CFAR

Passion and Group Life

Larry Hirschhorn, Ph.D.

February 2003

Passion and its Vicissitudes

Passion and Meaning

Passion and group life are always and everywhere uneasily joined, and the links between the two constitute one of the biggest challenges we face in building productive organizations. Passion most often shows up as a problem by its absence. Perhaps the single most common complaint managers have at all levels of an organization is that their subordinates are not motivated, that they do what is necessary but no more. Yet what does the problem of motivation really signify? Motivation, as Burkhard Sievers has argued, is in fact only a problem when work lacks meaning (Sievers, 1986). For as Gestalt psychology teaches us, when a task has intrinsic meaning we are pulled along to complete it. The task is its own reward.

I want to suggest here that meaning is linked to passion. Passion, in fact, *is the measure of the level of meaning we accord a task.* Moreover, passion is the vector sum of *two* dimensions of feeling. First, there is the feeling that some person, object, activity is terribly important, it has much meaning, and second, there is the feeling that I, you, the passionate person, is in some way incomplete, that we need to strengthen our attachment to the object or activity to render its meaning whole for us and to render us whole. *It is the simultaneous completion of the self and the task that gives passion its motivating force.*

There is a very cheery story about how a passion helped create an entire industry. Fred Hapgood in his wonderful history of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, or MIT, documents how the students of the "Tech Model Railroad Club" at MIT played an important role in the development of computer software (Hapgood, 1993). The club members, a group of enthusiastic and quirky model

train hobbyists, built a room that housed 1,200 square feet of rails and industrial and residential landscapes over a period of decades. The railroad hobbyist was for a certain time in the United States the quintessential nut: passionate without reason, for anything to do with toy trains. Beginning in the early 1950s, club members were obsessed with the problem of running trains according to different schedules and speeds—a delicate problem since the rails were fed from a single power source. They stumbled upon the use of electric relays to solve the problem and, in the mid-1950s, were lucky enough to get Western Electric's, once part of the Bell Telephone Company and now called Lucent Technology, entire excess supply of relays.

Electric relays are configured to mimic logic circuits so they can feed power to different parts of the track in different patterns. As it turns out, the logic of relays and the logic of computer programming are closely linked; each is based on the concatenation of "and," "or," "if" and "not" to execute a sequence of instructions. So when MIT got its first computer for nondefense work, club members lingered at the computer facility for 24 hours a day using any available down time to develop computer codes to control the model train traffic. To improve their chances of utilizing this scarce resource, they offered to do programming jobs for others, and taking less time than they had signed up for, they could use the balance for their own work in creating computer code for their railroad. They called themselves "hackers" to highlight their identity as pranksters and jesters. Many were later hired by Professor Minsky to staff the first artificial intelligence lab. Thus the computer hackers of today, known for their inventiveness, quirkiness and outlaw-like activities, are the grandchildren of model train hobbyists. Hapgood describes their values as rooted in "communal

bonhomie, irreverence, high tolerance for goofiness, belief in the power of fantasy, and an insistence on having total control of their own world" (Hapgood, 1993, p. 104).

Indeed, this kind of passion continues to simulate innovation in the computer world. No story has been as dramatic than the creation and diffusion of the Linux operating system developed by hundreds of programmers around the world that is free to anyone who wants to use it. Red Hat, a company that services and supports Linux, has recently gone public, and IBM has announced that it will support Linux as an alternative to Microsoft's operating system. Linus Torvald, the originator of Linux, was drawn to the technical problem of creating an operating system more reliable than Microsoft's system. His passion was purely technical— he had no desire to become rich or famous. When IBM wanted to use the Linux code developed by the "Apache group," an informal association of programmers who were building Linux, they could not purchase it from them because Apache had no legal status—it was just a club. Instead, IBM offered to share with them some new tricks, or "hacks," for using the group's software to run Microsoft's NT system more quickly and promised to share all future hacks with them. Now *that* was attractive, and the deal was done (McHugh, 1988).

These are rosy stories; however, a psychoanalytic framework suggests that there is a shadow side as well. Passion can be profoundly anti-social and, as a result, groups and organizations are in an eternal state of ambivalence about passion and its vicissitudes. Passion threatens groups in three ways: with withdrawal and excess, with tension and provocation, and by undermining the constituents of authority in a group.

Withdrawal and Excess

Freud argued that others could experience the love between a couple as an attack on group life. Because the couple projects a certain self-sufficiency, as if the group did not matter, it becomes an object of envy. The couple succeeds in making true every group member's wish—to be free of the group and the constraints it creates. As a result, the group may try to appropriate the couple for its own purposes. This is one way to interpret Bion's concept of the pairing basic assumption in group life. Presented with a couple or potential couple, the group turns them into progenitors, whose coupling will produce a new group, a group without conflict and with all its problems solved. They are a couple on *behalf* of the group not in *opposition* to it (Bion, 1959).

The same dilemma is stimulated by a person's passionate attachment to an idea, a project. Here the couple is the person and the project is the scientist and his or her experiment. In this situation the scientist feels compelled to pursue the project to its bitter or happy ending, to see it to completion as a way of seeking internal completion. The incomplete project is in this sense the psychological equivalent of an unconsummated relationship, and this can be a problem for the company sponsoring the experiment or project. It is not uncommon for scientists in a pharmaceutical company to become too attached to a particular compound and the marketable drug it represents, even when there are signs that the drug cannot make money for the company (e.g., a competitor comes out with a similar drug first). The company, organized around the task of producing profits, needs its scientists to be both passionate and promiscuous. They should be able to both cathect and decathect a project with ease. This is a tall order.

Indeed, a classic tension in the management of commercial research and development organizations is how to give scientists freedom to pursue their interests while at the same time assuring that their work advances the company. Researchers suggest that one solution is to actively engage the scientists in the life of the organization, to put them squarely into the group; for example, by having them set their own goals in conversation with peers and superiors. The aim is to facilitate the scientist's cathexis to the group as well as to his or her passionately held project (Allison, 1969).

This apparent obstinacy from the point of view of managers is one aspect of a passion's relationship to excess. Rodin, the famous sculptor, went through a personal crisis after his sister died. He gave up his work and entered a monastery. When he finally left the monastery, Rodin had what one author describes as an "orgy of touching, fingering, pawing." He sculptured 12,000 hands of which he destroyed 10,000 (Deutsch, 1959, pp. 41-42). Groups unfortunately frequently punish the person who pursues something to excess.

Consider John, a physician working for a large, multi-hospital health system. Concerned and fascinated by the problems of delivering health care in an age of managed care, he became preoccupied with studying health outcome measures. His thesis was simple: hospital systems that could prove they cured patients and kept them healthy would win in the competition for insurance dollars. The multi-hospital system had put him in an R&D role to explore this issue but soon found that there were more pressing issues facing the senior executive group. For example, they were questioning what other hospitals they should acquire, whether they should buy up physician practices, and how they would respond if a for-profit chain entered their region. So they neglected John's working

papers and presentations. John was peeved by this lack of attention—so much so that whenever he rose to speak at a meeting of the 50 or so senior executives of the hospital, he only spoke about outcome measures. No matter what the subject, he found a way to connect it to outcome measures. People were first amused by this behavior, but over time they began to ridicule him. They found his preoccupation with the subject extremely troublesome.

Ultimately, John's passion for health outcome measures was not misplaced. A decade after John began pursuing his interest in this subject, the field of "evidence-based medicine" emerged and its proponents advocated exactly what John had been preaching—to develop sound data to test whether what doctors did actually help their patients.

John suffered the "disability" caused by passion's excess. He became so obsessed by the subject that his capacity to exercise sound judgment and tact was impaired. Yet the health system lost something also. It could not take advantage of John's prescience to build a business reputation around a very important issue.

Excess and Neurosis

Why might some groups be wary of excess? There are perhaps rational reasons why excess is suspect—it could waste group members' time, attention and resources. However, I think there is another fear, based on the psychodynamics of excess. I think we recognize in excess an element of neurotic behavior. The excess is one manifestation of what Freud called the compulsion to repeat, to return over and over again to the same core fantasy that animates us but also hobbles us. Consider, for example, the case of Fredrick Winslow Taylor—the founder of Industrial Engineering whose impact on how jobs have been designed

for the last 80 years has been unequaled. You will recall that he introduced the method we now call "time and motion" studies in which tasks are broken down into their smaller elements and methods are sought for speeding up each of the elements. In a study of his character, Abraham Zaleznik (1993) notes:

> "At the age of 12, being troubled by nightmares, he constructed for himself a harness of straps and wooden points, the latter so arranged that whenever in his sleep he turned over upon his the back, the wooden points would press the dorsal muscle and at once awaken him. Before going to a dance he would consciously and systematically list the attractive and unattractive girls with the object of dividing his time equally between them. In the diary of his trip to Europe, the only curious feature is the occasional listing of all stations the train passed through with the exact times of arrival and departure." (p. 281)

We may smile at this, knowing that Taylor's obsession with lists, mechanisms and counting was likely the wellspring for his creative application of science to designing tools and production systems; however, it seems likely that pain also lies at the basis of this creativity. Indeed, one commonly held assumption among psychoanalytic thinkers is that illness and creativity are linked (Chessick, 1999). An excess of neurosis can defeat creativity (Kubie, 1958). The artist or scientist loses the flexibility she needs to create. Nonetheless, the neurosis itself provides a drive to repair the damage to one's spirit by creating something beautiful and complete that others will appreciate. This is why Melanie Klein felt that the reparative motive, the desire of repair, animated artists (Klein and Riviere, 1974). It is interesting in this context to note that the word "passion" is

etymologically linked to the idea of "suffering." That is why we speak of the "passion of Christ."

Taylor's experience gives us additional insight into John's position. We do not know the sources of John's obsession with health outcome measures, but let us assume that, like Taylor, John's obsession was prefigured by psychological difficulties he too experienced in his early years. One hypothesis is that John, in contrast to Taylor, could not bear his pain long enough to rework it into something creative. Instead, he "ejected" it at every opportunity as if he were asking his colleagues to help him wrestle his personal demons. Moreover, the resulting ridicule allowed John to imagine that the pain he was experiencing was "out there" rather than inside him.

Tension and Provocation

Passion is linked to the creation of tension, and often results in aggression. I once coached an executive of a financial services company. He was in his early forties and quite successful, but he was in danger of being "plateau-ed" because his boss came to believe he could not get along with women. As I worked with him, I saw that he, in fact, managed through provocation. He asked subordinates a question and when they would answer it he would stake out an opposite position to challenge them. His behavior, while tough, was by no means arbitrary. He was not a tyrant. Instead he was insistent, in your face. He had just built a line of business in the company, providing back-office supports to investment fund managers that were very successful. My coaching centered on helping him be more facilitative, "cooler" we might say, but I did this work, to be frank, with a heavy heart. I felt that while I was defanging him for his own benefit, I was also depriving him and

the organization of the good results of his productive passions. I hypothesized that his provocations were linked to the problem he reportedly had with women subordinates. He was a very good-looking man, and his provocations may have been experienced sexually and unconsciously. Indeed, he may have intended them to be, but in this case I don't think it would have been possible to have the passion without the sexuality—one was the flip side of the other.

To be sure, you could say that my coaching followed in the footsteps of modern management theory. One way to characterize much of management theory is to say that its idea is the "cool" environment, where everyone is professional and people are dispassionate. This is what people mostly mean when they talk of fostering teamwork. Yet if staying cool is an ideal, it often runs up against the reality that important business decisions have high stakes for everyone involved. In my observations as a consultant I have found that when top executives meet to consider important strategic decisions, for example, to spend millions on a new drug or a new information systems, the environment is in fact filled with tension, though everyone is on their best behavior. What you observe instead is a kind of aggressive and cutting behavior, as if the rage is close to the surface, though it is successfully repressed. This indirect aggression, the outcropping of repressed passions itself, leaves a sour taste. (This is less true of family businesses.) To use Freud's felicitous metaphor, the wine of passion is turned into the vinegar of suppressed rage. I am afraid that this may be one result of my coaching.

Let me give you an even more extreme example. Consider George, a brilliant lawyer and keen strategist, who was the senior attorney and a vice president of a consumer products company. George decided that his staff should

develop a deep understanding of the company's overall business and its strategy for creating value. The department's legal strategies, he insisted, could not be created in the abstract but must be grounded in the company's business goals and approaches. He articulated this vision with passion, challenging his subordinates to work more like line managers within the company rather than as legal professionals. Though George was withering in his criticism of others and frequently lost his temper, his subordinates felt loyal to him precisely because he made their work exciting. As one lawyer noted, "We hate the climate, but if George left the company we would all leave."

To be sure, I believe that there was some psychopathology here. George's temper was a sign perhaps of his narcissism. He could not believe that the world and those around him were not immediately and always to his liking. In this case we might say that George should have carried his passion into the work while checking his temper at the door, but unfortunately, temper and passion are frequently linked.

Consider the temperament of the ex-mayor of Philadelphia, Ed Rendell, now governor of the state of Pennsylvania. In a much-acclaimed book, Buzz Bissinger provides a sympathetic and in-depth description of his leadership qualities (Bissinger, 1997). His temper was sometimes uncontrollable, but his passion for the city was unquestionable. He would go to ridiculous lengths to support it, get it money, win it friends. David Cohen, his chief of staff, tells the story of feeling rattled when one day he looked out the window of his city hall office only to see Rendell "announcing July 23 as hot dog day and then wrestling with a mascot in the shape of a six-foot pig." Rendell made this appearance because a hot dog company promised to donate $5,000 to the recreation

department, "but even Rendell wondered whether he had gone past the threshold" (p. 239). But he could lose his temper and quite inappropriately. One time he assaulted a woman reporter who asked him a discomfiting question. She considered but did not file a police report. He was very lucky.

Passion and Authority

Passion also does not sit easily with authority, which as you know is the heart and soul of any work organization. Consider the following. I consulted to a program that provided alternatives to jail for young offenders, mostly minority Latino and African-American teenagers. The court sent these teenagers to this program for six months as an alternative to sending them to jail. The youthful offenders had a second chance. Mike, who was in charge of the educational component, was a man of great passion. He lived and ate the program, and in the context of working on a design team to redesign the way the agency did its core work, he provided the insight that unlocked the design team's energies and enabled it to work. However, as the executive director of the program reported to me, Mike had been a source of endless trouble as well. He simply did not like nor did he respect the assistant director of the program and had no compunction in disagreeing with him in public and behaving, as we might say, in an insubordinate fashion. We can imagine why the executive director felt stymied. He could not resolve the conflict he felt between two opposing principals, supporting the hierarchy and giving free reign to the passion. I wondered what gave Mike the internal authority to be so insubordinate. I don't think it lay in a character flaw. He was not grandiose or narcissistic; what you saw is what you got. Instead, his passion was the source of his authority. He deeply identified with the program, it was his ego ideal, and he

felt free to violate hierarchy in the services of protecting the program he loved. Perhaps one proof of this hypothesis is that the assistant director ultimately left (chased out would be a better term). The executive director restructured the hierarchy so that that Mike now reported to an assistant he respected and collaborated with—a counterpart on the clinical side that he loved dearly. It was in this context that the successful redesign of the program took place. Remarkably the organization was redesigned around Mike.

Organizing Passion

Passion is the source of innovation, but it can be very hostile to group life. We are left with an important question: Can passion ever be generative and inclusive *withou*t bringing in its wake what Freud would have called the death drive, the compulsion to repeat, the self-centeredness, the excess, the temper and the aggression? Recall that Freud had a model for this kind of subdued passion, which he called sublimation. He was, of course, the master of sublimation himself One cannot read his letters without experiencing in them a man who had mastered his feelings while at the same time giving them some play, some sunlight. One hypothesis is that this was the only way he could manage in the swirl of transferences that were constantly provoked by his towering intellect and creativity. Can we have the sublimated organization, can we even describe it?

Perhaps it is an organization based on the culture of interpretation in which people surface feelings as hypotheses to clarify their experience of the group's experience. People are in this sense thoughtful about their feelings. This is how we might describe a successful group therapy session. However, such organizations are rare indeed, and in elevating them as models we run the risk of

creating an unachievable ideal. If we preach this ideal to our clients, or advance it in our writings, we run the risk of it being discounted as fanciful or utopian. An ideal dismissed as a fantasy gives rise to the idea that the ideal's opposite is in fact true. To be sure the sublimated organization shows up many places in bits and pieces: a good meeting, a feelingful retreat. Yet it is very rare to find an organization where the culture of interpretation is constitutive. Indeed, as Douglas Kirsner's work on psychoanalytic institutes suggests, people skilled in practice of interpretation are not necessarily able to create a passionate group life that is also sublimated (Kirsner, 2000).

The Case of ASDA

Let me outline an alternative conception by turning to the case of the ASDA grocery chain in Great Britain. The case, as interpreted here, is about the role Alan Leighton, the second in command, played at the time of its dramatic turnaround. In 1991 the company was in danger of defaulting on a number of loans. It was 700 million pounds in debt, and the share price had fallen from 120 in September 1989 to about 30 in early October 1991. Leighton and the CEO, Archie Norman, crafted a strategy that turned ASDA back to its roots in food retailing by creating a store renewal program that bypassed the chain of command and energized and excited store managers and their subordinates on the front line. They restored the company to profitability (Harvard Business School Case: 9-498-005. 1998).

There are many fascinating details to this case, but for our purposes what was most remarkable was a venue that Leighton created, which he called "The SHITM." This appellation stood for "Stores Head Office Interactive Trading Meeting," but obviously provoked thinking about the kind of stuff that "hits the

fan" when there is trouble around. It is worth quoting him at length here. The quote comes a case study of the turnaround written by staff and faculty at the Harvard Business School.

"In December 1993 we invented this thing called a SHITM, which was a meeting that I chaired every month at ASDA House. It included all the regional managers, traders and distribution people, and everyone hated it, but it was fantastic because we put all of the issues on the table. The meeting was very tense and confrontational: regional managers would accuse traders of wasting their time and dumping things on the stores, and the traders would get defensive and try to explain themselves. Then the traders would get their chance and go right back after the regional managers, telling them how they were messing up. And I would let them build to a fever pitch before calming them down. To make it entertaining we had this thing called the plank on this big table, and it was like walking the plank. I asked the traders whom they wanted on the plank, and they would pick a regional manager. The regional manager would get on the plank, and the traders would attack him and every time he didn't have an answer he would go further out on the plank. It became one of the totems, and you would even hear managers outside the meeting saying we need to get someone on the plank." (pp. 12–13)

There is reason to be skeptical of this story. Could Leighton build the group process to a "fever pitch" and then calm it down as he pleased? Could he provoke tension, aggression and passion and still have a fruitful meeting? I have come to

trust this report because I had the good fortune of watching Leighton as he addressed a conference of academics and consultants at the Harvard Business School in which this case discussed.

After the case was discussed, Leighton, who had listened to the conference deliberations, was asked to address its participants. Not surprisingly for a man clearly comfortable with aggression, he began confrontively. This is how the transcript of the conference reads. (All quotes are from the unpublished transcript produced by the conference organizers.)

> "There is a big difference between us. I think there might be four or five of us in this room who actually do this, and there are number of you in this room who talk about it quite elegantly. And there is a big difference between the two things and never forget it [applause and laughter]."

This is a familiar critique of pointy-headed academics, but instead of the group reacting sullenly or defensively there is applause and laughter, why? Let me suggest two hypotheses. First, the participants accepted his critique because; after all he had made himself a subject for discussion. He *was* the case, and we owed him one. Leighton sensed his right to our consideration because he had taken the risk of exposing himself. In this sense he recreated in a small moment a process he had used at ASDA. By taking personal risks, leaders create a sense of obligation among community members. This in turn gives them the right to aggress in the service of a task, in this case, the task of clarifying the case.

Second, I also believe that we laughed because we experienced his ability to play with aggression. He was not so much spoiling for a fight as he was

enjoying it. His capacity to enjoy the fight was itself infectious and made his confrontive performance part of a game we could all play. Here he recreated in a small moment the process he used intuitively in managing the SHITM.

The Audience Responds

This last hypothesis is confirmed by another interaction. One member of the conference critiqued him saying:

> "There is not a model of an organization in what I've heard here today. The only thing [it seems] that they we have to know it is all about psychology and individuals. In other words, you are not talking about what is important."

Leighton then replies:

> "Let me come back to you on that Henry, because I agree with part of what you are saying, but I don't agree with all of it. And the reason I don't agree with it is because you missed the point again [laughter]. It's very hard for you and lots of others to actually see into this and to be able to put any real analysis around it all, that makes it even more powerful to me. And that's why I think it is a real piece of competitive advantage."

The laughter reflected the pleasure participants took in Leighton's thrust and parry, particularly the way in which his first comment, "I agree with part of you" is a feint, for his later comment, "you missed the point again." But later in the conversation another participant comes back at him suggesting that he could not

really be capable of engaging people, of leading them, because he, in fact, had attacked Barry.

> "And you begin by saying 'Henry I agree with you, however you misunderstand the point.' And I began to believe that if that's what you do back home, when someone challenges you, I can't see how you reached 80,000 people and do the kind of thing you're saying you do."

Leighton's Comeback

In response to this critique, this confrontation, Alan, in thrust and parry fashion, dodges the bullet and says, "I agree with you," and laughter and applause again follow. Leighton then adds, "My point is I am particularly trying to rile Barry." In other words, he is having fun. The participant, persisting, then says, "You just said that my strategy was to rile Henry so a part of your strategy is to keep the strategy you use secret." to which Leighton replies, "I am completely lost now," once again to laughter.

Heart Versus Love

How can we characterize what Leighton does? Consider an earlier interaction between Leighton and another member of the conference. After finishing his opening remarks a member says, "What you are saying is that it is all about love." Leighton replies, "No I wouldn't say it's all about love. I think it is all about access. No I don't like that." The participant replies, "Well, you talk about heart," and Leighton replies, "Yes it is in the heart; I think organizations have hearts."

Leighton's attraction to the word "heart" merits analysis, particularly since he much prefers it to love. When in English we say he has "heart" we are referring to someone who is generous, who includes others in his life. In this sense, heart, in contrast to passion, is inclusive rather than exclusive. Alternatively, another way of describing heart is to say that the person with heart has a passion for relationships to others. Indeed, Leighton finished his presentation with an eloquent, almost love song to people. Describing the secret to his success he notes:

> "It's the bit that nobody understands; it's very difficult to teach; it's all in the people; it's absolutely all in the people. And nobody yet I have ever come across has ever really been able to get to the bottom of this. And certainly you have not been able tot get to the bottom of it, to teach people how to get people to do things for them willingly and well who are just ordinary people. And that is the code to crack."

As was already suggested passion derives its motive force from the experience of incompleteness. In her magisterial study of romantic love, Ethel Person (1995) emphasizes romantic love's link to the drive to merge to overcome one's limitations and essential loneliness. The meaning of the other is not only represented by his or her characteristics but also in the way the other helps the romantic lover complete his or her own identity. This is why love based on romantic passions is vulnerable to the processes of maturation. As romantic lovers mature they become and feel more differentiated as people and need each other less to fill in the gaps, the holes in identity.

Leighton, at least insofar as he is a man with heart, represents a different psychology. It is the psychology of differentiation rather than merger, or what Maslow calls "self-actualization." Howard Schwartz, in a psychoanalytic interpretation of Maslow's hierarchy, notes that the self–actualized person relates deeply to others while still being herself (Schwartz, 1983):

> "Sociability, not in the sense of a disposition to attend cocktail parties, but as a developmental necessity to relate to other persons, is a part of a human nature, and the self-actualized person accepts it as part of his or her own nature. What self-actualized people have learned to do is to integrate their sociability as part of their narcissism." (p. 950)

Leighton's sociability was evident at the case conference. He loved "mixing it up" with the participants. Most telling was his evident ability to integrate aggression with playfulness. Were he simply playful, we might experience in him a desire to please, in the extreme he would be the "clown." Were he simply aggressive we would experience in him the desire to separate, in the extreme he would appear power hungry. The integration of both is a measure of his "sociable differentiation," his relatedness to people without his dependence on them.

Creating the Passionate Organization

The paper raised the question of how an organization can be passionate without at the same time falling prey to its dark side. Let me suggest the following hypothesis. *Leaders who have heart allow others to pursue their passions.* Passion threatens group life because it threatens the group with its excess, its provocations and its attack on authority. When leaders establish a psychosocial context of

inclusiveness and generosity, not to mention fun, they make passion seem less dangerous, they contain it. Group members are less likely to feel that love and attention is scarce and that the passionate person will suck up all the emotional oxygen in the room. Such leaders sometimes have to aggress against other people's narcissism, to sustain this climate of generosity. Indeed, we can interpret some of Leighton's behavior at the conference as the management of some of the participants' narcissism. It is sometimes the case that people in a conference who attack the presenter do so partly out of envy for the presenter's standing.

The "heartful" leader can be contrasted with the narcissistic one. Each is the flip side of the other. The latter makes his desire the organization's project. He is the only one entitled to passion. Rather than enable passion he monopolizes its. The heartful leader democratizes passion by relinquishing his need for it. His state of differentiation, his sociability, means that his individuality does not need expression in a passion. There is, of course, a wide continuum between the narcissistic leader on the one side and the heartful leader on the other. In between we have the leaders who struggle with their narcissism, who manage their competitiveness with their subordinates, who test their fantasy of the organization against the organization's real environment. Many of these are "good enough" leaders. This continuum, from the narcissistic to the heartful, should displace the tacitly held continuum—the aggressive leader on the one end and the inclusive and conciliatory leader on the other—that influences much management writing. The presumption of this latter continuum is that organizations can develop if their leaders become less aggressive and more conciliatory. However, as Leighton demonstrates, the heartful leader feels free to aggress in the service of work.

This concept of the heartful leader should also enable us to evaluate better the quality of leadership available to us, as well as to refine what we mean by "leadership development." People who design leadership-development programs are insufficiently aware of the role of narcissism in leadership. On the one side, these programs create a manifest ego-ideal leader, who is the paragon of mental health, e.g., the leader "tolerates ambiguity," "brings out the best in others," "provides vision," without acknowledging the sometimes necessary narcissism that underlies any person's heroic quest. On the other side, the latent content of these programs often appeals to participants' narcissism—they too can be, or are already, heroes. In designing these programs it is more useful to consider that it is developmental for some people to come into touch with their narcissism and use it for productive purposes, whereas for others it is time for them to come into touch with their ability to differentiate and become heartful.

References

ALLISON, D., ed. *The R&D Game: Technical men, technical managers, and Research Productivity*. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1969.

BION, W. *Experiences in Groups*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

BISSINGER, B. *A Prayer for the City*. New York: Random House, 1997.

CHESSICK, R. *Emotional Illness and Creativity*. Madison, Conn.: Internatonal Universities Press, 1999.

DEUTSCH, F. Creative passion of the artist and its synesthetic aspects. *International Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 40, 1959, 31-51.

HAPGOOD, F. *Up the Infinite Corridor: MIT and the Technical Imagination*. Reading, Mass: Addison Wesley, 1993.

KIRSNER, D. *Unfree Associations: Inside Psychoanalytic Institutes*. London: Process Press, 2000.

KLEIN, M. *Love, Guilt, and Reparation and Other Works, 1921-1945*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1975.

KUBIE, L. *Neurotic Distortion of the Creative Process*. Lawrence, Kan.: University of Kansas Press, 1958.

MCHUGH, J. For the love of hacking: A band of rebels, think that software's secret should be as free as the air we breathe. Don't sell Microsoft short—but don't underestimate the rebels either." *Forbes*, Aug. 10, 1998.

SCHWARTZ, H. S. Maslow and the hierarchical enactment of organizational. *Human Relations,* Volume 36, No. 10, (933-956), 1983.

PERSON, E. *By Force of Fantasy*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.

SIEVERS, B. Beyond the surrogate of motivation. *Organization Studies*, 7(4), 1986, 335-351.

TREVELYAN, R. The paradox of autonomy: A case of academic research scientists. *Human Relations, 54*(4): 495–525.

ZALEZNIK, A. (1993). The case of the obsessional leader—Frederick Winslow Taylor. *Learnings for Leadership.* Chicago, Bonus Books, 281.

For more information on this or related materials, contact CFAR at info@cfar.com or 215.320.3200, or visit our website at http://www.cfar.com.