

## APPENDIX F Deconstructing the Burns Typology from Ethical View

**Deconstructing the Burns Typology** The Burns Typology can be deconstructed in various ways. Most interesting, in my view, is how Mahatma Gandhi and Adolph Hitler are not included in Chapters 6 to 9 of Transformational Leadership or chapters 10 to 14 of Transactional Leadership. They appear here and there in discussions of other leaders, but do not become sketches for the subcategories of Burns' typology (Table Two). Both Gandhi and Hitler, along with Lenin (who is sketched as both transformational as a revolutionary leader, and transactional as a party leader) -- are however central leader figures in the chapters on the origins of leadership (chapters 3 to 5). The question arises, *why does Burns leave Gandhi and Hitler (as well as Nehru, Mussolini, and Stalin) out of his famous typology of great leaders?*

Leaving out Gandhi is a conspicuous silence. Meanwhile, Lenin, unlike Gandhi (or Hitler), is given a prominent place in the actual transaction and transformation typology, even though all three are analyzed as the foundation of the typology (chapters 1 to 5). Lenin is given a pivotal position in the typology, as perhaps the only leader (other than Roosevelt), who has the qualities of both transactional (party) and transformational (revolutionary) leadership.

Why is Gandhi left outside the transformational/ transactional typology? The answer for Burns is one of motive, the ambition of each leader is different. Lenin, Hitler, and Gandhi each have "ambition" and ambition for Burns has something to do with Nietzsche's "will to power" (p. 13-15), Hobbes' power through fear (p. 15), and McClelland's need for power (p. 14). For Burns to exercise a will to power, is a naked, brute, and despotic use of amoral power and can not be considered as leadership. But then why is Gandhi left out?

What does Burns say about Gandhi? A clue to Burns' own psychosocial theory of leadership is "Long before Gandhi, Christian thinkers were preaching non-violence" (p. 2). Burns relies on Erikson's psychoanalysis of the family circumstance of Gandhi, Lenin, and Hitler to decide the differences among the three, and who will ultimately be admitted to Burns' (1978) new pantheon of leadership.

- Gandhi, Lenin, and Hitler all felt close to their mothers (p. 58).
- Gandhi, Lenin and Hitler all lost their father at an early age (p. 93).
- Gandhi, Lenin and Hitler each were shaped early in their manhood by the "spur of ambition" (p. 106-111).

**The Spur of Ambition** - the spur of ambition (p. 107) is the characteristic motive that unites Hitler, Lenin, and Gandhi. "If ambition is a ceaseless spur, we must know more about its consequences" (Burns, 1978: 111).

At several points Burns, admits that Gandhi is a transformational leader.

- Gandhi "created followers who were also leaders" (p. 129-130).

- Gandhi is an example of "transforming leadership" (p. 20).
- "Gandhi almost perfectly exemplified" what Burns summarizes as "egocentric self-actualization" (p. 449).

It is this last quote that, to me, explains why Burns is so conflicted about Gandhi, as a leader, and ultimately, must resort to exorcising Gandhi from his noble transformational and transactional leadership theory. Gandhi failed Burns' leadership test, because he not only suffered the spur of ambition, but was a self-actualizer. And self-actualizing leaders are too close to the Nietzschean will to power to ever be admitted to the pantheon.

[Please refer to Myers-Briggs site](#) for my attempt to integrate M-B traits of leaders we have discussed with Figures One and Two leader dimensions.

## **X DIMENSION** (See Figure One and Two) **Transaction/**

**Transformation Theory and Weber.** As TRANSACTIONAL/ TRANSFORMATIONAL (X) becomes less about managerial capitalism (command and control hierarchies, pushing about the rewards and punishments, and playing the corporate game), and more about intellectual capitalism (knowledge networks, diversity, pushing about information systems, and changing the game rules), we move from one end of the X-axis to the other. Everybody predicts a move away from bureaucratic, to post-bureaucratic settings, and a need for leaders who can manage the transformation process to get us there.

Burns, in my view, based his overall exchange model on Weber's approach to charisma, bureaucracy, and power (p. 12, 243). We can see that transactional exchange is Weber's bureaucratic authority and transformational exchange is the charismatic heroic authority. But Weber had a category, that Burns did not include, that of traditional (feudal) authority. Weber (1947) overall model distinguished between bureaucratic, charismatic (heroic), and traditional (feudal fiefdom or what I call Princely) leadership and authority. Burns did rely on Weber for a theory of power. Burns had very little to say about Machiavelli or Nietzsche's theories of power. Power for Burns, was Weber's power theory, the probability one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out is own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests.

Here and there Burns misreads Weber. For examples Burns (p. 243) asserts "Weber did not make clear whether this give of grace (charisma) was a quality possessed by leaders independent of society or a quality dependent on its recognition by followers." My own reading is Weber was quite clear on this point. "What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority, but his 'followers' or 'disciples' "(Weber, 1947: 359). Further Weber argued that followers expected continued proof of charisma, particular in leaders succession. Further, the routinization of charisma was a way to make charismatic more defined by the affirmation of followers (even votes) than by divine inspiration.

Burns extends the heroic role of leaders in Weber by looking at contemporary leaders who had a role in the transition of developing societies and economies. His main contribution is to develop a typology of categories of transaction and transformational leaders, based on his analysis of great historical leaders (See Table Two). Both Weber and Burns look at Napoleon as charismatic. Burns adds Joan of Arc, and Moses to the list of heroes, as well as John F. Kennedy.

Mao is part hero and part revolutionary. Other revolutionaries included by Burns are Castro and Lenin, and Louis XVI, who is the recipient of a revolution and is decapitated. In addition to heroes and revolutionaries Burns includes leaders who enact reform and bring about change through ideas.

Transaction leaders are typed into categories such as opinion, group, party, legislative, and executive.

---

## **TRANSACTIONAL CATEGORIES OF LEADERSHIP**

**Transactional leadership "requires a shrewd eye for opportunity, a good hand at bargaining, persuading, reciprocating" (p. 169).**

**Opinion Leaders and Spectacle** - In public opinion leadership, the transactions are less tangible, like the exchange of a political office for electoral support (p. 258). Voters get psychic rewards from vicarious participation in the spectacle of the campaign and election. No one expects opinion leaders to fulfill promises anymore. We watch the presidential campaigns, knowing full well the every facet is orchestrated to arouse this opinion or some other one. Speeches are drafted and redrafted to reflect the latest opinion polls. In the postmodern corporation, leaders change ad campaigns in response to consumer demand, and in the case of Nike and Phil Knight, in response to campus protests over campus apparel, and focus groups with young teens who have heard about sweatshops. Increasingly corporations such as Disney, McDonalds, Monsanto, and Nike control the formal media of communication. Disney buys ABC. Nike puts its swoosh on Mel Gibson in the recent movie "What do women want?" (Answer: they want Nike). corporations are rivals competing for the identical audiences. Corporations hire media managers and conduct public opinion polls about their products and executives. The manipulation of public opinion is the full time job of opinion-leader CEOs of the postmodern corporation. The spin is everything, and it is the staffers job to put a positive spin on every piece of bad news, and where possible keep bad news off the air (ownership of TV, radio, and newspapers helps). The public in the age of the WTO protest is increasingly skeptical of opinion-corporate leaders. The interactions and transactions over time of opinion leaders and all types of followers (employees, customers, workers, unions, suppliers, subcontractors, investors, legislatures, and even

activists) constitute the structure of political opinion leadership. Each faction seeks to sway public opinion in its direction.

---

**Group Leaders** - the bargainers and bureaucrats. Burns starts with William F. Whyte's *Street Corner Society*, a group of young men in their 20s, the Norton Street boys led by Doc. Beneath him are Mike and Dany and also Long John, and beneath them are Nutsy and Angelos and Frank and a half dozen other followers. Whyte examines the exchange relationships and transactions of this group. Docs part in the transaction was to offer protection to the group in exchange for their heeding his commands. Transactions consisted of mutual support and mutual promises, expectations, obligations and rewards (p. 288-289). For Burns, leaders such as Lenin, Hitler, and Gandhi remain part of a system of complex group relationships, where group memberships influence leader, and vice versa. Hitler's troops, for example, followed Hitler out of "dedication to Hitler as a strong, even immortal personality who would ensure their physical strength and protection... Hitler was a brute power wielder, but his role was transactional for certain groups at certain times" (p. 292). In this example, Burns emphasizes the situational aspects of transaction and transformational leadership.

Leaders can use charisma and transaction to enhance cohesion, solidarity, and conformity, as the situation demands. Leaders are at the center of the groups' communications. The overt exercise of leader power in a group promotes group conflict, heightens competing group claims, and thereby weakens solidarity.

Burns, in his chapter on group leaders, turns from Whyte's street gang leadership to a renewed discussion of bureaucracy. The tie-in is Whyte's observation that the gang engaged in much repetitive behavior, had self-maintaining tendencies, and a stable equilibrium. There was also a powerful tendency toward conformity in the gang, that is a common characteristic of bureaucracy. "Groups, like nation-states, may regard deviation as disloyalty, noncompliance as treason" (Burns, 1978: 291).

Members of groups usually rank one another informally on the basis of such factors as the recognized ability of the group member to relate to group goals, the extent to which the person lives up to group norms and follows group-approved procedures, and personal qualities that have no special relevance to the group but are highly valued in the culture (p. 291).

More recent studies of self-managing teams and leaderless groups such as Barker's (1993, 1999) studies of concertive control, find that the conformity norms and coercive sanctions of group can lead to concertive control, in which the group becomes more oppressive and panoptic than any lead by an authoritarian supervisor.

Bureaucracy favors consensus and discredits clash and controversy, as a threat to its stability (p. 296). As Weber points out bureaucracy discourages charismatic personalities, favoring a depersonalized hierarchy, with rules, norms, paperwork, and standards, a leadership vested in offices not in persons. Bureaucracy is anti-heroic. The most disciplined, impersonal, and rigid bureaucracy, is however full of Princely power, the jockeying for personal power and competitive advantage of one fiefdom group over another. At the root of bureaucracy is the Prince, the struggle for power and the politics of power. Rules, originally conceived to be valued ends become transformed into means, and thus the modal (means over ends) situation of bureaucracy. In the end the groups and divisions of a bureaucracy become political interest groups.

Leaders of bureaucratic groups and organizations can change social norms by adjusting transactions, conform, deviate and divisive until a new bargain is struck, or just leave.

---

**Government Political - Party Leadership** - (See Figure Three) parties contend and conflict in the struggle for power. Leaders face a perpetual battle of combative parties seeking power. Leaders discover their own interests and activate interests, wants, needs, and expectations of followers, and then promise to meet them, resulting in mobilized demands for economic, social and psychological resources. Power is channeled and distributed, creating the basis of transactional structures of political and party leadership (p. 311). The tendency in such transaction structures is towards oligarchy, as leaders of fighting groups are pitted against one another. In any organization the leader competes and bargains and compromises with competing parties of conflicting group interests. The oligarchy fights against fragmented and decentralization of power into splintered and diverse group interests. The populace resists strong centralized party leadership. The oligarchy resists by forming coalitions. This is Robert Michels' "iron law of oligarchy." Parties begin with transformational, even charismatic leadership and revolution and reform and end up as anti-democratic, bureaucratic, and political organizations. "Bureaucratic timidity replaced the old daring and creativity" (p. 314). Leaders in today's corporate empires engage in bargaining, coalition building, and compromise to get any movement at all among deadlocked political power groups.

In short there is a basic conflict between transactional and transformational forces that is being worked out and sorted out in complex organizations. And in this chapter, Burns ignores Machiavelli, but posits the politics of power. Burns' examples are mostly from Parliament and US democracy, but the corporation can be seen as an unstable coalition of political groups, vying for power, in Princely leadership.

---

**Legislative Leadership: The Price of Consensus** - Bargaining, reciprocity, and payoff is the transactional trading system of legislative leadership. None did legislative leadership better than Lyndon B. Johnson. His transactional leadership exploited channels of obligation, expectation, awarding and denying prize committee assignments and chairmanships, allotting congressional funds, amassing and distributing credits, and hinting at threat through scorn and accusation to get his way. Huey Long was also a legislative leader, able to throw up roadblocks, politicize the environment, and organize the rank-and-file. Burns did not remark at all on the relationship between legislative leadership and corporate power. Today's behind the scenes back-benchers are political action committees, where to finance legislative campaigns, legislators trade their allegiance from constituency to corporate interests.

---

**Executive Leadership** - "The distinguishing characteristics of executive leaders, in contrast with party or parliamentary leaders, are their lack of reliable political and institutional support, their dependence on bureaucratic resources such as staff and budget, and most of all their use of *themselves* - their own talent and character, prestige and popularity, in the clash of political interests and values" (p.372). Burns' hero of executive leadership is Charles de Gaulle. De Gaulle had little patience for party of legislative leadership. "De Gaulle drew his political power not from traditional political institutions but from his own resources of self-confidence and indomitability and from direct, personal contact with the French people" (p. 370). De Gaulle and more recently Ronald Ragan used the press conference to assemble journalists for a spectacle they would report to sway popular opinion by depicting dramatic leaderly poses and sound bites, and when popularity crested, the legislature was influenced to support the will of the people. de Gaulle was a theatrical leader, full of pomp and ceremony, using sound bites about the dignity of the office.

De Gaulle's use of the press conference epitomized his personal approach. In a vast hall used for galas, before six hundred journalists and two or three hundred cabinet members, officials, diplomats, and guests, and in the blaze of television lights, the general would enter through red curtains held apart by ushers in white tuxedos and tails. Answering mainly anticipated questions de Gaulle used the conferences less for the edification of the press than to inform and reassure his public (p. 370).

Spectacle is a powerful arbitrator to concentrate power. Philip Selznick, for Burns, provided the image of the total enterprise as a kind of polity embracing a number of sub organizations (p. 372). In such a polity, some executives cultivate conflict among their staff to better control them. Others look to available penalties, rewards and inducements to influence their staff (promotions, work assignments, appreciation, etc.). And some set up their own intelligence apparatus for their own unique purposes (p. 373). The accumulation of such power is necessary to overcome resistance to executive plans and techniques.

Few were better at executive leadership than Franklin Roosevelt. He displayed an intuitive grasp of the needs and motivations of each cabinet member, agency chief, legislator, and ambassador. He would use charm, flattery, manipulation or whatever mask it took to get the mission or task accomplished.

---

This brings us to what I consider a three dimensional model of leadership. The X (Transactional - Transformational), Y (Will to Server - Will to Power), and Z (Monophonic - Polyphonic). The combination of the three dimensions (X, Y, & Z) provides eight types of leadership. The first four are more monophonic than the last four (on Z narrative dimension). In this next display, I use the three dimensions to position a number of the types of leaders that Burns (1978) writes about, plus I include the Prince.

1. **Bureaucratic (X = Transactional; Y = Will to Serve; Z = Monophonic)**
2. **Heroic (X = Transformational; Y = Will to Serve; Z = Monophonic)**
3. **Prince (X = Transactional; Y = Will to Power; Z = Monophonic)**
4. **Super (X = Transformational; Y = Will to Power; Z = Monophonic)**
5. **Government (X = Transactional; Y = Will to Serve; Z = Polyphonic)**
6. **Intellectual/ Reform (X = Transformational; Y = Will to Serve; Z = Polyphonic)**
7. **Opinion (X = Transactional; Y = Will to Power; Z = Polyphonic)**
8. **Revolutionary (X = Transactional; Y = Will to Power; Z = Polyphonic)**

We have articulated a theory of network leadership within this three-dimensional space. It is space that bridges [managerial capitalism](#) (heroic-[quest](#) and [bureaucratic](#)) with the more [intellectual capitalism](#) ([postmodern](#) and [chaos](#)). The Antenarrative is the story before it is told, before the bits and pieces find some narrator to give it a sensible storyline.