

The scales of leadership, between political legitimacy, style of commands and managing networks

Dominique Desjeux, anthropologist, professor at the Sorbonne, Université Paris Descartes. Director of the professional doctorate in social sciences.

In the history of the humanities the concept of leadership can be found in numerous disciplines, at various scales of observation relating to authority and *Obedience to Authority* (Milgram, 1974), and the decision, negotiation, efficiency or legitimacy of power. The notion of leadership relates simultaneously to psychology of the leader, the style of commandment, the sociology of organisations and interactions between leaders and subordinates, to the political science of the State and to monarchical, democratic or despotic regimes, or to management, and at the same time to the cultural dimension of management or leadership. What is a good leader, what is an effective leader, or do several styles of leadership exist – these are the questions, often without a definitive answer, which intersect with the question of leadership. They are even questions which are as old as the world, if one refers to the creation of the world in the book of Genesis of the Jewish Torah and the Christian Bible, where God appears to be an effective entrepreneur, since he is reported to have created the world in 7 days, but a strict manager towards Adam and Eve, who are driven out of the earthly paradise, not to find themselves unemployed, but to work!

In 1961, the sociologist François Bourricaud published *Esquisse d'une théorie de l'autorité* (Draft of a theory of authority), published by Plon, where he makes the distinction between power which is based on force, and hence which may prove to be unstable, and legitimate power, or authority, which refers to a moral or legal norm. He also shows that the question of power, and hence of leadership, is just as applicable in the political sphere as in that of the company or small groups. It is this diversity which I would like to highlight by taking a detour through history, interculturality and the sociology of organisations.

1 – The macro-social approach of authority being situated between traditional, legal, and charismatic authority: leadership and politics in the 19th and 20th centuries.

In France, Montesquieu, writing in the 18th century, is often thought of as one of the first theorists of modern political leadership in western societies. What is perhaps less well-known is that he also based his work on Chinese authors, as is recalled by Philippe d'Iribarne in his book *The Logic of Honor (La logique de l'honneur)* published by Seuil in 1989, English translation published by Welcome Rain Publishers in 2003. In this book he cites Montesquieu making reference, in *The Spirit of the Laws (De l'esprit des lois, 1748, published in English in 1750)*, to a Chinese author describing the end of the Qin dynasty. Montesquieu declared that “The destruction of the dynasties of Tsin and Souï (says a Chinese author) was owing to this, the princes, instead of confining themselves, like their ancestors, to a general inspection, the only one worthy of a sovereign, wanted to govern everything immediately by themselves,” and he concluded: “Monarchy is destroyed when a prince thinks he shows a greater exertion of power in changing, than in conforming to, the order of things; when he deprives some of his subjects of their hereditary employments to bestow them arbitrarily upon others; and when

he is fonder of being guided by fancy than judgement.” (English translation of quotation from Montesquieu in *La logique de l'honneur*, p. 91)

This remark of Montesquieu written in the 18th century tallies with the analysis of *shi* made by François Julien in 1992 in *The Propensity of Things: Toward a History of Efficacy in China* (*La propension des choses, pour une histoire de l'efficacité en Chine*, published in 1992, English translation published by Zone Books in 1999), which shows that “the whole spectrum of Chinese thought which we know has focused since its origins on perceiving reality as a process of transformation” (p. 13). Beyond cultural diversity, *shi* can allow us to grasp that efficacy “originates not in human initiative but instead results from the very disposition of things. Instead of always imposing our own longing for meaning on reality, let us open ourselves to this immanent force and learn to seize it” (p.13). These quotes already indicate the tensions in which the practice of leadership will be embedded. These practices can vary as a function of situations, mainly between interventionism and accompaniment, or even *laissez-faire*. The important thing to bear in mind is that leadership does not exist in and of itself, but that it varies as a function of numerous parameters, including the effect of the situation and the ability or otherwise of the leader to comprehend the immanent social logic of the situation.

This is what is to be found, in a rather unexpected manner, in a work in English from 2011 on *The New Psychology of Leadership*, which I will present below. It emerges, in methodical terms, that what is new is often relative. Indeed, on the one hand, in a structural and predictable manner, the ambivalence of leadership between interventionism and “situationism” is a permanent tension, and has been since the beginning of societies and cultures, and in another and more contingent manner, the mode of application of leadership cannot be predicted well. It is renewed incessantly as a function of situations and the evolution of history. What varies is the emergence of new forms of leadership, the tension of the establishment of processes which create structure and provide stability, associated with permanent practices of adaptive regulation.

Still in the political sphere, one of the great sociological points of reference is Max Weber. A sociologist of the late 19th and early 20th century, he was both a critic and a defender of parliamentary politics against revolutionary romanticism (p. 162). He was also an analyst of the tension between the “ethic of conviction”, which aims for purity without taking into account the imperfections of men and the irrationality of the world [1], and “the ethic of responsibility” according to which “one has to give an account of the foreseeable results of one’s action (p. 172). This debate on compromise and progressive change is at the heart of discussions on the role of leadership in the implementation of change in public and private organisations. The ethics of responsibility are those which take into account the reality, or even the course of things, to make the connection with Chinese *shi* once again, but Weber does not say that.

And nonetheless, Weber’s comment may have a more general scope. It can in fact regularly be observed in organisations that the development of a new company structure, or the elaboration of an overall scheme or plan of action comes from what could be called “ethics of managerial conviction”, which do not have real-life observation as a point of departure, but the conception of an “ideal”, “coherent” organisation. However, for the leader these ideal models come more from an attempt to be freed of the constraints of everyday life, thanks to a flight into imaginary programmatics of plans and diagrams, than from taking into consideration the constraints which organise the social sphere [2].

As early as in 1963, Michel Crozier noted in *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon (Le Phénomène bureaucratique)*, published in 1963 by Seuil and first published in English in 1964) the paradox of change in bureaucratic organisations, and the poor ability of leaders to make effective suggestions, since due to a poor circulation of information, the responsible people who had the power to decide changes did not have the power of information, and those who had the power of information did not have the power of decision. The elaboration of ideal schemata can be explained as much by the priority given to the values of an ideal world as by a poor circulation of information, which makes it impossible to follow the *shi*, since the course of things itself is unknown to the deciders. The ethics of conviction may become an obstacle to taking into account reality in the exercise of leadership.

However, it should immediately be added that in certain situations, not taking reality into account may be more effective than a more realistic position, at least at the very beginning of a process of change – here I am thinking of General De Gaulle in 1940 and his appeal of 18 June, which was not very realistic in view of military power relations of the time. This is why taking the situation into account implies applying a principle of symmetry: there is no behaviour which is good in itself, since efficacy depends on the situation and its constraints, and hence authoritarian leadership may be just as effective as participatory leadership, which in turn may be found to be ineffective depending on the situation. This principle of symmetry, however, very often enters into tension with the value system of actors, when these values have not been constructed on the basis of permanent reflection on the development of society and the emergence of new situations, which in turn do not allow the same rules of governance or leadership to be applied, be they liberal or statist, to take up a current global debate.

In *Politics as a Vocation (Politik als Beruf)*, 1919), Max Weber explains his typology, which became famous, of three foundations of legitimacy: that founded on tradition, as with the patriarch or the prince; that founded on the personal quality of an individual, the charisma, with “the prophet, the elected war lord, the plebiscitarian ruler, the great demagogue [of Greek cities], or the political party leader”, with the latter’s authority being founded on legality associated with a competence, a legal status, in the same way as the “servants of the state” of modern States. The explanation for obedience is not limited to these three legitimacies, for Max Weber, but is also explained by “motives of fear and hope – fear of the vengeance of magical powers or of the power-holder, hope for reward in this world or in the beyond”. These three models of traditional (also called patrimonial or despotic) authority, of legal authority and of charismatic authority can be found in other analyses and in diverse types of organisations or leaderships.

Still in the 19th century, Gustave Le Bon’s theory of a charismatic leader is a good example. Gustave Lebon is opposed to the gregarious crowd and, according to Bernard Dantier [3], is a supporter of an aristocratic individualism. In one sense he follows on from Tocqueville in *Democracy in America, (De la Démocratie en Amérique)*, 1835-1840, translations in 2000 and 2004) who also feared that too wide a democracy would represent a threat for individuals, but without the racist presuppositions of Gustave Le Bon, who in 1895 published *The Crowd: a Study of the Popular Mind (La Psychologie des Foules)*, published in 1895, English translation published in 1896), a book in which in particular he explained the case of the charismatic chef. In his introduction, Bernard Dantier explains that “G. Le Bon demonstrates how the crowds feel the almost vital need for a leader (a leader which, as we have said, is interpreted by Freud as a representative of the father of the original horde) which produces a specific form of domination, the domination driven by the force of “a charismatic character, extraordinary submission to the holy character, the heroic qualities or the exemplary value of a person”. This leader has often been seen as a prefiguration of Hitler, as is shown by the extracts of *My Fight (Mein Kampf)* below [4]:

“There must be no majority decisions, but only responsible persons... Surely every man will have advisers by his side, but the decision will be made by one man...he alone may possess the authority and right to command....Even then it will not be possible to dispense with ... parliaments. But their councillors will then actually give counsel; [...] In no chamber and in no senate does a vote ever take place. They are working institutions and not voting machines.

This principle – absolute responsibility unconditionally combined with absolute authority – will gradually breed an élite of leaders such as today, in this era of irresponsible parliamentarianism, is utterly inconceivable. [...] The best organization is not that which inserts the greatest, but that which inserts the smallest, intermediary apparatus between the leadership of a movement and its individual adherents. For the function of organization is the transmission of a definite idea - which always first arises from the brain of an individual - to a larger body of men and the supervision of its realization.”

In a talk given to the SA (a Nazi paramilitary organisation) Hitler declared, “Everything that you are, you are through me; everything that I am, I am only through you.” Political leadership is expressed via the emotional community or tribe. Here leadership signifies fusion and a total hold of the leader over his subordinates. This is the “typical ideal” model of the charismatic leader. American psychosociology, beginning in the 1930s, the decade to see the rise of Nazism and Stalinism, was to explore the alternatives to authoritarian power, and in particular that of democratic power.

2 – The American micro-social approach to types of command, between 1930 and 1950

In 1953, the sociologist François Bourricaud published an article in which he asked whether the theory of small groups could apply to political society, and concluded in the affirmative, with a certain number of reserves linked to the difference in scale of observation, such as that between society and “microscopic” observation for restricted groups (p. 470), and the characteristics of political pressure groups. What distinguishes the microsocial and macrosocial approaches is the unconscious forces of society, which are invisible when only restricted groups are observed.

He also shows that, since the political leader plays the role of “mediator” due to his belonging to a “restricted group” and a “larger collectivity”, this practice can be compared with that of the leaders of restricted groups. He also provided a reminder that “multiple belonging” to a family, to a profession, to a party and to the nation “is the norm in complex societies” (p. 459) [5].

What the study of politics and that of restricted groups have in common is that whatever the group, a certain degree of cohesion needs to be ensured, which is the task of leadership. A leader, for François Bourricaud, is a “person who governs other people”, a concept which he opposes to the government of things defended by Saint Simon (1760-1825), and which takes into account the informal part of the organisation (p. 448). “The function of a leader is to ensure the cohesion of the group [...] and to act as arbitrator for conflicts which emerge incessantly”. The leader is “above all a leader of people”. Ultimately, it is “the individual whose role is to lead those over whom his power is exerted to contribute towards common tasks.” (pp. 458-459) [6]. Trust is the cement of the link between the leader and the members of the group. There is therefore a link between political leadership and leadership of a small group, with respect to the question of trust, but do they, despite everything, stem from the same social logic, due to the very fact of the great difference in the scale of action and

therefore of the actors concerned? The question remains largely open, even if American psychosociology has attempted to reply in the affirmative.

It was the style of leadership, and hence its ability to successfully complete a collective task, which were to be studied through the observation of restricted groups by American psychosociologists, before and particularly after the Second World War. With the American psychosociology of the 1930s and 1940s, the question of leadership changed its scale of observation, and became an object for observation in the laboratory.

From 1947 onwards, a laboratory for experiments in human behaviour was created at Harvard in the USA. One of the most famous experiments was that of Robert F. Bales with his team [7] on the discovery of two complementary leaders in the conduct of social groups: the “task leader”, who allows the group to carry out the task which it is assigned, and the understanding or “socio-emotional” leader.

The different leader roles appeared following the observation of verbal interaction within small groups, in which he was to distinguish between the expression of ideas and the expression of sympathy or antipathy. He also distinguished between what belongs to the activity, what belongs to competence with respect to the task, and the sympathy which the leader inspires. A leader who has a high score in these three areas is a good leader, but such a leader is rare. One who has a high score for the activity and for competence equates to a task leader who can cooperate with the socio-emotional leader, a leader who has a high score for sympathy but a low score for activity and competence. He notes another case of an overly active leader, who has a high score for activity but a low one for competence and sympathy: “this is a person of whom it is said, in the literature on leadership, that he manifests ‘domination’ rather than leadership” (p. 277). Ultimately, effective groups are those in which the two functions of accomplishing a task on the one hand and regulating tensions on the other hand are carried out by one or two leaders.

The other famous experiment, which was published first in 1939 and then in 1947, is that of the link between the style of commands, the satisfaction and the effectiveness of the group for groups of children, an experiment carried out by Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt et Ralph K. White [8]. The experiment tests three types of leader: authoritarian, democratic and *laissez-faire*. The role of “authoritarian leadership” requires the leader to take all of the decisions concerning the group. He fixes the steps of action to carry out and who does what. He does not participate much in group activities. The role of “democratic leadership” – in the sense of a psychosocial behaviour which is close to the understanding behaviour of Bales, and not in the sense of political democracy – is carried out with a leader who discusses decisions with the group, clarifies objectives and allows the members of the group to work with whomever they wish. He tries to be a member of the group. *Laissez-faire* leadership requires a leader who leaves the individuals every freedom to decide what they want to do (p. 281). The “authoritarian” leader led to two kinds of reaction, one being aggressiveness, and the other being apathy, with a greater dependence on the leader than there exists towards the “democratic” or “laissez-faire” leaders. Generally, the authoritarian leader causes stronger aggressiveness, unlike democratic or laissez-faire leaders. Members of a democratic group also feel freer to produce ideas. However, groups with a *laissez-faire* leader did not succeed in working in a cooperative manner. Simplifying a little, groups with a “democratic” leader worked to the greatest satisfaction, with less frustration, and with good efficiency [9].

Today, 50 years after all of these studies on leadership in small groups, what can be said about commands, authority and leadership in large organisations in France?

3 – In 2011, what has happened to the theory of leadership?

There are two particularly interesting continuations, that of psychosociology with the publication of the works of S. Alexander Haslam, Stephen D. Reicher and Mickael J. Platow in *The New Psychology of Leadership. Identity, Influence and Power*, published by Psychology Press, and that of the sociology of organisations, with the latest book by François Dupuy.

Haslam, Reicher and Platow defend a central theory with respect to the theories of the 1950s in the USA: leadership does not depend primarily on individual or psychological characteristics, or on the style of commands, even if this may play a role, but on the context of the functioning of the group. A good leader is therefore one who is able to grasp the effects of context and situation, which is close to the Chinese *shi*⁴, the course of things.

Instead of using the question of the psychological qualities of the leader as a point of departure, they ask instead what makes a group work, and what determines whether the members of a group will follow a leader or not. Their answer is that the members will follow a leader if the latter takes into account the identity of the members of the group.

In fact, for the authors, a group mainly functions based on the identity which it has constructed as an “in group”, a group of belonging, with reference to the “out group”, the group of outsiders. The leader is therefore essentially, for these three authors, a creator of collective identity, who makes the actors of the group pass from “I” to “we”.

Their demonstration is based on an experimental observation that the identity of a group does not exist in itself, but is the result of group life which, in turn, produces a feeling of belonging. Following the work of H. Tajfel in Great Britain in the 1960s, then of J.C. Turner or of Doise in the 1970s on social identity, the authors describe laboratory experiments on students’ identity construction.

The experiment consists of forming two groups of students, in one of which the students are supposed to prefer Klee, and in the other of which they are supposed to prefer Kandinsky – two great abstract painters of the 20th century – in other words, two opposed “in groups”. At the end they are asked to give a reward either to a friend of theirs in the out group or to somebody they do not like in the in group. Most of them choose to give it to the person in their “in group”. For the authors, this result is a good piece of evidence that collective identity has priority over individual preferences, and that collective identity represents a force which a good leader should be able to capture in order to help the group advance better with respect to its goals, which may be political, moral or economic.

The authors make a second finding – that power is the second important element in the functioning of groups. They distinguish two sorts of power, “power over”, i.e. that which is imposed on the group, and “power through”, which comes from the group (p. 61). Put another way, this means that an effective leader is one who uses the energy of the group as a basis. His power resides in the ability to mobilise the collective identity, which is seen here as the energy, the driving force of the group. The power of the leader is all the stronger when he is part of the group, and hence is more able to avoid imposing his power from outside, and thereby to move the group from “I” to “we”.

However, the important point is that for the authors, the content of the collective identity is not fixed – they speak of “Scottishness” (p.67). When a Scot compares himself with a Greek, he sees himself as being more hard-working, and when he compares himself with an Englishman, he sees himself as being friendlier. This shows that identity does not have an

immutable essence, but is the result of a social construction. This is why the authors speak of a leader as being an “entrepreneur of identity” (p.71): a leader who tries to make sense of the world, whether he be a politician, a military chief, or the head of a company, must be able to bring out the characteristics which constitute the collective identity of the group. He must therefore incarnate from within the values produced by the group, the values of “we” and not of “I”. The leader “must be like one of us”, and must work in favour of the interests of the group, whether it is a small group, a family, or a national or international community. It is the ability of the leader to capture this “we” which will allow the construction of a collective energy which is capable of moving the group, of making it “move mountains”, to use a phrase from the Christian New Testament. For the authors, the characteristics of a leader are therefore not personal characteristics, but have to do with his ability to represent the characteristics of the group.

Here the authors reconnect with the great classics of American social psychology on the research into the connection between leadership and group performance, on the one hand, and on the other hand the ability to create a link, to regulate conflicts. The experiment of Sheriff and his team is confirmed here: effective groups are those which have leaders who are integrated into the group and those who are seen as favouring the construction of the “we”. We find the idea of a magnet which was already touched on by Magdalena François-Turin in her work on leadership in China and in Europe. This is why, following Lewin, they can also conclude that an “authoritarian” leader or a “laissez-faire” leader is less effective than a “participative” leader. With an authoritarian leader, the members of the group do not have the impression that they are working for themselves, but for someone else’s interests, the opposite of what happens with a “democratic” leader (p. 82).

In conclusion, it can be certainly seen that the authors consider the question of leadership in terms of a process of influence. For them, what makes a leader influential has to do less with the psychological charisma of the leader than with his ability to grasp what constitutes the collective identity of the group, the “we”, in other words the energy which can make it progress.

While I find this work very interesting, I nonetheless cannot share all of their conclusions, in particular the fact that they do not sufficiently consider the potential lack of continuity between laboratory experiments *in vitro* and political life *in vivo*, or perhaps that they do not sufficiently discuss the boundaries between using the energy of the group and manipulation, even if these boundaries are always vague and they refrain from supporting a thesis of manipulation; or the fact that they do not consider the full extent of the consequences of the effect of the situation, which they greatly emphasise, quite rightly, and which signifies that an authoritarian or democratic leader could be a good or bad solution depending on the situation and the constraints of the situation. However, what seems important to me is that they highlight once again the collective dimension of leadership in western culture, while many authors present westerners as being individualists. They probably have individualist values, but in practice, as everywhere, groups function in collective mode. What varies is the form of collective action, and the fact that, depending on cultures, the existence of collective life may or may not be highly valued. It must be recalled that there is no society without a collective life, without a minimal form of “collectivism”, and hence that “individualism” is partly an illusion, considered as positive by some and as negative by others.

This collective dimension can be found in the last book of François Dupuy, which has the suggestive title *Lost in management* (Seuil, 2011), which is reminiscent of the title of the film *Lost in translation* released in 2004 by Sofia Copola. François Dupuy is a specialist of the sociology of organisations. He worked with Michel Crozier for a long time. He defends a

paradoxical theory: far from being authoritarian or despotic institutions, some French companies have lost control of their employees, in favour of divisions by types of activity or groups of staff who are protected from the incentives given by their boss for them to work differently or more. Instead, it is rather blind institutions which are trying to regain control, through the putting in place of impersonal processes such as “reporting”, an often impersonal procedure which requires the subordinate to give a report of his work, and in which the importance of regulating matters face-to-face is often underestimated.

The system nonetheless functions, thanks to a whole series of internal adjustments, or through externalisation. These practices aim either to reduce the transactional costs of face-to-face relations, in particular through the automation of tasks, or to lubricate relations by the development of parallel networks in order to bypass the rigidity of the system, or to make the tasks to be accomplished more flexible by subcontracting to contractors and external companies, which are not protected by functioning in divisions and hence are forced to adapt to requests for change and flexibility. In this way the costs of production can be reduced.

Limiting the costs of transaction translates into a “retaylorisation” of work. It is what a French sociologist, Jean Pierre Durand, called “the invisible chain”. This designates the process by which information technology reintroduces a control on productivity in the service sector, as the chain previously did in factories. It also corresponds to the automation of services, such as automatic checkouts in large supermarkets or automatic machines in the Paris metro to manage mobility with the *Passe Navigo* (monthly travel pass), or the “smart grids” used in residences and in factories in order to regulate energy consumption, etc.

The lowering of production costs is also carried out through delocalisation towards emerging countries, towards Asia, or within China towards the centre of China or to Vietnam, for example.

The lubrication of the functioning of large organisations is carried out in France, and in many countries, through the development of informal networks which allow burdensome bureaucracy to be bypassed, not to mention the importance of networks formed by alumni of civil servants’ training schools, large business schools, the ENA (National School of Administration) or the engineering schools which are specific to the French system.

The flexibility of tasks is made possible due to the recruitment of interim workers and contractors, and due to external subcontractors. As senior managers said, “We ask more of the interim employees”, or “Interim employees work more than the others” (p. 38). Some of the “underproductiveness” of permanent staff may be explained, on the one hand, by the large number of meetings which are not productive, but which are strategically important for other reasons such as creating of networks, being present to prevent decisions which would increase one’s workload, being present so as not to be conspicuous by one’s absence, etc. All of these reasons are entirely legitimate from the point of view of each actor. This relative “underproductiveness” may also be explained by the number of emails and attached texts which may have to be dealt with.

These adjustments are all the more worthwhile since external pressure is strong, due to market competition or the loss of clientele. Nonetheless, the changes linked with this pressure collide with the routines and arrangements which enable employees to protect themselves against excessive pressure due to work, and which have been constructed over the years.

What François Dupuy shows is that all of this forms a system. The local managers may notice that too little work is being done in a particular workshop or department. However, if they try to change the situation, they risk a conflict with a trade union, without the support of their

senior management. They therefore have no advantage in changing things, as the human cost is too high. In the long term, this human cost favours automation, which in replacing humans by machines reduces the costs linked with conflicts.

This cost also leads to delocalisation, to the employment of interim workers, and to subcontracting, in order to make the factory or the department work without needing to bear the costs of these human transactions.

All of this contributes towards showing the costs of change and adaptation, both from the point of view of the employees, what Vincent de Gaulejac has called the cost of excellence (*Le coût de l'excellence*), and from the point of view of the organisations. The high cost of change explains why “change happens not when it is necessary but when it is possible” (p. 44) and therefore under constraints.

Finally, this makes it possible to show that the quality of a leader will depend first of all on the situation, and on whether or not he has the ability to seize an opportunity for change. Conversely, an ineffective leader is one who tries to bring about change when it is not socially possible. The problem, for a leader, is creating the social conditions for change in such a way that he minimises energy expenditure and optimises the energy of the group in favour of the change. This is why the leader does not necessarily need to show himself, but he has to observe constantly, in order to identify a favourable moment at which he can initiate the process of change.

Conclusion in the form of an opening

The sociology of organisations, with Michel Crozier and his team, and Erhard Friedberg in particular, has developed another face of leadership, not in terms of style or identity as in psychosociology, or legitimacy as in political sciences, but in terms of relations of power and ability to act within an organisation. All of these explanations are valid, depending on the problem posed and the focus of observation. The important thing is to know how to mobilise them depending on the situation.

For the moment, it is sufficient to remember the sociological demonstration carried out by François Dupuy, which shows that the question of leadership perhaps has a more universal dimension than is normally thought. This revolves around an observation that the rationalisation of large organisations in the west by processes, rules and clarity is opposed to the kind of management which accepts confrontation, complexity and vagueness. The important thing is not to fix rules, but to learn to regulate. The first regulation is that of networks. Here, to some extent, we can refer back to China and intercultural perspectives. In Chinese “leadership” is translated by *ling2 dao3 guan1 xi0*, word by word: director of networks.

Leadership appears to be a complex notion with multiple psychological, organisational, political and intercultural facets. Nonetheless, a common point can be gathered from all of these approaches: the challenge of leadership is not to manage things with rules, but people and their networks, according to situational constraints.

[1] “You may demonstrate to a convinced syndicalist, believing in an ethic of ultimate ends, that his action will result in increasing the opportunities of reaction, in increasing the oppression of his class, and obstructing its ascent – and you will not make the slightest impression upon him. If an action of good intent leads to bad results, then, in the actor's eyes, not he but the world, or the stupidity of other men, or God's will who made them thus, is responsible for the evil.

The believer in an ethic of ultimate ends feels 'responsible' only for seeing to it that the flame of pure intentions is not quenched: for example, the flame of protesting against the injustice of the social order.”

<http://anthropos-lab.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Weber-Politics-as-a-Vocation.pdf>

[2] Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, in *The New Spirit of Capitalism (Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme)*, Gallimard, 1999, English translation Verso, 2005), seem to be describing this imaginary side of capitalist management more than its practice.

[3] See the introduction to *La psychologie de foules* (Gustave le Bon) written by Bernard Dantier (French only):

classiques.uqac.ca/contemporains/dantier_bernard/intro_psycho_foules/Dantier_intro_psycho_foules.pdf

[4] www.encyclopedie.bseditions.fr/article.php?pArticleId=146&pChapitreId=15480&pSousChapitreId=15490

(Quotes taken from the English translation of *Mein Kampf* on <http://www.mondopolitico.com/library/meinkampf/v2c4.htm>)

[5] Bernard Lahire's book *The Plural Actor (L'Homme pluriel)*, published in 1998 by Nathan, English translation published in 2011), which is very interesting on the *scope of collective action*, seems to imply that multiple belonging is a new phenomenon of the 1990s, which is not entirely correct. Similarly, the idea of mediation, which is often presented as a novelty today, dates back to the 1950s.

[6] Bourricaud François. “La sociologie du « leadership » et son application à la théorie politique” (The sociology of leadership and its application to political theory). In: *Revue française de sciences politique*, 3ème année, 1953, pp. 445-470 (www.persee.fr)

[7] Bales Robert F., “18. Rôles centrés sur la tâche et rôles sociaux dans des groupes ayant des problèmes à résoudre” (Task-centred roles and social roles in groups having problems to solve), in André Lévy, 1972, *Psychologie sociales*, pp. 263-277.

[8] Lippit Ronald, White Ralph K. White, “19. Une étude expérimentale du commandement et de la vie en groupe” (An experimental study of commands and of life in a group), in André Lévy, 1972, *Psychologie sociales*, pp 278-292.

[9] For a critical analysis of the experiment, read F. Bourricaud, 1961, *Esquisse d'un théorie de l'autorité* (Draft of a theory of authority), Plon.