination of voters who would join him in at least minimal disapproval of slavery. He had to convince some people that it was in their own interest not to let the problem fester—he told them they could not afford to take Stephen Douglas’s “hands-off” attitude.

Many voters resisted Lincoln—as I did my father in the summer of 1951. Lincoln deferred to some of their prejudices—left them independent in that sense—in order to win agreement on a policy of (at least) some hope for ultimate manumission. He argued in terms of his listeners own commitment. They celebrated the Declaration of Independence, with its claim that all men are created equal. How could they stay true to their political identity, based on the Declaration, if they did not at some level oppose slavery? By keeping this option open for gradual approximation, Lincoln was able to move at a later period for more direct action on the problem. In that sense, he temporized not to evade the problem but to prevent its evasion. G.K. Chesterton perfectly captured the delicacy of his operation:

He loved to repeat that slavery was intolerable while he tolerated it, and to prove that something ought to be done while it was impossible to do it . . . . But, for all that, this inconsistency beat the politicians at their own game, and this abstracted logic proved most practical after all. For, when the chance did come to do something, there was no doubt about the thing to be done. The thunderbolt fell from the clear heights of heaven.

In order to know just how far he could go at any moment, Lincoln had to understand the mix of motives in his fellow citizens, the counterbalancing intensities with which the different positions were
There is something selfless in the very selfishness of leaders—they must see things as the followers see them in order to recruit those followers.

My father was a natural leader who acted in small arenas. Even as a child, I thought it childish of him to want to get his way all the time. I did not notice then that he got his way by entering into the minds of others and finding something there that would respond to his attentions - as, on a vastly different scale, Lincoln trimmed and hedged on slavery in order to make people take small steps in the direction of facing the problem.

If the followers get marshaled toward action by a leader, the leader need not be loved or admired (though that can help). I had no great admiration for my father when I found myself responding to his initiatives. Conversely, one can admire or love people who are not, by virtue of that love, leaders.

Imagine a meeting called to consider a course of action – let us say, to mount a protest against an employer whose hiring and promotion practice discriminate against women. A speaker rises who is stunningly eloquent. Listener A knows and admires the speaker, would go anywhere to hear her speak, hopes to emulate her eloquence in his own way; but he does not care about the issue, and the speech does not bring him any closer to caring. Listener B, on the contrary, has never met the speaker, does not particularly like her, is disposed to resent the employer but had no hope of finding allies to resist him, and is now heartened to act in conjunction with others responding to the speaker. Who is the follower here? If, as seems certain, it is Listener B, then admiration, imitation, and affection are not necessary to followership. Agreement on a goal is necessary.

So far I have been discussing just two things – leaders and followers. That is better, at least, than treatments dealing with only one thing – leaders. But the discussion cannot get far without a third thing – the goal. This is not something added on to the other two. It is the reason for the other two’s existence. It is also the equalizer between leader and followers. The followers do not submit to the person of the leader. They join him or her in pursuit of the goal. My father and I were working together for the success of his new business. Of course, he had separate motives for wanting me there, and I had motives for not wanting to be there. We could not share those motives, unique to our own situation. It was the thing we could share that created the possibility of leadership.

It is time for a definition: the leader is one who mobilizes others toward a goal shared by leader and followers. In that brief definition, all three elements are present, and indispensable. Most literature on leadership is unitarian. But life is Trinitarian. One-legged and two-legged chairs do not, of themselves, stand. A third leg is needed. Leaders, followers, and goals make up the three equally necessary supports for leadership.

The goal must be shared, no matter how many other motives are present that are not shared. Go back to the meeting that called for a protest at employer discrimination. The speaker may have had many ancillary motives for speaking — to show off her rhetorical style, to impress a sexual partner in the audience, to launch a larger political career. Her listeners surely would have many motives — some to improve their prospects with the employer, or their regard among fellow workers. But the followers become followers only insofar as they agree with the speaker on a plan of action against the employer.

This plan is cast in terms of justice, though it is easy to think this is only a
rationale for the mix of various motives, some shared, some not. Each is in this to get something different. David Hume, the eighteenth-century philosopher, said people obey others for their own advantage, and this writhing of various wormlike urges for advantage is far from the picture of idealistic leaders and docile followers.

Yet Hume, perceptive as he was, knew that people follow most reliably when they are convinced that what they were doing is right. He knew the utility of that belief. (Hume, “Of the First Principles of Government,” in Essays Moral, Political, and Literary) If, at the meeting to discuss discrimination, only those who would benefit directly by the protest were to join the speaker, that would limit the followership from the outset. And that small number would always be fraying away. The boss could buy off dissent by special favors to a few of the activists, or threats to the weak-hearted. Once one person got what she wanted, there would be no future motive for supporting her sisters. Private advantage shifts constantly, and is a poor basis for public action. That is why Lincoln based his policy on the moral claim of the Declaration of Independence. Some thought he did not go far enough, others that he went too far, but the moral ground of the Declaration was both broad and narrow enough to accommodate many positions while remaining fixed itself.

Lincoln had to persuade voters. He could not force them. Where coercion exists, to the extent of its existence, leadership becomes unnecessary or impossible. Loose uses of the word “lead” can mislead. We talk of a policeman leading his prisoner to jail. But the captor is not a leader in our sense — he is a captor. Though he is mobilizing another toward a goal, it is not a goal they share in their intentions. The prisoner’s goal is to get as far away from the prison as possible.

A slave master buying labor can “lead” slaves to his plantation, but that does not make him their leader. He is their owner. If I had worked for my father only because I needed the money and could get it nowhere else, I would not have been a follower, just an employee. Coercion is not leadership any more than is mesmerism. Followers cannot be automatons. The totalitarian jailer who drugs a prisoner into confession of a crime has not led him to some shared view of reality.

James MacGregor Burns’s well-known definition of leadership, though it tries to cover all bases, is inadequate precisely because it leaves out this note of a goal shared by leader and followers:

“Leadership over other human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers.” (Burns, Leadership)

Any person who affects others is a leader, by this definition. Hitler’s enormities, let us say, arouse hatred in me, mobilize me, and that hatred is satisfying to me — am I, then, a follower of Hitler? Not when the goals of our action are so different. My aim is to destroy Hitler. That is not his aim. Hitler’s followers shared, at some level, his goals — vindication of German complaints about the Versailles treaty, the restoration of discipline in society, the glorification of the German nation (and, to varying degrees, the German race) at the expense of others.

Burns’s definition would cover all kinds of influence on others — a musician’s arousing of pleasure in the audience, a celebrity’s gratification of curiosity. A person does not become a “follower” of Bach by being aroused and satisfied. A reader of the National Enquirer “follows” reports on Cher or Michael Jackson, but is not a follower of them toward some shared goal. A thinker may be influenced by the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein, but their wills were never consciously engaged in cooperative movement toward a goal. (On Wittgenstein’s influence, see chapter 10.) A fan of Madonna is not like a soldier in Joan of Arc’s army. Influence is not, of itself, leadership. The weather influences us. So do earthquakes, or background music in public places.

The leader does not just vaguely affect others. He or she takes others toward the object of their joint quest. That object defines the kind of leadership at issue. Different types of leaders should be distinguished more by their goals than by the personality of the leader (the most common practice). The crisis of mere subsistence on a life raft calls for one type of leader. Democratic stability for another. Revolution-
ary activity for still a third. The compromise and flexibility of Lincoln were appropriate for his kind of leadership. But in his own time other leaders had to be quite different in their methods. General Grant could not sound out his military “constituents.” William Lloyd Garrison could not temporize on principle when leading the abolitionists. Harriet Tubman, organizing raids to rescue slaves in the South, could not lead by discussion-group methods.

If the leader takes his or her followers to the goal, to great achievements, it is because the followers were capable of that kind of response. Jefferson said the American people responded to revolution in a way that led to a free republic, while the French responded in a way that led to an imperial dictatorship. The followers were as much to blame for the latter development as was Napoleon. In the same way, the German people were jointly responsible for Hitler’s atrocities. He was powerless to act without followers.

Show me your leader, and you have bared your soul. You respond only to one who has set certain goals. You are responsible for that activity, for motion toward those goals. If leadership is mysterious and often scary, so is followership. That is why some would prefer not to follow at all. At the dawn of the ancient Greek achievement, Hesiod had already identified the problem with people who will neither lead nor follow:

“The best is he who calls men to the best. And those who heed the call are likewise blessed. But worthless who call not, heed not, but rest.”

(Hesiod, Works and Days)
Some people lament a current lack of leaders, implying that they would become wonderful followers if only some leader worthy of them came along. But perhaps they have not been looking very hard.

Others think that if the president is not a leader to their liking, the whole national scene is empty. But, throughout history, the great leaders have not been only or mainly in the White House. Except in time of war or other crisis, a democratic leader is usually a reconciler of voting blocs rather than a leader of embattled causes. Resisted change has been accomplished by abolitionists, suffragists, labor organizers, civil rights defenders, anti-war activists.

In our own day, vast changes have been taking place, with strong leaders on both sides of each issue. Dr. King led the integration struggle and George Wallace opposed it, with great skill. No social change has been more vast than that of women’s place in society. Leaders on one side, like Gloria Steinem and Faye Wattleton, have been met and resisted by a Phyllis Schlafly or Beverly LaHaye. The environmental movement, the gay rights movement have had devoted leaders, and devoted opposition. Randall Terry and his followers have been inventive and determined in their opposition to abortion. A Ralph Nader on the left faces a leader on the right like William F. Buckley. We do not lack leaders. Various trumpets are always being sounded. Take your pick. We lack sufficient followers. That is always the real problem with leadership. Calls are always going down into the vasty deep; but what spirits will respond?

**Conclusion**

I fear that some readers may have opened my book, as they do so many others on the subject, with this question: “How am I to become a leader?” It is an incomplete question. Leader of whom? Going where? Dr. King would, in any case, have been an impressive preacher, a respected pastor, pampered by his congregations – a leader in that sense. But at a moment in history, he identified a different range of potential followers; lifted up his voice for them; was carried forward, by them, to goals he had not foreseen, but which he ended up pursuing with them. What differentiated him from a successful preacher like, say, Robert Schuller, was a different set of followers and a different goal. How, then, should one become a leader? By finding the right followers and the right goal. One of the two is no good without the other. And they must be right for you and for the historical moment.

But what if one has the followers and the goal, yet is unable to mobilize the former toward the latter? Perhaps one is not meant to be a leader. Not everyone is. That does not consign one to second-class humanity. Hume the original thinker (who has exercised influence in history, not leadership) was a more important figure than Hume the intellectual leader, with his popular political writings. Roger Smith would have been better off if he had stayed in his office of financial planning, from which he influenced the fortune of General Motors in a benign way, rather than moved up to an office that called for leadership as well as influence.

Other leaders proved inadequate because they were more enamored of their own image of leadership than of the followers or the goal - General McClellan clearly illustrates that; as, to a lesser degree, do Ammon Hennacy, Adlai Stevenson, or Stephen Douglas. This does not mean leaders must be entirely selfless. Ambition is useful—often necessary—fuel for driving the leader. But if it makes him or her blind to the followers’ needs and desires, then those cannot be addressed in such a way that they end up mobilized toward the goal. Stevenson preferred losing with grace (and not too much effort) to accomplishing the political projects he praised so mellifluously (in other people’s words).

Some of the antitypes I have chosen were great leaders themselves – but not great in the category being considered. Cromwell was a fine leader of men, though he could not lead them to the republican goals he enunciated for them. Robert Moses was a great civil rights leader, though he was not the rhetorical leader that Dr. King was.

Some should lead. Others should follow. My book has missed it object if the role of the follower is made somehow less worthy than that of the leader. Dr. King’s greatness is genuine, but not entirely his. Hundreds of men, women, and children marched, sang, and protested with him. They were beaten for it, knocked down with hoses, attacked by dogs, killed with clubs. The
heroes were not all leaders. But they were all heroes.

Some of the civil rights leaders were less than heroic. Some showboaters, backbiters, people more flawed than the ones they marshaled forward. Flawed leaders are as common as noble followers. But the goal is what mattered, to enough of them, to make them risk insult, harm, and their very lives marching towards their goal. It was a joint achievement, as all social accomplishments must be. And once they had reached their goal, being there was more important than sorting out each person’s different role in getting them there.

Circumstance is important, if unpredictable. Many get their chance to lead by accident. Angelo Roncalli was chosen as the pope late in his life, and not because great things were expected of him - quite the opposite. Without realizing it himself, he had prepared well for this office - he was a good bishop before he was a good pope. But his impact would not have been felt if a body of followers had not also, without knowing it, been preparing themselves in ways that made them respond to him. The ecumenical and liturgical and biblical study groups within Catholicism had set up a kind of covert activity, in seminaries and in parishes, that John XXIII summoned out into the daylight. In that sense, Dorothy Day, affecting so many young Catholic leaders in America, was training them to be followers of John XXIII when he came along. In the same way, Harriet Tubman’s missions in the 1850s helped prepare the ground for Lincoln’s effort in the 1860’s.

Both Washington and Napoleon needed great revolutions to make them great leaders – different as their actions were (because their revolutions differed so greatly.) What would Roosevelt have been without the Depression and World War II? Of course, the leader must not only be given his or her historical moment, but must be able to see that it is a critical time. For this, a sense of history is required. Washington grasped earlier than anyone —even Hamilton—the fact that armed withdrawal from the British Empire would remake the colonies engaged in this secession. He recognized how many forces were opposed to national union, which alone (he believed) could make the former colonies masters of their own situation. With this in mind, he acted throughout the Revolution and after as if setting precedents for a national system of legal responsibility to the American people as a whole. Washington was not a bookish student of history, but he had eagerly absorbed everything he could of the imperial British navy’s and army’s action on his continent. His sense of a classical past was derived from symbolic formulations like Addison’s Roman play, Cato, and from the arguments of Madison at the constitutional convention.

Pope John XXIII was a man saturated in the church history of councils (especially the one attended by his hero, Charles Borromeo). Martin King had lived the African-American story of enslavement and deliverance encoded in spirituals, biblical extracts, and sermons. Dorothy Day was not freed for her own original work until Peter Maurin brought her the lore of Catholicism’s past. She could not circumvent ecclesiastical obstacles until he convinced her that this had happened regularly in church history. The saints, he knew, stride through barriers, even church barriers. Napoleon was an avid reader of Plutarch, who described the different ways great men reacted to the different cultural situations of Greece and Rome.

Napoleon did not directly imitate any known leader from Plutarch, though his sense of any leader’s possibilities and problems no doubt grew by reading the book. Pope John did imitate specific acts of Charles Borromeo - especially his parish visitations and clerical synods - but different circum-
stances made him less authoritarian than Borromeo could be (perhaps had to be) in the sixteenth century. A sense of history can tell one when not to imitate historical models. Washington followed the ideals of Cato, as presented to him in an Enlightenment context. It was a very eighteenth-century Cato he became, a man of his time, one who would not have the same opportunity for austere leadership in our own less formal and more egalitarian period. No American politician can directly imitate him today. No one person, past or present, has the “secret” for becoming a leader, or even for fostering leaders. A sense of diverse opportunities is one the best lessons that can be taken from a study of great leaders in their incommunicable historical moments.

Well, but how about non-great leaders? Most people will not lead revolutions, reform a church, conquer an enemy nation. The basic tools of leadership are available in small arenas as well as large. To lead a PTA meeting well, one must still have a firm grasp on the goal – improvement of the particular school in its particular troubles – and a sense of the parents’ and teachers’ needs and aspirations. A Napoleon would be a poor leader of PTA meetings; but Lincoln would be a superb one. And a person who could never be a Lincoln on the national stage can have something like his success at the PTA level.

The mystery of leadership and followership goes on all around us – and within us. We are all in some measure leaders and followers – as we area, most of us, alternately parents and children, employers and employees, teachers and taught. Integration of our leading and led selves is one of the goals we seek when we look at exemplary cases of leadership and following. Tell me who your admired leaders are, and you have bared your soul.

James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner have “administered a questionnaire to over 75,000 people around the globe…. The results…have been striking in their regularity over the years. It appears that a person must pass several essential tests before others are willing to grant the title leader. …what people most look for and admire in a leader has been constant. As the data clearly show, for people to follow someone willingly, the majority of constituents must believe the leader is:

- Honest
- Forward-looking
- Competent
- Inspiring

James M. Kouzes and Barry Z. Posner,
New Mexico received a plethora of national recognition in 2002. Unfortunately, much of it came in the form of dismal rankings and unfortunate statistics.

Here’s a look back.

- 50th “smartest” state.
- 6th highest unemployment rate in the country.
- 42nd for public school teacher salaries.
- One of the three worst states for school plumbing
- 75 percent of NM schools are in unsatisfactory environmental condition.
- 29 percent of New Mexico schools have crumbling roofs.
- 42 percent of New Mexico schools lack adequate power outlets and wiring for classroom computers.
- Suicide rate in the 15-24 range 75 percent higher than the national average.
- 42nd healthiest state.
- 46th most livable state.
- 3rd highest incidence of violent crimes per capita.
- 1st for number of heroin-related deaths.
- 1st for accidental deaths occurring in the home.
- 1st for lightening-related deaths.
- 2nd for violent death rates among teens.
- 2nd for per capita number of households living in mobile homes.
- 3rd for number of reported sexual assaults.
- 3rd for occurrence of violent crimes.
- 4th for number of drunk-driving fatalities.
- 47th for “friendliness” toward small businesses.
- 5th for percentage of children covered by health insurance.
- 50th for number of households with phone service.
- 3rd for number of suicides.
- 1st state to allow psychologists to prescribe drugs.
- 49th for e-commerce.
- 10 percent of Santa Fe’s teachers don’t have licenses.
- 50th for pedestrian safety.

*Santa Fe Reporter, 12/25-03 - 1/ 7/03, p. 8.*
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Why Should New Mexico Pay Attention to Leadership Now?

Readings

Owen M. Lopez — Op-Ed, The Albuquerque Tribune
By Owen M. Lopez
November 18, 1998

New Mexico has been my home since birth and the home of my parents, grandparents and great-grandparents for more than one hundred years. There is no other state I could love more nor would rather call home, and I have visited all but Hawaii.

On the surface, New Mexico is one of the most physically attractive places to live. Its history is unrivaled and spans prehistoric dinosaurs, the Clovis Man, the Anasazi and their Pueblo descendants, the Di-neh and Apaches, the Conquistadors and their descendants, the Anglo influx, the first Atomic Bomb, the National Laboratories, and the Very Large Array on the plains of San Augustin. New Mexico’s diverse geographical landscape, encompassing the Rio Grande Valley, the Jemez and Sangre de Cristo Mountains, the northwestern mesas and plateaus, White Sands, Carlsbad Caverns and the Gila Wilderness, provides a sense of place and scenic beauty that compares favorably with any other state. Combine all of this with New Mexico’s unsurpassable weather, incomparable sky with breathtaking sunrises and sunsets, along with its various cultures and preserved traditions, and the result is truly the Land of Enchantment.

Unfortunately, however, there is a darker side. New Mexico is the state with the lowest per capita income of the 50 states; the least desirable state for rearing children; the state with the highest percentage of children living in poverty and without access to health care; the state with one of the highest per capita rates of teenage pregnancy, teenage suicide, domestic violence, and deaths from violence and alcohol. The bitter irony is that these statistics apply to a state that outranks all others in dollars received from Washington. What is wrong here?

A root cause of New Mexico’s inability to better succeed is its disproportionate dependence on federal and state tax dollars and “la politics” that flows from it. When the vast majority of jobs derive from government sources, and when poverty is so widespread, it seems inevitable that politics will have a too important influence over the well-being of New Mexico’s citizens. It also seems inevitable that this imbalance will nurture a “we” versus “they” mentality, causing deep and bitter divisions in communities, no matter how small or large. Although the ‘patron” has typically been identified with politics in Rio Arriba County, as a representative of a statewide funding organization, my experience is that a patronage system permeates activities throughout the state; it is not solely an Hispanic phenomenon. Too much power resides in the hands of politicians and their governmental bureaucracies and commissions.

Moreover, because poverty is so extensive, the fear of not getting a piece of the government pie can often lead to racial or ethnic divisions and hostilities. The competition for the pieces of the pie is not limited to the Native American community, nor to Hispanic rural towns and villages in the northern part of the state. It includes the majority of New Mexico’s citizenry whose paychecks are drawn directly from government sources - whether they come from the national labs, the air bases, the missile range, myriad federal and state, judicial, regulatory and administrative agencies, including all public education, and yes, even private companies and consulting firms whose support is heavily dependent on government contracts.

For five years I have served as Executive Director of the McCune Charitable Foundation, headquartered in Santa Fe, which provides financial support for non-profit charitable and educational organizations throughout the state. I have met and
worked with many enlightened and remarkably dedicated individuals who are combating the state’s social maladies. But it’s an uphill and often losing battle.

Given the extent to which New Mexicans are dependent on government, including the organizations our foundation supports, it also becomes clear why they cannot escape the pervasive influence of the “patron” system and the political culture and mindset which it fosters. The dependence on government also creates a breeding ground for incompetence because employment too often is based on “who” you know and what favors you’ve done for them rather than “what” you know. When employment patronage is political and not necessarily based on competence, the educational system is undermined as well, because the extent of a person’s education too often has little or no value in either securing employment or moving up through the job ranks. When the populace receives little to no value from the educational system in its search for subsistence livelihood, the educational system is demeaned. It therefore becomes difficult, if not impossible, to improve our educational system when there is no buy-in by the public.

A tax-based employment system becomes even more dysfunctional when government cuts back its funding, as is now happening. New Mexico, unfortunately, again is unique when compared to all other western states whose economies are expanding, in some cases by leaps and bounds. We, on the other hand, have moved from 49th to the 50th in per capita income and are now the poorest state. The “Latino” populations in the other western states are expanding, if not exploding, due in large measure to immigration, but New Mexico’s “Latino” population is decreasing as a percentage of the whole. Immigration into this state is not a major problem because, like bees to honey, immigrants go where there are jobs, which we don’t have.

The Catch-22 we find ourselves in would be funny if it were not tragic. We damn any new businesses and industries because of possible adverse environmental consequences; yet, because they could impact the status quo, whether positively or negatively, they are largely irrelevant. We resent change. Yet the only way out of the mire in which we’re struck is new jobs in the private sector which business and industry bring. Again, however, it’s difficult to attract the private sector to New Mexico because of the disturbing lack of education and skill in the work force.

What’s the solution? I wish I had even a clue. I do believe that confronting the realities of the New Mexico workplace could be a helpful first step. It could also be helpful to get real about economic development. It is worse than laughable when the state's total annual economic development budget is less than that of Amarillo, Texas, and when the entire budget for rural economic development is less than $300,000 per year. You could argue that the federal government has a responsibility to help us extricate ourselves from the black hole it has created for us with its huge defense spending beginning with World War II and continuing through the Cold War to the present day. But might not this simply dig the hole even deeper?

In the final analysis, I believe that, if we New Mexicans would understand that our divisions and partisanship are often caused by petty jealousies and political rhetoric, “la invidia” and “la political” then we could work toward producing systemic change through consensus building and cooperation.
American politics has lost its civic voice. 

...Liberals and conservatives share an impoverished vision of citizenship, leaving them unable to address the anxiety and frustration abroad in the land. ...the two concerns at the heart of our discontent [are] the fear that, individually and collectively, we are losing control of the forces that govern our lives... [and] that, from family to neighborhood to nation, the moral fabric of community is unraveling around us. These two fears define the anxiety of the age.


Over the course of the 1990s, both parties had their fundamental ideologies rejected by the public — health care reform for the Democrats, the Gingrich Revolution for the Republicans. In the wake of these political disasters, political leaders in both parties are lost, substituting tiny tinkers for real vision.

*Andrei Cherny, The Next Deal*
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What Can Be Done To Advance New Mexico?

READINGS

Young Irish Disorders

WORKSHEET: What Changes Could be Made to Advance New Mexico?

Frances Hesselbein — Barriers to Leadership

Building Leadership in Arizona: 80th Arizona Town Hall

New Mexico First 2002 Planning Retreat for Leadership Town Hall

Views on the State’s Most Pressing Needs and Assessments of a Crisis in Leadership
In the **YOUNG IRISH DISORDERS** in Ireland, 1848, the following nine men were captured, tried and convicted of treason against Her Majesty:

- **JOHN MITCHELL**
- **RICHARD O'GORMAN**
- **MORRIS LYEME**
- **CHARLES DUFFY**
- **TERENCE MCMANUS**
- **PATRICK DONAHUE**
- **THOMAS MEAGHER**
- **MICHAEL IRELAND**
- **THOMAS MCGEE**

They were sentenced to death. Before passing sentence, the Judge asked if there was anything that any wished to say. Meagher, speaking for all, said:

“**My lord, this is our first offence, but not our last. If you will be easy with us this once, we promise, on our word as gentlemen, to try and do better next time. And next time sure, we won’t be fools enough to get caught.”**

Thereupon, the indignant judge sentenced them all to be hanged by the neck until dead, and drawn and quartered in the approved fashion.

Passionate protests from all over the world forced Queen Victoria to commute the sentences to transportation for life to far, wild Australia.

In 1874 word reached the astounded Queen Victoria that the Sir Charles Duffy who had just been elected Prime Minister of Australia was the same **CHARLES DUFFY** who had been transported 26 years before. On the Queen’s demand, the records of the rest of the transported men were revealed and this is what was uncovered:

- **THOMAS MEAGHER**
  Governor of Montana
- **TERENCE MCMANUS**
  Brigadier General, United States Army
- **PATRICK DONAHUE**
  Brigadier General, United States Army
- **RICHARD O'GORMAN**
  Governor General of Newfoundland
- **MORRIS LYEME**
  Attorney General of Australia, in which office **MICHAEL IRELAND**, succeeded him
- **THOMAS DARCY MCGEE**
  Member of Parliament, Montreal, Minister of Agriculture and President of Council, Dominion of Canada.
- **JOHN MITCHELL**
  Prominent in New York politics. This was the grandfather of Mayor John Purroy Mitchell.
Before turning to read about changes people in Arizona thought about making…and that a group of New Mexico leaders speculated about when they were thinking of conducting this Town Hall…DO YOUR OWN THINKING.

Fill in the boxes with your own thoughts before turning to the other readings. Take out a pen and write them down. This is for your use. No one will read it.

• A good way to think about this is to ask yourself, “What does New Mexico need in order to advance?” And then, what is it that leadership could do to help that advancement?

• Think both about formal leaders – mayors, city council members, county commissioners, state legislators or even the governor – and about those who lead without a title.

1) Can you think of any changes in “rules” or “laws” that effect current or potential leadership that if made would benefit NM?

2) Are there changes in structures or institutions that, if made, would improve the state?

3) Can you think of new ways to convene people that could have benefits for New Mexico? For example, what might be done to convene people from all of the sectors (government, business, nonprofits, foundations, congregations) to work together to realize a better future for NM?

4) What might be done to change the curriculum of public schools or even colleges and universitites that could potentially benefit existing or potential leaders…or even that could benefit those of us who follow?

5) What could be done to help ensure that those who lead, lead with integrity?
Leadership has been my business for 25 years, with careers in Girl Scouting and now the Drucker Foundation. My messages on leadership always have been upbeat (even my blood type is B-positive). Invitations to speak invariably have been on the challenges, visions, imperatives, or future of leadership. So when a group of Kellogg Foundation National Leadership Fellows asked me to address “Barriers to Leadership,” I was a little taken aback. It was the only time I’ve been asked to address the negative aspects of the subject.

The request forced me to shift gears, to consciously distill what I had learned from experience but not yet articulated about barriers to leadership. From this introspection emerged two types of barriers: one personal and self-imposed, the other institutional, structural, or cultural.

**Self-Imposed Barriers**

Lack of formal, articulated personal goals and a road map of how to meet them. These should be written and close at hand, not just rolling around in your head.

1) No clear understanding of one’s own strengths and weaknesses (this calls for input from others, plus a plan for improving).
2) Believing that there is something called “business ethics,” that there can be two standards: one for our personal lives and one for our professional lives.
3) Lack of generosity — not sharing ideas, time, encouragement, respect, compliments, and feedback with others — resulting in exactly the same treatment from them.
4) Leading from the rear — being tentative, fence sitting, never taking responsibility.
5) Always stressing what others can’t do well rather than building on their strengths, what they do uncommonly well.
7) Not taking charge of one’s own personal learning and development.

**Institutional Barriers**

1) Hierarchical structures that restrict, constrict, box people in.
2) Corporate cultures that encourage mediocrity and reward playing it safe.
3) Corporate cultures and practices that kill the messenger.
4) Racism and sexism unacknowledged and unaddressed.
5) Fuzzy lines of accountability.
6) Lack of sharp differentiation between governance and management, and between policy and operations, with no clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
7) No mentoring plan for promising staff members.
8) Bottom-line mentality; not seeing people as the company’s greatest asset.
9) Failing to build, now, a richly diverse, pluralistic organization that includes diversity on the board of directors and top management teams.
10) Not walking the talk; a leadership team whose behavior doesn’t match its message.
11) Static staffing structures, with no job rotation, or job expansion.
12) Lack of a formal, articulated plan for succession.

It takes leadership to bulldoze the barriers — frequently time-honored, tradition-bound, deeply ingrained practices. It takes courage for a leader to identify and confront self-imposed barriers, to put in place the personal strategies required to unleash the energy, innovation, and commitment to self-development. It takes equal courage to identify and confront the institutional barriers that limit and inhibit the people of the organization. And it takes...
Leading with Integrity

real leadership to bulldoze the barriers — frequently time-honored, tradition-bound, deeply ingrained practices.

But when the barriers come down, the result is a competitive, productive, and motivated workforce focused on the future.

Morale soars, performance rises, and the organization is liberated to reach its highest potential. Seeking out the barriers demands high intelligence; doing something about them demands managerial courage.

◆

Building Leadership in Arizona

80th ARIZONA TOWN HALL
May 19 - 22, 2002

“Arizona can ‘get along’ with the leadership that it’s had over the last few years, but if it wants to thrive, and to develop into an outstanding state with a quality of life that so many of our citizens desire, leadership must be improved.” Thus was the premise of the 80th Arizona Town Hall stated by a young participant.

Leadership cannot be legislated. Every segment of Arizona’s diverse communities must play an active role in encouraging and developing leadership for Arizona’s future — families, the education system, broad-based community groups, employers and those in public service. To strengthen the state’s leadership, the Town Hall adopted the following recommendations, among others:

• Effective leadership is critical to Arizona’s future and must be improved.

• Families should encourage and teach strong values and a sense of self-worth to their children beginning in early childhood. All members of the community should encourage the development of young, emerging leaders. Employers should encourage and expect their employees to give back to their communities. Communities should encourage recently retired people to become more involved in leadership.

• The voting public needs to inform elected officials of issues that concern it and hold them accountable.

• The Arizona Legislature should create an ongoing legislative structure that provides a mandatory orientation program for all legislators-plus staff. The executive branch should create a comprehensive program for departing and incoming elected and appointed officials.

• A statewide association of broad-based community groups might be formed to support and encourage collaboration and the identification of leaders for our communities.

• More corporate headquarters should locate to Arizona, and all-sized businesses and franchises should be developed. Many new companies do not have a corporate culture requiring or even encouraging community involvement. They should understand that the community cannot be strong without their involvement and involvement will benefit their bottom line.

• The education system should, and does, play a vital role in the development of leaders, a role that should continue and become more defined and active. The role of education includes developing new leaders, building the capacity of existing leaders through continuing education and teaching citizenship.

• The media has a valuable role as a watchdog to inform the public of questionable conduct by its leaders. They should observe boundaries, such as the privacy rights of leaders’ families, the violation of which can discourage quality leaders from serving.

• Perhaps the most significant impediment to developing new leaders in Arizona is the lack of a common vision for the state. A vision is continually revisited and updated and monitored to gauge progress toward realizing the vision.

• Business, political leaders and broad-based community groups should look beyond the narrow interests of the moment to the long-term interest of the broader community.

◆

New Mexico lacks a shared vision of how to take the state forward, nor even how to preserve its exquisite natural and human resources.

Abridged Feb. ‘03 by Ed Moreno for New Mexico First.
New Mexico First convened a diverse group of leaders to begin planning this unique Town Hall on leadership. The group was asked, “What would be some of the desirable outcomes of a Town Hall on “Leading with Integrity?” Here are some of the ideas they offered:

**Why Does NM need to examine its methods of developing leadership?**

- The next generation is at risk. Education is failing many of New Mexico’s children. Children need role models, a sense of place in the community. This generation doesn’t have an ideological leader. We are even starting to see a lack of ethics and dishonesty among students.
- New Mexico lacks a shared vision of how to take the state forward, nor even how to preserve its exquisite natural and human resources. This is due, in part, to excessive partisanship, insular community attitudes and the lack of incentives for collaboration and cohesion.
- The state faces major challenges: water, economic development, education, health care, taxes, and the brain drain.
- New Mexico hasn’t asked for good leadership. Many people are satisfied with no change.
- Communities function independently, which makes it hard to address issues collectively and cohesively. Many parts of the state outside of Albuquerque and Santa Fe feel as though they have no say.

**What results would we want from a Town Hall on “Leading with Integrity?”**

- More quality leaders in New Mexico?
- More people feeling engaged in leadership?
- More people taking responsibility for developing and maintaining leadership?
- Raising the level of public discourse?
- Contributing to a sense of achieving common goals?
- More ethical followers?
- More people (who are often overlooked by society) becoming leaders and good ambassadors?
- Increasing social capital?

**What kinds of programs, projects and possibilities may be created to achieve such results?**

- Devise a way to hold leaders accountable and to evaluate political leadership. For example, compile a list of the Top 10 expectations of leaders and outline the ramifications of not living up to them.
- Remove barriers to political leadership. Change the rules of engagement and participation. Restore a sense of public service. Provide more opportunities for people to experience leadership. Encourage more diversity in who is willing to serve the public.
- Create an environment that encourages leaders to come forward, such as fair compensation.
- Have an ongoing process to decide what matters to New Mexico. Develop publicly supported strategic plans and goals as a platform on which political leaders can campaign.
- Encourage public service. Motivate widespread participation in social issues.
- Collectively change the view, often negative, that New Mexico has of itself. Emphasize “what we have to offer.”
- Create a Leadership Institute – a center that pays attention to leadership.
- Address leadership with intention in the K-12 curriculum. Focus leadership skills on everyone, especially students in middle school.
- Require community service of all high school students, so that they may develop shared values and norms.
- Take someone else’s child to work for a day. Expose children to more possibilities.
- Enable every young person to have a Town Hall experience.
- Celebrate demonstrated instances of ethical leadership.
- Think ahead about how to deal with complexity and value conflicts and when they arise. Teach and offer the services of dispute resolution.
- Capture different kinds of leadership, new palettes of leadership skills.
- Create a sense of hope so people feel they can take responsibility to improve leadership at all levels.
PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF POLITICS IN NEW MEXICO: 
VIEWS ON THE STATE’S MOST PRESSING NEEDS & ASSESSMENTS 
OF A CRISIS IN LEADERSHIP

By Amy Sue Goodin and Amelia A. Rouse
UNM Institute for Public Policy

Political, religious and business leaders throughout New Mexico deal with what seem to be intractable issues involving the educational system, crime, drug use, environmental quality, health care, and jobs and the economy on a daily basis. While many in leadership positions believe that they are resolving these problems in the most efficient and effective manner possible, the public does not always perceive such efforts to involve anything more than the application of stopgap measures that do not effectively get at the heart of issues. To assess the extent to which this may be the case in New Mexico, the University of New Mexico Institute for Public Policy (IPP) asked New Mexicans several questions as part of the Institute’s Public Opinion Profile (POP) conducted in the fall and winter of this year.

The following discussion examines responses from approximately 750 randomly selected adults from around the state to a series of questions addressing issues of concern to New Mexicans and several aspects of leadership. Specifically, the IPP asked New Mexicans:

• If you had to choose from the following categories, what would you say is the single, biggest problem facing people in New Mexico today?

• What would you say is the second, biggest problem facing people in New Mexico today?

• Using a scale from one to seven where one is very poor and seven is very good, please tell me how you would rate the quality of leadership in New Mexico provided for or by each of the following: education, economic development, health care, the environmental, religious leadership, elected state officials, elected city or county officials, and public employees.

• Some people believe that there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico today. Please tell me whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree with this statement.

• Regardless of whether you disagree or agree with the statement that there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico today, as briefly as possible, please tell me what this statement means to you.

Figure 1 shows that, overall, more than one-in-three New Mexicans (37%) consider issues focusing on jobs and the economy to be the “single biggest problem facing New Mexico today.” The next issue that garners support is public education (at 22%), followed by drug abuse (14%), crime and health care (both at 12%), and environmental quality (3%). No one issue receives support from more than a fraction of respondents, indicating the diverse nature of public opinion when it comes to identifying areas of concern, which makes decision-making all the more difficult for New Mexico’s leadership.

Table 1 shows how New Mexicans in our survey not only rank the single biggest problem facing New Mexico “today,” but also the second biggest problem. The most important aspect of examining the issues in this context is that a pattern of interrelatedness emerges that shows the salience of personally and socially focused issues. For instance, among those who rank jobs and the economy as the single biggest problem, public education and health care are equally likely to be identified as the second problem of importance. When public education is the primary concern, jobs and the economy stand outs; likewise for drug abuse and health care. The exceptions to this pattern are when crime and environmental quality are ranked as the single biggest concerns.
Considering crime, drug abuse stands out as the second biggest problem, followed by public education, then jobs and the economy. Nevertheless, there is still an impression of personal and social salience linking the issues. Finally, environmental quality is a different type of issue altogether, being linked with public education; thus it seems that when New Mexicans consider environmental quality a problem, it is not one that is insurmountable since such a problem can be overcome through education.

Table 2 shows a comparison of what different racial and ethnic groups perceive to be the single biggest problem. All in all, there is little difference in the rankings of the problems. The most substantial difference is indicated in the magnitude of the rankings. Specifically, while Hispanic respondents still rank jobs and the economy as the primary problem, it is closely followed by public education (with only a difference of 5%). This stands in sharp contrast with the rankings shown for White, non-Hispanic respondents and the “Other” group where roughly 40% of respondents ranked jobs and the economy first and public education a distant second. (Native Americans, Asians, Black respondents, and those who refused to self-identify were combined into one category for ease of reporting due to the relatively small number of respondents in these categories.)

The rankings are also similar when considering gender, although the range between jobs and the economy and education is not as broad among females as it is among males. While 35% of females ranked jobs and the economy first and 25% did so for public education, 40% of males ranked jobs and the economy first compared to only 22% of males when the issue was public education. The results of this break out are shown in Table 3.

How do perceptions of the single biggest problem compare across the generations? Examination of Table 4 indicates that the rankings remain relatively stable when comparing the issues by generation, and not unlike the situation when considering race and ethnicity, it is the magnitude of the rankings that stand out, with Generation Y and the Silent Generation least likely to make a strong distinction between whether jobs and the economy and public education should be considered the single biggest issue facing New Mexico today.

Turning to the issue of how New Mexicans rate the quality of leadership for a variety of issues and different types of leaders, Table 5 shows the average responses for each of the types of leaders or issues respondents were
Table 2. Respondent perceptions regarding the single biggest problems facing New Mexico today by Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biggest Problem</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>White, non-Hispanic</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/economy</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Quality</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Respondent perceptions regarding the single biggest problems facing New Mexico today by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biggest Problem</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/economy</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Quality</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Respondent perceptions regarding the single biggest problems facing NM today by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs/economy</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Educ.</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Quality</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

asked to rate on a scale ranging from one (very poor) to seven (very good). Overall, responses were at or just below the scale midpoint of four, which means respondents tended to rate leadership just slightly on the poor side of the scale. While this finding holds for the most part when examining the issues across demographic subgroups, the following exceptions are worth noting for leadership in the four policy areas: Hispanics report slightly more positive ratings for environmental leadership, as do members of the Silent Generation, Generation Y, and females; Generation Y also reports slightly more positive ratings for all other issue areas than do their counterparts. Considering specific types of leaders, the following exceptions can be noted: Religious leaders are ranked slightly more favorably by those in the “Other” racial/ethnic group, females, and those from Generation Y and the Silent Generation; and Hispanics, Generation Y and the Silent Generation rate Elected State Officials slightly more favorable than their counterparts.

Another important topic of discussion pertains to whether there is a perception among New Mexicans that there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico. Specifically, respondents were asked to respond to the
Table 5. Average Ratings Assessing the Quality of Leadership for Four Types of Leaders and Four Policy Issues—by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age (Scale ranges from 1-Very Poor to 7-Very Good)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Educ</th>
<th>Econ</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Env.</th>
<th>Religious Ldrs</th>
<th>NM Officials</th>
<th>Local Officials</th>
<th>Public Emp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hisp.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Y (1982-present)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1962-81)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer (1943-61)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Gen. (1925-42)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Respondent Agreement or Disagreement with the Question asking whether they “believe that there is a crisis in leadership in NM today” by Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hisp.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Y (1982-present)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen X (1962-81)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Boomer (1943-61)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silent Gen. (1925-42)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following: Some people believe that there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico today. Please tell me whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree with this statement. As indicated in Table 6, strong majorities in all demographic subgroups do not agree with the statement. (Note that while the scale has been collapsed for simplicity in reporting, it has no affect on the aggregate findings.) However, this picture is somewhat deceptive when considering that we also asked respondents to tell us what characteristics would be indicative of a crisis in leadership. The point trying to be made here is that by asking both questions, it was imperative to know that answers to one question or another weren’t affected by the order in which the questions were asked. To make sure this was not a problem, we implemented a split design in which some respondents received the question assessing agreement or disagreement with the statement that there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico first and the balance received the open-ended question asking respondents to define this statement first. Only in this manner could we be sure of our results regarding whether New Mexicans believe there either is or is not a crisis in leadership in New Mexico. The results using a variable to delineate which question respondents received first are presented in Table 7.

Does question order have an affect on how respondents assess whether there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico? The answer is yes, but with the caveat that the affect is in the magnitude of responses by response category rather than on the actual outcome. Specifically, a majority of respondents do not agree with the statement that there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico regardless of which question they received first. Nevertheless, what the findings do suggest is that when respondents are afforded the opportunity to ponder and articulate what the statement means to them, they then have a context for assess-
...issues of integrity, 
‘good ‘ole boy’ politics, and partisanship are the characteristics that appear to drive perceptions of a crisis in leadership.

In summary, while New Mexico is faced with many of the same problems that other states are, it does not appear that leadership, per se, plays a large role when people are asked to rank the problems confronting New Mexico. However, leadership does play into the equation, as seen, when asking New Mexicans to assess whether there is a crisis in leadership in New Mexico. Overall, the biggest indicator of this is New Mexican’s responses to an open-ended question that asks them to assess how they define a crisis in leadership in New Mexico and issues like integrity, patronage, and partisanship emerges time and time again. Further, as the test on question order suggests, when people actually are forced to articulate the issue of what it means for there to be a crisis in leadership in New Mexico, such factors can have an affect on whether people actually perceive a crisis. However, the results also suggest that there is still time to overcome such problems, but this is not the place to address such issues.

Table 7. Assessing Differences in Perceptions to the Questions Assessing Whether There is a Crisis in Leadership in New Mexico by Question Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Crisis Q First</th>
<th>Definition Question First</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**LEADERSHIP LINKS**

Below are some links to websites that focus on one or another aspect of leadership from the Harvard Kennedy School of Government Center for Public Leadership:

http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/leadership/links.html

- **Advocacy Institute**
  - www.advocacy.org

- **American Management Association**
  - www.amanet.org/index.htm

- **Anitioch University, Ph.D. in Leadership and Change**
  - www.phd.antioch.edu/

- **Ashoka**
  - www.ashoka.org/home/index.cfm

- **Association of Leadership Educators**
  - www.aces.uiuc.edu/%7EALE/

- **Center for Army Leadership**
  - www-cqsc.army.mil/cal/

- **Center for Creative Leadership**
  - www.ccl.org/index.shtml

- **Center for Health Leadership and Practice**
  - www.cfhl.org/

- **Center for Leadership and Change Management**
  - leadership.wharton.upenn.edu/welcome/index.shtml

- **Center for Study of the Presidency**
  - www.thepresidency.org/

- **CIO.com Leadership Resource Center**
  - www.cio.com/research/leadership/

- **Community Leadership Association**
  - www.communityleadership.org/

- **Consortium on Global Leadership**
  - http://sa.hbs.edu/global/

- **Council of Women World Leaders**
  - www.womenworldleaders.org/

- **Department of Organizational Leadership, Purdue University**
  - www.tech.purdue.edu/ols/

- **DePree Leadership Center**
  - www.depree.org/index.html

- **Durcker Foundation for Nonprofit Management**
  - www.pdif.org

- **Echoing Green Foundation**
  - www.ecoinggreen.org/
The Glietsman Foundation  
www.glietsman.org/

GovLeaders.org  
www.govleaders.org/

Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership  
www.greenleaf.org/

Hart Leadership Program, Duke University  
www.pubpol.duke.edu/center/hlp/index.htm

Healthy Companies International  
www.healthycompanies.com/

Institute for Leadership Research  
http://ilr.ba.ttu.edu/

InterAction Concil  
www.asiawide.or.jp/iac/

International Leadership Academy  
www.la.unu.edu/index.htm

International Leadership Association  
www.academy.umd.edu/ila/

International Society of Political Psychology  
http://ispp.org/

International Women’s Foundation  
www.iwmf.org/

James McGregor Burns Academy of Leadership, University of Maryland  
www.academy.umd.edu/

Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond  
http://oncampus.richmond.edu/academics/leadership/

John Ben Sheppard Public Leadership Institute  
www.utpb.edu/jbs/leadership.htm

John Glenn Institute for Public Service & Public Policy  
www.glenninstitute.org/glenn/index.asp

Jossey-Bass Publishers  
www.josseybass.com/cda/sec/0,,918,00.html/0,,00.html

Journal of Leadership Studies  
www.baker.edu/departments/leadership/ils-main.htm

J.W. Fanning Institute Leadership  
www.fanning.uga.edu/

Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership  
www.emkf.org

Kravis Leadership Institute  
http://research.mckenna.edu/kli/

LEAD International  
www.lead.org/

Leader to Leader  
www.pfdf.org/leaderbooks/L@L/index.html

Leadership Center at Morehouse College  
www.morehouse.edu/leadershipcenter/index.htm

Leadership for A Changing World  
http://leadershipforchange.org/

Leadership Development, Inc.  
www.leadershipdevelopment.com/

The Leadership Learning Community  
www.leadershipelearning.org/

The Leadership Network  
http://leadership.gc.ca/menu_e.asp

Leadership Quarterly  
www.elsevier.com/inca/publications/store/6/2/0/2/2/1/index.htm

McDonough Leadership Program  
www.marietta.edu/%7Elead/

National Clearinghouse for Leadership Programs  
www.nclp.umd.edu

National Leadership Institute  
www.umuc.edu/prog/nli/nli.html

Next Generation Leadership  
www.ngl.net/

Public Allies  
www.publicallies.org
Public Health Leadership Institute
www.albany.edu/sph/li_main.html

Reflective Leadership Center
www.hhh.umn.edu/centers/rlc/

Sloan Leader Forum
www.sloanleader.com/

Team Harmony Foundation
www.teamharmony.org/

Wexner Foundation
www.wexnerfoundation.org/

W.K. Kellogg Foundation
www.wkkf.org/

Youth Service America
www.ysa.org/

ADDITIONAL LINKS

Working Knowledge
www.workingknowledge.hbs.edu/

International City/County Management Association
http://www2.icma.org

National Civic League
http://ncl.org

National Governors Association
www.nqa.org/center/

◆