



Leading Change

By James O'Toole

Review By Mahesh Makulwar

The genesis of this book was a recent decision by the Aspen Institute to create the corporate leader forum, a consortium of twenty corporation dedicated to preparing the next generation of executives to lead change. After twenty years of frustration with academia the commitment of the forum executives to the difficult process of effectively and morally transforming their organisation energized

He approached these topics with some trepidation. Leadership is too trendy a subject to inspire confidence in readers that one who writes about it is anything but a shameless gold digger Worse, change has become the mantra of the current era. In business organisation and government, we hear a constant murmur on lips of executives of all stripes and persuasions about “the necessity of change”, the imperative of effective major transformation. For starter, there is no shortage of change. Quite the opposite. He explains, leader in 190 faces all the change that they will ever need in the form of disorder fueled by volatile economic condition, rapid technological obsolescence.

Turbulent international competition, market dislocation, upstart institutional investors and continually shifting political and social conditions. From time immemorial man and woman have complained of turmoil caused by unprecedented changes, but there is reason to believe that in fact the depth of the alterations experienced today is more profound than ever before. Consider just one example of deep, unprecedented change in the world of business –the imminent collapse of recognizable boundaries between nations, between firms between functional disciplines. It is now increasingly recognized that the executives



challenge is to pilot through these roiling seas in a purposeful and successful manner, to steer an appropriate organizational course in turbulent condition. Hence corporation must not simply change they must be transformed effectively. Executives say that nothing could be harder. In order to the challenges of external chaos the management of change has become the prime occupation of those who inhabit the executive suites of the world's leading enterprises. Nearly everywhere one or more of a variety of powerful techniques is addressing this requisite for change: reengineering, restructuring, downsizing, rightsizing, TQM, EVA and the like. Such techniques are designed to allow corporation to operate more efficiently, usually by becoming smaller, leaner, and we hope smarter .It is increasingly clear to executives that while these techniques are absolutely necessary they are not sufficient condition for effective change .the fact is that such techniques, even when they work well enough. For example, firms have found that becoming smaller even becoming markedly more efficient does not equate with being effective and competitive. Something is missing. Executives increasingly believe that the missing condition for long-term competitiveness is Leadership. In particular, what is proving to be singularly effective is the emerging style of values based leadership, both as motivation for constant innovation up and down all organizational levels and as a source of unity and coherence across fragmented firm boundaries.

Today's corporate executives believe they are struggling with an unprecedented leadership challenge to create internal strategic unity within a chaotic external environment. That is, they are convinced that today's leaders must create strong corporate values to unite their increasingly decentralized operations, but they feel this is easier said than done in a world characterized by pluralism, diversity and myriad other fragmenting forces. Moreover, some executives fear that the creation of shared values will lead to "group think" and the accompanying loss of independent entrepreneurship and initiative that is needed more than ever throughout the ranks of their corporation. Hence, that familiar imperative of contemporary leadership: organisation must decentralize, de-layer and destroy bureaucracy in order to obtain the entrepreneurialism, autonomy, and innovation needed to serve customers effectively .Yet .in meeting that imperative, leader must not lose the cooperation, synergy, economies of scale and sense of community that are the central benefits of the business form of organisation. In essence, the leadership challenge is to provide the glue to cohere independent units a world characterized by forces of entropy and fragmentation. Only one element has been identified as powerful enough to overcome those centripetal forces and that is trust. And recent experience shows that such trust emanates



from leadership based on shared purpose, shared vision and especially, shared values. All of this is now familiar. Perhaps, it is too familiar. Indeed, most of today's executives agree with the above description of the challenges they face as they agree with the general prescription for the kind of leadership they must provide. Here's the rub –few leaders succeed at the task. Executive know what needs to be done and even how to do it. Nonetheless, they are unable to lead change effectively.

Author proposes a provocative new vision of leadership in the business world--a vision of leadership rooted in moral values and a consistent display of respect for all followers. As O'Toole brilliantly demonstrates, values-based leadership is not only fair and just; it is also highly effective in today's complex organizations. When leaders truly believe that their prime goal is the welfare of their followers, they get results. The finest leaders--from political giants like Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln to contemporary CEOs like Max De Pree and James Houghton--have always shared leadership with their followers. They create organizations that encourage change and self-reevaluation; they foster an atmosphere of open-mindedness and fresh thinking, in which assumptions can be challenged and goals reassessed. Grounded in the ideas of moral philosophy, *Leading Change* powerfully transcends the standard how-to management primer to define a challenging new approach to leadership. As author so persuasively argues, growth and change are possible, indeed necessary, and individuals who have the stature and the courage to lead morally will affect them. This important book, at once thought provoking and totally practical, is bound to take its place as one of the landmark business volumes of our times. He has written the essential work for organizations to survive and thrive in today's changing world. His intellectually penetrating thinking shows us how the sometimes conflicting problems we wrestle with--often in piecemeal fashion--fit together to form a complete picture, even as the picture itself continues to change. His message is so critical to the very existence of every organization that any leader who fails to heed his advice condemns his or her company to mediocrity and/or early death.

Perhaps the most daring aspect of *Leading Change* is author clear repudiation of the contingency theories so prevalent today in leadership research and coaching programs. He obviously did not come to this conclusion frivolously. This work includes his observations and experience from over two decades of working with the corporate leaders mentors such as Bennis; He proclaims that the contingency theories so revered today simply don't work



in the long run. He maintains that by their very design they typically destroy trust between leaders and followers. He then offers a values-based alternative, which is a primary focus of the book.

Leading Change begins with author drawing a number of deep analogies from a painting by James Ensor. Ensor's painting, not a soul in the crowd pays a centime's worth of attention to the one who would be their savior And that condition turns out to be a pretty fair assessment of the starting place of all would be agents of change in modern so modern society and organization the painting does raises a question that has remained paramount to these days. Is leadership possible in modern complex system or is democratic leadership simply an oxymoron. Ensor understood that social chaos could soon arise from the secular democracy than aborning in Europe.

He immediately draws you into the books theme by probing a number of profound leadership questions and scenarios analogous to paintings theme. As an author, he seeks to answer three related questions: *Leading Change* is divided into two parts within which he addresses three related questions:

- What are the major causes of resistance to change?
- How can leaders effectively and morally overcome that resistance?
- Why is the dominant philosophy of leadership, based on contingency theory, neither an effective nor a moral guide for people who wish to lead change?

To answer these questions author divides the book into two halves. The first half deals with leaders and the second half with followers. The main theme of his work is to seriously question the validity of contingency theory and propose the alternative of value-based leadership behavior. writes, "Instead, values-based leadership is an attitude about people, philosophy, and process. To overcome the resistance to change, one must be willing, for starters, to change oneself. In essence, then, values-based leadership is "unnatural." According to O'Toole, "today's executives believe they are struggling with an unprecedented leadership challenge to create internal strategic unity within a chaotic external environment. Executives know what needs to be done and even how to do it. Nonetheless, they are unable to lead change effectively. Explaining the sources of this paradox and offering a practical way to resolve it are the purposes of this book."



For author, values-based leadership is provided by those who he calls “Rushmoreans”: They possess courage, authenticity, integrity, vision, passion, conviction, and persistence. To vary degrees, “Rushmoreans” listen to others, encourage dissenting opinion among their closest advisers, grant ample authority to their subordinates, and lead by example rather than by power, manipulation, or coercion. Granted, history produces very few Washington, Jefferson’s, Lincolns, and Roosevelt’s. Nonetheless, according to him, there is much of value to learn from them by those who struggle with an unprecedented leadership challenge to create internal strategic unity within a chaotic external environment.

In Part One, author explains why values-based leadership is more effective than any other, notably “tough” or “amoral” leadership, which is frequently (and inaccurately) characterized as being “realistic.” For author, democratic leadership “is not about voting; it is about the democratic value of inclusion. There is nothing oxymoronic, chaotic, or ineffective about leadership based on that moral principle.”

In Part Two author shifts his attention to followers in order to discover why we all resist change that would be in our self-interest to embrace, and, why followers so often resist the leadership they claim to crave. For author, Shakespeare had it right when explaining resistance to change: “The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars/But in ourselves.”

The first responsibility of a leader is to define reality. The last is to say thank you. In between the two, the leader must become a servant and a debtor. That sums up the progress of an artful leader. Concepts of leadership, ideas about leadership, and leadership practices are the subject of much thought, discussion, writing, teaching, and learning. True leaders are sought after and cultivated. Leadership is not an easy subject to explain. A friend of mine characterizes leaders simply like this: “Leaders don't inflict pain; they bear pain.” The art of leadership requires us to think about the leader-as-steward in terms of relationships: of assets and legacy, of momentum and effectiveness, of civility and values. The concept of organizational change when used in business and management literature usually refers to planned,



organization-wide change. Still, the concept can seem so broad and general in nature that it's hard to keep perspective. The concepts included in this topic are associated with the nature of organization-wide change, and are not in and of themselves programs to enhance organizational performance. Change has an important place in the study of organizational viability. The right kind of change enables an organization to maintain its viability in its changing environment. On the other hand, the wrong kind of change can destroy the organization. The demise of one system might work to the benefit of the others. For instance, a competitive firm might benefit from the failure of another. Revolutionaries also may view the destruction of an old political system as necessary if their ideal is to be implemented. Still, despite such exceptions, it is clear that change per se may be dysfunctional as well as functional. The challenge is to create change that increases or renews the viability of an organization's position in its environment. "Renewal is not just innovation and change. It is also the process of bringing the results of change in line with the organization's purposes.

He talks about two types of leadership groups: the Rushmoreans and the Realists. Of course, as a South Dakota native I was immediately drawn to the Rushmoreans. He named this leadership approach after the presidents whose faces are carved on Mt. Rushmore (Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt). Although faced with different challenges and employing different styles, they all had certain values that they never compromised or lost sight of—such as integrity, trust and respect for followers. They exemplify values-based leadership. I found particularly appealing the description of Jefferson in the context of the Declaration of Independence, which today some might call a "vision statement:" In that declaration Jefferson set out the long-term aspirations of a new nation, and in asserting a natural right to happiness Jefferson meant that all individuals are entitled to make all they can of their lives.

However, people who don't think well of themselves don't act to change their conditions. And key to the success of the Rushmorean leadership philosophy is that while leaders must respect the right of individuals to make the most of their lives, followers also have an obligation to gain self-confidence and to make all they can of their lives. The rushmoreans and indelible lesson in value based leadership. We will never be able to find perfect leader all are flawed because are like us individuals long dead whom we have come to think of, as heroes were during their lives ordinarily human beings. Integrity is evident from the fact that the long-term courses they adopt were based on what was morally right.



One of the clearest manifestation of value based leadership of the declaration of independence, document that today would probably be called vision statement Trust, leadership means responsibility not privileges. The obverse of hope is trust by securing the trust of the people

Values-based leadership requires integrity, which is two-pronged: truth-telling honesty and moral behavior. He describes integrity as a wholeness or completeness that is achieved by people who are said to have healthy self-confidence and self-esteem. People with integrity know who they are, which allows them to esteem and respect others. Leaders must avoid behaving paternalistically toward followers, even if for their own good, because that is to deny them the basic right of individual dignity, according to the author. Thus, treating people with respect is what values-based leadership is all about.

One of the key statements in the book is that you don't have to become someone else or become like someone else to be a leader, you have to just become yourself. That is the core of integrity. Values-based leaders "... enable others to lead by sharing information, by fostering a sense of community, and by creating a consistent system of rewards, structure, process, and communication."

In general the successful process of change initiated at the companies cited in this chapter of the following things

- 1) Change had top management support -- because the process of changing the entire culture of large organization is a slow one the leaders of the corporation must make the commitment to the long hard work involved including the commitment to change their own behaviour
- 2) Change built on the unique strengths and value of the corporation --organization don't start with coherent philosophy or set of values these evolve overtime pragmatically and grow out of experience new values cant be created by fiat
- 3) The specific of change were not imposed from the top instead all level of corporation participated broadly and openly in all stages of the process.
- 4) Change was holistic because the part of culture the complexly interrelated changing one part requires changing them all to achieve consistency along objectives strategies reward structure training



- 5) Change was planned the long term process was mapped out in advance and there was a period of education in which every employee was informed about the what and why of the effort
- 6) Change were made in the guts of the organization power relationship information access and reward system
- 7) Change was approached from the stakeholder viewpoint because the goal of change must be to meet the needs of all corporate stakeholder as efficiently as possible the primary source of impetus and direction for change usually comes from the external environment
- 8) Change became ongoing because the environment doesn't stand still and the needs of stakeholders aren't static the ideas is institutionalization of the process of continuing change

As for the Realists, their basic philosophy is that you have to do whatever it takes to get the job done. This leadership approach is mostly characterized by taking firm, bold action; being strong, aggressive, decisive, enacting pragmatic exercises to reach a goal. Realists get followers to do what the leader has outlined. He describes different realist leaders, including those who are usually touted in news and management magazines as leaders.

In chapter 3 he explain why isn't value based leadership style of leadership practiced more often? The responses can be grouped into five major categories:

- 1 It is no different from what is doing values based leadership is rejected as being undifferentiated from traditional models.
- 2 It is not theoretically sound the value based leadership is rejected as being at odds with either contingency theory or the result of social science research
- 3 It doesn't work value based leadership is dismissed as ineffective.
- 4 It is incompatible with human nature value based leadership is considered antithetical to what is known about nature of such imitable factors as hierarchical dominance
- 5 It is counter cultural value base leadership is said to run counter to the historical fact that there have always been strongly directive leader in western and Asian society.



The desirability of command and control leadership in non-crisis situation is supported by host of realist assumption

- People are by nature evil and self interested therefore they must be controlled
- Human group are given to anarchy
- Progress comes from discipline order and obeying tradition
- Order arises from leadership
- There can be only one leadership
- The leader is dominant member of the group
- Leadership is the exercise of power
- Any sign of weakness will undercut the leader authority
- Might make right (the leader is, by definition worthy of loyalty)
- Loyalty effort and change can be commanded successfully

In chapter 4 he explains why amoral leadership doesn't work? Few leaders have been as successful at the art of change as South Africa's Nelson Mandela. On the eve of his ultimate electoral victory May 1,1994 the New York times recapped Mandela lengthy career attempting to elucidate the essence of Nobel prize winner leadership the reporter conclude that all thing considered Mandela was a pragmatist, realist a man willing to do whatever the situation required in order to succeed

- Try as admires well to sentimentalize Mr. Mandela the president in waiting of a reborn south Africa is at heart the most practical of men
- He is not unfeeling but passion even anger at what he has endured does not drive him or distract him enjoy debate but he is not a great philosopher or intellectual. He has a principle but he will bend them if they stand in the way of his objective which for the last half century has been ending white domination

The existence of one moral absolute would do the trick. Author offers three such principles:



Slavery is never justifiable

Torture is never justifiable: any activity that inflict intense pain on other is, like slavery ,a violation of human rights. Moreover it is wrong to apply this principle selectively. Female circumcision (genital mutilation) is another case in point It is defended by relativistic on the ground that it is a traditional culture practice and that consequently westerners have no right to pass judgement on it.

- Any violation of natural (human) rights is always wrong: This moral principle subsumes the first two and adds to them. Slavery and torture are invasion of the liberty, dignity and personal autonomy to which all humans have an equal right by virtue of their common humanity

The Chinese philosopher Lao-tzu expressed some six hundred years before the birth of Christ

A leader is best

When people barely know that he exists,

Not so good when people obey and acclaim him.

Worst when they despise him.

“Fail to honor people,

They fail to honor you”

But of a good leader, who talks little,

When his work is done, his aim fulfilled,

They will all say, “We did this ourselves”

Author cites, for example, Jack Welch, whose tenure as CEO of General Electric resulted in unmatched financial performance among U.S. corporations. Welch's leadership slogan is, "It all depends:' Realists are the leaders who feel they need to take charge. They eschew working in groups and employee participation. If the job is going to get done, they need to take charge and get people to follow orders. O'Toole says these leaders are generally more successful in short-term situations, but over the long term they don't get the very best out of followers.

To digress a little here, included in the book is a discussion of a more "feminine" style of leadership vs. the traditionally "masculine" style, which I-being of the correct



gender-found intriguing. The author associates the feminine style more with the Rushmoreans and the masculine style more with the Realists. I'm not sure this adds a lot to the book in the sense of understanding leadership-and it actually might detract because for some people this might range into political sensitivity-but I found this to be very supportive of my style, so my observation may not be too objective.

I do think the Realists have the upper hand in the literature today and are dominant in Western and Far East culture. And certainly there is a need for strong leadership in times of crisis or gridlock: When you need to get something done and you need to get everybody moving in the same direction, you can't run organizations as democracies, Realists might say.

However, I particularly liked author's definition of participative management, which is more aligned with the Rushmorean style: " ... decisions will not be arbitrary, secret, or closed to questioning." While it's a more open kind of process, participative management is sometimes confused with being a democracy. It's easy to be misunderstood on this issue-having a say and having input on a particular topic does not mean one will have a vote or there will be a consensus decision. Participative management means making the best decision after getting the input of all those affected by the decision.

The second section of the book talks about followers. The author acknowledges that we all resist change, that it's a normal human reaction to resist change. Following a list of 33 examples of why we resist change, such as fear of the unknown and contentment with the status quo, the author reviews several situations in which leaders tried to lead but were not successful because they were unable to inspire followers.

He discusses several leaders whose ideas, in retrospect, were important, but nonetheless were initially rejected by American industry. For example, W. Edwards Deming, known for his statistical quality control techniques, was ignored by the U.S. business establishment for many years, during which time he had a great influence on Japanese business. The author shares a wonderful quote that describes Deming's dilemma: "The ultimate curse is to be a passenger on a large ship, to know that the ship is going to sink, to know precisely what to do to prevent it and to realize that no one will listen. This is the curse that has been visited for a quarter of a century on W. Edwards Deming."



Other chapters dealt with Robert Owen, the early 19th century British entrepreneur, who introduced employee benefits in his textile mill. While some of his ideas work very well today, they were largely unrecognized early on. Owen never overcame society's deeply rooted resistance to change. One of the more interesting points he makes in his discussion of Owen's ideas is that their rejection reflects society as a whole. The author infers that individuality in some may be seen as eccentricity, not as a source of progress. It's seen as an affront to custom and therefore rejected.

He concludes that those who are perceived to have the most power are most afraid of change because they see change taking away some of that power. Leaders can only succeed when followers feel they are not being asked to act against their will. You can't push people over the long term to get the job done or to make a corporation successful; you can only pull them in the direction they wish to go.

He reminds us that change occurs all the time; that is just the way life is. We can attempt to keep our organization static, but if we don't continually change as the world outside our corporation changes, the gap will become so large that we are forced to turn to more short-term, dramatic kinds of leadership. *Leading Change* conveys an enduring, thoughtful philosophy of leadership. It moves from more abstract principles to concrete examples and studies of companies, and also measures the long-term effects of leadership vs. the short-term outcomes. It's fairly easy to rectify an obvious problem, but it's much more difficult to establish a corporate environment where you prepare for the future. As O'Toole writes: "Great leaders recognize that there is no single truth, no final answer, and that the process of leadership is a never-ending struggle to balance the constant and never-abating demands of those with different objectives."

In Chapter 7, author briefly examines 33 of the most popular hypotheses concerning the root causes of change. They include the usual suspects: homeostasis, stare decisis, inertia, self-interest, and fear. Of course, there are exceptions to each of the 33; also, all 33 are never present in the same situation; moreover, no single one can totally account for all forms of resistance to change.

Here is sample of some of the most popular hypotheses

- 1 Homeostasis. Continual change is not a natural condition of life, hence resistance to change is a healthy human instinct.



- 2 Stare decisis. In common law, the presumption must always be given to status quo. The burden of proof must always be on the change agent.
- 3 Inertia. When a large body is in motion, it takes considerable force to alter its course.
- 4 Satisfaction. Most people are perfectly content with the status quo.
- 5 Lack of ripeness. Change occurs only when certain preconditions have been met. Such conditions are rare and cannot be forced.
- 6 Fear. Humans have an innate fear of the unknown .We prefer to take our chances with the devil we know.
- 7 Self-interest. Change may be good for others or even for the system as a whole, but unless it is specifically good for us ,we will resist it
- 8 Lack of confidence. Change threatens our self-esteem. New condition requires of us fresh skills, abilities and attitude, but we lack the confidence that we are up to the new challenges.
- 9 Future shock. When people are overwhelmed by major change as they are in modern society they hunker down and resist because the species is capable of only so much adaptation
- 10 Futility: Plus ca change, plus c'est la meme chose. Since all change is largely superficial, cosmetic and hence illusory why would people take part in the charade when they know that the power structure of society will remain unchanged
- 11 Lack of knowledge. We don't know how to change. Ignorance and faulty analysis get in the way of effective change.
- 12 Human nature. We are innately competitive, aggressive, greedy, and selfish. Because planned change assumes a degree of altruism, it is doomed to fail.
- 13 Cynicism. In light of assumption 12 we must suspect the motives of the change agent.
- 14 Perversity. Change sounds like a good idea; unfortunately, the unintended consequences will be the exact opposite of the stated objective.
- 15 Individual genius versus group mediocrity. Einstein wrote that "great souls have always met with violent opposition from mediocre minds"
- 16 Ego. Change requires that the powerful admit that they have been wrong.
- 17 Short time thinking. People can't defer gratification. People are always much inclined to prefer present interest to the distant and remote.



- 18 Myopia. Because we can't see beyond the tips of our noses, we can't see that change is in our broader self interest
- 19 Sleepwalking. Because most of us lead unexamined lives, we have "somnambulistic certainty" about the rectitude of the status quo.
- 20 Snow blindness. Groupthink, or social conformity, is the problem .as early as the sixteenth century
- 21 Collective fantasy. People in-group often act contrary to the way reason points and enlightened self interest suggests.
- 22 Chauvinistic conditioning. The way we do it is right, they are wrong and if you are one of us and you advocate what they do you are disloyal.
- 23 Fallacy of the exception. Change might work elsewhere, but we are different in fact, we can't learn anything from other unless their situation the same as ours
- 24 Ideology. Because we each have different worldviews inherently conflicting values any plan for change will divide the community into hopeless adversarial camps
- 25 Institutionalism. Individuals may change, but groups do not. Indeed the prime task of the organisation is self preservation and self perpetuation
- 26 Natura non facit saltum."Nature does not proceed by leaps "In other words change occurs only in very short and slow steps
- 27 The rectitude of the powerful .The best and the brightest have set ue on the current course
- 28 Change has no constituency. The stake that a minority of individuals has in preserving their certain place in the status quo is far stronger than the stake that the majority have in brining about an uncertain alternative.
- 29 Determinism. There was nothing anyone could do to bring about purposeful change. Through change might occur it is not as the result of conscious human action
- 30 Scientism. The contemporary academic corollary to Hegel's hypothesis is that society shouldn't learn from the lessons of history because they aren't scientific.
- 31 Habit. Habits are the flywheel of society and covers the formation of attitudes .our basic sensitivities and ways of meeting and responding to all the condition which we meet in living



- 32 The despotism of custom. Individuality is viewed as an affront to custom. Because the ideas of change agent are seen as a reproach to society, progress is thwarted by “despotic” habit
- 33 Human mindlessness. It is hard to free fools from the chains they revere. This is the most pessimistic hypothesis of all.

How leaders may bring about effective and moral change, we now turn to the half of the leadership equation typically overlooked followers. An explanation of why followers so often resist change that the very leadership that they claim to crave. To prevent the natural defensiveness likely to arise in such an analysis, our main subject will not be a business practitioner but instead three familiar would be agent of organizational change.

In Chapter 9, author discusses J. Edwards Deming in order to illustrate this “curious and troubling aspect of human behavior”: reasonable men and women often resist acting on social knowledge which will advance their collective self-interest.” How ironic that Deming’s managerial methods that were so effective in helping to defeat the Japanese during World War II were then rejected by American industry but refined and employed by the Japanese to win world markets and then, and only then, were Deming and his managerial methods embraced by American industry in desperation to learn the “secrets of Japanese management.”

In Chapter 10, he shifts his attention to Robert Owen (1771-1858) whose “paternalistic” treatment of his own employees earned an immense personal fortune for him but, meanwhile, he was widely reviled for molycoddling the workforce (and thus not creating even greater profits) or for being a manipulative capitalist “in the government’s pay.” Alas, as he notes, “Owen never learned how to overcome the deeply rooted resistance to change, a skill that is a prime characteristic of great moral leadership.” As a result, “humanity suffered for nearly a century from that singularly consequential flaw of one of history’s gentlest souls.”

In the final two chapters of *Leading Change*, he examines what he calls “the despotism of custom” and “the ideology of comfort.” Anyone in any organization (regardless of size or nature) who has attempted to be a change leader is already familiar



with both. The question remains, how to overcome them? Everything that precedes these two final chapters creates a frame-of-reference within which he correlates and galvanizes his key points. Obviously, he fully understands why there is such great resistance to change. Also, he fully understands why visionaries such as Robert Owen fail to attract the support they need. He concludes this brilliant book with a rejection of leadership by command, manipulation, or paternalism...insisting once again that only value-based leadership can be both moral and effective. “Once a leader makes that commitment, all the other pieces will eventually fall into place, bit by bit.”

This analysis refocuses attention on the central problem of leading change .The current focus of leadership studies in business has a misplaced emphasis on helping haves overcome resistance among the have lessees and have –knots in their organisation .The far greater problem is overcoming resistance among the haves, in fact it is progressives inside and outside corporations who face resistance from the people who have the most power to resist

In all instances in modern society, then, change is exceptional. When it comes about, it does so primarily as a response to outside forces. it may also occasionally occur through shift in values say as result of learning” when the time is ripe” And most rarely it may come about as the result of leadership But in no case does it come about readily. Traditional societies can be characterized by chaos leading to social collapse. Therefore society must have one foot permanently on the brake; it must have a predisposition to tradition and conservatism .The source of resistance to bad frivolous and dangerous change is same as the resistance to good necessary and positive change. The ideology of comfort draws no distinction between resisting the calls of Hitler to change society, on the one hand, and resisting the calls of a Churchill to resist Hitler on the other. Advanced societies thus became as resistant to progress as small scale, tradition bound communities.

In essence, then, the challenge in a modern nation or organisation is for leaders to distinguish for their fellow haves the differences between moral and immoral, virtuous and evil and true and false change .The natural conservatism of groups can only be overcome by leader’s appeal to a manifestly moral necessity .The leader must convince the people with



power of the rectitude of the proposed change. Even more the leader must be able to show that the proposed change is necessary step toward progress as define by the haves

This is the most difficult challenge of leadership. Brining about change without imposing one's will on others is a paradoxical, but not impossible, art to master. in both statecraft and the craft of business ,there are numerous example of men and women who have overcome the resistance to change by virtue of their moral leadership. This values based leadership may not be for everyone, but it is the only course open to leader who wish to be effective agents of change

