



THE JACOB RADER MARCUS CENTER OF THE
AMERICAN JEWISH ARCHIVES

MS-763: Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman Collection, 1930-2004.

Series I: Wexner Heritage Foundation, 1947-2004.

Subseries 1: General Files, 1949-2004.

Box
64

Folder
7

Leadership. 1994.

For more information on this collection, please see the finding aid on the
American Jewish Archives website.

ACT NOW

A proposal by
Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman
May 18, 1994

* * * * *

A PREVIOUS PERIOD OF INACTIVITY

THE 1930'S AND 1940'S

During this period there was bitter fighting over ideologies. The two major organizations disagreed as to objectives. The Joint Distribution Committee felt that emphasis should be placed on the rescue of and assistance to endangered populations of Jews, rather than on the development of Palestine which seemed to be a distant goal, ill-suited to an amelioration of the present dangerous situation.

The Zionist-oriented forces, campaigning under the banner of the United Palestine Appeal, resisted and resented the JDC approach, as being short-sighted and unaware of the tremendous yearning of East European Jewry for a place of its own where it could be at peace. Further, there was an underlying uneasiness between the two societies, due to the differences still prevailing between German and Russian-Polish elements. The JDC had been founded by the "uptown" German Jews, while the Zionist movement derived its support from the masses of Russian-Polish immigrants.

The arguments over ideologies resulted in fiercely competitive fund-raising. This situation prevailed over a number of years and existed not only on the national level but infected the local communities as well. Neither campaign did well. Bereft of adequate funds, both goals languished and struggled along while the fate of millions of Jews overseas grew increasingly perilous. Finally the moment arrived when it became obvious that the major fund-raising would have to be conducted in a united fashion in order to mobilize American Jewry. The moment was Kristallnacht, the night of November 8-9, 1938, when a massive attack raged throughout the entire country of Germany against synagogues and business establishments which came crashing down in a blizzard of broken glass. The Nazi goal became clearer. The two antagonistic organizations launched the first united campaign within eight weeks, following years of suspicion and separation.

Year	Goal	Raised
1939	\$20M	\$16.25M
1940	\$23M	less
1941	\$25M	\$38M

1942-1944	The JDC continued to receive more than the UPA.
-----------	---

AMERICAN JEWISH

In 1942 - The Zionists passed the Biltmore Resolution, calling for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. This caused tension in the fund-raising arena and a renewed sense of competition.

In 1943 - There was established the American Council for Judaism, a violently anti-Zionist pressure and propaganda group, largely supported by the Reform movement, which fought openly and hard against the idea of a State. This also affected the fund-raising climate.

In 1944 - The goal was \$32 million - amount raised was \$27 million.

Between 1939 - 1945, inclusive, a total of seven years of uneasy cooperation, interrupted by frequent fights and suspicions, a total of \$124 million was raised, for an average of 17.7 million per year.

American Jewry could not agree on the nature of the danger nor on the method to counter it. The only positive fact was that the UJA managed to hold together, because both sides compromised, but the campaign limped along.

ACTION DURING THE 50's - 90's

American and Diaspora Jewry simply decided, once the State of Israel was established, that this should be the priority. The campaign took on a focus, ideological quarreling ceased, and the upbuilding of the new country assumed center stage. Absorbing immigrants (rescue), security and the economy were the highlights. There were ups and downs in the yearly campaign totals, but slowly the momentum gathered strength; the wars developed a sense of maturity and realism; the thrill of creation provided additional stimuli, and the net result of a half-century of concentrated effort elevated the campaign from a \$60 million level to more than one billion.

This focus and concentration must continue at a high level for the balance of the decade, or so long as the migration from the ex-Soviet Union maintains itself at the 50 - 70,000 annual level.

MEANWHILE, WE MUST PREPARE FOR THE NEXT HISTORIC PERIOD

Everyone in the leadership ranks is fully aware of the terrible danger regarding the future survivability of the organized Jewish community. The term "CONTINUITY" has, in the short space of one year, become a dreadful cliché - so badly overused that most people are ashamed to use it. The word is hollow because there is no action flowing from it. Actually, from the time of the CJF General Assembly in November 1992, when the issue was first raised in a manner which brought it to the attention of the entire community with great impact, until today, there have been reams of speeches describing what must be done, and almost no concrete steps have been implemented.

Yes, there are continuity committees in every city and in every organization and in many synagogues, and there are small beginnings, but no action on a national level, and not even the slightest rumblings of a master plan or parts of a plan or anything resembling a galvanization of energy and will to address the matter on the proper scale. There is an awareness that the drift toward indifference and dissolution can be ameliorated, slowed down, perhaps even reversed by certain

programs, such as a rejuvenated Hillel on the college campuses, a massive number of teen-agers being exposed to an Israel Experience, and a network of superior day and boarding schools on the upper level. Faint beginnings have been made in all these areas. But what is needed - a major shock to awaken consciousness, to lead the way toward widespread action - is not being spoken of, let alone showing up on anyone's drawing board.

No - we are not paralyzed by ideological arguments as were our predecessors in the 30's and 40's. Happily there is no argument or disagreement as to the diagnosis or the prescription. There is simply continuous fumbling, with no one taking the lead.

We need one or more national personalities to mobilize a small group of caring people who will:

1. Form a new non-profit tax-deductible 501 c 3 corporation which will create and supervise master programs in six areas:

- A) Israel-centered Experiences for youth, ages 10 - 25.
- B) Boarding Schools, of high calibre, with Judaic-secular curricula, for grades 9 - 13.
- C) Hillel Foundations, on college campuses, to encompass both undergraduates and graduate students, ages 18 - 22, and 22 - 28.
- D) Summer Camps in U.S.
- E) Sabbatical Year in Israel, for adults.
- F) Family Life Seminars, for adults.

Outline for Leadership Seminars June 1994

I. Introduction

A. Let's discuss quickly the basic lessons of the four readings-

1. Peres - What are his three dilemmas - and his answers?

2. Lamm - Two loves

Ahavat Israel

favored by Yehudah
ha-Levi 12th c. Spain

Ahavat Torah

favored by Saadia Gaon
10th c. Babylon

U.S. Jewry has demonstrated *Ahavat Israel* - now must rally to *Ahavat Torah*

3. Definition of leadership - discuss each one quickly

4. What leaders really do -

leadership complements management
setting direction v. planning and budgeting
aligning people v. organizing and staffing
motivating people v. controlling and problem solving

B. Attributes of leaders and Ten Commandments for them

C. Importance of followers

II. Now that we have re-visited what you already know - i.e. how leaders should act - the big question is:

What are the main goals for American Jewry today?

How do you set these goals into action? Not talk - action.

How do you obtain followers?

A. Read best papers

B. My six-point program

Summary:

**PRIME MINISTER SHIMON PERES
WRITES ON
"GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF LEADERSHIP"**

1. Creative genius is not necessarily leadership.
Do not be fooled by the number of Jewish Nobel Laureates.
2. Leadership contains dilemmas and challenges:
 - a. The leader as bearer of his own vision, or the leader as his people's representative. *You must choose the former - and then you will serve tomorrow's constituency as well as today's.*
 - b. The leader's desire to take decisive action, even in the absence of consensus, or the leader's desire to preserve unity, even at the price of decision. *You must choose the latter.*
 - c. The leader's need to fulfill the tasks of daily husbandry, or the leader's need to undertake major initiatives. *You must choose the former, except in case of war.*
3. The leader must beware of thinking of himself as a historic figure. Beware of history -- you are not a page or a paragraph or a footnote.

My theme this evening is both general and specific. I shall try to trace some of our current problems to a conceptual dichotomy that has been latent for centuries. I shall seek, thereby, to identify two constants that are prerequisite for Jewish leadership and for a viable Jewish community as we move into the closing decades of this century.

In his *The Great Chain of Being*, a pioneering work on the history of ideas published almost 50 years ago, Prof. Arthur O. Lovejoy showed how two ideas conjoined in the philosophy of Plato lived side by side peacefully for about two millennia, only to come into violent conflict with each other as their implications were spelled out over the generations. Even in the realm of ideas, friends can become foes. Compatible ideas can break out into open opposition, and apparently differing concepts can later merge into one.

I detect a similar process taking place in the thought and experience of the Jewish people. Two great precepts that lived harmoniously with each other have now become sharpened into two antagonistic forces that threaten to rip apart the fabric of our people. Only a deliberate and conscious effort on the part of Jewish leaders and opinion-molders to establish peace between these ideas—to embrace both of them harmoniously—can restore the wholeness of the House of Israel in our time.

Ahavat Yisrael and Ahavat Ha-Torah

These two ideas are: *ahavat Yisrael*, the love of Israel, the feeling of profound kinship with all Jews everywhere, the sense of identity and sympathy with all Jews whatever

their disposition; and *ahavat ha-Torah*, the love of Torah, the esteem for learning the divine Word, the immersion in Jewish law and lore, the appreciation and pursuit of Jewish education.

These two principles of love of Israel and love of Torah appear to be thoroughly compatible, indeed complementary to each other. What can be more natural than the love of one's people and the love of that which gives it its meaning, its mission, its culture, its way, its distinctiveness?

Yet, early on there began a testing of these two ideas against each other—only in a theoretical way, of course, and without any clear awareness that this opposition could have real and even disastrous consequences.

Clearly, these two are foundations of Jewish existence and experience. They represent the body and soul of our people, its physical identity and metaphysical dimension. Yet, which is more important? Which must give way before the other? We have here a classical *mahloket rishonim*, a disagreement between two of our most eminent authorities.

The spokesman for one opinion is the Egyptian-born giant of Jewish law and philosophy, the tenth century Babylonian Saadia Gaon, who wrote that "our people is a people only by virtue of the Torah." Our peoplehood is meaningless without the Torah which gives us purpose and direction, and hence the love of Torah is clearly superior to the love of Israel.

The opposing point of view is advocated by the immortal poet-philosopher of twelfth century Spain, Yehudah Halevi, who taught that the special qualities of Israel existed before the giving of the Torah; that we are not Jews because of the Torah but rather the Torah was given to us

ATTRIBUTES OF LEADERSHIP

One of our full class seminars worked out the following rules for leadership conduct which can bring real benefit to a community:

1. TO HAVE A VISION

This means concentrating on what is seminal, what will really change the future. This means having a sense of priorities, distinguishing between major and minor, realizing that all projects and programs are not equal in importance. No leader can or should work on everything, because this spreads him/her too thin. Vision involves the largest dreams, which usually take the longest time to bring into activity. Vision inevitably means taking risks. Vision demands persistence, patience, and exquisite articulation.

2. TO ARTICULATE THE VISION AND COMMUNICATE IT

This means thinking it through first by yourself; writing it down very carefully in short form; testing it on a small group whose brains and experience you value; expanding it into a document and testing it on a larger group; then putting it into the cumbersome "process" which moves it widely through the committees and sub-committees, boards and agencies, etc., saturating the broadest possible number of decision makers in the community.

It also means developing other means of communication in addition to a basic document, such as, a speech version (both long and short); possibly a videotape version; a written version for a one-page advertisement in the local Anglo-Jewish paper; a question-and-answer version for quick, easy consumption; a brochure, with pictures, if possible; and any other forms you can think of. Your articulation must sell the vision.

3. TO TRANSLATE THE VISION INTO SPECIFIC GOALS

This means taking the central theme of the vision and breaking it up into separate pieces or modules, each one of which might be a useful goal, in and of itself, so that the individual parts can be beneficial even if the total mosaic takes a longer time to achieve. For example, suppose the total vision encompasses an educational network from pre-kindergarten to junior college. Each individual piece of such a totality can be useful by itself, even as the total plan proceeds toward completion, over years or decades. the specific goals must be carefully crafted; thoroughly thought out; rationalized in detail as to benefits gained; dovetailed with existing institutions in the community.

4. TO DEVELOP A PLAN OF EXECUTION

This means creating a total blueprint for action, including:

1. Costing the project, in whole and in parts.
2. Planning a fund-raising strategy.
3. Describing the personnel required, both staff and volunteers, for all aspects; as well as a method for recruiting them.
4. Selling the whole package to the community.

5. TO LEARN THE NECESSARY FUND-RAISING SKILLS

1. How to arrive at a campaign goal (One-day retreat).
2. How to segment that goal into workable subdivisions.
3. How to create a campaign calendar.
4. How to package the campaign in an advertising program.
5. How to select division and trade leaders (solicit simultaneously with invitation to serve).
6. How to monitor achievement - i.e. know where you are succeeding or failing.
7. How to create special events for stimulation.
8. How to use his/her own gift as stimulation (early and maximum is price of leadership).
9. How to solicit a gift.
10. How to close a campaign (re-solicit at end, if you are close to goal).

6. TO KEEP A THIRD EYE ON THE IN-PLACE PROGRAMS

This means devoting some time and energy on the maintenance and fine-tuning of all the good programs and projects going on. While the leader is preoccupied with vision (i.e. future), the present must not be totally ignored. Most of the on-going supervision can be delegated to others, still the leader must be supplied with a constantly updated overview of current activity.

SUMMARY:

TEN COMMANDMENTS FOR LEADERS

1. Provide direction (vision and goals)
2. Articulate views clearly, (both orally and written)
3. Involve others
4. Raise money
5. Exemplify many traits: moralist, jurist, teacher, steward, philosopher
6. Develop skills, style, staff, shared values
7. Also play role of manager: creating strategy, structure and systems
8. Handle basic dilemmas, as outlined by Shimon Peres
 - a. Is the leader the bearer of his/her own vision, or is he/she the peoples' representative? *Leader must be former, and will then serve the future needs, not only the present wishes.*
 - b. Does the leader take decisive action, even in the absence of consensus, or should he/she preserve unity, even at the cost of indecision? *Leader must preserve unity.*
 - c. Does the leader fulfill the task of daily husbandry, or concentrate on major initiatives? *Leader's priority must be the daily life of the people.*
9. Handle fund-allocation decisions with a sense of history, and without anger
10. Handle capital fund decisions with a sense of priorities, not surrendering to temporary hysteria or pressure.

SOME DEFINITIONS OF LEADERSHIP

1. Leadership is essentially a philosophical activity that must deal with values, because they "impinge upon every phase of the administrative process."
(C. Hodgkinson, *The Philosophy of Leadership*, 1983: St. Martins Press, N.Y.)
2. The leader's job is to provide direction as well as to be considerate of his subordinate's needs. The most effective leader is one who uses participatory management.
3. An effective leader must be able to act as a moral agent to persuade others to follow the leader's moral point of view. The leader must be able to articulate his/her view and only during "moral dispute" can conflict over ethical dimensions be resolved.
4. It is impossible for an individual to be both a manager and a leader. If an individual tries to be too much of one, the other will suffer. The individual who understands the distinction between manager and leader will have greater success in achieving the goals for the organization.
5. An effective leader should possess five traits. He/she should be a *moralist*, a *jurist*, a *teacher*, a *steward* and a *philosopher*.
6. Managers and leaders are basically different types. The manager is seen as (over) relying on the "hard" S's (strategy, structure and systems), while the leader's mastery of the "soft" elements (style, skills, staff and shared values) helps to galvanize his/her organizations into superior performance.

"CERTAIN TRUMPETS"

The Call of Leaders

by

Garry Wills

Excerpts from *Introduction* and *Conclusion*

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.

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 occurs rarely 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 other of these models--or, inconsistently, both. The superior-person model says the leader must become *worthy* of being followed--more disciplined than others, more committed, better organized. This sends aspiring leaders to the mirror, to strike firm-jawed poses, to cultivate self-confidence and a refusal to hedge.

Or the leader is taught to be ingratiating. This is the salesmanship or Dale Carnegie approach--how to win friends and influence people. It treats followers as customers who "buy" the leader's views after these have been consumer tested and tailored to maximum acceptance.

The followers are, in this literature, a hazy and not very estimable lot--people to be dominated or served, mesmerized or flattered. We have thousands of books on leadership, none on followership. I have heard college presidents tell their students that schools are meant to train leaders. I have never heard anyone profess to train followers. The ideal seems to be a world in which everyone is a leader--but who would be left for them to be leading?

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 vast 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?" 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--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, not 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.

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 summonses down into the deep. But it would be a waste of time.)

In Lincoln's constituency were some abolitionist, 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 policy of (at least) some hope for ultimate manumission. He argued in terms of his listener's 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 held, and in what directions they were changing, moment by moment. The leader needs to understand followers far more than they need to understand him.

* * * * *

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 found a grudging acceptance of the Declaration's pledge on which to build his strategy of emancipation. My father's tactics were different with me, with my sister, with the golfing friends I observed him with while caddying. 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.

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.

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, 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 leader does not just vaguely affect others. He or she takes others toward the object of their 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. Revolutionary activity for still a third. The compromise and flexibility of Lincoln were appropriate for his kind of leadership.

Most important, I hope that readers will keep in mind the different types of *followers* appropriate to historically conditioned goals. Not many of us will be leaders; and even those who are leaders must also be followers much of the time. This is the crucial role. Followers judge leaders. Only if the leaders pass that test do they have any impact. The potential followers, if their judgment is poor, have judged themselves. 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 to their revolution 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.

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 our 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, antiwar 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 Fay Wattleton, have been met and resisted by a Phyllis Schlafly or a Beverly LaHaye. The environment movement, the consumer 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 congregation--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. Ambition is a 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 should lead. Others should follow. My book has missed its 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, thrown into jail, threatened with bombs, killed with bombs, killed with guns, 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 were showboaters, backbiters, people more flawed than the ones they marshaled forward. Flawed leaders are as common as noble followers. But the goal was what mattered, to enough of them, to make them risk insult, harm, and their very lives marching toward 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.

Well, but how about *nongreat* 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 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 are, 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.

Excerpt from Appendix

...the theme of this book--that leadership is tempered by specific social context (i.e. both the goals conceivable and the followers available in a concrete situation)...



Profiles in Leadership

Garry Wills reflects on what it takes to get people to follow you.

CERTAIN TRUMPETS

The Call of Leaders.

By Garry Wills.

Illustrated. 336 pp. New York:

Simon & Schuster. \$23.

By Frank Kermode

GARRY WILLS, a prolific and deservedly popular historian, has not lacked occasions to meditate on the problem of leadership. His earlier works include studies of several Presidents, not only the more recent incumbents but also Washington and Lincoln. "Lincoln at Gettysburg" won the Pulitzer Prize for general nonfiction in 1993, and Lincoln naturally turns up again in his new book, "Certain Trumpets: The Call of Leaders." So do many less obvious examples: Mr. Wills deploys considerable quantities of disparate historical material.

Leadership is a complicated and sometimes emotional issue, and Mr. Wills thinks that if we are to understand it we need to impose on the concept, or the cluster of concepts, some schematic order. To this end he chooses 16 personalities as representatives of different types of leadership, and devotes a chapter to each. Then he adds to each chapter a sketch of another person, offered as the "antitype" of the chosen leader. The contrast is meant to help us understand the positive qualities of the principal figures.

• • •

What these paragons have in common is what their antitypes lack: an ability to benefit from a reciprocal engagement between two wills, those of the leader and the follower. "He or she takes others toward the object of their joint quest," Mr. Wills writes. However they may differ, the leader and the led must be thus mutually indebted and have the same goal.

This approach rules out a certain kind of leader, the

Frank Kermode is currently the Henry Luce Visiting Scholar in the Humanities and Social Thought at the Whitney Humanities Institute, Yale University.

type who leads simply by virtue, of his or her own unquestioned power. Pericles is an example: as Thucydides admiringly remarked, he didn't have to compromise with public opinion but could do just as he pleased. Lincoln, on the other hand, had to consider his constituents. So he asserted "the superior position assigned to the white race"; had he not done so he would never have been in a position to do any leading at all.

Mr. Wills's leaders are not necessarily democratic by belief or temperament, but they all have to know how to be ingratiating. Machiavelli is applauded for insisting that this requirement is imperative. So is the ability to improvise, to adapt one's plans to the pressure of circumstances. Napoleon was a great leader in his earlier days, when he could share with his citizen armies the conviction that they were fighting for the ideals of the Revolution, and when he could improvise brilliantly on the battlefield; he ceased to be a great leader when he became an emperor, cut off from the troops and having to run an empire from the top.

OBVIOUSLY the skills of leadership vary somewhat in accordance with the goal toward which leader and led aspire (Napoleon, as Mr. Wills remarks, would not have made a good C.E.O.). To elucidate these variations Mr. Wills adopts a typology borrowed from Max Weber, dividing leaders into the charismatic, the traditional and the legal-rational, or constitutional. The charismatic leader, for example King David, has absolute personal authority; he may establish an order to be maintained later by a successor who is not a charismatic but a traditional leader. The third Weberian type, the constitutional, accounts for leaders who are obliged to seek election and, once in power, to consult continually the mood of their followers. Thus, Mr. Wills observes, "no American President, no matter how personally charming, can be a charismatic leader in Weber's sense."

These rather complicated rules tend to make Mr. Wills's enterprise seem rather like a game, and in fact he does invite his readers to play along with him. Anybody who does so may decide that it is a very peculiar game. Among the 16 leaders celebrated we find not only Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, Napoleon, King David, Pope John XXIII, Washington and

Continued on page 18

Profiles in Leadership

Continued from page 14

Martin Luther King, but also Harriet Tubman, Ross Perot, Socrates, Mary Baker Eddy, Carl Stotz, Martha Graham, Cesare Borgia, Dorothy Day and Andrew Young.

The brief and selective biographies here provided are expertly done. Napoleon's campaigns, the regard of Socrates for his fellow citizens, Stotz's creation of the Little League, the reasons Machiavelli admired Cesare Borgia, Eddy's genius for organization, the dedication of Graham and the saintliness of Day — all these are worth attending to, the more so since their lives were by no means flawless. Mr. Wills likes heroes, especially when they become so against fearful odds, like Roosevelt's polio. But he can be quite hard on them. He obviously adores Martin Luther King and has a brave try at explaining why his oratory was so astonishing; yet Mr. Wills wants the institution that granted King his Ph.D. to withdraw it because parts of the thesis are now known to have been plagiarized. (He doesn't even suggest a posthumous honorary doctorate in its place.)

• • •

So there is plenty of lively narrative and argument; but the mixture of choices seems odd and arbitrary, and the selection of antitypes is simply bewildering. The antitype of Pope John XXIII is Pope Celestine V (1215-96), "the only pope who resigned his office" — which surely makes him an antitype of the entire institution of the papacy. Mr. Wills says the case of Celestine proves that "holiness is not, of itself, a quality of leadership." It is a case hardly requiring such recondite proof. Other

antitypes include Solomon (to David), Adlai E. Stevenson (to Franklin Roosevelt), Nancy Reagan (to Eleanor Roosevelt), Cromwell (to Washington), Wittgenstein (to Socrates), Roger Smith (to Ross Perot), Clark Kerr (to Andrew Young) and Madonna (to Martha Graham).

Some of the comparisons are helpful (for instance, the victorious Washington, unlike Cromwell, did not turn into a virtual dictator), but these losers are mostly given short shrift. Since they are not leaders according to his prescription, Mr. Wills refuses to follow them very far. Even though some have the kind of almost ruthless single-mindedness he really admires, they fail the decisive test: the leader must get on with ordinary people. Wittgenstein, unlike Socrates, didn't get on with ordinary people, so he was, though influential, not Willsian leadership material. He was withdrawn and contemplative, and Mr. Wills assumes that the contemplative and active lives don't mix — an opinion contrary to that of Francis Bacon, whom he occasionally quotes. He might have broadened his discussion of the issue by taking a look at the poet-statesman Philip Sidney, for example.

Mr. Wills has some good things to say about a wide range of subjects — Machiavelli, Clausewitz and Weber, the Italy of Borgia and the France of Napoleon — but his basic concerns are understandably American, and the foreign examples sometimes feel a bit like exotic imports. Though eloquent, Mr. Wills is not a witty writer, so the odd quip is all the more welcome. But will this strange medley of a book make much difference to the way we followers think about our leaders? It seems very doubtful. □

Follow That Leader

CERTAIN TRUMPETS

The Call of Leaders

By Garry Wills

Simon & Schuster, 336 pp. \$23

Reviewed by Jonathan Yardley

There's a slight air of offhandedness to Garry Wills's study of leadership, just as there often is to his newspaper columns, but this does not significantly diminish the usefulness of many of the 16 essays in "Certain Trumpets." Wills understands that leadership is at once simpler and more complex than most of us imagine it to be, and he provides a valuable corrective to the prevailing notion that we have managed to stumble into an

era in which leadership is either deficient or nonexistent.

The "recurrent questions" in this book, Wills notes more than halfway through, are: "Who were followers of this leader, and what was their joint goal?" Wills asks these questions because he understands that leadership does not exist in a vacuum, independent of other considerations. For a leader to exist, he or she must have followers and must share goals. "We have long lists of the leader's requisites," Wills writes. "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."

Add to this a shared goal, and a definition of leadership is possible:

"The leader is one who mobilizes others toward a goal shared by leader and followers. In that brief definition, all three ele-

Washington Post Weekly
May 2-8, 1994

ments 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."

This may seem, thus stated, a matter of laboring the obvious, but in the popular mind generally and the political mind specifically, leadership tends to be seen in terms of the heroic individual, the "great man" of legend. Readers with reasonably long memories will recall that after a group of Texans paid a visit to John Kennedy in the White House, one emerged to complain that what the country really needed was "a man on horseback." It is a complaint often expressed now, if in different terms, and it arises from the same illusion: that a forceful, "charismatic" individual is all that is needed to effect whatever activity or change is desired.