

372

HOW LEADERSHIP MAY BE TAUGHT WITHOUT

DOING MORE HARM THAN GOOD

By Prof. Eugene Rossenstock Huesay

I LEADERSHIP. The viewpoint in your teaching

L	1a	2	3	4	5	6
Officer	2nd	1st				
Baseline	Candidate	Lt.	Capt.	Major	Colonel	General

1. VP ₁	X ₁	VP	-----	X ₁	-----	6
2. VP ₂	X ₂	VP	-----	X ₂	-----	6
3. VP ₃	X ₃	VP	-----	X ₃	-----	6

X₁ = experiences, Y₁ = expectations, hopes, aims

X₂ = assurance Y₂ =

X₃ = routines etc

VP is the View Point which serves as the meeting ground of x and y. It gives off light in relation to both past and future, but will not do so unless both x and y are made to play against the middle.

The VP lies under bombardment from 1 and from 6.

The enlightenment resulting will be best whenever the fierceness of aims (ambitions, dreams, hopes, great expectations) and the warm security and belongingness of experiences are mediated by the light of reason, by the clarity of conscious presentation.

Attempts to teach leadership from past experience only or solely from future expectations would necessarily fail.

If VP is developed as a point of relation between both attitudes, the constant $x_1 y_1 = VP$

$$x_2 y_2 = VP$$

will prove its usefulness because the student then will realize his own suspense between

leader and follower.

As to past experience, he is already "leader"

As to the future, however, he as yet is merely 'potential', id est, a follower.

This approach has the merit of establishing in each student the human perspective:

I am already responsible but also still obedient.

The wrong, merely objective, perspective would be:

I am a leader, i.e. others must obey me.

In other words, the right VP permits the teacher and the students to search for the problems of obedience inside themselves, before making generalizations about their prospective "followers".

A leader is not simply a man who has followers. A leader as we move in the historical continuity is a man who no longer is simply a follower, but has been pushed already into some succession of leadership. The leader who, for vanity's sake, or ambition, "wants" to be a leader too much, rarely is a good leader. Either the emergency or the confidence of others calls forth the good leader.

Leaders, then, are not self-appointed.

Hence, we never must study them as timeless "characters." They are called forth either by the cry

of communal necessity (fire, panic, riot, attack by the enemy) or by the vote of confidence of others. Tyrants are self-appointed.

The basis of leadership, then, always is a vote of confidence plus his own faith in the goals of the group to which he belongs. Thus, his faith is ambivalent as any loyalty may polarize into either obedience or leadership. No definition of leadership is valid which does not mention the processes of appointment, of being called forth, and of confidence, of loyalty, faith, obedience.

RULES:

1. It should not be your first aim to give a definition of leadership.
2. It should not be your first aim to ask for a definition of leadership.
3. It should be your first aim to evoke the real VP situation of every student.
4. It should be your second aim to exclude all animalistic definitions of leadership which omit the democratic, human and historical features of leadership. These features are all predicated on the fact that human beings speak to each other and speak of each other.
5. The students should be made to understand that any definition which excludes the realities of our living in a speaking, listening, gossiping, planning, id est, historical, traditional and progressive society, must turn the leader's head. Then he will come to think of himself as somebody who handles men.

All men talk back, either loudly or silently. But they all do! The very term "handling" comes from the school of animal behaviorism. Behaviorism is practically abandoned today in the social sciences,

even for low level individual actions. If Behaviorism is applied to the highest social relationship, leadership, as it does in the term 'handling man', it destroys its own purpose. Therefore a considerable time should be spent on a discussion of why leadership cannot be defined as the method of handling men.

6. In this discussion, a wealth of facts can be drawn upon to show that the leader himself is 'handled' by his men as much as he handled them. "Je suis leur chef. Il faut que je les suive."

7. The freedom of choice, for a leader, depends on the amount of rope his followers are ready to give him. The more ample their faith in him, the more effective his measures can be. The best leader obviously is he who is free to make the most unpopular decision. The most unpopular decision requires the highest degree of leadership.

Any popular decision can immediately be understood. Such a decision is so obvious that anybody could make it. Hence, there is a scale for leadership in decisions:

- 1- All would make the decision = Time lag is zero between leader and followers
- 2- Leader makes decision. No- = Time lag is infinity between leader and followers
body except the leader would (Jesus' decision)
dare to make the decision

All real problems of leadership are found on a gliding scale of "obviousness" between 0 and Infinity. It is good if a leader knows:

- 1- That obvious decisions are not drawing on his leadership, but simply on his office.

Here he orders what everybody knows!

2- That the less unopposedly he makes these "obvious" decisions, the more he saves up his leadership for serious occasions.

3- That the more he trains his men to share in the obvious decisions, by inner approval, the more they will be glad to have him decide the less and less obvious cases.

8. A man who has become aware of his VP as a lighthouse between the roots and the crown of his career, between past experience and future aims, will wish to extend the VP situation by some permanent routines. Great drama and biographies both offer such opportunity if approached, not as "literature" in a Department of Literature, but as energy which enable the soldier to keep strong in his unnatural situation between two Wars.

The need for this constant ² of cultivating the Light of Consciousness will not be realized if the teaching tends to confuse peace-time and war-time conditions. A definite choice must be made.

If and as long as the Air University wishes to train peace-time officers, the norm cannot be the leader but must be the official.

If and as soon as The Air University is ready to put the training of war-time officers first, the norm must be leadership, not management.

(Note: Man - agement literally means "handling"!!!)

The term "soldier" is a crossbreed between leader and official. This may point to your solution.

An officer in a standing army is a potential leader who training must make concessions to officialdom. But the hard core must be "leadership." Concessions may be made to management and officialdom, but they must be recognized and deliberately treated as concessions, id est as revocable.

An officer has irrevocable and revocable qualities.
