

**Two
Excerpts
from
Leadership***



James MacGregor Burns

Leadership is an aspect of power, but it is also a separate and vital process in itself.

Power over other persons, we have noted, is exercised when potential power wielders, motivated to achieve certain goals of their own, marshal in their power base resources (economic, military, institutional, or skill) that enable them to influence the behavior of respondents by activating motives of respondents relevant to those resources and to those goals. This is done in order to realize the purposes of the power wielders, whether or not these are also the goals of the respondents. Power wielders also exercise influence by mobilizing their own power base in such a way as to establish direct physical control over others' behavior, as in a war of conquest or through measures of harsh deprivation, but these

* From the book: *Leadership*. Copyright © 1978 by James MacGregor Burns. Reprinted by permission of Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

are highly restricted exercises of power, dependent on certain times, cultures, and personalities, and they are often self-destructive and transitory.

Leadership over 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. This is done in order to realize goals mutually held by both leaders and followers, as in Lenin's calls for peace, bread, and land. In brief, leaders with motive and power bases tap followers' motives in order to realize the purposes of both leaders and followers. Not only must motivation be relevant, as in power generally, but its purposes must be realized and satisfied. Leadership is exercised in a condition of *conflict or competition* in which leaders contend in appealing to the motive bases of potential followers. Naked power, on the other hand, admits of no competition or conflict—there is no engagement.

Leaders are a particular kind of power holder. Like power, leadership is relational, collective, and purposeful. Leadership shares with power the central function of achieving purpose. But the reach and domain of leadership are, in the short range at least, more limited than those of power. Leaders do not obliterate followers' motives though they may arouse certain motives and ignore others. They lead other creatures, not things (and lead animals only to the degree that they recognize animal motives—i.e., leading cattle to shelter rather than to slaughter). To control *things*—tools, mineral resources, money, energy—is an act of power, not leadership, for things have no motives. Power wielders may treat people as things. Leaders may not.

All leaders are actual or potential power holders, but not all power holders are leaders.

The crucial variable is *purpose*. Some define leadership as leaders making followers do what followers would not otherwise do, or as leaders making followers do what the *leaders* want them to do; I define leadership as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and the motivations—the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations—of *both leaders and followers*. And the genius of leadership lies in



the manner in which leaders see and act on their own and their followers' values and motivations.

Leadership, unlike naked power-wielding, is thus inseparable from followers' needs and goals. The essence of the leader-follower relation is the interaction of persons with different levels of motivations and of power potential, including skill, in pursuit of a common or at least joint purpose. That interaction, however, takes two fundamentally different forms. The first I will call *transactional* leadership. Such leadership occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things. The exchange could be economic or political or psychological in nature: a swap of goods or of one good for money; a trading of votes between candidate and citizen or between legislators; hospitality to another person in exchange for willingness to listen to one's troubles. Each party to the bargain is conscious of the power resources and attitudes of the other. Each person recognizes the other as a *person*. Their purposes are related, at least to the extent that the purposes stand within the bargaining process and

can be advanced by maintaining that process. But beyond this the relationship does not go. The bargainers have no enduring purpose that holds them together, hence they may go their separate ways. A leadership act took place, but it was not one that binds leader and follower together in a mutual and continuing pursuit of a higher purpose.

Contrast this with *transforming leadership*. Such leadership occurs when one or more persons *engage* with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality. Their purposes, which might have started out as separate but related, as in the case of transactional leadership, become fused. Power bases are linked not as counterweights but as mutual support for common purpose. Various names are used for such leadership, some of them derisory: elevating, mobilizing, inspiring, exalting, uplifting, preaching, exhorting, evangelizing. The relationship can be moralistic, of course. But transforming leadership ultimately becomes *moral* in that it raises the level of human conduct and ethical aspiration of both leader and led, and thus it has a transforming effect on both. Perhaps the best modern example is Gandhi, who aroused and elevated the hopes and demands of millions of Indians and whose life and personality were enhanced in the process. Transcending leadership is dynamic leadership in the sense that the leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers who will feel "elevated" by it and often become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders. Transcending leadership is leadership *engage*. Naked power-wielding can be neither transactional nor transforming; only leadership can be.

Leaders and followers may be inseparable in function, but they are not the same. The leader takes the initiative in making the leader-led connection; it is the leader who creates the links that allow communication and exchange to take place. An office seeker does this in accosting a voter on the street, but if the voter spies and accosts the politician, the voter is assuming a leadership function, at least for that brief moment. The leader is more skillful in evaluating followers' motives, anticipating their responses to an initiative, and estimating their power bases, than the reverse. Leaders continue to take the major part in main-

taining and effectuating the relationship with followers and will have the major role in ultimately carrying out the combined purpose of leaders and followers. Finally, and most important by far, leaders address themselves to followers' wants, needs, and other motivations, as well as to their own, and thus they serve as an *independent force in changing the makeup of the followers' motive base through gratifying their motives* (pp. 18-20).

Advice to Would-Be Leaders

How, then, do we exert influence as a leader? First, by clarifying within ourselves our own personal goal. If that goal is *only* to secure a livelihood or advance a career, our tactic need only be calculatedly self-serving and manipulative—at least until our career or prominence is assured. We will at least know who has been led where. Alternatively, we may link our career with a cause that rises above considerations of personal success and may provide some social good. In practice leaders so intertwine their motives that they are hard to separate, as leaders variously support causes that in turn support them. But what happens at the fateful moment when career diverges from cause? Students over the years have told their teachers that they first would "make their million" and then go into politics or the public service. A few, like Jeb Magruder, manage the transition, though not always with happy results; most fail to amass their million or do amass it and then concentrate on keeping it or amassing another. *Decide on whether we are really trying to lead anyone but ourselves, and what part of ourselves, and where, and for what purposes.*

The second question is *whom* are we seeking to lead? This is not a matter of defining merely the voters or coalitions we wish to mobilize, but of the motives, aspirations, values, and goals that are to be mobilized within the followers, within their groups. Authentic leadership is a collective process, I contend, and it emerges from the clash and congruence of motives and goals of leaders and followers. It requires neither that leaders slavishly adapt their own motives and goals to those of followers nor vice versa. It means that, in the reaching out by leaders to potential followers, broader and higher ranges of motivation come into play and that both goals and means of



achieving them are informed by the force of higher end-values and modal values. Leaders' goals at the start may be only bread and circuses, but as those goals are reached or blocked, their purpose may be converted to the realization of higher needs like esteem, recognition, and fulfillment for both leaders and led. *Define our potential followers, not in the manipulative sense of how to persuade them to our own ends, such as they are, but in terms of mutuality and of future motives that may be stimulated as present motives are variously realized or blocked.*

Third, where are we seeking to go? The answer usually seems obvious: the goal consists of immediate, short-run, easily definable, step-by-step objectives. But often these calculations of tangible objectives fail to allow for the likelihood that goals will be changed as intermediate steps are taken; that targets will be transformed and perhaps elevated as more followers become involved; that conflict will develop and alter outcomes. Above all, the absorption with short-run, specifiable goals may dilute attention to the likely final outcome of a long and complex process of leadership-followership interaction. Attention may continue to center in the predictable, visible matters of technique and process and personality rather than in the prospects and nature of fundamental, substantive alterations in people's lives and welfare and opportunities—of "real change." Political leadership, however, can be defined only in terms of, and to the extent of the realization of, purposeful, substantive change in the conditions of people's lives. *The ultimate test of practical lead-*

ership is the realization of intended, real change that meets people's enduring needs.

Fourth, how do we overcome obstacles to realizing our goals? Only two generalizations can we apply to the hundreds of specific situations a political leader may face. One is to recognize the motivations of potential followers in all their fullness and complexity. The other is never to assess at face value, or by reputation, or by easy quantification, the power bases of a rival or possible obstructionist (or of possible supporters). Those power bases—which may look so impressive in the form of the presidency of an institution or the possession of money or the command of armies or the availability of weapons or the support of millions of persons—*must always be assessed in terms of the motivations of those leaders and followers*, as those motivations relate to the disposition of power resources. The question is always one of convertibility, and political power, unlike electric power, is not easily convertible. *Watch out for the towering giant with feet of clay, especially if we are the giant.*

These "rules" for practical influence may seem impractical in some instances, perhaps even utopian. But what is proposed is not all that different from what we do daily and automatically as we make approaches to people and anticipate their reactions—and perhaps anticipate our own reactions to their reactions. The function of leadership is to *engage* followers, not merely to activate them, to commingle needs and aspirations and goals in a common enterprise, and in the process to make better citizens of both leaders and followers. To move from manipulation to power-wielding is to move from the arithmetic of everyday contacts and collisions to the geometry of the structure and dynamics of interaction. It is to move from checkers to chess, for in the "game of kings" we estimate the powers of our chessmen and the intentions and calculations and indeed the motives of our adversary. But democratic leadership moves far beyond chess because, as we play the game, the chessmen come alive, the bishops and knights and pawns take part on their own terms and with their own motivations, values, and goals, and the game moves ahead with new momentum, direction, and possibilities. In real life the most practical advice for leaders is not to treat pawns like pawns, nor princes like princes, but all persons like *persons* (pp. 460-62).

Copyright © 1979 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.