

Charismatic Leadership: A Critical Analysis

Dr. Yasmeen Yousif Pardesi*
Prof. Yousif Pardesi**

Abstract

The leader might be some one who seems larger than life, that is, one who appears to attract others like a magnet or by some form of charisma. The leader may be the person others want to follow a person who commands trust and respect as well as loyalty. This could be an emergent leader or the "great man" who captures the imagination as well as the admiration of his followers. These include the historical figures, presidents and revolutionary leaders.

Max Weber pioneered the concept, outlining three types of leadership: traditional, rational-legal, and charismatic. He made a distinction between power, the ability to force people to obey, regardless of their resistance; and authority, where orders are voluntarily obeyed by those receiving them. Charismatic leader seeks to inspire followers to sacrifice to attain super ordinate goals. Lincoln, Churchill, and even Hitler reflect charismatic leadership with qualitatively distinct approaches to leading.

This paper explains general concept and characteristics of leadership; it focuses on the concept of charisma and charismatic leadership, the charisma is examined in the context of modern times, with reference to the previous periods. It is also deals with the role of charismatic leadership and the difference it makes in an organization, finally it discusses varied facets of charisma with reference to the world renowned charismatic leaders.

Keywords: Leadership, Charisma, Concepts, Modern Times, and Organization

General View of Leadership

Charisma is one of the many aspects of leadership. An overview of the term leadership is imperative in understanding the concept and general character of charisma and their relation with each other. Leadership is the relation between an individual and a group for common interest and behaving in a manner directed or determined by him. It is no doubt that the relation of leadership arises only where a group follows an individual from free choice and not under command or coercion and, secondly, not in response to blind drives but on positive and more or less rational grounds. In general leadership implies a following whose behavior is the result of a conscious consideration of the leader's personality, of its own interests and of the anticipated social consequences.

In addition to the above, there are different definitions of leadership from renowned writers. Out of these, one or two, which are relevant in the context of public administration in general and organization in particular are reproduced here. According to Ralph "Leadership may be considered as the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organized group in its efforts towards goal setting and goal achievement (1981: 03). Rauch and Behling have yet another definition of leadership. Their definition implies that it is "the process of influencing the activities of an organizational group toward goal achievements" (Ibid: 03).

The common elements in their definitions imply that leadership involves a social influence process in which a person steers members of the group towards a goal. Originally a leader was one who showed the way and was followed by others; he literally led by performing some activity inspired his followers and they copied him faithfully.

These personality traits of a leader may be disputed, but there are definitely certain qualities and skills which serve as pre-requisites for effective leadership in most of the situations. Some of these qualities and skills are briefly discussed as under:

1. Belief in the Possibility of Success

Leaders want to change or maintain some aspect of social, political, or economic life; they must believe that there is a significant, though possibly small, but hopefully that their efforts will make a difference. Anyone who takes the stance that "there's nothing I can do about it anyway" is not very likely to influence others to work toward a common goal.

2. Communication Skills

The verbal skill is generally required and very important for Leaders' communication with followers. The followers must have a reasonably clear picture of what is expected of them if they are to work in a coordinated way toward a desired common purpose.

3. Empathy

Leaders always have a deep understanding of the psychology, thought processes, aspirations and fears of their followers. Empathy is not only facilitates communication but also enables the leader to find successful ways of influencing people. It is no doubt that empathy is not sympathy. Perhaps I. Edgar Hoover, former director of the FBI, is the most familiar example of this. Few would have found him "warm." Yet, he was extremely effective in building the FBI into a strong federal police agency, partly because he understood the outlook of a large number of Americans on crime, communism, and morality. By 1974, the FBI had a central file of some 159 million fingerprints, and the number was increasing by about three thousand per day. These were mostly supplied by state and local agencies and private employers. But due to his ability to dispel Americans' fears of a national police agency while playing upon their anxiety concerning communism, Hoover built the FBI into precisely such an agency with very little real opposition (Lewis, 1980: 109)

4. Energy

It tales about the long hours put in by leaders are legion. The "workaholic" label probably fits many. In this context, Eugene Lewis observes that, Hyman Rickover, "father" of the U.S. nuclear Navy, and Robert Moses, who directed the building of more roads, bridges, tunnels, and parks than perhaps anyone in recent history and devoted tremendous time and attention to gaining detailed understanding of the projects and technologies that might be appropriate for their organizations (Ibid: 109).

5. Sound Judgment

Continuing leadership may depend substantially upon the exercise of sound and reasoned judgment. Emotional, arbitrary, or capricious responses to situations are not the hallmark of long-lasting leadership--at least where the followers are free to abandon the leader. History is rife with examples of the downfall of leaders who irrationally engaged in disastrous blunders. One of the problems leaders may face is developing a feeling of infallibility, which will make sound judgment all the more difficult. In organizational terms, it is generally expected and important for leaders to maintain an unbiased, disinterested (but not uninterested) posture with regard to the organization's members. This surely helps the leader to keep matters in perspective. One should always consider such questions as: How major or minor is an infraction or an individual's incompetence from the perspective of keeping an organization functioning toward the achievement of its goals? How serious a threat has some event or action occurring outside the organization? For instance, should scarce resources be expended to fight off every threat to a public administrative organization's jurisdiction, no matter how minor or remote?

Leadership in the strict sense admits differentiation into two types, which may appropriately be designated as representative or symbolic and dynamic or creative leadership. A representative leader is an individual who satisfies the expectations of the group by acting on its behalf. The legendary figures of the classical times, who even after centuries are still remembered for their exceptional qualities, reveal that in those times the phenomenon of one or more individuals are leading the group from which they are distinctive on the basis of their real or accepted extraordinary powers in its traditional activities. In different spheres like military, political, economic, cultural and religious, leaders exercise a notable influence on the course of events by serving as models for others to imitate. They become symbols for the coming generations.

Creative leadership is different from representative leadership as it involves and attempts to enrich or change the existing values of a society. They are in a way the path breakers and can be from the field of art, religion and/or politics. The creative leader is primarily different for his creativity, excellence and innovation. A genuine leader, in addition to depth and intensity, has a much broader perspective and influence. He is generally known for his dynamism which is magnified and serves a broader goal.

From the review of what we have discussed so far, the leadership can precisely be defined as the creation and setting forth of exceptional behavior patterns in such a way that other person's response to them. It can be equated with personal social control and implies as the behavior of a while he is directing group activities. It is clearly an interaction process in which an individual usually through the medium of speech influences the behavior of others toward a particular end. So, it involves persuasion and inspiration as its basic elements. Effective leaders do not imply coercive procedures but adopt a behavior that makes a difference in the behavior of others.

Leadership does not imply activity; rather it is itself an activity. It is necessary that leaders should be more persistent, participative, and able to maintain a high rate of physical activity. To be an effective leader, one should be keenly alert to the surrounding environment, knowledgeable, task-oriented and able to diagnose situations. He is required to be vigorous and persistent in the pursuit of goals.

John P. Campbell, while analyzing the influence of leader writes that, "the leader should be

able to manipulate reinforcements, punishments, incentives, expectancies, instrumentalities, and the like, and thereby influence subordinate behavior. Second, the individual's level of skill can be increased if the leader is a good "teacher." Certainly, not all training would qualify as leadership. Anybody can hand a new employee a set of programmed instructional materials. However, to the extent that the superior demonstrates correct procedures, evaluates the individual's performance, and serves as an effective model, leadership is taking place. Thirdly, the leader can do much to aid subordinates in learning and setting the goals for a task. That is, someone who has the necessary skills for a job and the desire to do it still must inform how much to do and when" (1977: 224).

Leaders frequently are believed by their followers to be men with skills or qualities necessary to accomplish tasks or to further goals important to them. It is generally perceived that wisdom, foresight, firmness and strength of character make one a good leader. The second dimension relates to the common man's persuasion of a leader's statements and ideas. Ann Ruth Willner in her book 'The Spellbinders' writes that, "there are normally many bases upon which followers can accept, what a leader tell them because it sounds reasonable, because it conforms with knowledge obtained from other sources, because it accords with their own experience, because of the leader's status or prestige, to mention only a few" (1984: 6).

In addition to the above followers comply with directives and commands of leaders because they seem reasonable or lawful and it is their advantage to obey and above all because of leader's persuasiveness.

Concept of Charismatic Leadership

Max Weber defines charisma as "a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities." These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a 'leader' (1978: 241-42).

In this context he pull upon historical examples of known leaders which include the persons who were recognized in their own time as well as in the coming times and then selected a core of definitive characteristics which explain the type of authority that enable them to rule. Historically charismatic leadership may be different from ideal type, but the charismatic may emerge as a religious prophet, a war leader or a great orator. Some people find the world of religion as locus of charisma, as a form of spiritual energy oriented to other-worldly ideals which are in sharp contrast to the facts of daily life.

Weber recognizes significant differences between the institutional spheres of the military, politics, and religion. However, he does not divorce leadership from the political structure and cultural context in which it functions. Thus Weber links the study of charismatic leadership to an analysis of legitimating and social structure. His conception of the charismatic leader is in conformity with the concept of genius as it was applied since the Renaissance to artistic and intellectual leaders. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (1986), while pointing to Weber's concepts as analytical tools for reconstruction of various mechanisms write that "they are not descriptive categories, with which one tries to 'taste' the color and grasp the surface image of the "spirit of the time". They are not concepts that contemplate the

supposed substances of great men and epochs. In spite of Weber's emphasis on charisma, he is not likely to focus on "the great figures of history. Napoleon, Calvin and Cromwell, Washington and Lincoln, appear in his texts only in passing. He tries to grasp what is retained of their work in the institutional orders and continuities of history. Not Julius Caesar, but Caesarism; not Calvin, but Calvinism is Weber's concern" (Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 1986: 14).

The success of charisma essentially depends on two dimensions. The first is psychological which implies that the origin is from the inner dynamism of the leader's personality. The second, sociological, suggests that charisma is dependent upon people's recognition of a leader's qualities and collectively decide to offer devotion and deference by means of following the leadership. For this reason it can be said that a social movement which is led by a charismatic leader is less prone to schisms, because the function of the leader is symbol of unification. However, Weber sees this type of leader outside the realm of every day routine and profane sphere. In this respect it is sharply opposed to rational and particularly bureaucratic authority. Charismatic authority is specifically irrational in the sense of being not inclined to accept the set rules, as for him, established role does not exist.

A charismatic leader is instrumental in bringing about change because of qualities of creativeness and spontaneity, and because this leadership comes to the forefront when social change is needed.

The term charismatic leader in the modern times attained wide currency. In the past it was occasionally applied to the figures that inspired the historical movements like Hitler, Lenin, and Roosevelt. Now almost every leader with marked popular appeal especially those of new states, is indiscriminately tagged as charismatic, whether the term charisma can properly be applied in contemporary politics needs objective assessment. The Charismatic leadership depends upon a belief in the existence of extraordinary or super natural capacities, but such beliefs are not available in the secular context. In the modern politics, the qualities of personality which attract the voters indicate the popularity, which is not necessarily the charisma of a successful political leader. This is the reason that charisma in proper sense is found in those areas of the world in which a popular belief in super natural powers is still widespread. However, Weber did not confine the term charisma to magical or religious beliefs and analyzed it through kinship, hereditary and office. So charismatic element can be found in all societies, however, the opportunities for genuine charisma has diminished in the course of an increasing rationalization and bureaucratization of western society. Men of all societies confront exigencies of life which demand a comprehensive solution. The need for establishing some order with reference to different concerns in life may vary among men, but the point is that charisma attaches itself to those individuals or institutions which satisfy that need or promise to do so. Such ordering may involve philosophical or artistic representations, religious doctrines, interpretation of law or the authority of government.

Again coming back to Weber's basic definition of charisma, which entails five specifications, first is that charisma is the greatest revolutionary power in periods of established tradition. Second, that it typically neglects consideration of economic efficiency and rationality. Third, he emphasizes that a charismatic leader and his followers constitute a congregation. Fourth is that a recognition on the part of those subject to authority, is freely given and guaranteed by the revelation, hero worship or absolute trust in the leader. Fifth, the recognition is a matter of complete personal devotion to the possessor of the quality rising out

of enthusiasm.

There are many historical examples of a leader who feels the call but cannot find a following, or of people at large searching in vain for a leader who will satisfy their deep desire for miracle. In this respect the charisma frequently appears to occur because the search for it continues. But general charisma is a rare event, borne as it is of a belief in the mysterious gift of one person which person shares with those who follow him.

The Modern Concept of Charisma

In the previous chapter we discussed the concept of charisma in some detail with special reference to how Weber perceived the term. In adopting the term, Weber discusses not on the possession of grace itself but on the belief by the followers of such a religious leader and by the leader himself of such possession. The belief in possession of divine inspiration was critical for quoted Weber as saying that "in primitive circumstances this peculiar kind of quality in thought of as resting on magical powers, whether of prophets, persons with a reputation for therapeutic or legal wisdom, leaders in the hunt, or heroes in What is alone important is how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority, by 'followers' or disciples" (Weber. Joseph Bensman and Michael Givant, 1986: 28).

Charismatic leadership usually arises in times of crises in which the basic values, institution and legitimacy of the society are in question. War, revolution, foreign domination or unexplained natural phenomena may shake the faith in the legitimacy of the established order and belief systems. The religious, political, and social hierarchies that sustain and are identified with these belief systems are also questioned.

Pure charismatic leadership is revolutionary and in conflict with the established order. While pure or genuine charisma is personal, direct, radical, revolutionary, and extraordinary, when the charismatic movement is successful charisma becomes ordinary. Its leadership becomes routinized, de-personalized, and de-radicalized. Again Weber has been quoted by Bensman and Givant as saying that "every charisma is on the road from a turbulently emotional life that knows no economic rationality to a slow death by suffocation under the weight of material interests; every hour of its existence brings it nearer to this end" (Ibid: 31).

Weber in this way develops subtypes of routinized, depersonalized and legitimate charisma, where a whole clan or kin group may claim unusual power and privileges on the basis of descent from a charismatic hero. In addition to, there is hereditary charisma in which a prince or king may justify his rule by descent from a charismatic hero. But all these cases are the opposite of pure charisma. In pure charisma the claim to the obedience is personal. It is based on the ability of the charismatically leader to evoke the sense of faith, loyalty, and obedience of a group of personal followers.

Weber used the concept of charisma in precise ways. The new and popular usage of charisma among lay audiences selects only one aspect of all the various meanings of the term and treats that aspect as its only meanings. The selected and emphasized quality is the quality of the extraordinary character of the charismatic hero. Extraordinariness is treated as the unusually psychological qualities and exceptional ability to embody the central values of society. E. Shils, a famous sociologist, in an attempt to refocus the discussion of charisma, emphasizes the elements in charisma that linked it to established orders. He sees the

charismatic hero as in an extraordinary man. In addition to divine or other transcendent power, Shils also relates special order to charisma. In this connection Bensman and Givant in their article quote Shils as observing:

"The generator or author of order arouses the charismatic responsiveness. Whether it is God's law or natural law or scientific law or positive law or the society as a whole, or even a particular corporate body or institution like an army, whatever embodies, expresses or symbolizes the essence of an ordered cosmos or any significant sector thereof awakens the disposition of awe and reverence, the charismatic disposition" (Ibid: 35).

Shils is mainly concerned with the diffusion of charisma throughout a society; its embodiment is not in a charismatic hero, nor in the charisma of an office, but in the entire institutional structure of a society, in the society itself, in its elites, in its central values, in its population and in groups that have high prestige. Shils concept of charismatic hero, in contrast to Weber, has no specific institutional base, nor any specific attributes. It is free floating attribute that can attach itself to any thing including individuals. It may be called metaphysical entity in the sense that the need for order is taken as given, beyond explanation to simpler elements.

McIntosh, while emphasizing the idea of extraordinary quality of charisma opines that charisma is virtually a pure Psychological state. With reference to Psychological components and dimension of charisma, McIntosh has been quoted Bensman and Givant as saying that "the outstanding quality of charisma is its enormous power, every human on psyche" and "charisma is an unconscious force which has been displaced outward" (Ibid: 41).

McIntosh, like Shils and unlike Weber, finds charisma as a universal human experience. This finding implies that all social actions, institutions, social movements and forms of legitimacy are deeply in bred with charisma. With reference to application of the concept of charisma to the modern world, especially in the political context, Bensman and Givant (1986) note that "modern charismatic leaders have claimed universal power because they have allegedly embodied the genius of the "race," have concentrated in themselves the spirit or essence of an earlier, more glorious period in a nation's history, or have claimed to be uniquely qualified to understand the dialectic or the laws of history and thus to bring the future into being" (Ibid: 44). McIntosh, however, deal only with these forms of charisma that are attracted to the state, corporate bodies and established institutions or highly organized social movements.

He also criticizes Weber's sociology of religion to the modern world, because religious charisma is no longer important in a world that is no longer religious. Bensman and Givant (1986) commenting upon charisma in the secular world say that, "modern world composed of large-scale states, business organizations, political parties, mass media, all operating over vast social and psychological distances, the processes leading to identification, to legitimacy, and to charisma are somewhat more differentiated, specific, and complicated than can be subsumed in anyone term or concept, whether that term be charisma, legitimacy, or identification. The broadening of each term, as done by Shils and McIntosh, so that it subsumes the other, leads neither to clarity nor to understanding of the modern world. Rather, the breakdown of conceptual distinctions leads only to a theoretical circularity wherein each term dissolves into each other, with little reference to what occurs in the empirical world" (Ibid: 46).

Charisma, in the modern world is most apathy can be studied with reference to the

politics and political leaders. Political leaders, by creating their images, become the objects of intense administration in the masses. Similarly certain film or T.V. stars with sex appeal or personal magnetism have charisma because of their stage presence or star quality. Professional sportsman, also get projection in the mass media and become charismatic heroes in the warrior image. These modern lines of figures in showbiz, politics and sports, etc manifest that Weber's concept of charisma does not encompass the broader aspects (Bensman and Givant 1986: 47). "The dimensions of the concept of charisma that are obscured by the broadening of the concept are fundamental. These, as we have noted perhaps too often, are: (1) the personal nature of charisma; (2) its radical (or revolutionary) nature; (3) and its irrationality. Ultimately the modern usage of the term charisma refers to an ability to project an image of a direct, warm, or exciting, sincere, engaging, personal or unofficial and "human" personal" (Ibid: 47).

Karl Lowenstein (1966) says that genuine charisma of the ancient world rarely exists in the modern era. He writes that "in a closed authority-directed society, in which the organs of propaganda are controlled by the supposed holder of charisma and his subservient following, the mass media can produce reinforcement and deepening of an originally spurious but artificially promoted charisma attributed to the ruler" (1966: 86).

The study of political leaders of the present and past and those of the present time show that mass media play a vital role in determining the qualities of charismatic leaders. Then the mechanics or techniques of different leaders to achieve charisma also vary to a large extent. These do include the psychological and personal methods or organizational and media devices. Even some leaders, at times, appear charismatic but it is difficult to determine the reasons of their being charismatic "Some 'charismatic' leaders after achieving a degree of prominence, demonstrate their larger-than-life humanity by showing themselves in carefully arranged situations to be human and personable. Others will emphasize the awe and mystery by maintaining distance and an attitude of formality toward their followers. Lighting, camera angles, makeup, distance, and camera focus as well as, at times, face-lifting and other cosmetic and illusion-producing stage craft help to produce 'charisma' (Bensman and Givant 1986, 50).

Modern charisma is predominantly related to rational planning which involves the conscious selection of themes, slogans and imagery that is based upon the understanding of audiences and general public. Then it is not necessary that all political leaders are charismatic or they manipulate to present charismatic images. Of course, popularity does not mean charismatic. The conditions, under which charisma may arise in the modern society are also important to be seen. Peter Blau (1963) argued that Weber failed to specify such conditions. He states that Weber's theory of charisma "encompasses only the historical processes that lead from charismatic movements to increasing rationalization and does not include an analysis of the historical conditions that give rise to charismatic eruptions in the social structure" (Blau1963: 309-16).

Charisma and Organization

According to Weber there are two kinds of organizations; one is alien to charisma, while the other effectively assists charisma. Before we look into the relationship between charisma and organization, an overview of leadership in general, with reference to organization, is explained here.

The outstanding characteristics of organizations today is the number of antagonistic forces that are colliding head-on: stringent corporate requirements versus employee aspirations; sophisticated technological systems versus the social system; integrated production processes versus worker expectations; impersonal jobs versus subordinate satisfaction; neat interfacing networks versus human needs; intricate structures versus a sense of identity; cost and profit pressures versus personal progress and growth; stability versus innovation; uniformity versus change; conformity versus creativity; company growth versus constructive regulations; corporate profit seeking versus demands of society. Therefore the clash of thesis and antithesis goes on unendingly.

How can practicing managers evolve a new synthesis from these opposing phenomena so that the organization's inherent potential energy can be made kinetic? The simplest, least expensive and most realistic strategy is to become both effective managers and effective leaders. The management is largely an action-oriented cerebral process, but leadership is principally an action oriented interpersonal process.

It is a promising area because in everyday life people seem to believe that leadership matters, that it is important to the realization of a desirable state of affairs. This is what people mean when they bemoan the absence of "Good" or 'strong' leadership or when industrialists seek to recruit to their firm people with the 'right' leadership qualities.

The common elements in the concept of leadership we have examined earlier imply that it involves a social influence process in which a person steers members of the group towards a goal. Originally, a leader was one who showed the way and was followed by others; he quite literally led by performing some activity which was copied faithfully by his followers, so leadership is the ability to gain consensus and commitment to common objectives, beyond organizational requirements, which are attained with the experience of contribution and satisfaction on the part of work group.

There are certain key terms which really need clarification. In this regard James Cribbin has discussed the following terms in his book 'leadership'.

Ability to Gain

Leadership is an influence process that enables managers to get from his people the work done in the best possible way. This influence process is always bio-lateral. The people, in return also influence the behavior of the manager, sometimes with more intensity.

Consensus and Commitment

Lenin once said that 100 organized men, committed to an objective, would conquer 1,000. John Hancock is reported to have stated that he would prefer a decision that was only 50 percent technically correct and that the group would embrace with 90 percent enthusiasm. This implies that the leader, whenever possible, strives for consensus and commitment rather than the tyranny of the majority of one vote.

To Common Objective

This distinguishes leadership from manipulation. The goals of the leader and the subordinates need not be, and rarely can be, identical. But in order to work together, these should be some common objectives.

Which are attained

Leadership aims at producing results that surpass the ordinary expectations of the organization. A mere administrator can achieve average results. The leader gets superior results from average people.

Experience of Contribution and Satisfaction

This involves much more than the mere feeling of contribution, success, and satisfaction. Unless people genuinely experience more success than failure, the situation is bleak. Employees must also be stimulated by the quality of the leadership behavior.

Apparently charisma and organization appear contradictory. In contrast to bureaucratic organization, charisma knows no formal rules and regulations, no technical jurisdictions and no permanent institutions. This is the reason that when a charismatic leader becomes the head of the state, he finds himself into a conflict with official bureaucracy. Despite this conflict, charismatic beliefs require an effective organization for their implementation. Charismatic leader can not realize his mission without material means and manifold assistance. So a leader has to build up an effective charismatic apparatus for accomplishing his purpose. The main task is to superimpose the apparatus upon the regular bureaucracy as soon as the leader comes in power. Weber was inclined to expect that in the struggle over administration, bureaucracy will win over charisma. He further says that internal dynamics of party organization and the social and economic conditions, in any given situation, are closely interlinked. During the last six or seven decades, the opportunities for charisma increased due to wars, depressions and independence movements. As a result new political parties emerged which, at times, worked against democratic norms. This gave way to dictatorship and one party rule. The co-existence of democratic and dictatorial parties corresponds to the distinction between democratic and dictatorial charisma. The result of parallelism for the relationship between charisma and organization has been described as, "The cleavage between the two has been significantly reduced because of the affinity between democratic charisma and bureaucracy or between dictatorial charisma and dictatorial bureaucracy. A fundamental antagonism prevails only between democratic charisma and dictatorial bureaucracy or between dictatorial charisma and democratic bureaucracy. At the same time, opportunities for building up a charismatic apparatus have increased both in democratic as well as dictatorial charisma. As the executive branch became stronger relative to the legislative branch of modern states so the opportunities grew for creating and promoting a charismatic apparatus, in democracy as well as in dictatorship. The result has been that the relative significance of routinized charisma fell, while a new avenue opened up for the phenomenal growth of synergistic charisma. This new kind of leadership in itself gave rise to a positive inter-linkage between charisma, ideology, and organization" (*Schweitzer* 1984: 131).

As we have seen charisma is opposite to all institutional routines, those of tradition and those subject to rational management. This holds for economic order. When used in a strictly technical manner, the concept of charisma is free from all evaluations. Napoleon as well as Jesus Christ is grouped as charismatic leaders, as they have in common the fact that people obey them because of faith in their personal extraordinary qualities.

Charismatic leadership is one of the most competitive advantages an organization can

posses today. Charismatic leaders are unconventional and present a paradox for organizations. It is difficult to live with them and at the same time without them. The importance of the charismatic leader lies in their skill of communication, motivation, and innovation. The leaders like Iacoca or McGill of the United States who revitalized the organizations like Chrysler and A.T & T, instill confidence and self-esteem in their workers. But the question is that can everybody become a charismatic leader like Iacoca and McGill. Probably not, because charismatic leaders are God given and born leaders. However, anybody can enhance the strategic abilities and skills by following the charismatic leaders. The ability and desire to lead are often lost because of the lack of opportunities to develop as a leader. The training programs of different organizations are creating managers and not leaders as these perpetuate administrative skills rather than leadership skills. They teach simple goal setting, managing by objectives, participative decision making. The charisma leader requires vision, persuasive abilities, and motivational skills.

Charismatic leaders in an organization would tend to challenge the status quo. Secondly charismatic leaders prefer extensive autonomy, at times, may need to be complemented by others with strong operational skills. Similarly a leader who is charismatic in one situation may not be so in another. The environment of an organization is also closely linked with the working of a charismatic leader Conger (1989) with reference to mature and stable organizations writes that, "These are usually marked by bureaucratic controls, little personal autonomy, and limited room for innovation--a far less attractive environment for individuals with the skills and temperament of a charismatic leader. As well, an organization operating in a stable marketplace may not require such dominant and directive leadership. Stable and mature organizations are more likely to be averse to risk and to have routinized their operations to the point where rules and standard procedures, rather than leadership, are the primary means of managing. Instead, entrepreneurial ventures in organizations undergoing dramatic change or pressures for change may be the most appropriate situations for charismatic leaders" (1989: 174-75).

Organizations should adapt themselves to the vision of the charismatic leader to get the best out of him. Charisma is a changing agent and demand special attention. If placed in an atmosphere and environment of their liking, charisma can play a vital role in the renewal and uplift of organizations.

Different Facets of Charisma

Once again we revert to Max Weber who introduced the concept of the charismatic leader in the context of his classic classification of authority or legitimate domination into three ideal types: legal or rational, traditional, and charismatic. The basis of his classification is the content of the prevailing beliefs in a society that govern its dominant pattern of command and compliance. Charismatic authority, as we have seen, is distinctly personal as it is lodged neither in office nor in status but derives from the capacity of a particular person to arouse and maintain belief in him or herself as the source of legitimacy.

Charismatic leadership mainly manifest in the religious and political arena. Weber's study of charisma stressed its revolutionary role in religion and politics. The charismatic leader is always in some sense a revolutionary, setting himself in conscious opposition to some established aspects of the society in which he works.

The search for certainty spawned countless prophet's *gurus*, *messiahs* and panacea-mongers whose messages suggested order in the chaotic world. This stress is a form of piety and often ascribes unrestrained power to these personalities. They are perceived as possessed with supernatural endowments. To religious charisma, this articulates and embodies a cosmos. In an unstable environment, the charismatic advances a plan of action and vision which envisage permanence and a transform order.

Although such charismatic leaders may appear at any time, they specially become prominent during the periods of turmoil. While talking about religious charisma and the charisma of scientism emerged in the post-war period, Alan (1986) writes that, "The distinction between religion and idolatry in Western religions rests largely upon the role of mystery in religious life. Mystery implies a limitation on the merely rational. Without advocating the overthrow of reason, religion upholds the possibility of divine eruptions in human existence. For example, Martin Buber spoke of the religious perception of the world in terms of astonishment. The scientific revolution, for its part, attempted to enlarge man's scope of know ledge. As such, there is no irreconcilable difference between religious mystery and science. By the second half of the twentieth century, however, our understanding of science had deteriorated into scientism, which has grave implications for leadership and religion. In distinction to science, scientism is a severely limiting concept" (Alan 1986: 86-87).

There are some political leaders who gain charisma after they obtained power. During the stage of a leader's ascent to formal power, political charisma works as major asset. A charismatically oriented following can be ordered to the polls or out onto the streets at will. Its members openly demonstrate their leader's popularity, swell audiences and campaign for him with extraordinary vigor. A leader can use such followers as a means of subtle intimidation, provoking them to demonstrations, boycotts and violence. He can restrain them from action or violence if it seems advantageous. He has, in short, a most effective instrument to use at will.

A charismatic hold on some part of his following permits a leader greater flexibility than leaders without charisma are likely to have'. Political leaders on the rise generally seek to broaden their support. Charismatic leaders are less constrained. Even if they lose their popularity, those who are charismatically oriented to them, stay with them.

We have before us examples of different leaders in the history, who can be bracketed as charismatic. One is the revolutionary which is seen as an emotional and antirational force. The charismatic quality revolutionizes men from within and shapes material and social conditions according to its revolutionary will. Generally, this form of charisma has the capacity to undermine bureaucratic and traditional orders. In addition to their general dynamism, their existed a list of charismatic revolutionaries in the political sphere, apart from the ancient times, the leaders of French Revolution and some dictators of modern times can be seen who ignored traditional legitimacy and formal legality .

While referring to the different kinds of charismatic revolutionaries and the respective situation which include religiously inspired uprisings, charismatic military heroes like Cromwell and Napoleon, Schweitzer (1984) notes as follows: "For each of these leaders were evolved a twofold authorization and legitimating of the expected or actual revolutions. The leader not only felt his inner calling but also believed in the revolutionary Ideals. The followers were not only emotionally attached to the leader but also shared his revolutionary

ideals. Whether the revolutions were originally defensive or revengeful, destructive or constructive, the respective actions and the authority of the leaders were legitimized by revolutionary ideals. The same was true for the schismatic claim of the leader whose power was legitimized by the worship of the followers. As in democratic so in revolutionary leadership: The fusion of two kinds of authorities and legitimacies signified the existence of synergistic charisma, whether for the movement or for the respective government" (Schweitzer 89:52).

While thinking of charisma in the context of different leaders, the names of Lenin, Mao, Gandhi, Roosevelt, Napoleon, Nasir, Abraham Lincoln, and Jinnah come in mind. Some of the leaders stand for dictatorial charisma.

Hitler is the most prominent example. Hitler displayed an extraordinary self-confidence, which took him to the top of the movement. His self-confidence can be seen from his words "nothing is impossible; one can do everything if one has the necessary will". The study of Hitler rising to the top and subsequent actions to lead the nation shows that he was undoubtedly an outstanding example of a charismatic giant. He derived his extraordinary qualities from natural as well as super natural sources, from developing different subtypes of unconditional authority and combining various forms of exceptional actions into an unusual kind of cumulative charisma. On top of these were grafted his personality cult and belief in his infallibility.

In the very recent past, the name of Khomeini appears as striking example of charismatic leader. While living in exile he led a popular revolution against the powerful Shah of Iran and forced him to leave the country. Khomeini embodies many of the characteristics of a charismatic leader while his authority exemplifies the ideal type of charismatic domination. His charismatic authority derives ultimately from his personal characteristics which, of course, are legitimated by recourse to religious ethics.

CONCLUSION

Leadership in general and charismatic leadership is two distinct concepts. Again management is one thing, leadership is another. The manager thinks today and tomorrow. The leader must think day after tomorrow. The leader represents a direction of history. Charismatic leadership requires great vision and the capacity for action.

From different studies it can be seen that charisma appears when consummate belief on one side and the prompting of enthusiasm, despair or hope on the other, imperatively call for unconditional authority and obedience. Though Weberian concept of charisma was originally applied to highly personal social movements that were revolutionary irrational, his concept is not out of context if seen with special reference to modern political and social movements. However, Weber perhaps could not foresee the systematic use of appearances of charisma as a continuous rationality calculated strategy by the staffs and agencies of bureaucratic and political machines and elites in large scale mass bureaucratic societies. He also failed to foresee the rational political movements based on the systematic exploitation of irrationality. However, he fully comprehended the quest for deeper meaning, irrational, emotional, and spiritual existence that could lead to new forms of totalitarianism.

References

- Stogdill Ralph 1981, *Hand Book of Leadership: A Survey of Theory A*. New York: The Free Press.
- Ibid: 03.
- Eugene Lewis 1980, *Public Entrepreneurship: Toward of Bureaucratic Political Power*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- John P. Campbell 1977, "The Cutting Edge of Leadership: An Overview." in James G. Hunt and Lasrs L. Larson (ed.) *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ann R. Willner 1984, *The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Max Weber 1978, *Economy and Society*, Berkeley: University of California.
- Gerth H.H and C. Wright Mills 1986, "Bureaucracy and Charisma: A Philosophy of History" in Ronald M.G. & William H.S. (ed.) *Charisma, History and Social Structure*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Joseph Bensman and Michael Givant 1986, "Charisma and Modernity: The Use and Abuse of a Concept", in Ronald M.G. & William H.S. (ed.) *Charisma, History and Social Structure*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Karal Lowenstein 1966, *Max Weber's Political Ideas in the Perspective of our Time*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Blau Peter, "Critical Remarks on Weber's Theory of Authority". *American Political Science Review*, 57: 1963.
- Schweitzer Arthur 1984, *The Age of Charisma*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Conger Jay A. 1989, *The Charismatic Leadership: Behind the Mystique of Exceptional Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Alan L. Berger 1986, "Hasidism and Msoonism: Charisma in the Counterculture", in Ronald & William (ed.) *Charisma, History and Social Structure*. New York: Greenwood Press.