

Leadership

The notion of leadership studies, appears to spring from a self-conscious age, in which the members of society are prone to explain to one another how to do things (like reading or gardening or making love) which in another time-period would have been 'left to nature.' Now, as a consequence, we see academic manuals like *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, in which we can learn how others, at other times, have learned how to lead, following—for this is the strong bias our time, in theory if not always in practice—the broad outlines of democratic capitalism. We can learn how to do the leading while making it pay, but without unduly trampling down the competition.

At the conclusion of the Second World War, it seems, the Allies, duly horrified by the atrocities that had come down, followed a difficult course of action, in their quest to settle the dust, reintroduce a degree of mutual understanding among diverse nations, and to, in short to establish new 'goals for humanity.' Here is where a modern leadership crisis comes in. Defeated. Japan and Germany, though crushed former opponents, were for all their devastation, the strongest remaining world powers, with whom to collaborate in the construction of a 'new world order.' But what kind of leadership dilemma did this situation create? The Allies necessarily poured immense funds into the coffers of their former enemies, in order to build up trading partners, and regenerate a thriving set of global partnerships. By doing so, however the western Allies stumbled over the dilemma of leadership issues: in order to build up a healthy global community, in which leadership skills could thrive, it was necessary to overarm and over support those nations whose bias was a hostility toward the Western victors.