

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

by WARREN BENNIS

© COPYRIGHT 1999 contents of above, American Management Association

A shrinking world in which technological and political complexities increase at an accelerating rate offers fewer and fewer arenas in which individual action, topdown leadership, suffices. The source for effective change is the workforce in creative alliance with top leadership.

I've never fully approved of formal debates.

The very premise of a debate, where issues are egregiously oversimplified, can't help but lose the subtly nuanced distinctions we academics relish and thrive on. So when I was asked not long ago to participate in this kind of foolishness, I was naturally resistant to participate.

Especially when the "resolution before the house" was phrased as follows: "All successful organizational change must originate at the top." To make matters worse, the organizers of the debate insisted that I take the opposite position of the "resolution of the house," casting me "against type," so to speak.

I would have felt far more comfortable being on the side of strong leadership, a position more compatible with most of my recent writing.

I did agree, however, despite my strong reservations primarily because the organizers were colleagues and I wanted an expense paid trip to the East Coast. In accepting, I was reminded of an old NEW YORKER cartoon showing Charles Dickens in his publisher's office, being told rather sternly by his editor:

"Well, Mr. Dickens, it's either the best of times OR the worst of time. It can't be both."

What I discovered was that getting impaled on the horns of a false dichotomy was rather more fun than I anticipated. More importantly in preparing for the debate, I arrived at an unexpected conclusion, close to an epiphanic event. I came to the unmistakable realization that TOPdown leadership was not only wrong, unrealistic and maladaptive but also, given the report of history, dangerous. And given certain changes taking place in the organizational landscape, this obsolete form of leadership will erode competitive advantage and destroy the aspirations of any organization that aims to be in the phone book beyond the year 2002.

I think it is now possible to talk about the end of leadership without the risk of hyperbole. Some of this change is organic and inevitable. But much of it is the legacy of our times ignited by that dynamic duo: globalization and relentlessly disruptive technology.

THE ENCOMPASSING TENDENCY

The idea of traditional TOPdown leadership is based on the myth of the triumphant individual.

It is a myth deeply ingrained in the American psyche and unfortunately fostered and celebrated in the daily press, business magazines, and much of academic and popular writing.

My own work, at times, has also suffered from this deification of the icons of American business:

the Welches, the Barneviks, the Gateses fill in your own hero. Whether it is midnight rider Paul Revere or basketball's Michael Jordan or, more recently, Mark McGwire, we are a nation enamored of heroesrugged selfstarters who meet challenges and overcome adversity. Our contemporary views of leadership are entwined with our notions of heroism, so much so that the distinction between "leader" and "hero" (or "celebrity," for that matter) often becomes blurred.

In our society leadership is too often seen as an inherently individual phenomenon. It's Oprah and Michael (Jordan or Eisner) and Bill (Clinton or Gates) and Larry and Hillary and Monica. We are all victims or witnesses to what Leo Braudy calls the "frenzy of renown," the "peoplification" of society. Think of it: Can you imagine a bestselling magazine as popular as PEOPLE called SYSTEM? And yet we do understand the significance of systems. After all, it is systems that encourage collaboration and systems which makes change not only effective but possible. A shrinking world in which technological and political complexity increase at an accelerating rate offers fewer and fewer arenas in which individual action, TOPdown leadership, suffices. And here is the troubling disconnect. Despite the rhetoric of collaboration, we continue to live in a "byline" culture where recognition and status are conferred on individuals, not teams of people who make change possible.

But even as the lone hero continues to gallop through our imaginations, shattering obstacles with silver bullets, leaping tall buildings in a single bound, we know that that's

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

a falsely lulling fantasy and that is not the way real change, enduring change, takes place.

We know there is an alternative reality. What's surprising is that this should surprise us. In a society as complex and technologically sophisticated as ours, the most urgent projects require the coordinated contributions of many talented people working together. Whether the task is building a global business or discovering the mysteries of the human brain, it doesn't happen at the top; TOPdown leadership can't hope to accomplish it, however gifted the person at the TOP is. There are simply too many problems to be identified and solved, too many connections to be made. So we cling to the myth of the Lone Ranger that great things are accomplished by a largerthanlife individual shouting commands, giving direction, inspiring the troops, sounding the tocsin, decreeing the compelling vision, leading the way and changing paradigms with brio and shimmer.

This encompassing tendency is dysfunctional in today's world of blurring, spastic, hyperturbulent change, and will get us into unspeakable troubles unless we understand that the search engine, the main stem winder for effective change is the workforce and their creative alliance with top leadership.

A personal case in point. My colleague, David Heenan and I, wrote a book about the role of Number Twos in organizations, how they work and don't work. We thought it an original idea, one that was significant and astonishingly neglected in the literature. We entitled the book "Second Banana" and had chapters on some of the most famous and successful partnerships between Ones and Twos in corporate life; for example, the fabled relationship between Warren Buffet and his Number Two, Charles Munger, known for containing Buffet's enthusiasm about investments and referred to by Buffet as the "Abominable No Man." And there was a chapter called Banana Splits, on infamously unsuccessful partnerships such as the widely publicized split between Michael Eisner and Michael Ovitz. All twelve of the publishers who reviewed the book declined. One put it rather nicely. He said, "Warren, no one in America wants to be Number Two." He also quoted Leonard Bernstein who once proclaimed that "The hardest instrument to play in a symphony orchestra is second fiddle."

So David and I changed the title to CoLeaders and added a subtitle, The Power of Great Partnerships. With that new title and a shift in emphasis away from being Number Two, it was published this year by John Wiley.

I give this example not to plug the book but to illustrate the

power of this encompassing tendency of the Great Man which dominates our thinking and perverts our understanding of organizational life and how leading change really works.

THE ARGUMENT I will present my argument in an unorthodox way by drawing on sources a little out of the ordinary for management scholars: examples and analogies from poetry, history and theater, as well as the more traditional sources of experimental studies and business anecdotes.

I'll start with an excerpt from a poem by Berthold Brecht, the Marxist playwright.

QUESTIONS FROM A WORKER

Who built the town of Thebes of Seven Gates? The names of kings are written in the books.

Was it the kings who dragged the slab of rock? And Babylon, so many times destroyed, Who built her up again so many times? Young Alexander conquered India.

All by himself? Caesar beat the Gauls.

Not even a cook to help him with his meals? Philip of Spain wept aloud when his Armada Went down. Did no one else weep? Frederick the Great won the Seven Years War. Who Else was the winner? On every page a triumph.

Who baked the victory cake? In ever decade a great man.

Who picked up the check? So many reports.

So many questions.

"In every decade a great man." That encompassing tendency again. And it shows up throughout history. In Plutarch's great biography of Cato the Elder, he wrote: "Rome showed itself to be truly great, and hence worthy of great leaders." What we tend to forget is that greatness lies within nations and organizations themselves as much, if not more, than their leaders. Could Gandhi achieve his greatness without staying close to the people representing their greatness of spirit? So many questions... Now for a contemporary business example. I wrote an article in which I quoted one of my favorite management philosophers, The Great One, Wayne Gretzky, saying: It's not where the puck is, it's where the puck will be." Soon after I received a rather sour letter from the Chairman and CEO of one of our largest FORTUNE 100 companies who wrote: "I was particularly interested in what you characterize as the Gretzky factor. I think I know where the

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

puck is going to bethe problem is, we've got thousands and thousands of folk who don't want the puck to go there, would rather that it wasn't going there, and in the event that it is going there, aren't going to let us position ourselves to meet it until after we've skated past. In plain English, we've got a bunch of people who want the world to be the way it used to beand are very disinclined to accept any alternative forecast of the future." (Emphasis mine.)

Now what's interesting about this "leader" is that (a) he was regarded as one of the most innovative and creative CEOs in his industrial sector and (b) his unquestionable "genius" was totally useless because he lacked a critical mass of willing followers. And he had no followers because he was unable to generate and sustain a minimum degree of trust with his workforce, widely known to be resistant to andno exaggerationdyspeptic with his preCopernican ego and macho style.

If there is one generalization we make about leadership and change, it is this: No change can occur without willing and committed followers.

Let us turn now to social movements and how they are led and mobilized. Mohammed Gandhi's singular American apostle was Dr.

Martin Luther King, Jr. who was introduced to his teachings as a graduate student in Boston University's Divinity School in the early 1950's. I had gone to college with Coretta Scott and got acquainted with her future husband while she attended the New England Conservatory of Music and I was in graduate school at M.I.T. Recently, upon reading John Lewis's book, *Walking with the Wind*, I recalled how back then, light years ago, Coretta seemed the charismatic one and Martin shy and bashful. Lewis, one of King's acolytes in the Civil Rights Movement of the '60s, now a Congressman from Atlanta and one of the most respected AfricanAmerican leaders, tells us in his book how much of the movement was a team effort, a "band of brothers and sisters," and how Dr. King "often joined demonstrations late or ducked out early." (I should add that Lewis was and is a devoted admirer of King.) Gary Wills writes that "he tried to lift others up and found himself lifted up in the process. He literally talked himself into useful kinds of trouble.

King's oratory urged others on to heroic tasks and where they went he had to follow. Reluctant to go to jail, he was shamed into going after so many young people responded to his speeches and found themselves in danger."

(Emphasis mine.)

Don't be misled here. I'm not just reiterating one of those well worn bromides about leadership; you know, where leaders carefully watch where their followers are going and then follow them. I'm saying something quite different. I'm saying that exemplary leadership and organizational change are impossible without the full inclusion, initiatives and cooperation of followers.

I mentioned earlier on that TOPdown leadership tendency is also maladaptive and I think it's time to return to that now. It's become something of a cliché to discuss the extraordinary complexity and ambiguity and uncertainties of our current business environment.

As one of my CEO friends put it, "If you're not confused, you don't know what's going on." At the risk of oversimplifying his important work on leadership, Ron Heifetz asserts that with relatively simple, "technical problems," leadership is relatively "easy"; i.e.

TOPdown leadership can solve them. But with "adaptive" problems, complex and messy problems, like dealing with a seriously ill cancer patient or cleaning up an ecological hazard, many stakeholders must be involved and mobilized. The truth is that adaptive problems require complex and diverse alliances. Decrees, orders, etc., do not work.

An elegant experiment dreamed up by one of the most imaginative, and least acknowledged social psychologists of his day, Alex Bavelas, dramatizes, if not proves, this point. Imagine a simple, wooden circular dining room table, about 10 feet in diameter with plywood partitions walling off the five participants from visible sight of each other. The table is constructed so that subjects can communicate only by passing messages written on 3 X 5 cards through narrow slots in the partitions. The cards are all color coded so that you can count how many messages were sent to whom and by whom. Also, the table was constructed so that different organizational forms can be simulated. For example, you can create a rough example of a typical bureaucratic, commandandcontrol organization by restricting the flow of messages to only one central person. We used three kinds of organizational models, the Wheel, which more or less resembles the typical organizational pyramid, the Chain, a slight modification of the Wheel and the Circle where everyone could communicate to the two participants adjacent to them. Not quite a completely connected network, but one of equality (see Figure 1).

The problem to be solved was relatively simple. Each subject was given a pill box which contained six different colored marbles.

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

They were what we used to call "purees," pure white, pure blue, pure green, red, etc., and easily identifiable. For each experimental trial, there was only one color that each subject had in common. On one trial, for example, it was the red, on another it was the green, and so on, randomly varied.

There were 15 trials. As soon as the subject thought he had the correct color, he would drop the marble down a rubber tube in the table so that the experimenter could not only measure the accuracy for the group but also how long it took for all five subjects to deposit the marble. Our predictions were not surprising and they were confirmed. The Wheel, the form most like the TOPdown leadership model was the most accurate and the most efficient; they were very, very quick. We did notice that in our postexperiment questionnaire, the central person reported having the highest morale and was wildly enthusiastic about his role while the other group members were, to be polite, pissed.

Expectable and not particularly exciting results. So we decided to change the task to a more "adaptive" problem and substituted for the primary colors, the so-called "purees," ambiguously colored marbles: cat's eyes, ginger aleish, bluishgreen or greenish blue, all sorts of dappled colored marbles...Again, our predictions were confirmed. Now, under ambiguous and changing conditions, the Circle was the most efficient and accurate and all members claimed relatively high morale. On only one occasion, and we repeated this particular experiment about 50 times, did the Wheel perform better. In this one case, the central person was an exceptionally gifted artist and writer. She was also taking a minor in art history. Genius happens. Once in a blue moon.

The connection between that antediluvian experiment and the messy, changing business environment barely needs stating.

But it dramatically illustrates my point that none of us is as smart as all of us, that the TOPdown model, in the present business context, is dysfunctional, maladaptive and, as I'll get to now, dangerous.

The dangers of TOPdown leadership, vivid examples of colossal folly and disaster, are so numerous that one doesn't know where to begin. Stalin's communal farms? Niemeyer's Brasilia? Hitler's Holocaust? Chainsaw Al's Follies? Napoleon's Russian campaign? LBJ's Vietnam? Mao's Cultural Revolution? Maggie Thatcher's poll tax? Perhaps the best source to turn to in this respect is Barbara Tuchman's *March of Folly*, an ignored treasure for students of organizational behavior.

She argues that folly occurs when a governmental leader pursues policies contrary to the self-interest of the nation. But to be real Folly, the policy must have been perceived as counterproductive in its own time, not merely by hindsight. Secondly, there are always feasible alternative means that were available. She takes her notion of folly and refracts it through the prism of four major epochal events: the Trojan Horse escorted through the gates of Troy, led innocently (and stupidly) by Priam's own warriors (who had heard from Cassandra, among others, that it was probably a Greek ploy); the Renaissance Popes and how their actions brought about the Protestant Reformation; George III and the loss of the "colonies"; and LBJ and the Viet Nam War. Tuchman writes: "Woodenheadedness, the source of self-deception, is a factor that plays a remarkable role in individuals. It consists in assessing a situation in terms of preconceived fixed notions while ignoring or rejecting any contrary signs. It is acting according to wish while not allowing oneself to be deflected by the facts. It is epitomized in a historian's statement about Philip II of Spain, the surpassing woodenhead of all sovereigns: 'No experience of the failure of the policy could shake his belief in its essential excellence.' THE NEW LEADERSHIP So where does all of this lead us in terms of the current organizational context? What should be clear by now is that postbureaucratic organization requires a new kind of alliance between leaders and the led. Today's organizations are evolving into federations, networks, clusters, crossfunctional teams, temporary systems, ad hoc task forces, lattices, modules, matrices almost anything but pyramids with their obsolete TOPdown leadership.

The new leader will encourage healthy dissent and values those followers courageous enough to say no. It will go to the leader who exults in cultural differences and knows that diversity is the best hope for longterm survival and success. The title of this article was deliberately provocative but, I hope, not too misleading. It's not quite the end of leadership, actually, but it clearly points the way to a new, far more subtle and indirect form of influence for leaders to be effective. The new reality is that intellectual capital, brain power, knowhow, human imagination has supplanted capital as the critical success factor and leaders will have to learn an entirely new set of skills that are not understood, not taught in our business schools, and, for all of those reasons, rarely practiced. I am going to suggest that there are four competencies that will determine the success of New Leadership.

1The New Leader understands and practices the Power of Appreciation. They are connoisseurs of talent, more curators than creators.

We all pay lip service to acknowledgement and

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

appreciation. To generalize just a tad, most organizations are woefully neglectful of bestowing either. And it is one of the most powerful motivators, especially for knowledge workers. To take only one example out of numberless cases, many years ago, I sent my first book to the Dean and, in turn, received a perfunctory, dictated note saying that he would take the book on his next plane trip and read it then. That was it. That was the last word I ever heard from him about something I had spent over three years working on.

Not very motivating or energizing, to say the least.

What I'm also getting at is that the leader is rarely the best or the brightest in the new organizations. The New Leader has a smell for talent, an imaginative rolodex, unafraid of hiring people better than they are and are often more a curator than a creator. In my book, *Organizing Genius*, I looked at the leadership of Great Groups and in most cases, the leader was rarely the cleverest or the sharpest.

Peter Schneider, president of Disney's colossally successful Feature Animation studio, leads a group of 1,200 animators. He can't draw to save his life. Bob Taylor, former head of the Palo Alto Research Center, where the first commercial PC was invented, wasn't a computer scientist. J. Robert Oppenheimer, head of the befabled Manhattan Project which produced the first nuclear device, while a brilliant physicist, never matched the accomplishments of the future Nobel Laureates working for him at Los Alamos. It goes on and on. Perhaps a story about two of Britain's most famous 19th Century Prime Ministers illustrates this point. It was said about William Ewart Gladstone that when you had dinner with Mr. Gladstone, you felt that he was the world's most brilliant and provocative, the most intelligent and wittiest conversationalist you have ever met. But when you were dining with Mr. Disraeli, you felt that you were the world's most brilliant and provocative, the most...

Max DePree put it best when he said that good leaders "abandon their ego to the talents of others."

2The New Leader keeps reminding people of what's important.

Organizations drift into entropy and the bureaucratization of imagination when they forget what's important. Simple to say, but that one sentence is one of the few pieces of advice I suggest to leaders: Remind your people of what's important. Even in my profession of teaching I will occasionally hear a colleague say, usually in halfjest, that the university would be a great place to work if only there weren't students around. What else is there but helping

students to become successful at life. What can be more ennobling? A powerful enough vision can transform what would otherwise be routine and drudgery into collectively focused energy even sacrifice. Witness again the Manhattan Project. The scientists there were willing to put their careers on hold and to undertake what was, in essence, a massive engineering feat because they believed the free world depended on their doing so. Reminiscing about Los Alamos, Richard Feynman, the irreverent and future Nobel Laureate, told a story that illustrates how reminding people of "what's important" can give meaning and value to work. The U.S. Army had recruited talented engineers from all over the United States for special duty on the project. They were assigned to work on the primitive computers of the period (1943'45), doing energy calculations and other tedious jobs. But the Army, obsessed with security, refused to tell them anything specific about the project.

They didn't know that they were building a weapon that could end the war or even what their calculations meant. They were simply expected to do the work, which they did slowly and not very well. Feynman, who supervised the technicians, prevailed on his superiors to tell the recruits what they were doing and why. Permission was granted to lift the veil of secrecy, and Oppenheimer gave them a special lecture on the nature of the project and their own contribution.

"Complete transformation," Feynman recalled. "They began to invent ways of doing it better. They improved the scheme. They worked at night. They didn't need supervising in the night; they didn't need anything. They understood everything; they invented several of the programs we used." Ever the scientist, Feynman calculated that the work was done "nearly ten times as fast" after it had meaning.

Meaning. Charles Handy has it right in his book *The Hungry Spirit*. We are all hungry spirits craving purpose and meaning at work, to contribute something beyond ourselves, and leaders can never forget to stop reminding people of what's important.

3The New Leader Generates and Sustains Trust.

We're all aware that the terms of the new social contract of work have changed. No one can depend on lifelong loyalty or commitment to any organization. Since 1985, 25% of the American workforce has been laid off at least once. That's about a halfmillion on average each year. In 1998, when the unemployment rate was the lowest in 30 years, roughly 110,000 workers were downsized. At a time when the new social contract makes the times between

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

organizations and their knowledge workers tenuous, trust becomes the emotional glue that can bond people to an organization.

Trust is a small word with powerful connotations and is a hugely complex factor.

The ingredients are a combination of competence, constancy, caring, fairness, candor and authenticity. Most of all the latter. And that is achieved by the New Leaders when they can balance successfully the tripod of forces working on and in most of us: ambition, competence and integrity. Authenticity, as Groucho joked, cannot be faked. To be redundant, it's real. The current cliché is "walk your talk."

But it's far more than that. The best and perhaps the only way I know of to illustrate (as opposed to define) authenticity is to quote from Robert Bolt's Preface to his play, *A Man for All Seasons*:

"At any rate, Thomas More, as I wrote about him, became for me a man with an adamant sense of his own self. He knew where he began and left off, what area of himself he could yield to the encroachments of his enemies, and what to the encroachments of those he loved. It was a substantial area in both cases, for he had a proper sense of fear and was a busy lover. Since he was a clever man and a great lawyer, he was able to retire from those areas in wonderfully good order, but at length he was asked to retreat from that final area where he located his self. And there this supple, humorous, unassuming and sophisticated person set like metal, was overtaken by an absolutely primitive rigor, and could no more be budged than a cliff."

4The New Leader and the Led Are Intimate Allies Earlier I referred to how Dr. King's followers shamed him into going to jail because so many young people responded to his speeches and found themselves in danger.

They were the unsung heroes. People you've never heard of: James Bevel, Diane Nash, Otis Moss and many others. All heroes. John Lewis tells us in his book how much of the Civil Rights Movement was a heroic team effort, referring to Henry V "band of brothers."

It's not too much of a stretch to consider Jakob Schindler, the protagonist of an epochal story immortalized in the film *Schindler's List*.

The power of Spielberg's film is the transformation of Schindler from a sleazy, down-at-the-heels smalltime conman who moves to Poland in order to harness cheap

Jewish labor to make munitions which he can then sell to the Germans at low cost. His transformation is the singular compelling narrative of the film.

And it comes about over a period of time where Schindler interacts with his Jewish workers, most of all the accountant, Levin, but also frequent and achingly painful moments where he confronts the evil of the war, of the holocaust, of the suffering, of the injustice. In the penultimate scene, when the war is over and the Nazis have evacuated the factory, but before the American troops arrive, the prisoners give him a ring, made for him, from the precious metals used by the workers. As he tries to put the ring on, he begins crying, "Why, why are you doing this? With this metal, we could have saved three, maybe four, maybe five more Jews." And he drives off in tears.

I find it hard to be objective about a scene that tears at my soul, but I want to argue that though this was a unique, singular event, it portrays what New Leadership is all about:

that great leaders are made by great groups and by organizations that create the social architecture of respect and dignity. And, through some kind of weird alchemy, some ineffable symbiosis, great leadership brings that about. Without each other, the leader and the led are culturally impoverished. Only a poet could sum up the majesty of this alchemy:

We are all angels with only one wing.

We can only fly while embracing each other.

These New Leaders will not have the loudest voice, but the most attentive ear.

Instead of pyramids, these postbureaucratic organizations will be structures built of energy and ideas, led by people who find their joy in the task at hand, while embracing each other and not worrying about leaving monuments behind.

Warren Bennis University Professor and Founding Chairman of The Leadership Institute at the University of Southern California.

He also serves as Visiting Professor of Leadership at the University of Exeter and Fellow of the Royal Society of the Arts (UK). He is the author or editor of over 25 books on such topics as leadership, change management and creative collaboration. Over one million copies of his books are in print. He consults with a number of global

The End of Leadership: Exemplary Leadership Is Impossible Without Full Inclusion, Initiatives, and Cooperation of Followers.

corporations as well as political leaders. His book, *Leaders*, was recently designated as one of the top 50 business books of all times by the Financial Times. Forbes magazine refers to him as the "Dean of Leadership Gurus." His latest books, *Organizing Genius: The Secrets of Creative Collaboration* (AddisonWesley, '97) and *CoLeaders*, 1999, bring together Bennis's main interests: Leadership, Change, Great Groups and Powerful Partnerships.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

There are several books I referred to in the article that would more likely be found on the book shelf of a history or English professor than a management scholar or practitioner but two of them, *Frenzy of Renown* by Leo Braudy, (Oxford, 1986) and Barbara Tuchman's *March of Folly* (Alfred Knopf, 1984), deserve to be.

They are just terrific books on leadership.

Braudy's is the first and only history of celebrity and is brilliantly written as might be expected but often found lacking in academic treatises. I've said enough about Tuchman in the text. I use it in my undergraduate leadership class and it's very useful. What historian Tuchman refers to as folly or woodenheadedness, we might refer to as cognitive dissonance.

John Lewis's book, *Walking with the Wind* (Simon & Schuster, 1998) is a splendid personal memoir of the civil rights movement, written by one of the most important AfricanAmerican leaders. In Jim O'Toole's *Leading Change* (JosseyBass, 1995), the frontis piece of that book which I reproduced here underlines, with great wit and clarity, the basic premise of this important work; i.e. leaders better learn how to enroll willing followers.

It could have also been written by a humanities professor, which he basically is, except with brio and a deep philosophical lens, he has written one of the most provocative and important books on leadership. Ronald Heifetz's book, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Belknap, 1994), more than lives up to its name and is not an easy read as the title suggests. But it is deep and complex and goes way beyond the domain of Corporate America, though he doesn't exclude that, into areas of community leadership, doctor/patient relationships among others. Gary Wills's book *Certain Trumpets* (Simon & Schuster, 1994) is already a classic. It has a lot in common with Howard Gardner's *Leading Minds* (Basic Books, 1995) which I should have referenced as well. Wills goes at leadership as a political scientist cum historian would, while Gardner is a cognitive psychologist. They both rely

on fascinating narratives, but their choices of leaders, at the margins anyway, give away their world view, their range, and their informed biases. So while Wills chooses to focus on Cesare Borgia or King David, Gardner will take up Robert Maynard Hutchins or Jean Monet. At the same time, they often choose the same icon, like Martha Graham, Gandhi, Eleanor Roosevelt and Pope John XXIII. Two recent books I coauthored, one with Patricia Biederman, *Organizing Genius* (Perseus, 1997)

and one with David Heenan, *CoLeaders* (Wiley, 1999) provided some of the conceptual background for this article but tries to put the spotlight not so much on leadership but on Great Groups and Partnerships.

I'll end this bibliographic narrative with Berthold Brecht who always liked to have the last word anyway. He was incapable of collaboration or partnership except for his brilliantly wicked work with Kurt Weill (*Threepenny Opera*) was not capable of either except for his wicked and bittersweet lyrics to Kurt Weill's *Threepenny Opera*. The poem I used came from Georg Tabori's book, *The World of Brecht* (Samuel French, 1964).