

Student Work

4-1-1982

Foundations of Democratic Leadership in America

M. Payrow-Olia

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Payrow-Olia, M., "Foundations of Democratic Leadership in America" (1982). *Student Work*. 2217.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2217>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

Foundations of Democratic Leadership in America

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Political Science

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

M. Payrow-Olia

April, 1982

UMI Number: EP73759

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP73759

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name

Department

<i>Orville D. Menard</i>	<i>Political Science</i>
<i>H. Carl Camp</i>	<i>Political Science</i>
<i>Harold A. Pelatone</i>	<i>History</i>

Chairman

Date

Kent A. Juwan

5/21/82

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	THOUGHTS ON LEADERSHIP AND DEMOCRACY	1
	Introductory Remarks	
	Leadership	
	Democracy	
	American Linkages	
	Outline for Analysis	
II	AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP	25
	Regime Principles	
	Regime Organization	
	Democratic Leaders	
	Democratic People	
III	CONCLUSIONS	77
.		
	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	86

CHAPTER I

THOUGHTS OF LEADERSHIP AND DEMOCRACY

Introductory Remarks

Estrangement (disunity) is a fundamental political reality. It arises from the human condition; that is, a human is a discrete individual physically and intellectually. Human individuals are also social beings who attempt to reach out to each other and overcome their isolation. Community or unity is essential for order which underlies civilization. Leadership establishes the unity relationship among human individuals. Leadership is the ability to mobilize human resources in the pursuit of specific goals. However, there are many different ways of mobilizing people and many different goals to pursue.

Throughout political philosophy, democracy and leadership have often been assumed to be in opposition. The notion of democratic leadership has been considered problematic, practically and theoretically.¹ Democratic leadership has also been the subject of contempt or

¹Democracy results in anarchy and disorder in Plato, The Republic, 2nd edition. Trans. Desmond Lee (Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1975), Bk. VIII. See also Aristotle, The Politics of Aristotle, ed. & trans. Ernest Barker (New York: Oxford University Press, 1974). A ruling aristocracy is necessary for the maintenance of civilization and order in Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution of France (New York: Anchor Press, 1973). The grubby rabble and superior men are con-

of derision in much of contemporary scholarship. Democratic leadership, we are warned, is either a naive relic from a bygone era that is ill-adapted to modern requirements, or democratic leadership is an illusory facade that hides the "real" leadership of sinister elite groups. At one extreme, we are told, democratic political systems are ruled and manipulated by small elite cliques who only use mass democratic claims to justify their rule.² At the other extreme, we are admonished that reliance on democratic rule has paved the way to impending disaster, and that our very survival depends upon the revamping of our political systems and investing power in authoritarian experts.³ Can the requirements of democracy be recon-

trasted with superior men in Friedrich Nietzsche, "Thus Spoke Zarathustra," in Democracy and Elitism: Two Essays with Selected Readings, ed. Harry K. Girvetz (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), pp. 254-258. Political democracy leads to anarchy and decline in Gaetano Mosca, "The Ruling Class," in Democracy and Elitism, ed. Harry K. Girvetz (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), pp. 289-290.

²The influence of the elitist school of thought is considerable. Some of the classic thoughts which outline the main points of elite theory can be found in the works of Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto, and Charles Wright Mills. A representative sample of their writings can be found in Harry K. Girvetz, ed., Democracy and Elitism (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), pp. 264-319.

³William Ophuls cites a litany of contemporary problems and concludes that complex post-industrial societies in an age of scarcity require authoritarian political systems for survival. The seemingly hopelessness of the present situation is depicted in his Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity: Prologue to a Political Theory of the Steady State (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1977).

ciled with those of leadership? The Founders of the American regime thought so. Is the outline for democratic leadership set forth in the Constitution still applicable to the present-day United States? This paper is addressed toward a re-examination of democracy and leadership. By reflecting on some aspects of American democratic leadership, the linkages between democracy and leadership can be shown to be both viable and pertinent.

Leadership

Different conceptions of leadership abound and are ultimately based upon various assumptions concerning human nature, and consequently, the nature of human ends and goals. An understanding of the values and regime principles which influence leaders and followers is crucial in evaluating political decisions and actions, for without

a reasonably clear idea of man as he is, as he might be, and as he should be, we cannot distinguish between those evils that can be modified or eliminated and those evils that are intrinsic to the human condition and must be borne.⁴

Values and principles are central to Burns' definition of leadership "as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivations--the wants and needs, the aspira-

⁴Phillip H. Rhinelander, Is Man Incomprehensible to Man? (San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1973), p. 13.

tions and expectations--of both leaders and followers."⁵ For Machiavelli, leadership was the capacity and willingness to use physical and psychological force to establish order and maintain the state. The leader maintained his position of influence over his followers by rewarding and punishing them through the manipulation of love, fear, and self-interest.⁶

Leadership is a relationship which involves decision-making and decisiveness. Decisions are made on what goals to pursue and on what means to use to pursue these goals. Decisions are guided by principles and influenced by a combination of reason, passion, and circumstances. The proliferation of ideologies attests to the range of values and goals.⁷ The importance of regime principles and their influence on leadership can best be demonstrated by comparing leaders who faced

⁵Burn continues, differentiating between two different types of leadership: transactional and transforming. Transactional leadership involves the bargaining between people in order for each to achieve his/her particular purpose. Transforming leadership is the engagement among leaders and followers that elevates the level of human behavior and the ethical aspirations of all parties involved. Burns' categories could be another way of distinguishing between mere leaders and great leaders or politicians and statesmen. James MacGregor Burns, Leadership (New York: Harper & Row, 1978), pp. 19-20.

⁶Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince, trans. & ed. Robert M. Adams (New York: Norton Publishing, 1977).

⁷A survey of political ideologies can be found in Isaac Kramnick and Frederick Watkins, The Age of Ideology--Political Thought, 1750 to the Present, 2nd edition. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1979).

similar problems with different values and goals.⁸

A leader begins with self-knowledge as well as an understanding of human nature.⁹ Followers must have a corresponding sense of self-understanding. This is especially true for a democracy because

Such a political system requires for its successful functioning and continuity a steady awareness of the self as an independent entity, combined with similar individual entities, all together seeking to achieve, through a sense of civic obligation, the requirements and expectations of each person.¹⁰

Hobbes thought that all people shared a fear of death and an individual self-interest. These combined would cause people to agree to submit to the domination of a single leader. The leader would create order by forcing conformity to his/her will through coercion and the

⁸For example, compare Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler and the United States under Franklin Roosevelt. Franklin Roosevelt himself called attention to the consequences of the German people trading political freedom and responsibility for promises of a good life and blind obedience to a supreme leader in his "Address at University of Pennsylvania, 20 September 1940," in The Political Thought of American Statesmen: Selected Writings and Speeches, eds. Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens (Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1973), p. 334. A classic study of the powerful attraction between a leader who promised salvation to followers in exchange for obeisance, and the human depravity which resulted is in Alan Bullock, Hitler, A Study in Tyranny (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

⁹Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), p. 26. A modern twist emphasizes the knowledge of a leader's personality in order to predict his/her performance in James David Barber, The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977).

¹⁰Saul K. Padover, ed. Sources of Democracy (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. xviii.

threat of death. Both the leader and the followers would have the same desire to have a strong, centralized regime which would promote self-preservation.¹¹

Leadership is a relationship among people that rests upon an understanding that is influenced by organization and expectation, and that seeks to benefit its participants. Without a common understanding of values, goals, roles, rights and obligations, confusion and conflict would rip the relationship asunder. Some degree of stability is required to pursue a civilized level of life rather than mere bestial life of survival.

The stability which is a prerequisite for civilization demands some form of organization. For Selznick, the primary aspect of leadership was the choice of key values and the creation of a "social structure that embodies them."¹² Other aspects of leadership involve the leader's skill in defining the group's mission, his/her proficiency in defending the group's essential character from internal and external attacks, and the ability to use internal and external conflicts in a way that enhances goal accomplishment.

¹¹Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1950).

¹²Selznick, Leadership in Administration, p. 60.

Burns concentrates on similar aspects of leadership. The ideal or transformational leader consciously pursues end-values like liberty and equality. Leaders engage followers to commingle needs and goals in a common enterprise. Leaders mediate conflict among followers and among values. Good leadership ultimately transforms both leaders and followers into better (morally speaking) people.¹³

For Frisch and Stevens, change and continuity are blended in leadership so as to remove

the greatest amount of evil while disturbing the least amount of prejudice . . . to preserve the country . . . forming and reforming the characters of the citizens by calling forth from them a readiness to behave in a way which is good both for them and for the country as a whole.¹⁴

Leadership then must take into account the cultural, social and historical habits and prejudices that exist in a community. The burden for good government should be shared by both leaders and followers by their choices between wants and needs. Leadership also involves self-rule. Both leaders and followers would have to have "The intellectual and moral virtues for ruling themselves and one another well."¹⁵

¹³Burns, Leadership, pp. 425-461.

¹⁴Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens, American Political Thought: The Philosophic Dimension of American Statesmanship (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1976), pp. 7-8.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 19-20.

Leadership also involves the development and exercise of power. This involves a wide range of psychological, social, economic, and physical forces. Human beings are daily faced with conflicting needs (biological, ethical, social, intellectual, emotional, psychological, etc.) as well as by conflicting external demands.¹⁶ Good and skilled leadership is needed to help people realize their human potential. Ethical conscience as well as genetic make-up may aid the development of an individual's will toward the common good, but within each person, egotism is a strong force for the development of the individual's will toward selfish interests.¹⁷ Power may be organized in several

¹⁶There are a multitude of variables associated with leader-follower relationships. "Each of the three aspects of human fate--anatomy, history and personality--must always be studied in its relationship to the other two, for each codetermines the others." Erik H. Erikson, Life History and the Historical Moment (New York: W. W. Norton, 1975), p. 228. Morris and Seeman recognize five different ways of studying the leader-follower relationship: as a result of a leader's behavior; as criteria for evaluation; as concomitants or determiners or conditioners of the leader's behavior. Richard T. Morris and Melvin Seeman, "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach," American Journal of Sociology 61 (September 1950): 149.

¹⁷From a biopolitical standpoint, the survival of humans as a specie is considered as the human end or goal. Human tendencies toward altruism, social behavior, and dominance-deference relationships are seen as specie-specific genetic traits that enhance specie survival. Thomas C. Wiegèle, Biopolitics: Search for a More Human Politic Science (Boulder: Westview Press, 1979), pp. 9-31. From an ethical standpoint, community can be seen as the highest human goal. The human capability for moral behavior may be oriented toward peace and mutual respect, the necessary conditions for true community. Claes Ryn, Democracy and the Ethical Life: A Philosophy of Politics and Community (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978), pp. 81-89. See also Irving Babbitt, Democracy and Leadership (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924), p. 180.

ways. It may be set up as a group of equals who exert influence on each other arriving at a consensus which in turn all support and implement. The organization may be hierarchical and authoritarian in which the greatest amount of power and authority rests at the top from which it filters down in such a way that each level has some power but less than the one above it. All levels of leadership in a hierarchy are both integrated and interrelated. Leadership may be exerted by the majority influencing the few as in the case of peer pressure promoting conformity. Leadership may be exercised by a few due to their special knowledge, technical expertise, social standing, or command of scarce resources.

Stogdill found several common aspects of leadership. Leaders plan, organize and control resources in order to effect their intended purposes. Leaders define common goals and focus all actions toward the securing of these goals. Leaders create and utilize group structures, and try to influence group action, interaction, cohesiveness, and satisfaction in order to achieve their intended purposes.¹⁸

Organization enables a leader to exercise power, but a person's power is enhanced if he/she has charisma. In the United States, Amer-

¹⁸Ralph M. Stogdill, Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research (New York: Free Press, 1974), p. 30.

icans traditionally have had ambivalent attitudes towards their leaders and the exercise of power. Americans seem to feel that a leader's power should be limited and yet they also seem to yearn for charismatic leaders to whom they would gladly submit. Fontaine pinpointed another modern paradox:

The exercise of power is increasingly difficult. People are asking more of their leaders and at the same time they are more and more reluctant to obey orders, so there is an impasse. That is one of the reasons why those who might be leaders are not tempted by the opportunity.¹⁹

The appeal of an elite group or of a great man invested with extraordinary powers can be traced, in part, to many things: the frustrations of living in an increasingly complex society, the bewilderment of people who are daily faced with conflicting goals with little social and moral guidance, and the burden of living with decisions that more often than not have unexpected and undesirable ramifications. It could be that "men's minds and feelings are still permeated with ideas of leadership imposed from above, ideas that developed in the long early history of mankind."²⁰ The duties, responsibilities, and

¹⁹Andre Fontaine, "The End of Optimism," World Press Review 27 (July 1980): 19-21.

²⁰John Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 38.

obligations of self-government may also seem burdensome to many people. It is easier to cast blame elsewhere for problems which resist solution rather than to accept responsibility for obtaining the answers.²¹ On the surface, it seems more efficient and faster for a few to decide than the many.²² It is apparent that decisions made by many people seem to be time-consuming and full of compromises. Throughout the history of the United States, people have sought to sort out the thorny issues of leadership and democracy. F. D. Roosevelt addressed both the appeal and the danger of a restricted form of leadership in a democratic society:

A conflict between the point of view of Alexander Hamilton, sincerely believing in the superiority of Government by a small group of public-spirited and usually wealthy citizens, and . . . the point of view of Thomas Jefferson, an advocate of Government by representatives chosen by all the people . . . that Jefferson pointed out that, on the doctrine of sheer human frailty, the Hamilton theory was bound to develop, in the long run, into Government by selfishness or Government for personal gain or Government by class. Even today . . . there are . . . demands for a return of Government to the control of a fewer number of people, people who, because of business ability or economic omniscience are supposed to be just a touch above the average of our citi-

²¹This phenomenon may be described:
 "Each of us had a father, a prestige figure, magically endowed. Many of us found security in that figure. Since we continue to need security, perhaps we continue to carry with us out of childhood the father symbol, the Leader. . . . Leaders serve as ink blots onto which people project their desires for security and dependence."

I. Knickerbocker, "Leadership: A Conception and Some Implications," in Leadership, Selected Readings, ed. C. A. Gibb (England: Penguin Books, 1969), pp. 26-27.

²²Reinhard Bendix, Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), p. 16.

zens. . . . As in the days of Hamilton, we of our own generation should give those who demand government by the few all credit for pure intention and high ideals. Nevertheless, their type of political thinking could easily lead to Government by selfish seekers for power and riches and glory. For the greatest danger is that once Government falls into the hands of a few elite, curtailment or even abolition of free elections might be adopted as the means of keeping them in power.²³

Leadership appears to require unity of purpose and direction, speed of decision and action, unlimited power, a monopoly of special knowledge and information, and certain skills. Democracy, by its nature, requires different things.

Democracy

Democracy rests upon a basic assumption concerning political life: power resides in the people. All people have the capacity to will and to act. Will, by itself, is an attribute of an individual and operates in the realm of philosophic freedom (the unencumbered movement of thought). Power is more closely akin to the capability of action, and as such, operates in the realm of political freedom (the unchecked movement of action). This conceptualization suggests power is equal to the human will being actualized. And because action, unlike individual thoughts, always affects others, the nature of power is both personal and political, potential and actual.²⁴

²³Roosevelt, "Address at University of Pennsylvania," pp. 332-334.

²⁴Hannah Arendt, The Life of the Mind, vol. 2. Willing (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978), pp. 199-201.

People, by nature are diverse in opinions, talents, interests, and ambitions. These natural differences seem to have "rendered them more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good."²⁵ The tendency of human emotions to become inflamed during these disputes and conflicts of interest works against the formation of a calm deliberative sense of community which is needed for stability. A pure democracy which gives equal weight to each citizen's decision ultimately results in a war of all against all and encourages inflamed passions.²⁶ A political regime which ignores the majority's decision-making capabilities limits human potential and ignores the source of power. A scheme for striking a balance between democracy and leadership has been found in the investing of power in the people's representatives. To ensure these representatives promote the best interests of the people, their tenure in office is checked by frequent and popular elections. Restrictions on the representative bodies and on suffrage would promote the happiness of the people and keep the rulers strictly accountable to the people.²⁷

²⁵Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, The Federalist (New York: Modern Library paperback edition, n. d.), article 10, p. 56. Hereafter, references to this work will be cited as Federalist, the number of the article, and the page number.

²⁶See Plato, Republic.

²⁷John Stuart Mill, Considerations on Representative Government (New York: Henry Holt, 1882).

Through representation, people were thought to be capable of making reasoned decisions and cooperating with each other, of creating an environment conducive to civilization, and to establishing an area in which civic liberty may be exercised.

Ideally democracy is a . . . form of social and political organization which does justice to two dimensions of human existence: to man's spiritual stature and his social character; to the uniqueness and variety of life, as well as the common necessities of all men. An ideal democratic order seeks unity within the condition of freedom; and maintains freedom within the framework of order.²⁸

The balancing act between freedom and equality, human emotions and rationality, and human wants and needs is a tall order for a political regime, let alone a political leader. Sweet-sounding platitudes are not enough:

Human appetites, passions, prejudices, and self-love will never be conquered by benevolence and knowledge alone. . . . The numbers of men in all ages have preferred ease, slumber, and good cheer to liberty. . . . We must not, then, depend alone upon the love of liberty in the soul of man for its preservation. Some political institutions must be prepared to assist this love against its enemies.²⁹

²⁸Reinhold Niebuhr, "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness," in Social Ethics: Issues in Ethics and Society, ed. Gibson Winter, Harper Forum Books (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), p. 143.

²⁹John Adams, "Letter to Samuel Adams, 18 October 1790," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 29.

No observer of human society would disagree that social-economic stratification exists, although the terms used to describe it may vary. Traditionally, the demarcation has been between governors-governed or rich-poor. A modern variation has been made between dominance-deference behaviors.³⁰ Careful students of human society would hesitate to draw distinct lines separating leaders from followers, for in actual life situations, an individual assumes different roles, sometimes following and sometimes leading.

Every human being has the potential for leadership insofar as he/she is able to choose to work in concert or to act alone. "The word democracy implies that the active involvement of the whole people is necessary for the achievement of the goal of community."³¹ Democratic decision-making rests on "faith in the capacity of human nature; faith in human intelligence and in the power of pooled and cooperative experience."³² Democracy then demands freedom of information and knowledge. Mutual respect and cooperation are the keystones to a successful democracy:

The freedom and opportunity that have characterized American development in the past can be maintained if we recognize the fact that the individual system of our day calls for the collabora-

³¹Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 17.

³²Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration."

tion of all of us to provide, at the least, security for all of us. Those words 'freedom' and 'opportunity' do not mean a license to climb upwards by pushing other people down. Any paternalistic system which tries to provide security for everyone from above only calls for an impossible task and a regimentation utterly uncongenial to the spirit of our people.³³

Democracy requires shared power, pooled knowledge, common virtue and pooled wealth rather than in the limited power concentrated in individual knowledge, virtue and wealth.³⁴ While this principle may be true, pure democracy has never endured. The rule of all was thought to lead to the endless bickering among the people, the loss of the merits of arguments through grandiose oratory, confusion of action and slowness of decision-making.³⁵

³³Franklin D. Roosevelt, "Address to Young Democratic Clubs of America, 24 August 1935," in Political Thought of American Statesmen, eds. Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens (Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1973), p. 307.

³⁴John Taylor, "An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States, 1814," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 70-73. Aristotle made a similar observation:

"There is this to be said for the Many. Each of them by himself may not be of a good quality; but when they all come together it is possible that they may surpass--collectively and as a body, although not individually--the quality of the few best."
Aristotle, Politics, Bk. III, p. 123.

³⁵Condon sees the American War of Independence as having been fought over differing interpretations of democratic rule, liberty, and civic order:

"Those who supporting American independence tended to regard government--public authority--as the principal threat to personal liberty. By contrast the Loyalist frame of mind perceived that liberty could be threatened from below as well as a ministry, that a committee could violate conscience as well as a king, that

Notions of democracy emphasize the ability of the people to make reasoned decisions in concert, ensuring both stability and the realization of the common interest. Notions of leadership, on the other hand, put the emphasis on individual leader who organizes and unites people toward a common goal. Without leaders to direct them, the people are thought to be incapable of working together long enough to achieve their goals:

Large numbers of generally irrational adults have insufficient intelligence even to commence to reason in the complexity of a somewhat irrational society. . . . They lack interest and feel helpless to think and act correctly in other than purely private concerns. . . . Most adults are feeble reeds in the wild, whistling storm of a dangerous world they neither made nor could ever understand. To ask for the people's reasoned decision and advice on weighty matters of policy would seem to be a waste of everyone's time and energy, including their own.³⁶

In other words, democracy puts its trust in the people whereas leadership emphasizes the chosen few. Leadership seems to require unity,

men could be deprived of their personal peace and security by the absence of authority as well as its abuse. And in the Loyalists' judgment, the greatest danger to liberty came in fact from below. Whatever its occasional excesses, the British government separated as it was by 3000 miles of ocean and restrained by its own internal traditions of constitutional procedure, seemed as a much less likely threat to American liberty than the tendencies toward mob rule, enforced conformity, and brutalization which were so pervasive within the individualized colonies."

Ann Condon, "Marching to a Different Drummer: The Political Philosophy of the American Loyalists," in Red, White and True Blue: The Loyalists in the Revolution, ed. Esmond Wright (New York: AMS Press, 1976), p. 6.

³⁶H. Wentworth Eldredge, The Second American Revolution (New York: William Morrow, 1964), pp. 82-83.

secrecy, special skills, exclusive power, and monopolized information. Democracy seems to require diversity, openness, general skills, shared power and free access to information. Can the requirements of leadership and democracy be reconciled?

American Linkages

Thomas Jefferson, in his First Inaugural Address has a timeless reply to the argument advanced by critics of democracy: "Sometimes it is said that Man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. -- Can he then be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him?"³⁷ The American answer to the dilemma of leadership and democracy was a representative form of government through which the people would rule indirectly. "The genius of republican liberty seems to demand on the one side, not only that all power should be derived from the people, but those intrusted with it should be kept in dependence on the people."³⁸ The combination of frequent elections and mass education would aid the people in making their choices of leaders as well as in removing leaders who did not live up to their expectations. The leaders chosen

³⁷Thomas Jefferson, "First Inaugural Address," in The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, ed. Walter E. Volkmer (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), p. 104.

³⁸Federalist, 37, p. 227.

by the people would in turn guide the people toward the realization of the public interest. The leaders would represent the people and yet elevate this representation toward excellence:

The republican principle demands that the deliberate sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they intrust with the management of their affairs; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men, who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. It is a just observation, that the people commonly intend the PUBLIC GOOD. . . . When occasions present themselves, in which the interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed to be the guardians of those interests, to withstand the temporary delusion, in order to give them time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection.³⁹

The Founders of the American regime never denied or ignored the existence of gifted people among the masses. Jefferson thought that a natural aristocracy existed based on virtue and talent.⁴⁰ However, the mere possession of talent and virtue does not guarantee that decisions made will always be wise. All people make decisions for a variety of reasons: "Ambition, avarice, personal animosity, party, opposition, and many other motives not more laudable than these, are

³⁹Ibid., 71, pp. 464-465.

⁴⁰Thomas Jefferson, "Letter to John Adams, 28 October 1813," in The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, ed. Walter E. Volkmer (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), pp. 107-111. See also John Adams, "Letter to John Taylor, 15 April 1814," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 73-75.

apt to operate as well upon those who support as those who oppose the right side of a question."⁴¹ Good people as well as evil people share common motives and make mistakes.

The Founders understood that insufficient attention to the means usually corrupts the ends. They sought to embody democratic principles in a viable political institution. The federal system under a written constitution was the result. The Constitution's checks and balances plus its dispersion of power and shared responsibility, attempted to contain the excesses of the human lust for power while encouraging the rational/ethical element of human nature. Americans' special affinity for their constitution and laws may indicate a political culture that is conducive to democratic statesmanship:

Constitutionalism involves a distrust of unhampered action and spontaneous decision. These are regarded as containing an element of arbitrariness destructive of the spirit of the civilized political order. One purpose of constitutional law, and lesser laws, is to create conditions for reasoned, well-considered public decisions. The attempt to make room for critical detachment in the formulation of policy may have an ethical aspect. Where there is room for deliberation, there is room for the application of a moral perspective.⁴²

This potential for morality or the good in politics does not automatically result from a mere piece of paper called a constitution. But if the practice of submitting political decisions to the people for

⁴¹Federalist, 1, p. 5.

⁴²Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 15.

critical review is internalized, the possibility for moral considerations and moral development is enhanced.⁴³ The American regime may then play a positive role in fostering the moral and political development of people.

Principles of rational deliberation, responsibility for decisions, rule of law, justice, civic liberty, and equality before the law are crucial to democratic leadership. Perhaps Lyndon Johnson's conception of justice, liberty and union best expresses the principles which define the common good for Americans:

Justice was the promise that all . . . would share in the fruits of the land. . . . Liberty was self-government. America would be a place where each man could be proud to be himself--stretching his talents, rejoicing in his work, important in the life of a common enterprise--a cause greater than themselves. And each of us must find a way to advance the purpose of this nation, and thus find new purpose for ourselves. . . . To those who were small and few against the wilderness, the success of liberty demanded the strength of Union.⁴⁵

⁴³"It is the manners and the spirit of a people which preserve a republic in vigor. A degeneracy in these is a canker which soon eats to the heart of its laws and constitution." Thomas Jefferson, "Notes on the State of Virginia, Query XIX," in The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, ed. Walter E. Volkmer (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), p. 87.

⁴⁴"It is impossible to define good leaders without referencing to a system of values." Erik H. Erikson, "On the Nature of Psycho-Historical Evidence: In Search of Gandhi," Daedalus 97 (Summer 1968): 727.

⁴⁵Lyndon B. Johnson, "Inaugural Address, 20 January 1965," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 264. For a discussion of what constitutes the public interest and how it affects leadership, see Herbert J. Storing, "The

Humans have the unique ability to discriminate according to standards and to refrain from certain acts in the pursuit of a moral and ethical life. Ultimately the human potential for true liberty may rest upon the strength of inner control, adherence to law, and a finely developed sense of obligation.⁴⁶

The American regime established by the Constitution tried to strike a balance between the common interest and individual interest and to find a middle ground of cooperation where neither the followers nor the leaders would dominate. The American regime was designed to help democratic leaders promote union and consensus amidst conflict and diversity. However, great emphasis was placed on the political power of persuasion. It has been difficult for democratic leaders to induce or cajole or bring about a consensus if the issues have not appeared to be immediately threatening to the people.⁴⁷ The

Crucial Link: Public Administration, Responsibility, and the Public Interest," Public Administration Review 24 (March 1964): 47-51. Wills is not entirely successful in distinguishing between the political, philosophical and symbolic aspects of the Declaration of Independence in Garry Wills, Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978). For a statement of guiding principles see also the Preamble to the American Constitution in Alpheus Thomas Mason and William M. Beany, American Constitutional Law: Introductory Essays and Selected Cases, 5th edition. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972), p. 667.

⁴⁶Babbitt, Democracy and Leadership.

⁴⁷This may be due to different ideas or expectations of what a leader ought to do and what falls under the purview of the followers. Perhaps in dangerous or life-threatening situations, where the source of danger is evident, everyone agrees that a leader should act whereas

tension between leaders and followers in a representative democracy seems to be very strong. At times, the balance seems to shift in favor of one or the other. The shared power concept hampers the decisiveness of both leaders and followers.⁴⁸ Does this mean that democracy and leadership cannot be linked or reconciled?

Outline for Analysis

Some common aspects of both leadership and democracy have been chosen in order to construct an outline of analysis of American democratic leadership. The components of this outline will consist of: regime principles, regime organization, democratic leaders, and democratic people. This paper does not presume to list all aspects of American democratic leadership common to democratic theory and leadership theory, nor does it pretend that these categories for

in everyday situations where stress or danger comes in different intensities from a variety of sources or is unclear or obscured, differences of opinion regarding what a leader's role should be arise. Lewis J. Edinger, "Political Science and Political Biography," Journal of Politics 26 (August 1964): 657. Authoritarian leaders emerge in times of stress. David C. Korten, "Situational Determinants of Leadership Structure," in Leadership: Readings for an Emerging Field, ed. Glenn D. Paige (New York: Free Press, 1972), p. 163. Charismatic leaders arise during periods of social distress. Robert C. Tucker, "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership," Daedalus 97 (Summer 1968): 747.

⁴⁸The power of democratic leaders is limited by law, court interpretations, tradition and public outcry. See Max J. Skidmore and Marshall Carter Wanke, American Government: A Brief Introduction (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974). A brief overview of court interpretations regarding the separation of powers can be found in Mason and Beany, American Constitutional Law, pp. 59-102.

analysis are mutually exclusive. However, this paper does attempt to use these components of democratic leadership as beginning points for organizing the material. These particular aspects of democratic leadership were chosen primarily because they most clearly demonstrated the linkages between the requirements of democracy and the requirements of leadership.

CHAPTER II

AMERICAN DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Regime Principles

At the time the Constitution was formed, the Founders were aware that an important political question was being addressed: "whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on accident and force."¹ From its conception, the American regime has made a commitment to deliberate rule under the law, based on reason and reflection by leaders representing, and responsible to, the people. The Constitution and law should be respected. This is especially important in a self-governing nation that gives laws to itself, because it is only one short step from the principle that the laws are merely a product of one's own will to the opinion that the only consideration that informs the law is self-interest; and this opinion is only one remove from lawlessness. A nation of simply self-interested men will soon enough perish from the earth.

The ends of government have been held to be the pursuit of happiness, civil liberty, and equality before the law. These principles help to promote justice and by implication involve morality.

¹Federalist, 1, p. 3.

A moral community, unlike a hive of bees or a hill of ants, is one whose members are expected freely to obey the laws and, unlike those in a tyranny, are trusted to obey the laws. If people are not saddened when someone else suffers, or angry when someone suffers unjustly, the implication is that they do not care for anyone other than themselves or that they lack some quality that befits a human. When we criticize them for this, we acknowledge that they ought to care for others. If people are not angry when a person suffers an injustice, the implication is that their moral faculties have been corrupted, that they are not good citizens. Respect for the law and the principles which it implements must remind us of the moral order by which alone we can live as human beings.

The Founders were aware of the dangers to democracy: concentrations of power, weaknesses of human nature, corrupting influences of power, and tendencies toward dissension. However, the premise of the American regime was based on the human capacity for self-restraint, cooperation, reflection, and reason. The regime embodies a profound principle of political action--an "energizing" principle. It is supposed to operate at all times and under all conditions against oligarchy, special privilege, and arbitrary power. The energizing principle is the preservation and perfecting of self-government, the securing to each citizen of an equal voice in his/her own government. This grand object must be constantly striven for. Even if we can never perfectly achieve it, we must constantly try to

approximate it. This is a truly burdensome principle to live by. It is easier to be servile than free, easier to submit to the rule of the few than to keep up the endless struggle for self-rule. It is easier to fight enemies abroad than to fight for the republican principle at home.

The ties of a common nationality do not bind Americans together and never will. The Founders recognized that diversity was a fact of American life. And they recognized that unity could be achieved in the midst of diversity through the right ordering of power and interests. Both order and diversity are intrinsic parts of the human condition; one without the other would result in a less-than-human existence. Order without diversity would result in mindless uniformity. Diversity without order would result in brutish chaos. There are inherent tensions between the individual and the community, and between philosophic freedom (of thought) and political freedom (of action).² The American regime has sought to reconcile these tensions as well as striking a balance between the requirements of both leadership and democracy: people seek liberty and happiness but government needs energy and stability in order to secure these ends; power resides in the people, but people require leaders to direct this power; leaders require power equal to their responsibilities but power tends to corrupt powerholders; leaders must represent the people but unin-

²Arendt, Life of the Mind: Willing, pp. 199-201.

formed public opinion does not lead to sound political decisions. Recognizing that the causes of human conflict (liberty to decide and difference of opinion) cannot be removed, the Founders sought to focus the conflict in such a way as to counter power with power, and at the same time secure public order and the common interest. The danger to the American regime did not arise from the number of people exercising power, but from power's expansive nature. A majority as well as a minority could use power in a tyrannical way.³

On the other hand, power, understood as energy and vigor in government, is "essential to the security of liberty."⁴ Government power cannot be limited to such an extent that it is incapable of ensuring public order, preserving the peace, and defending itself from internal and external attacks. A government must have enough power to meet its responsibilities to its citizens: "the means ought to be proportioned to the ends: the persons, from whose agency the attainment of any end is expected, ought to possess the means by which it is to be attained."⁵ Efficiency was not the sole guiding princi-

³Federalist, 15, pp. 92-93.

⁴Ibid., 1, p. 5.

⁵Ibid., 23, p. 142.

ple of the regime.⁶ The goal was to limit power and yet have sufficient power to govern without betraying the principles of liberty, justice, equality, and the pursuit of happiness.⁷

Authority, tradition and religion provide a dimension of depth to human existence which spans generations. Together they provide a common world for people by lending a sense of durability and reliability to human affairs. The fast pace of life, the impact of technological advancement, and the difficulties of relating present life to the past have led to a decline of authority, tradition, and religion in post-industrial America. It seems as if people must begin anew to confront the fundamental problems of human living-together.⁸ Perhaps the American fondness for the Constitution provides a fragile common sense of stability to their political life.

In the American regime, power has been allocated to distinct branches of government based on specified functions rather than on social class. This, along with representation and federalism made it difficult for any one group of people to seize total power.

⁶"Efficiency is a modern way of overstressing means and neglecting ends." Selznick, Leadership in Administration, p. 135.

⁷The threat to these principles comes from three different configurations of rule: the representatives as rulers can oppress the people, the people can oppress the representatives, or the people by pressuring its representatives will rule foolishly. Martin Diamond, "The Federalist," in History of Political Philosophy, 2nd edition. Eds. Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972), p. 641.

⁸Hannah Arendt, Between Past and Future (New York: Viking Press, 1961), pp. 91-141.

The ambitions of political leaders were to be countered by the ambitions of each other and by the ambitions of the mass. In this way, each holder of power would jealously guard his/her power from encroachment by another. Each would be on the lookout for another trying to increase his/her power. This heightened vigilance would be driven by self-interest but could lead to a sense of responsibility geared toward the public interest.

The regime principles of rational and responsible government by the people, civil liberty, equality before the law, and the pursuit of happiness are ideals which must be translated into a vernacular idiom and a practical application. If this can be done, regime principles form a standard that can be used to guide the citizen as well as the leader in confronting the tension between principles themselves and between self-interest and the public interest.⁹ Notions of equality and liberty are not cut and dried issues. The practical limits to these ideals have been debated and probed in a wide range of recent controversies: civil rights of racial, ethnic, age, and gender groups; government obligations to provide care for the poor, the disabled, the disadvantaged, and the young; the proper balance among economic demands, technological developments, and environmental concerns.

⁹Storing, "Crucial Link," p. 45.

Democractic leaders are considered to be political authorities on regime principles. Their authority is usually expressed through a verbal demonstration of their grasp of the country's most pressing problems and proposed solutions which are couched in idealistic terms of responsibility, liberty, justice, and equality. Citizens are expected to be able to distinguish between honest and misleading public utterances. Wilson thought that debates over basic principles by strong party leaders would be able to instruct and elevate public opinion. The clarification of positions would both present a clear choice to the citizens and promote an understanding of the common good. Citizens would be encouraged to participate in politics due to their interest in the outcome of the debates. Responsibility could be nurtured by subjecting the actions, opinions and decisions of political leaders to public scrutiny.¹⁰ However, demagoguery has always been the bane of democracies. Constant appeals to popular feelings promote strife and destroy the civil bonds needed for public order and rational rule.

Unkept promises made by leaders have lead to a widespread public distrust of political rhetoric. The prevalence of ambiguity

¹⁰ Woodrow Wilson, Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1885). See also, Woodrow Wilson, The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous Energies of a People (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1913). For a concise essay on Wilsonian thought, see Harry Clor, "Woodrow Wilson," in American Political Thought, eds. Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens (Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1976), pp. 191-218.

and of misinformation in political statements have led to both citizens trying to guess where leaders stand on an issue and citizens projecting their own attitudes onto the leaders.¹¹ This dilutes a leader's ability to foster a shared understanding of regime principles.

A common view of the world is a unifying element which enables people to act together. Through observation, it appears that only a small portion of people are overwhelmingly compelled by reason or quest for philosophical truth. The freedoms of thought, speech and religion seem to reject the existence of a transcendent or absolute truth-for-humanity. Rational truth and factual truth, however, do inform political and philosophical opinion. The constant vagueness or lying by political leaders in their attempt to change the world (through the denial of factual truth) destroys the means by which people take their bearings in the world. Deception does not aid the establishment of order but perpetuates insecurity, instability and impermanence.¹² The freedom of information and the importance of truth in a democracy is crucial. Only when people are informed can they make informed decisions. In the past twenty years, two

¹¹ Political leaders' vagueness on issues and its effects are documented in Benjamin I. Page, Choices and Echoes in Presidential Elections: Rational Man and Electoral Democracy (Chicago: University Press, 1978), pp. 152-191.

¹² Hannah Arendt, "Reflections: Truth and Politics," New Yorker 43 (25 February 1967): 49-88. See also Hannah Arendt, "Understanding and Politics," Partisan Review 20 (July-August 1953): 377-392. Arendt, Between Past and Future, p. 132.

presidents have contributed to a profound sense of betrayal of the regime's basic principles. President Johnson promised a war against poverty and no wider war in Asia. Despite his good intentions, he launched a massive war in Asia and left the poor as poor as ever. Many people resented this apparent breach of faith and he was peacefully driven from power. Six years later, President Nixon discovered the people resented his attempt to place himself above the law. He, too, was peacefully driven from power. These tested American principles.

Principles do not apply to the government alone. The President must "give leadership to the development of moral, social and economic forces outside of government which makes for the betterment of our country."¹³ This underscores the essential principle of democracy: no one person or small group alone is able to find solutions to human problems. Citizens in a democratic regime must be able to relate regime principles to particular situations. Americans have done so by refusing to let two successive Presidents abuse power and betray their trust. In doing so, the people demonstrated that Presidential despotism alone does not keep the United States intact. The

¹³Herbert Hoover, "Address to Gridiron Club, Washington, D.C., 14 December 1929," in The Conservative Tradition in American Thought, ed. Jay A. Sigler (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), p. 315.

American people had participated in public affairs. Despite the presidents' pleas to rally around the flag and the oval office, the people demonstrated that the powerful did not have the exclusive right to define duties to the regime. The American people had exercised a keen vigilance over their leaders by refusing to submit to corrupt power and to blind faith in their leaders.

Regime principles must become a way of life for all members in a democracy. Democratic leaders must be able to "make use of unforeseen minor events to pursue major goals that are kept clearly in view. . . to promote changes as well as to become aware of changes that have gone unrecognized."¹⁴ Moreover, a democratic leader's behavior as well as his words set standards by which his/her followers can measure their own behavior and utterances. It was not that Americans denied that President Johnson had the right to conduct foreign affairs. Rather the people were asserting their right to be informed of the truth; they were tired of the treachery, the duplicity, and the escalation of fighting connected with the Vietnam War. Furthermore, the legislature was asserting its authority to declare war. With Nixon, too, his claim to executive privilege was never outright declared null and void. Rather his claim was held up against the claims of the people's right to know and the claims of the judiciary

¹⁴Dankwart A. Rustow, ed. Philosophers and Kings: Studies in Leadership (New York: George Braziller, 1970), pp. 25-26.

to determine if a crime had been committed. Above all, leaders must be practical, remembering that "standards are a matter of observation and common sense, the absolute is only a metaphysical conceit."¹⁵

President's Wilson devotion to world peace through the League of Nations blinded him to the practical political realities of his time.

Lincoln was a leader who never lost sight of the principles guiding the American regime and who was able to strike a responsive chord in the American people. For him, the continuance of government based on the essential equality of human beings was the primary principle of the United States that was threatened from within by a faction. Lincoln was terribly cognizant that the moral indifference prevalent during that time was capable of subverting the fundamental underpinnings of the American regime:

Public opinion on any subject always has a 'central idea' from which all its minor thoughts radiate. The 'central idea' in our public opinion at the beginning was, and till recently has continued to be, 'the equality of man;' and, although it has always submitted patiently to whatever inequality seemed to be the matter of actual necessity, its constant working has been a steady and progressive effort towards the practical equality of all men.¹⁶

¹⁵Babbitt, Democracy and Leadership, p. 306.

¹⁶Abraham Lincoln, as quoted in Abraham Lincoln, Lord Charnwood (New York: Garden City Publishing, 1917), p. 131.

At the time, the country was in an emotional and moral turmoil. The political notion of equality was merged with the economic questions of slavery and agriculture, with the moral questions of respect and duty to fellow humans, and with political questions of liberty concerning states' rights, secession, and self-determination. Emotional commitments, religious beliefs, and political platforms were joined in various and sundry ways to confront the issue. Throughout this period, Lincoln identified himself with the principles of equality and union, and was able to arouse a heightened awareness of these principles in others:

'A house divided against itself cannot stand.' I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free, I do not expect the Union to be dissolved--I do not expect the house to fall--but I do expect that it will cease to be divided.¹⁷

Lincoln's identification with these great principles was so strong that he preferred to lose political office rather than remain silent or compromise his principles for his own benefit:

The time has come when these sentiments should be uttered; and if it is decreed that I go down because of this speech, then let me go down linked to the truth--let me die in the advocacy of what is just and right.¹⁸

Lincoln forced competing politicians to take a stand and gave the people a clear choice. His political ambition was combined with a sense of duty to do what was necessary to preserve these principles and when every conceivable compromise consistent with them had failed, when all

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 146.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 147-148.

attempts to reconcile the differences of opinion came to naught, Lincoln led a country to war to do so.¹⁹

An ideal democratic regime would be constructed to safeguard deliberate rule under the law, utilizing the virtues and talents of all its citizens and avoiding concentrations of power which allow arbitrary rule. A caution is in order: a mechanical system of separation of powers or a paper declaration of the law is not enough to guarantee democratic principles. All participants must agree to abide by the limits on power and on the definitions of regime principles. In the event someone strays from the limits on power or from the regime principles, the citizens must enforce them. Respect for the rule of law and a sense of self-restraint are also necessary for a democratic regime to work:

All the checks ever created, all the balances ever devised could not restrain the ambition that lay in the hearts of talented citizens. . . . The effective government relies not on written rules only, but on an unwritten ethic, the shared expectations that make government necessary, the conventions that make it acceptable, the agreements that make it work.²⁰

¹⁹Considering the Lincoln-Douglas debates, Jaffa addresses the relationship among past political events, the formulation of contemporary issues, the application of principles to politics, and the role of political ambition. Harry N. Jaffa, "Abraham Lincoln," in American Political Thought, eds. Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens (Duke University Press, 1976), pp. 125-143. See K. C. Wheare, "Lincoln's Devotion to the Union, Intense and Supreme," in The Leadership of Abraham Lincoln, ed. Don E. Fehrenbacher (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970), pp. 182-189.

²⁰Michael Lienesch, "The Constitutional Tradition: History, Political Action, and Progress in American Political Thought 1787-1793," Journal of Politics 42 (February 1980): 2-30.

The tension between leadership and democracy is evident when considering the application of regime principles to political realities. The principle of equality before the law applies to leader and citizen. If political leaders have the ability to decide public policy, they also have the responsibility to decide in the public's interest. If secrecy and speed is essential to the good conduct of foreign affairs, the leaders will be able to exercise them. If, however, speed and secrecy are used to dupe the public in order to advance a leader's own ambitions, then the balance is skewed and must be set aright. If political leaders wish to direct their followers toward a particular goal, the leaders should be able to present all the information available and to use all their skills to influence the public. However, the public should not be subjected to misinformation or lies or to manipulation of statistics. Leaders must unify the people around regime principles, but this does not mean that the people must conform to a particular leader's interpretation of the principles. Leaders must be responsible to the people, but this does not entail a blind obeisance to popular whim. Above all, democratic principles insist that power be shared, that the extremes of anarchy and tyranny be avoided, and that both leaders and followers work together.

Regime Organization

The Founders believed that a concentration of power promotes its arbitrary expansion and exercise, and that tyranny was "the accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective."²¹ The architects of the American regime believed in the rule of the people and the administration of justice. They were practical people, not philosophic fanatics. The dismal state of affairs under the Articles of Confederation had shown the need for vigorous leadership. So they attempted to mix leadership and democracy:

In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself.²²

The Founders drew the broad outlines of a regime organized upon a division and blending of powers. The threefold division of power in the Constitution assumes that for a stable representative democracy to operate under the rule of law, law-making, law-enforcement, and law-interpretation should be generally handled by different people.²³

²¹Federalist, 47, p. 313.

²²Ibid., 51, p. 337.

²³M. J. C. Vile, Constitutionalism and the Separation of Powers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 13-18.

However,

Experience has instructed us that no skill in the science of government has yet been able to discriminate and define, with sufficient certainty, its three great provinces--the legislature, executive, and judiciary; or even privileges and powers of the different legislative branches. Questions daily occur in the course of practice, which prove the obscurity which reigns in these subjects, and which puzzles the greatest adepts in political science.²⁴

The fact that the Founders could only draw the broad outlines of the separate government branches was not based solely on the understanding that human activities do not fit neatly into abstract categories. It was also based on the very practical realization that if power were granted exclusively to different branches, the three independent power centers might tear the country apart in the struggle for supreme power. The division of power on the basis of function rather than on class may have recognized the essential equality of people and may have diluted the animosity and conflict between classes.²⁵ The overlapping areas of power at times fostered interdependence and cohesion among the branches of government. But it was in these overlapping areas of power where the tension between leadership and democracy is most evident. A consideration of each branch will demonstrate how the regime principles incorporated into the regime organization sought a balance

²⁴ Federalist, 37, p. 229.

²⁵ Diamond sees the class struggle deliberately supplanted by the encouragement of a struggle of interests by the advocates of the division of power under the Constitution. Martin Diamond, "Democracy and The Federalist: A Reconsideration of the Framers' Intent," American Political Science Review LIII (March 1959): 52-68. See also, Diamond, "The Federalist," pp. 646-647.

between leadership and democracy.

The judicial branch was felt to be the least dangerous threat to liberty because it "has no influence over either the sword or the purse; no direction either of the strength of or wealth of society; and can take no active resolution whatever."²⁶ The judicial branch cannot originate legislation nor enforce its decisions nor undertake administrative duties. Its special function is to review and interpret law to ensure compliance with the Constitution. Because the Constitution provides the broad outline of the regime organization, it is open to interpretation; it is therefore both fixed and flexible. Judicial decisions invariably mix law and policy when applying old law to a new situation. Ideally, the judiciary would secure justice for all, protect the equality of all persons under the law, and foster the rule of law. An independent judiciary would be able to influence the character of the regime by encouraging the legislative and executive branches to qualify their actions in anticipation of judicial scrutiny. This aids the development of a sense of self-restraint that is crucial to responsible rule. Permanent tenure (based on good behavior) helps judges to resist the influences of the other branches and gives them an incentive to resist corruption.

²⁶ Federalist, 78, p. 504.

The other branches play a role in the initial appointment of a judge but they do not have the power to continue the appointment or dismiss a judge solely for political expediency. Due to the public scrutiny of judges prior to their appointment, there are strong incentives for the other branches to nominate and confirm persons of merit. No one desires to appear foolish or to be embarrassed or to be associated with corruption. Once appointed, a judge has a personal stake in the non-acceptance of bribes and in remaining impervious to political influences. If impeached for misconduct, a judge would not only lose his/her livelihood, but also respect. At the same time, the arrangement allowed the other branches enough overlapping power to feel that they had a stake in the continued operation of the judicial branch. The scheme aided the pursuit of justice by allowing the judiciary relatively free reign to deliberate on the merits of each case and to fulfill its duty "to declare all acts contrary to the manifest tenor of the Constitution void."²⁷

Judicial leadership has been extended to the defense of basic public values and principles as well as the protection of minority interests. Judicial activism has perhaps filled a vacuum: the judiciary has made itself the people's champion in the absence of action by either the federal or state governments. The assertion of

²⁷Ibid., 78, p. 505.

judicial leadership has had an impact on other forms of leadership. The Supreme Court, with Congress following their lead, has tended to expand and define basic freedoms under the Constitution.²⁸ For example, the Court's decision that the "separate but equal" practice was unconstitutional was based upon an interpretation of the principle of equality protected by the Constitution. In the absence of the Court ruling, nothing had stood in the way of either executive or legislative initiative. However, once the decision had been made by the Court, the executive branch supported it by sending troops, by setting up programs to administer programs, and by monitoring state compliance.

Although the judicial branch is aware of popular opinion and political pressures, the particular way it fits into the overall regime organization removes it somewhat from the wrath of public passion and allows reflective deliberation to take place. Its apparent dedication to justice has enhanced its image among the people and has contributed to a feeling of reverence for the law. People will usually argue about

²⁸Not everyone is happy with this development: "By creating rights, the courts set themselves up as rivals with the president in national agenda setting. Moreover, the particular charm of rights creation is that it can ignore the relational aspects of politics and treat each right as totally independent. As a result, the ability to create rights encourages the single-issue politics that are so troublesome to presidents who are necessarily concerned with coalition building. The Supreme Court can and does promote single-issue movements, leaving the president to deal with them."

Martin M. Shapiro, "The Presidency and the Federal Courts," in Politics and the Oval Office: Towards Presidential Governance, ed. Arnold J. Meltsner (San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1981), p. 147.

the morality of a judicial decision (for example, the ruling on abortion) but rarely about the Court's right to decide. Attempts to limit the types of cases heard by the Court or the remedies prescribed have generally been unsuccessful. Currently, Congress is considering a measure that would modify or curtail a remedy prescribed by the Court (busing to end desegregation of schools).²⁹ The Court might then have to decide if the legislature is granted the power to overrule the Court. When faced with challenges by the executive in the areas of executive privilege or need for secrecy, the judiciary has been careful to balance all aspects of the situations. In the case of the publication of a collection of papers called the Pentagon Papers, the court ruled that while the executive branch retained the right to withhold information in order to protect national security, the public had a right to information bearing on the public interest. The Court ruled in favor of the public because the executive could not prove in this instance an overriding need for secrecy. Again in the instance of the Nixon claim to executive privilege, the Court ruled that while the President had this right, it has a qualified one, and that, in the interests of justice, the tapes were to be released in order to establish the guilt or innocence of various people.

The executive branch was designed to have more power than the judiciary for it "not only dispenses the honors, but holds the sword

²⁹Newsweek 94 (19 April 1982): 67.

of the community."³⁰ The Founders strongly believed that

Energy in the executive is a leading character in the definition of good government. It is essential to the protection of the community against foreign attacks; it is not less essential to the steady administration of the laws; to the protection of property . . .; to the security of liberty against the enterprises and assaults of ambition, of faction, and of anarchy.³¹

Under Article II of the Constitution, executive power is vested in the President. This strong endorsement of leadership was designed to fix responsibility and to lead to good administration. Over the years, three different interpretations of presidential executive powers have emerged. The first believes that the president has only those powers enumerated in the Constitution and those which can be implied from the former. The second view holds that the president is empowered to do anything that is not expressly forbidden by the Constitution or law. The third interpretation goes beyond this by granting the president the power to do whatever he deems necessary for the common good regardless of law or the Constitution. Traditionally, the first view has been applied to domestic affairs, the second to foreign affairs, and the third to cases of national emergency.³² The president is charged with

³⁰Federalist, 78, p. 504.

³¹Ibid., 70, p. 454.

³²Ibid., 71, p. 463.

³³Mason and Beany, American Constitutional Law, pp. 67-102
For a decision regarding inherent power in domestic affairs see
Alan F. Westin, The Anatomy of a Constitutional Law Case (New York:
Macmillan Publishing, 1958).

the execution of laws, the conduct of war, the appointment of some government officials, the making of treaties, and pardoning.

The president must not only implement laws passed by Congress but also remedies decreed by Federal courts and statutes set by regulatory agencies. Through the administration of the government, the president is able to influence the application of public policies. As the Commander-in-Chief, the president is empowered to conduct war but Congress declares war. Some presidents have circumvented Congress by committing troops first and only sometimes seeking Congressional approval after the fact.³⁴ Congress has usually been willing to defer to the president as long as he deployed troops to protect or rescue Americans or American interests. The debates concerning the escalation of the conflict in Indochina and Vietnam led to the enactment of the War Powers Resolution and the reassertion of legislative leadership. While recognizing that circumstances may demand swift and decisive action by the president, Congress has reserved the right to determine if a full-scale war is warranted. By allowing the president to deploy troops immediately and yet requiring him to report to Congress within a specified time, there will be a public deliberation upon an issue

³⁴Many presidents acted without prior Congressional approval. Lincoln felt he had exclusive powers to maintain the Union against internal attacks. McKinley deployed troops to China during the Boxer rebellion to protect American lives, business interests, and political interests. Theodore Roosevelt and Taft moved troops to Latin America to complement their foreign policies. Franklin Roosevelt deployed equipment and troops. Truman sent troops to Korea. Carter sent troops to Iran. Thomas F. Eagleton, War and Presidential Power (New York: Liveright, 1974).

of importance to the people without hampering the executive to take whatever action he deems necessary to protect the people. In this way the requirement of leadership for speed is balanced by the requirement of democracy for deliberation.

The president is able to make appointments however his first selections may not always be approved. The power of pardon, though, is an absolute power. Ford exercised this power in pardoning Nixon. Although many people decried that fact that Nixon was pardoned before he was ever convicted of any wrongdoing, no one denied Ford's power to do so. Generally, the president has been able to conduct foreign policy with relatively few fetters. In the place of treaties which require Congressional approval, presidents have resorted to executive agreements. The judiciary has cooperated in this endeavor by ruling that executive agreements have the force of law. However, the predominance of the president in foreign affairs is qualified insofar as it rests upon several things: the president's ability to persuade Congress and the public of the wisdom of his policies; the reliance of the president's unilateral authority as commander-in-chief; and the assertion of presidential prerogative while limiting Congressional hostility by the skillful granting of concessions.³⁵

³⁵John M. Lewis, "The President and Congress: Foreign Policy," in Dimensions of the Modern Presidency, ed. Edward N. Kearney (Saint Louis: Forum Press, 1981), pp. 177-194.

The legislature has qualified the executive by having and exercising the powers to make laws, to declare war, to approve appointments and treaties, and to impeach in cases of misconduct. The judiciary has been able to influence the executive in questions which fell under the purview of constitutional rights and powers.

The president was granted the power of the veto in order to protect himself against legislative encroachment and to help ensure good legislation. This gave the executive limited, but not arbitrary, influence in law-making. The legislature, as the voice of the people, has the final say. The president sets the public agenda by proposing legislation and budgets to Congress. The proposals and budgets may be amended by Congress before passage, but by taking the initiative, the President is able to play a significant leadership role in law-making. Furthermore, through the power and prestige connected with his position, the president is able to put forth his proposals to the people with greater ease.

The blending of powers in these areas have encouraged a sense of cooperation, promoted patience and caution, and led to responsible rule. The sharing of powers has also highlighted the delicate balance between the requirements of leadership and democracy in the American regime. The particular way the president fits into the regime organization permits him flexibility, the opportunity to make decisions, the means to take speedy action, and ways to influence public policy. He is held publically accountable for his actions, his decisions may be

overruled by Congress or the Supreme Court, and his proposals and policies may be modified when subjected to public scrutiny and legislative action.

The legislative branch was considered to be the most powerful of the three branches due to its closeness to the people.³⁶ At its best, the legislative branch was designed

to refine and enlarge the public views, by passing them through the medium of a chosen body of citizens, whose wisdom may best discern the true interest of their country, and whose patriotism and love of justice will be least likely to sacrifice it to temporary or partial considerations. Under such a regulation, it may well happen that the public voice, pronounced by the representatives of the people, will be more consonant to the public good than if pronounced by the people themselves, convened for the purpose.³⁷

At its worst, the legislature would be the mere reflection of fleeting public passions. The specter of Congress bending to every change of popular opinion is not to be dismissed lightly. The growth of communications technology may make it possible in the next few decades for every citizen to have access to a computer terminal whereby they could indicate policy preferences. The legislative branch is more prone to a concentration and abuse of power:

³⁶Long debates at this time usually preceded the adoption of any government policy change. The small number of government programs aided legislative surveillance of the executive's administration. The experiences of the Revolutionary era and the example of the British parliamentary government put a premium on legislative leadership.

³⁷Federalist, 10, p. 59.

Its constitutional powers being at once more extensive, and less susceptible of precise limits, it can, with the greater facility, mask, under complicated and indirect measures, and encroachments which it makes on the coordinate departments. . . . The legislative department alone has access to the pockets of the people.³⁸

The remedy for the potential danger the legislature may pose is found through an internal division of powers between the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Frequent elections, "duty, gratitude, interest, ambition" were thought to bind the members of the House very closely to the people.³⁹ The more numerous House would be more easily swayed by popular opinion and subject to passionate and emotional decisions.⁴⁰ These tendencies were to be countered through the influence and required concurrence of the Senate. The members of the Senate, by their longer terms in office, limited numbers, and differences in age were thought to provide a stabilizing force that would lessen corruption, elevate representation, and encourage a cool and responsible deliberation of proposed laws.⁴¹ Senate leaders could be more independent, more inclined to take a longer view of things, and be able to lead a larger number of people. The split legislature promotes both cooperation and friction and creates a delay in passing legislation that is conducive to good government.⁴²

³⁸Ibid., 48, p. 323.

³⁹Ibid., 57, p. 373.

⁴⁰Ibid., 55, p. 361.

⁴¹Ibid., 62 and 63.

⁴²Diamond, "The Federalist," p. 645.

The American regime took account of both centrifugal and centripetal forces in human society. The Federal government brought representatives from the people together in order to work on broad issues with a national impact. The individual states brought representatives together to consider issues that had a more local impact. This layering of power and responsibility created many opportunities for democratic leadership and also stimulated citizen participation by creating different forums.

The organization of the American regime sought to make government serve the interests of liberty. But the liberty that the Founders had in mind was a civilized form of freedom, a civil liberty recognized and protected by society. The dividing lines set forth in the Constitution did not guarantee that each holder of power would not encroach on the other's preserve. The safety of liberty and justice did not rest in constant appeals to the people for several reasons: emotions would be inflamed, the legislature (by its closeness to the people) would become stronger and more influential, and the turmoil effected by frequent appeals would threaten the stability necessary for civil liberty. The best hope for securing regime principles was to be found in a regime that fostered rational deliberation by leaders held accountable to the people.⁴³

⁴³"But it is the reason, alone, of the public that ought to control and regulate the government. The passions ought to be controlled and regulated by the government." Federalist, 49, p. 331.

The Founders turned to democratic leaders, the people's representatives, as the most practical means of maintaining the regime and its principles. This was not a blind trust in the inherent goodness or sanctity of political leaders but an acknowledgment that the interplay of personal interest and ambition with the public good and regime stability is possible and should be encouraged:

This policy of supplying, by opposite and rival interests, the defect of better motives, might be traced through the whole system of human affairs, private as well as public. We see it particularly displayed in all the subordinate distributions of power, where the constant aim is to divide and arrange the several offices in such a manner as that each may be a check on the other --that the private interests of every individual may be a sentinel over public rights.⁴⁴

Institutional checks and balances working in concert with human nature were believed to be capable of securing regime principles. The American regime organization emphasized the good that people are capable of: "For if men's overt conduct is consistent with virtue: as a result of institutions, then these institutions lead men toward virtue, however indirectly."⁴⁵

The requirements of leadership and democracy are balanced in the regime organization. Diversity is preserved and its anarchic tendencies are controlled through the three-fold division of power in the national government and the manifold division of power among

⁴⁴Ibid., 51, p. 337.

⁴⁵Paul Eidelberg, A Discourse of Statesmanship: The Design and Transformation of the American Polity (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1974), p. 252.

the national, state, and local governments. Union rests on the shared beliefs and feelings that the regime will preserve regime principles of liberty, equality, justice, and the pursuit of happiness. Democracy appears in the House of Representatives and in the Senate through the emphasis on public debate, deliberation, discussion, and consent. Leadership predominates in the president as he gives national direction and purpose to the country through the conduct of foreign affairs and the proposal of legislation. The judiciary keeps public policies and laws consistent with the Constitution. The ultimate success of this arrangement depends upon "the character of men and the ends toward which they are dedicated."⁴⁶

Democratic Leaders

The regime's configuration sought to make representative democracy a viable political system by enhancing the selection of the best leaders possible, by helping the leaders to be responsive to the needs of the people, and by holding the leaders responsible to the people. By dividing power among the branches and levels of government, each branch or level could specialize in a particular government function. This made each different branch and level have a particular character and to require leaders to meet particular "job specifications, qualities which are necessary to the performance of the functions

⁴⁶ Ibid., pp. 227-228.

and which approximate wisdom and virtue. It is politically easier and more effective to ask the people to select the right man for the specific job."⁴⁷

Glory, honor, reputation, and a chance not only to help make history but also to be remembered by posterity encouraged leaders to seek government positions. Ambition and the desire for greatness prompted people to become leaders.⁴⁸ The regime configuration did not deny the reality or strength of these motives in politics:

Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.⁴⁹

By recognizing human beings for what they were (rather than forcing them into an idealistic model), the Founders tried to create "a regime in which the art of government is made commensurate with the capacity of men when their passions and interests are rightly arranged."⁵⁰

⁴⁷Diamond, "The Federalist," p. 645.

⁴⁸An aspiring leader, like de Gaulle, might "put himself at the service of a great cause that would give him the opportunity to be great by doing great things." Stanley Hoffman and Inge Hoffman, "The Will to Grandeur: de Gaulle as Political Artist," in Philosophers and Kings, ed. Dankwart A. Rustow (New York: George Braziller, 1970), p. 254.

⁴⁹Federalist, 51, p. 337. Political vanity and the search for vainglory affect political leaders. Paul L. Rosen, "Science, Power, and the Degradation of American Political Science," Polity 9 (September 1977): 463-480.

⁵⁰Diamond, "The Federalist," p. 650.

Another effect of the regime's configuration on political leaders was the pattern of behavior it encouraged. By placing a premium on both a variety of views and a need for consensus, leaders arose who were skilled in the art of persuasion and who practiced self-restraint in some areas in order to gain ground in others. All aspects of an issue were considered and the decisions reached were not skewed toward any extreme faction but usually represented the solution which was politically feasible.⁵¹ By tying leader's political fortunes to public policies, the private interests of the leaders were married to the public interest. The Founders understood that

Ambition was a neutral passion in itself. Checked by principle or by institutions governing the exercise of power it was not necessarily harmful, and if tempered by a concern for the common welfare it could be harnessed to produce a public good; unchecked and untempered, it could lead to the blackest villainy.⁵²

There was no guarantee that democratic leaders would always be wise or that they would always make decisions in the public interest. However, the regime was constructed in such a way that it could tolerate both wise and foolish leaders without lasting harm to the polity.

⁵¹This behavior was demonstrated by the people who wrote the Constitution, who

"made history and did it within the limits of consensus. . . . They were practical politicians in a democratic society, and no matter what their private dreams might be, they had to take home an acceptable package and defend it--and their own political future --against predictable attack."

John P. Roche, "The Founding Fathers: A Reform Caucus in Action," American Political Science Review LV (December 1961): 799-816.

⁵²Forrest McDonald, "A Comment," Journal of Politics 42 (February 1980): 31-35.

It appears the people who make the best democratic leaders have objectivity, intellectual discipline, persuasive talents, the willingness to serve, a deep sense of public responsibility, an awareness of the limits on their authority and power, and an understanding of current political, economic, and social issues.⁵³ By subjecting the leaders' actions and decisions to public scrutiny, the regime may also stimulate people who do not possess all the attributes of an ideal leader, to consciously reflect and seek advice prior to deciding or acting. This also is conducive to moral leadership.

Principles are what separate a statesmen from a politician, or so a bit of folk wisdom asserts. Putting democratic principles into practice is not easy. The perennial problem for democratic leaders is "to learn how to reconcile idealism with expediency, freedom with organization."⁵⁴ Statesmen, as opposed to politicians, ideally possess prudence, "the special capacity to grasp the connection between theory and practice and to fashion one's practises accordingly."⁵⁵ However, prudence, by its very nature, requires thoughtfulness and a propensity for contemplation, attributes not usually associated with American cul-

⁵³ Charles A. Nelson, Developing Responsible Public Leaders: A Report on Interviews and Correspondence with 52 Leading Americans (Dobbs Ferry: Oceana Publications, 1963), pp. 46-58.

⁵⁴ Selznick, Leadership in Administration, p. 1.

⁵⁵ Frisch and Stevens, American Political Thought, p. 3.

ture. Traditionally Americans have been a pragmatic people. The dearth of American political philosophy has hurt:

If to think like men of action means to be disposed to find practical, timely and acceptable ways to get things done, then the best of American leadership . . . possesses this quality conspicuously. If to act like men of thought means to govern one's day-to-day decisions by a clear perception of the ends, then this disposition is not so manifest in American leadership.⁵⁶

The Founders of the American regime hoped that all Americans were dedicated to democratic principles: "every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We are all republicans; we are all federalists."⁵⁷ However, democratic leaders are continually confronted with conflicts over definitions of principles, over differences regarding means, and over differences of priorities. At the same time, leaders are expected to direct the conflict in such a way so that it does not harm democratic principles.⁵⁸ On the national level, there is a very real danger that "the personal and political perceptions of the President become inexorably identified with the national interest and honor."⁵⁹ The debacle of Watergate demonstrated both the danger and

⁵⁶Nelson, Public Leaders, p. 110.

⁵⁷Jefferson, "First Inaugural Address," p. 103.

⁵⁸Conflict may have positive functions: values can be formed, priorities set, group coherence strengthened, and both internal and external challenges met and resolved. Lewis A. Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict (Glencoe: Free Press, 1956).

⁵⁹Kenneth McNaught, "The Carter Factor: 'Moral' Prescriptions for Political Problems," Toronto Star as cited in World Press Review 27 (July 1980): 39.

the tragedy which ensues when a President seeks to justify his misdeeds and abuses of power by cloaking them in the aura of "national security." By claiming the absolute and exclusive power to determine what constituted national security, Nixon denied the democratic principle of shared power and public participation in political affairs.

Lincoln was faced with factions so strong that the very life and character of the American regime was threatened.⁶⁰ Conflicting economic and social interests as well as clashing personalities within his group of advisors added to the chaotic situation. However, Lincoln was able to divert the conflict either towards the goals of union and equality, or to where the conflict would do the least harm to these long term goals. Lincoln gave in to political necessity, but he never let it sway him from the pursuit of his primary goals and principles.⁶¹

The ever present danger is that the means of conflict and conflict control could be transferred into primary goals themselves and sought for their own sake. Within bureaucracies, especially,

⁶⁰Yet Lincoln focused on what he perceived to be the underlying problem of the clash between the professed values of freedom, union, and equality, and the social reality of slavery, separation, and inequality. Frank Otto Gatell and Paul Goodman, Democracy and Union: The United States, 1815-1877 (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1972), p. 93.

⁶¹For an account of how Lincoln channeled conflict, see William B. Hesseltine, "Building a National Party," in The Leadership of Abraham Lincoln, ed. Don E. Fehrenbacher (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970).

rules established as means to ends tend to become ends unto themselves. Personal power and prestige loom more important than the collective goals of the regime. A leader him/herself must be able to distinguish and help others to distinguish acts that are related to personal security and prerogative from acts that are essential to the maintenance of regime principles and the furtherance of the common good.⁶² Conflict which is improperly channeled can arouse expectations that cannot be satisfied and ultimately destroy that toward which the leader is striving. Transforming leadership may lapse into transactional leadership where "relationships are dominated by quick calculations of costs-benefits."⁶³ Lincoln was terribly cognizant of the short-comings of the American regime in dealing with strong factional conflicts. He raised the question of

⁶²Plato provides a description and consequences of timocratic behavior which confuses means with ends in The Republic, Bk. VII, pp. 364-366. See also Robert K. Merton, Alisa Gray, Barbara Hockery, and Hanon G. Bennis, Reader in Bureaucracy (Glencoe: Free Press, 1952). See Warren G. Bennis, "Leadership Theory and Administrative Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly 4 (December 1959): 259-301. Selznick, Leadership in Administration, p. 153.

⁶³Burns, Leadership, p. 258. The cost-benefit analysis is a growing trend in western post-industrial societies in which the government looks for and promises quick and true solutions to contemporary problems. This approach does not admit that many problems may be inherent in the human condition, that some problems can only be partially solved over a long period of time, and that morality, ethics, and justice resist quantification. Suzanne Berger, Peter Gourevich, Patrice Higonnet, and Karl Kaiser, "The Problem of Reform in France: The Political Ideas of Local Elites," Political Science Quarterly 84 (September 1969): 446-447.

whether a constitutional republic, or democracy--a government of the people--can or cannot maintain its territorial integrity against its own domestic foes. . . . Must a government of necessity be too strong for the liberties of its own people, or too weak to maintain its own existence.⁶⁴

It seems that the American regime, when threatened, shifts toward leadership, and when unthreatened, shifts back toward democracy.

Democracy demands a quantity of quality leaders. It does not seek to eliminate leaders, "but to make them as numerous as possible and to create the circumstances in which a commitment to the common good is encouraged among them."⁶⁵ The necessity for shared leadership is demonstrated when considering the heavy load political leaders carry: long hours at work, estrangement from family life, a highly charged social life, and the stresses and strains of deliberating upon a complex range of items. Yet many people are attracted to leadership positions for a variety of reasons: a sense of national purpose, personal loyalty, or personality/psychological needs.⁶⁶

⁶⁴Abraham Lincoln, "Special Address to Congress, 4 July 1861," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 35.

⁶⁵Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 201.

⁶⁶In Washington, D. C., the rate of alcohol consumption is more than twice the national average. The high stress environment appears to affect political leaders' political perceptions. Wiegele, Biopolitics, pp. 84-90. The president has too much to do in any one area to be effective according to Eldredge, Second Revolution, p. 340. Many political problems are intermestic, affecting both domestic and international interests. A single leader is limited in skills, knowledge, and resources to deal with contemporary problems. Elaine Thompson, "Is America Governable?" World Press Review 27 (July 1980): 23.

Democratic leaders must be concerned with both "power and strict accountability for its use."⁶⁷ Contrary to this precept, Machivelli drew a distinction between public and private morality, and advised that while the appearance of adherence to moral standards is necessary for gaining popular support, a leader's attainment of political objectives and retention of power depend upon a willingness to take whatever actions are expedient.⁶⁸ If power and accountability are separated, rational rule is replaced with whimsy. Ideally a democratic leader is able to discern and appeal to enduring human needs rather than exploit transitory desires. However, the tendency for some political leaders to make inflated campaign promises which cannot be kept, appears to lead to public cynicism and a distrust of political leaders. By using and transforming popular opinion and prejudice, a democratic leader is able to effect real change toward the common good.⁶⁹ The fact that the American people did not stand for gross displays of deception and corruption by their leaders may indicate a latent strength or moral sense. Accountability to the people is perhaps the only way a people can temper the excesses and correct the errors that even the

⁶⁷Wilson, Congressional Government, p. 187.

⁶⁸Machiavelli, The Prince. See also, Niccolo Machiavelli, Discourses, trans. Leslie J. Walker (Boston: Routledge & K. Paul, 1975), Book I.

⁶⁹The ability of Lincoln to appeal to popular prejudices in order to elevate and activate the goodness within people is described in Charnwood, Abraham Lincoln, pp. 116-169.

best of leaders make. The fixing of responsibility enables all parties to demonstrate their trustworthiness and reliability.⁷⁰

More often than not, leaders are caught on the horns of a dilemma, one which Hoover so aptly describes:

At various points in every important debate the opposition never fails to call vigorously upon the executive to exert leadership, to give direction, to use the big stick. If he yields to these temptations, he is immediately discovered to be meddling in the responsibilities of the independent arm of the Government.⁷¹

It has been suggested that a good leader is one who removes as much evil as he/she can without jeopardizing the integrity of survival of the regime.⁷² Real social and political change must proceed step by step. A perfect polity grounded in pure justice cannot be fashioned overnight. Even given the best of circumstances, the ideal regime is something that people can only hope to approximate. Flaws and inconsistencies will remain in any human endeavor. In the words of Jefferson,

I think moderate imperfections had better be borne with; because once known we accomodate ourselves to them, and find practical means of correcting their ill effects. But I know also, that laws

⁷⁰For a model of shared leadership which emphasizes the importance of accountability and separation of power, see Charlotte Bunch, "Woman Power: The Courage to Lead, the Strength to Follow, and the Sense to Know the Difference," MS 9 (July 1980): 45-48 and 95-97.

⁷¹Hoover, "Address to Gridiron Club," p. 314.

⁷²Frisch and Stevens, American Political Thought, pp. 5-8. "Our duty is to cleanse, to reconsider, to restore, to correct evil without impairing the good, to purify and humanize every process of our common life." Woodrow Wilson, "First Inaugural Address, 4 March 1913," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 261.

and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind. As that becomes more developed, more enlightened, as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed, and manners and opinions change with the change in circumstances, institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the times.⁷³

Lincoln may have fought a civil war to safeguard the principles of union and equality, but Americans today are still grappling with implementing these principles in a country torn by racial, ethnic, and regional disparities and differences. At the same time, progress has been made. It appears to be true that

In each generation--with toil and tears--we have had to earn our heritage again.

If we fail now, then we will have forgotten in abundance what we learned in hardship; that democracy rests on faith, that freedom asks more than it gives, and the judgment of God is harshest on those most favored.⁷⁴

The notion of a leader being able to effect social change and in the process transform himself and his followers into something better does have some things in common with democratic principles: both rest on the belief in the human potential for good, on the faith in human control of human destiny, and on the active involvement of all.

⁷³Thomas Jefferson, "Letter to Samuel Kercheval, 12 July 1816," in The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, ed. Walter E. Volkomer (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), pp. 121-122.

⁷⁴Lyndon Johnson, "Inaugural Address," p. 265. F. D. Roosevelt made a similar point: "Yesterday's answers are inadequate for today's problems--just as the solutions of today will not fill the needs of tomorrow." Roosevelt, "Address at University of Pennsylvania," p. 335.

Democratic People

Regime principles and political realities can be reconciled only if principles are incorporated into everyday life:

Political institutions are indistinguishable from the cultural ethos of a people. Therefore, if a society is losing its commitment to what is above short-term economic efficiency and various kinds of narrow self-interests, the introduction of a certain decision-making device into new areas is not likely to lead to a restoration of genuine human values.⁷⁵

People in a democracy cannot abdicate their responsibility for good government by assigning all powers, duties, and responsibilities to their leaders. Substituting a parliamentary form of government, lengthening the terms of political office, or removing some of the built-in restraints on the power of political leaders will simply not ensure that regime principles will be secured.

Democracy is based on the understanding that each person is at once an individual, a citizen of a particular country, and a member of humanity.⁷⁶ Each person is responsible to him/herself, to the country, and to the rest of humanity for decisions made and actions taken. The American common good includes the proper balance between

⁷⁵Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 197.

⁷⁶A sense of one as a person is "rooted in the group" and the group is essential for the realization of self-fulfillment:
 "Justice . . . would imply full ethical, legal, and political recognition of individual uniqueness, group pluralism, and universalism. Without acknowledgement of all three dimensions, fulfillment of the human soul is frustrated and its freedom impaired."
 Sibley, Nature and Civilization, p.82.

liberty and equality, and between democracy and leadership. Justice seems to demand that the claims of the individual and the claims of the community do not take precedence over each other. Distributive justice appears to imply that people should be rewarded on the basis of their contribution. The American regime is able to achieve a rough approximation of justice through representation, equality under the law, and guarantees of certain freedoms and rights. Through representation, the regime recognizes that each person is able to contribute something to political life but that some are able to contribute more.⁷⁷ The common interest may then be considered to consist of justice, a shared commitment to principles, and a willingness to incorporate both individual rights and duties to others in political life. The common interest appears to be realized through a respect for the rights of others, self-restraint, conscious reflection upon one's actions, and freedoms of thought and action. One can strive toward the common good either individually or collectively.⁷⁸ Above all, the common good is life on a human or moral level rather than mere survival on a bestial one.

⁷⁷"The good in the sphere of politics is justice, and justice consists in what tends to promote the common good." Furthermore, rights and duties are linked: "Claims to political rights must be based on the ground of contributions to the elements which constitute the being of the state." Aristotle, Politics, p. 129 and p. 131.

⁷⁸"Definitions of the common good must arise out of the group experience and be expressed through group authority, just as individual autonomy is expressed by the legitimate authority of the rational personality over the elements which in part make it up." Sibley, Nature and Civilization, p. 195.

The American regime attempts to reconcile the requirements of democracy and those of leadership in a just way. The people are granted a basic set of freedoms as well as the opportunity to participate in public life. People who choose to make public life their vocation or career are accorded power. People who opt not to use their opportunity to participate in politics even at a minimum level (voting) forfeit the opportunity to influence public policies.

Democracy is predicated on the notion

that no man or limited set of men is wise enough or good enough to rule others without their consent. The positive meaning of this statement is that all those who are affected by social institutions must have a share in producing and managing them.⁷⁹

Ideally,

The keynote of democracy as a way of life may be expressed . . . as the necessity for the participation of every mature human being in the formation of the values that regulate the living of men together, which is necessary from the standpoint of both the general social welfare and the full development of human beings as individuals.⁸⁰

Public apathy contradicts the basic premise of democracy, that of self-government. Public apathy has its roots in many aspects of human life: the ego's will toward self-interest and self-gratification, technical specialization that promotes a narrow view of life, limited contact and exchange of vital information between leaders and followers, laziness, complacency, and a lack of understanding among people.⁸¹

⁷⁹Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration," p. 37.

⁸⁰Ibid.

⁸¹Nelson, Public Leaders, pp. 32-35.

In the past, political parties helped to counter public apathy by stirring up interest in issues through debates by party leaders, by imparting a sense of shared purpose and direction to both leaders and followers through the party platform, and by providing a forum where public options/policies could be compared and scrutinized, widening the audience of those who understood different political positions and therefore helping the people to make informed decisions accordingly.⁸² Even today, political parties offer different approaches to problems confronting the United States today.⁸³ Political action groups using direct mailing techniques and television advertisements have reached into private homes, offering another means of participation.

If a democracy's citizens opt to refrain from making political decisions, if they lose sight of the connection between their goals and those of the community, or if they relinquish their duties and responsibilities toward each other, there will always be someone only too willing to make political decisions with little regard to anyone's interest but his/her own.

⁸²Gatell and Goodman, Democracy and Union, pp. 29-30.

⁸³Page, Presidential Elections.

Freedom, equality, fraternity are linked inseparably to one another. Freedom . . . cannot be implemented fully without recognition of the equal claims of human beings to its exercise. But while equality suggests my claim to freedom is on parity with yours, it does not signify that we are identical. . . . But neither freedom nor equality can be fully understood without reference to fraternity and our obligations to others, who are indispensable for our own achievement of rational selfhood.⁸⁴

People must reflect upon the actions and utterances of their chosen leaders, measuring them against democratic principles and their own opinions. An unquestioning acceptance of everything a leader does and says skews the balance in favor of leadership to the detriment of the people: "if beliefs are held uncritically and are not periodically reexamined, it implies that thousands, if not millions, of human beings have in effect enslaved themselves."⁸⁵ Constant vigilance by the people is the best safeguard of democracy.⁸⁶ As the proportion of people who participate in politics or public affairs declines, the tendency for leaders to influence public affairs any way they desire increases.

⁸⁴Sibley, Nature and Civilization, p. 107. "The free man who steps forward to claim his inheritance and endowment as a free and equal member of a great civil body must understand that his duties and responsibilities are measured to him by the same scale as his rights and powers." William Graham Sumner, excerpt from Chapters 1 and 2 of What Social Classes Owe to Each Other, in The Conservative Tradition in American Thought, ed. Jay A. Sigler (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), p. 229.

⁸⁵Sibley, Nature and Civilization, p. 117.

⁸⁶"While the people retain their virtue, and vigilance, no administration, by any extreme of wickedness or folly, can seriously injure the government, in a short space of four years." Abraham Lincoln, "First Inaugural Address, 4 March 1861," in The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, ed. Walter E. Volkmer (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969), p. 209.

Why do some people limit their political participation to voting or discussion? Certain aspects of American culture may pose obstacles to public participation in politics. For example, the impact of economic values is enormous. Americans typically define happiness as economic success so they tend to concentrate the better part of their lives in pursuing money-making. They seem to judge jobs by salaries, pensions, benefits, and opportunities of career advancement. They take their basic freedoms of speech, thought and action for granted, without realizing how easily these freedoms can be infringed upon or qualified when political leaders, in the absence of public participation make decisions. For example, for many years the Federal Bureau of Investigation kept a secret file on the American Civil Liberties Union because the ACLU provided aid to citizens whose constitutional rights had been violated. Some one had decided that in doing so, the ACLU was trying to subvert the national political leadership and create internal turmoil. During the early days of Watergate, it appeared that some government leaders were trying to regulate the people's participation in such a way as to make them rubberstamp all decisions made by the leaders. This type of citizen would forego the exercise of his/her liberties (of independent speech, actions and judgments) because they somehow weakened the leaders' capabilities to conduct foreign affairs. Mutual respect would be replaced with mutual suspicion and patriotism would be equated with automatic condemnation of anything contrary to the official pronouncements of the leaders.

Other aspects of American culture affect political participation. Americans tend to profess a disdain for politics as "dirty" and value highly their privacy. This national ethos may divert people from seeking political office or from pursuing a profession dedicated to the public. A political profession may, at first glance, appear to be extremely unattractive: long absences from one's family and friends, long working hours, a loss of privacy, a lack of clear or sure lines of career advancement, and restrictions on power and authority. In addition, political decisions are usually made in an atmosphere of uncertainty. Success or failure is hard to immediately determine and can usually be judged only after the long range results can be assessed by history. Nevertheless, some people continue to be attracted to public service for a number of reasons: a desire to help make history, an ambition to shape the future of the country or to be remembered for doing great things, or a sense of obligation to contribute to society.

Education has been the traditional American response to the problem of preparing people for self-government and for imparting regime principles:

Worth and genius would thus have been sought out from every condition of life, and completely prepared by education for defeating the competition of wealth and birth for public trust. . . . Education would have raised the mass of the people to the high ground of moral responsibility necessary to their own safety and to orderly government.⁸⁷

⁸⁷Jefferson, "Letter to John Adams," pp. 109-110.

Formal education and the character of a society interact, both elevating and constraining an individual's sense of values. Education pervades all aspects of life and includes the nature of habits that are conducive to the development of responsibility, self-restraint, and ethical wisdom, or conversely, habits that encourage deference, submission, and moral laziness.⁸⁸ Education is not merely confined to intellectual broadening, but also includes the gamut of attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs that a person is exposed to and incorporates in his/her life. If a person is brought up in an authoritarian, hierarchical environment and has limited exposure to the discussion of first principles, it would close to a miracle to expect that person to emerge as ready, willing, and able to lead an active role in a democracy that emphasizes equality, self-rule, and free discussion. If a premium is placed on deference to persons in authority in one's formative years and if one is never allowed the opportunity to make decisions him/herself, could one realistically be expected to challenge leaders' actions and decisions or to decide to act independently of a leader?

⁸⁸ The effect of political culture and habits thus formed upon leadership has been examined by comparing Japanese and American leader-follower relationships. The plus sides of Japanese political leadership are: a small core of permanent high level bureaucrats share a communitarian vision with their followers and decisions are based upon an aggregation of interests. On the minus side, Japanese leadership tends to smother creativity and individuality, to ignore minority opposition, to condemn individual opinions as misguided, and to result in immobilization when one important member refuses to participate in a decision. Ezra F. Vogel, Japan as Number 1: Lessons for America (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), pp. 232-245.

In recognition that not all people are intellectually inclined or gifted, some have advocated preferential education rather than the mass education attempted by the United States, arguing that it is foolish to expend resources to pursue a "grinding egalitarianism, which stupidly subjects the brilliant of enormous potential value to society to the pedestrian lock-step training of the mentally average or still more incompetent."⁸⁹ This implies that government should be restricted to the brightest and the smartest. This is antithetical to the premise of self-rule. By denying people the opportunity for intellectual advancement (regardless of their talents), one limits their understanding, their potential, and their contributions to public life.⁹⁰

⁸⁹Eldredge, Second Revolution, p. 295. A similar argument for the adoption of an exclusive educational system can be found in Henri Peyre, "Excellence and Leadership: Has Western Europe Any Lessons for Us? Daedalus⁹⁰ (Fall 1961): 628-651. The European preference for such an educational system may be related to cultural backgrounds steeped in aristocratic notions. The American political culture, based on political and social equality, may not permit an aristocratic educational system to be blatantly promoted. Comparing France and the United States, Riesman suggests that feelings of local pride and a sense of accomplishment work against the establishment of such a system. David Riesman, "Notes on Meritocracy," Daedalus 96 (Summer 1967): 897-908.

⁹⁰"The very fact of natural and psychological inequality is all the more reason for establishment by law equality of opportunity, since otherwise the former becomes a means of oppression for the less gifted." Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration," p. 38.

The powerful influences of communications technology have been said to create a public that does not know what its real needs or opinions are.⁹¹ On the other hand, an informed public is crucial to a rational democracy. It may be that the people influence what type and quality of information they receive. Ambiguous and misleading statements of political leader may be widespread because the people do not press for more specific statements. On the other hand, political leaders are usually concerned with getting a balanced perspective of their views by the media. The emphasis on visual presentation of "news" discourages leaders from putting their thoughts in writing. The importance of appearing on television usually causes a political leader to concentrate on the "news event" rather than dispensing information. The proliferation of technological and scientific developments creates a need for an understanding of how these affect political, social and economic situations. The political leaders not only need a wide range of advisors, but the leaders themselves must play a crucial role in teaching and advising the people on technological impacts. If the leaders tend to monopolize knowledge, they are more likely to take advantage of the people's ignorance.

⁹¹Eldredge, Second Revolution, pp. 239-290. The growth of telecommunications technology is a two-edged sword. Communications media have the potential to expand people's horizons and in doing so may be able to offer an alternative way for people to consider information, make better decisions, and perhaps discover the common good. On the other hand, communications media may withhold information that is vital while disseminating useless information. The sheer bulk of information may make it difficult to separate what is critical from what isn't. Sibley, Nature and Civilization, pp. 138-139.

Education is not the only thing which may affect public participation. Nutritional deficiencies have been linked to apathy, passivity, and irritability; nutritional impairment, rather than poverty, may work against people making sustained social contributions that are essential to a real political community.⁹⁴ Perhaps the poor diet of many Americans works against political participation. The sedentary life style of many Americans has also been tentatively linked to an increase in psychological stress, tension, and anxiety.⁹⁵ This may exacerbate focusing on individual relief rather than on community problems. Geographic mobility and economic changes may also negatively influence the formation of strong community ties. The widespread use of drugs and alcohol has been linked to withdrawal from political involvement, increased feelings of lethargy, a decreased sense of political effectiveness, and a deflection from involvement in major political issues to individual/family centered problems.⁹⁶ All of these social conditions, alone or together, pose a threat to the well-being of democracy. And most of these factors have been operating

⁹⁴R. Stauffer, "The Biopolitics of Underdevelopment," Comparative Political Studies 2 (October 1969): 361-387.

⁹⁵Thomas C. Wiegele, "Toward a Psychophysiological Variable in Conflict Theory," Experimental Study of Politics 1 (July 1971): 51-81.

⁹⁶Dean Jaros, "Biochemical Desocialization: Depressants and Political Behavior," Midwest Journal of Political Science (February 1972): 1-28. D. C. McClland, "The Power of Positive Drinking," Psychology Today 4 (January 1971): 40-42. R. Stauffer, The Role of Drugs in Political Change (New York: General Learning Press, 1971).

in the United States for a long time.

If the people do not develop a sense of duty and responsibility, democratic government will fail and be supplanted by the government of the few. Eldredge's assertion may be true that "Modern citizenry is less interested in the powers of government than in results."⁹⁷ But results depend upon the people themselves. The dismal failure of Prohibition demonstrates that the leaders' powers were not strong enough to ensure results against the people's power.

Both leaders and people in a democracy are charged with reconciling regime principles with political realities. If either acquiesces to the other's departure from principles, the democratic nature of the regime is in jeopardy.⁹⁸ If public officials are to be responsible to the people, the people must hold them responsible:

Inequitable power relations are always at least a two-way affair, involving both the initiator or power holder and the persons subject to power, who by their attitudes and desires condition and potentially limit the power of the former.⁹⁹

The viability of a democratic regime ultimately rests upon the choices and actions of the people, for "it remains nevertheless true that

⁹⁷Eldredge, Second Revolution, p. 334.

⁹⁸"A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for a second; that second for a third; and so on, till the bulk of society is reduced to mere automatons of misery. . . ." Jefferson, "Letter to Samuel Kercheval," p. 121.

⁹⁹Sibley, Nature and Civilization, p. 121.

wicked men and evil systems continue to have power because millions . . . acquiesce in their wickedness or fear the consequences for themselves if they do not acquiesce."¹⁰⁰

¹⁰⁰Ibid., p. 119.

CHAPTER III

CONCLUSIONS

The foundations of the American regime allows a rough approximation of justice to be reached through a reconciliation of leadership and democracy. This has been achieved by striking a balance between the two and not by eliminating the tension between the requirements of leadership and the requirements of democracy. The tension between the two is a healthy one. Justice is secured by recognizing that each plays a role in human affairs and yet arranging it so that neither one overpowers the other.

Dangerous tendencies toward arbitrary and autocratic politics arise when the balance is skewed toward centralization and monopolization of power. An equally dangerous trend toward parochialism and turmoil arises when the balance is tipped toward anarchy and irresponsible power. Any individual left to him/herself with unlimited power, and in spite of good intentions, can wreck havoc and do irreparable harm to the common good. Any group or community of people which allows everyone to govern their own actions solely by each one's individual opinion and passion can destroy the bonds of civility which bind a human community together. The American regime strikes a balance through representation which includes both leaders and followers. The willingness to submit political issues and decisions to the people's representa-

tives indicates a belief that good government can be linked to self-rule:

By giving his ultimate loyalty to a cause which transcends his own time and place, the democratic citizen does not betray the idea of popular self-rule, but, on the contrary, affirms the unifying principle which alone can sustain it in the long run and give it moral worth.¹

Representative leaders can unify disparate opinions, elevate them, and arrive at an approximation of the common interest. The very complexity of contemporary political problems underscores the necessity for pooled problem-solving actions when facing issues that affect the community as a whole.²

The complexity of today's political problems lays in the uncertain and difficult realms of morality and justices as applied to social, economic, technological, and cultural developments. Politics, in this sense, is open-ended. Both leaders and followers must interact, sharing information, opinions, and principles in order to arrive at a common understanding of the public good:

¹Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 202. Technical specialists and advisory committees are needed to present information and options to the president, but the president must make the decisions. Hoover, "Address to Gridiron Club," p. 315.

²Arbitrary, tyrannical rule is encouraged by the speed of social change, the growth of the military, the erosion of the will to freedom, the distortions of law, the preference for efficiency at any cost, the search for political messiahs, and the efforts made to escape responsibility. Sibley, Nature and Civilization, pp. 135-138.

Representation in the morally significant sense implies a shared understanding of the ultimate goal of life and also an awareness that some men are better equipped for leadership than others. The true criterion is not wealth, position, or birth, but a special type of ability. The good representative is able to represent not the lower partisan selves of his fellow citizens, but their will to community. The willingness to put this kind of trust, to the point of respecting their judgment when it goes contrary to one's own wishes of the moment, is essential to the fulfillment of the higher goal of democracy.³

The people's opinions are taken into consideration but the leaders are not mere puppets of the most recent poll.⁴ The emphasis is on deliberate rule by those best able to decide. The people do, though, decide who their rulers are and do have the power to eliminate those who appear not to rule well.

Blind faith is placed neither in the overwhelming goodness of the people nor the superior talents of the leaders.⁵ The downfall of many leaders has been due to their own hubris and false sense of pride.⁶

³Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 200.

⁴Measurement of public opinion is an inexact science. Public opinion surveys may not indicate the public voice. There is no measurement of emotions underlying the responses, and the survey may measure the ability to express preferences rather than the preferences themselves. Wiegele, Biopolitics, pp. 59-61. People may lie, give socially desirable answers, or misunderstand the questions. The nature of the question (yes-no format or limited choice of predetermined responses) may also limit the quality and quantity of information gathered. John B. Williamson et al. The Research Craft: An Introduction to Social Science Methods (Boston, Little, Brown & Co., 1977).

⁵Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 202.

⁶This egotism may be fed by the individualism rampant in American culture.

Democratic leadership blends radical and conservative political outlooks in its willingness to change and meet new problems with ingenuity while holding on to what has proven to be possible and practical. Regime leaders are granted the power to deliberate upon political issues, to take decisive action in threatening situations, to exercise their special skills and to promote the common interest. The people share power with the leaders by choosing them and influencing them, by debating different policies, by exercising their freedoms, and by participating in public life as they are inclined. The exclusive and unified power of the leader in times of great danger is balanced by the shared and dispersed power of the many at other times. The monopoly of information and secrecy that enables the leaders to take swift and decisive action is countered by the free-flow of information and slow deliberation surrounding the administration of justice and legislation. The unity of the leaders is based upon a consensus of many disparate opinions. The stability of the community is ensured even though the turmoil surrounding the difference of opinions is strong. The tensions inherent in the human condition are not denied. The built-in checks and balances in the regime, while often appearing cumbersome and inefficient, aid democratic decision-making by ensuring time for deliberation as well as time for emotions to abate. The particular way in which power is shared and overlapped also creates an awareness that issues of good and evil are not clearly defined in politics, and that decisions made will have consequences that contain ele-

ments of each. The blending of democracy and leadership seeks to remove arbitrariness from government, to promote justice, and to pursue the common good. Moderation takes precedence over extremism, deliberation takes the place of whimsy, and power works within certain limits. Democratic leadership takes into account that in a fundamental sense all people are created equal and yet also incorporates the fact that certain people have special talents.⁷

The American foundations of democratic leadership attempted to make popular government good government. The regime and its principles were not constructed on always having the best combination of enlightened people, wise leaders, and propitious circumstances because life rarely complies. Members of a representative democracy must share

a sense of contrast between man's true destiny, as reflected in the highest standards of conduct known by civilization, and man's actual behavior . . . as well as an awareness of premature certainty, self-seeking, and even positive evil in human actions.⁸

⁷De Tocqueville noted salient aspects of American political culture that still apply today:

"Democratic institutions awaken and foster a passion for equality which they can never entirely satisfy. . . . Whatever transcends their own limits appears to be an obstacle to their desires, . . . Democratic communities have a natural taste for freedom: left to themselves they will seek it, cherish it, and view any privation of it with regret. But for equality, their passion is ardent, insatiable, incessant, invincible: they call for equality in freedom; if they cannot obtain that, they still call for equality in slavery." Alexis de Tocqueville, excerpts from Democracy in America in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 76-77.

⁸Ryn, Democracy and Ethical Life, p. 203. See Selznick, Leadership in Administration, pp. 142-143. Some negative aspects of democratic leadership are considered in John Adams, "Letter to John Taylor, 15 April 1814," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 73-75.

This simultaneous awareness of human strengths and weaknesses, of human potentials and limitations is built into the American regime. The American regime still adheres to the broad outline of the original configuration delineated in the Constitution. And we should not be unduly concerned with certain aspects which have changed over the years, because the Founders believed that the regime could be perfected as people and circumstances changed. That is, changes to be made to the regime must adhere to regime principles of deliberation, popular rule, separation of powers, responsibility, equality, justice, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Any adjustment must aim to secure the better of more just administration of government. Any tinkering with notions of democratic leadership must rest on the belief that each person

has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice . . . that government is established for the benefit of the individual and is charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the individual and his freedom in the exercise of his abilities.⁹

Democratic leadership also rests on the conviction that people working together can best realize individual interests as long as the people exercise responsibility and deliberation through a "blend of commitment,

⁹Harry S. Truman, Inaugural Address, 20 January 1949," in Sources of Democracy, ed. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 39-40.

understanding, and determination."¹⁰ Through participation in the political sphere, in elections, in deliberations and debates over issues, in respect for the law, and in holding each person responsible for his/her actions, democratic citizens fulfill their obligations to the community and at the same time safeguard their individual interests. Conversely, if demands for rights are divorced from the bonds of obligation and responsibility, if demands for action seek to circumvent the law, democratic leadership will inevitably fail. If a large portion of the citizenry does not even minimally participate in political affairs, democratic leaders must put stronger emphasis on the importance of participation. Democratic leaders seek to protect the people from their own worst enemies, themselves. The people seek to protect themselves from the excesses of their leaders. The tension allows unity in the midst of diversity, stability in the midst of turmoil, and justice in the midst of conflicting demands.

Consideration of democratic leadership involves perennial questions of human history. Political decisions may not simultaneously benefit the individual and the community. People generate power but don't always know the best way to administer it. Personal morals seem not to equal political morals. The tension between a good citizen and

¹⁰Selznick, Leadership in Administration, p. 142.

a good person as well as the tension between leadership and democracy strike at the heart of political philosophy. How to secure justice and prepare for the future is the soul of political thought. The regime principles of American democratic leaders may be linked to the country's goals and colored by its culture, but they are also determined by the aspirations of each individual. Without an understanding of a regime's principles and configuration, it is difficult to set standards to judge and measure the performance of democratic leaders and democratic people. Without guidelines, leaders cannot chart a course for the future. Without a sense of common purpose, the people will falter and the integrity of the regime will disintegrate.

Within the American framework, democratic leadership at its best makes crucial decisions that safeguard or expand applications and meanings of liberty, equality, justice, and the pursuit of human happiness. At its worst, democratic leadership flounders in opportunism and responds to short-term demands and pressures. Democratic leadership reconciles several aspects of the human condition, enabling people to realize their potential as individuals and as members of a community and by giving them an opportunity to exercise their moral faculties. An emphasis on leadership downplays the importance of the people while a corresponding glorification of the people ignores the contributions of leaders. Human political and civil society is built upon both leaders and people. The American foundations for democratic leadership open an area for both leaders and people to act and decide.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Arendt, Hannah. Between Past and Future. New York: Viking Press, 1961.
- _____. The Life of the Mind, vol. 2. Willing. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1978.
- Aristotle. The Politics of Aristotle. Edited and translated by Ernest Barker. New York: Oxford University Press, 1974.
- Babbitt, Irving. Democracy and Leadership. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.
- Barber, James David. The Presidential Character: Predicting Performance in the White House. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Bendix, Reinhard. Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.
- Bullock, Alan. Hitler, A Study in Tyranny. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Burke, Edmund. Reflections on the Revolution in France. New York: Anchor Press, 1973.
- Burns, James MacGregor. Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Charnwood, Lord. Abraham Lincoln. New York: Garden City Publishing, 1917.
- Coser, Lewis A. The Functions of Social Conflict. Glencoe: Free Press, 1956.
- Eagleton, Thomas F. War and Presidential Power. New York: Liveright, 1974.
- Eidelberg, Paul. A Discourse on Statesmanship: The Design and Transformation of the American Polity. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1974.

- Eldredge, H. Wentworth. The Second American Revolution. New York: William Morrow, 1964.
- Erikson, Erik H. Life History and the Historical Moment. New York: W. W. Norton, 1975.
- Frisch, Morton J. and Stevens, Richard G., eds. American Political Thought: The Philosophic Dimension of American Statesmanship. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1976.
- Gatell, Frank Otto and Goodman, Paul. Democracy and Union: The United States, 1815-1877. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1972.
- Girvetz, Harry K., ed. Democracy and Elitism: Two Essays with Selected Readings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.
- Hamilton, Alexander; Jay, John; and Madison, James. The Federalist. New York: Modern Library paperback edition, n. d.
- Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1950.
- Kramnick, Isaac and Watkins, Frederick. The Age of Ideology--Political Thought, 1750 to the Present, 2nd edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1979.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. Discourses. Translated by Leslie J. Warren. Boston: Routledge & K. Paul, 1975.
- _____. The Prince. Translated and edited by Robert M. Adams. New York: Norton Publishing, 1977.
- Mason, Alpheus Thomas and Beany, William M. American Constitutional Law: Introductory Essays and Selected Cases, 5th edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Merton, Robert K.; Gray, Alisa P.; Hockery, Barbara; and Selvin, Hanon C. Reader in Bureaucracy. Glencoe: Free Press, 1952.
- Mill, John Stuart. Considerations on Representative Government. New York: Henry Holt, 1882.
- Nelson, Charles A. Developing Responsible Public Leaders: A Report on Interviews and Correspondence with 52 Leading Americans. Dobbs Ferry: Oceana Publications, 1963.
- Ophuls, William. Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity: Prologue to a Political Theory of the Steady State. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1977.

- Padover, Saul K., ed. Sources of Democracy. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Page, Benjamin I. Choices and Echoes in Presidential Elections: Rational Man and Electoral Dmeocracy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Plato. The Republic, 2nd edition. Translated by Desmond Lee. Great Britain: Penguin Books, 1975.
- Rhineland, Philip H. Is Man Incomprehensible to Man? San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1973.
- Rustow, Dankwart A., ed. Philosophers and Kings: Studies in Leadership. New York: George Braziller, 1970.
- Ryn, Claes G. Democracy and Ethical Life: A Philosophy of Politics and Community. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.
- Selznick, Philip. Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Sibley, Mulford Q. Nature and Civilization: Some Implications for Politics. Loyola Series in Political Analysis. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1977.
- Skidmore, Max. J. and Wanke, Marshall Carter. American Government: A Brief Introduction. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1974.
- Sorenson, Theodore C. Decision Making in the White House: The Olive Branch or the Arrows. New York: Columbia University Press, 1965.
- Stauffer, R. The Role of Drugs in Political Change. New York: General Learning Press, 1971.
- Stogdill, Ralph M. Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of Theory and Research. New York: Free Press, 1974.
- Vile, M. J. C. Constitutionalism and the Separation of Powers. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.
- Vogel, Extra F. Japan as Number 1: Lessons for America. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.
- Westin, Alan F. The Anatomy of a Constitutional Law Case. New York: Macmillan Publishing, 1958.

Wiegele, Thomas C. Biopolitics: Search for a More Human Politic Science
Boulder: Westview Press, 1979.

Williamson, John B.; Karp, David A.; Dalphin, John R.; Dorr, Richard S.;
Barry, Stephen T.; and Raveis, Victoria H. The Research Craft:
An Introduction to Social Science Methods. Boston: Little,
Brown, & Co., 1977.

Wills, Garry. Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Indepen-
dence. New York: Doubleday, 1978.

Wilson, Woodrow. Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics.
Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1885.

_____. The New Freedom: A Call for the Emancipation of the Generous
Energies of a People. New York: Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1913.

Letters and Speeches

Adams, John. "Letter to John Taylor, 15 April 1814." In Sources of
Democracy, pp. 73-75. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York:
McGraw-Hill, 1973.

_____. "Letter to Samuel Adams, 18 October 1790." In Sources of Demo-
cracy, p. 29. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-
Hill, 1973.

Hoover, Herbert C. "Address to Gridiron Club, Washington, D. C.,
14 December 1929." In The Conservative Tradition in American
Thought, pp. 313-319. Edited by Jay A. Sigler. New York:
G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.

Jefferson, Thomas. "First Inaugural Address." In The Liberal Tradition
in American Thought, pp. 102-106. Edited by Walter E. Volkomer.
New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.

_____. "Letter to John Adams, 28 October 1813." In The Liberal
Tradition in American Thought, pp. 107-111. Edited by Walter E.
Volkomer. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.

_____. "Letter to Samuel Kercheval, 12 July 1816." In The Liberal
Tradition in American Thought, pp. 116-123. Edited by Walter E.
Volkomer. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.

Johnson, Lyndon B. "Inaugural Address, 20 January 1965." In Sources of
Democracy, pp. 263-265. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York:
McGraw-Hill, 1973.

- Lincoln, Abraham. "First Inaugural Address, 4 March 1861." In The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, pp. 205-210. Edited by Walter E. Volkmer. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.
- _____. "Special Message to Congress, 4 July 1861." In Sources of Democracy, p. 35. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Madison, James. "Letter to Thomas Jefferson, 24 October 1787." In Sources of Democracy, pp. 24-25. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Roosevelt, Franklin D. "Address at University of Pennsylvania, 20 September 1940." In The Political Thought of American Statesmen, pp. 331-336. Edited by Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1973.
- _____. "Address to Young Democratic Clubs of America, 24 August 1935." In The Political Thought of American Statesmen, pp. 304-317. Edited by Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens. Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, 1973.
- _____. "Second Inaugural Address, 20 January 1937." In Sources of Democracy, pp. 260-263. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Truman, Harry S. "Inaugural Address, 20 January 1949." In Sources of Democracy, pp. 39-40. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Wilson, Woodrow. "First Inaugural Address, 4 March 1913." In Sources of Democracy, pp. 260-261. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Articles and Excerpts

- Arendt, Hannah. "Reflections: Truth and Politics." New Yorker 43 (25 February 1967): 49-88.
- _____. "Understanding and Politics." Partisan Review 20 (July-August 1953): 377-392.
- Bennis, Warren G. "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority." Administrative Science Quarterly 4 (December 1959): 259-301.

- Berger, Suzanne; Gourevich, Peter; Higonnet, Patrice; and Kaiser, Karl. "The Problem of Reform in France: The Political Ideas of Local Elites." Political Science Quarterly 84 (September 1969): 436-459.
- Brown, Levi A. "Political Aspects of Urban Stormwater Management." Journal of the Water Resources Planning and Management Division of the American Society of Civil Engineers 106 (March 1980): 265-273.
- Bunch, Charlotte. "Woman Power: The Courage to Lead, the Strength to Follow, and the Sense to Know the Difference." MS 9 (July 1980): 45-48 and 95-97.
- Citrin, Jack. "The Changing American Electorate." In Politics and the Oval Office: Towards Presidential Governance, pp. 31-62. Edited by Arnold J. Meltsner. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1981.
- Clor, Harry. "Woodrow Wilson." In American Political Thought: The Philosophic Dimension of American Statesmanship, pp. 191-218. Edited by Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1976.
- Condon, Ann. "Marching to a Different Drummer: The Political Philosophy of the American Loyalists." In Red, White and True Blue: The Loyalists in the Revolution, pp. 1-18. Edited by Esmond Wright. New York: AMS Press, 1976.
- Dewey, John. "Democracy and Educational Administration." In Sources of Democracy, pp. 37-39. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Diamond, Martin. "Democracy and The Federalist: A Reconsideration of the Framers' Intent." American Political Science Review LIII (March 1959): 52-68.
- . "The Federalist." In History of Political Philosophy, 2nd edition, pp. 631-651. Edited by Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1972.
- Edinger, Lewis J. "Political Science and Political Biography." Journal of Politics 26 (August 1964): 648-676.
- Erikson, Erik H. "On the Nature of Psycho-Historical Evidence: In Search of Gandhi." Daedalus 97 (Summer 1968): 695-730.

- Fontaine, Andre. "The End of Optimism." World Press Review 7 (July 1980): 19-21.
- Grindle, Merilee S. "Power, Expertise and the 'Tecnio': Suggestions from a Mexican Case Study." Journal of Politics 39 (May 1977): 399-426.
- Hesseltine, William B. "Building a National Party." In The Leadership of Abraham Lincoln. Edited by Don E. Fehrenbacher. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Hoffman, Stanley and Hoffman, Inge. "The Will to Grandeur: de Gaulle as Political Artist." In Philosophers and Kings: Studies in Leadership, pp. 248-316. Edited by Dankwart Rustow. New York: George Braziller, 1970.
- Jaffa, Harry V. "Abraham Lincoln." In American Political Thought: The Philosophic Dimension of American Statesmanship, pp. 125-144. Edited by Morton J. Frisch and Richard G. Stevens. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt Publishing, 1976.
- Jaros, Dean. "Biochemical Desocialization: Depressants and Political Behavior." Midwest Journal of Political Science (February 1972): 1-28.
- Jefferson, Thomas. "Notes on the State of Virginia." In The Liberal Tradition in American Thought, pp. 84-87. Edited by Walter E. Volkmer. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.
- Johnson, Nevil. "Politics and Administration as the Art of the Possible." Political Studies 26 (June 1978): 267-273.
- Knickerbocker, I. "Leadership: A Conception and Some Implications." In Leadership, Selected Readings, pp. 26-27. Edited by C. A. Gibb. England: Penguin Books, 1969.
- Korten, David C. "Situational Determinants of Leadership Structure." In Leadership: Readings for an Emerging Field, p. 163. Edited by Glenn D. Paige. New York: Free Press, 1972.
- Lewis, John M. "The President and Congress: Foreign Policy." In Dimensions of the Modern Presidency, pp. 177-194. Edited by Edward N. Kearny. St. Louis: Forum Press, 1981.
- Lienesch, Michael. "The Constitutional Tradition: History, Political Action, and Progress in American Political Thought 1787-1793." Journal of Politics 42 (February 1980): 2-30.

McClelland, D. C. "The Power of Positive Drinking." Psychology Today 4 (January 1971): 40-42.

McDonald, Forrest. "A Comment." Journal of Politics 42 (February 1980): 31-35.

McNaught, Kenneth. "The Carter Factor: 'Moral' Prescriptions for Political Problems." Excerpt from Toronto Star cited in World Press Review 27 (July 1980): 39.

Morris, Richard T. and Seeman, Melvin. "The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach." American Journal of Sociology 61 (September 1950): 149-155.

Newsweek 94 (19 April 1982): 67.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. "The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness." In Social Ethics: Issues in Ethics and Society, pp. 143-164. Edited by Gibson Winter. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. Excerpt from Thus Spoke Zarathustra. In Democracy and Elitism: Two Essays with Selected Readings, pp. 253-258. Edited by Harry K. Girvetz. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

Peyre, Henri. "Excellence and Leadership: Has Western Europe Any Lessons for Us?" Daedalus 90 (Fall 1961): 628-651.

Riesman, David. "Notes on Meritocracy." Daedalus 90 (Summer 1967): 897-908.

Roche, John P. "The Founding Fathers: A Reform Caucus in Action." American Political Science Review LV (December 1961): 799-816.

Rosen, Paul L. "Science, Power, and the Degradation of American Political Science." Polity 9 (Summer 1977): 463-480.

Shapiro, Martin M. "The Presidency and the Federal Courts." In Politics and the Oval Office: Towards Presidential Governance, pp. 141-160. Edited by Arnold J. Meltsner. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1981.

Stauffer, R. "The Biopolitics of Underdevelopment." Comparative Political Studies 2 (October 1969): 361-387.

Storing, Herbert J. "The Crucial Link: Public Administration, Responsibility, and the Public Interest." Public Administration Review 24 (March 1964): 47-51.

- Sumner, William Graham. Excerpt from What Social Classes Owe to Each Other, Chapters 1 and 2. In The Conservative Tradition in American Thought, p. 229. Edited by Jay A. Sigler. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1969.
- Taylor, John. "An Inquiry into the Principles and Policy of the Government of the United States, 1814." In Sources of Democracy, pp. 70-73. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Thompson, Elaine. "Is America Governable?" World Press Review 27 (July 1980): 22-24.
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. Excerpt from Democracy in America, Part I Chapter 13 and Part II, Book 2, Chapter 1. In Sources of Democracy, pp. 76-77. Edited by Saul K. Padover. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Tucker, Robert C. "The Theory of Charismatic Leadership." Daedalus 97 (Summer 1968): 731-756.
- Wheare, K. C. "Lincoln's Devotion to the Union, Intense and Supreme." In The Leadership of Abraham Lincoln, pp. 182-189. Edited by Don E. Fehrenbacher. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Wiegele, Thomas C. "Toward a Psychophysiological Variable in Conflict Theory." Experimental Studies of Politics 1 (July 1971): 51-81.