From quotes to questions:

Caroline Walker Bynum: “Surely our job as teachers is to puzzle, confuse, and amaze. We must rear a new generation of students who will gaze in wonder at texts and artifacts . . . slow to project . . . quick to assume there is a significance, slow to generalize about it. For a flat, generalizing, presentist view of the past . . . makes it boring, whereas amazement yearns toward an understanding, a significance always a little beyond both our theories and our fears. Every view of things that is not wonderful is false.”

Seriously? Aren’t you here to solve puzzles rather than to be puzzled? What is presentism? Can we avoid it? Moreover, if we’re not trained to generalize from particulars, that is, to come up with statements that make sense of particulars, how can we predict and control what happens? Accurate predictions and complete control—shouldn’t those be the aims of higher education? Amazement is extracurricular; isn’t it?

William Butler Yeats: “The best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.”

What might Yeats have meant by “best” and by “worst”? What would those terms have to mean for you to subscribe to the truth packed into this line?

Thucydides: “Pericles . . . was their leader rather than being led by them [the Athenians], because he did not speak to please them.”

Shouldn’t we expect leaders to be led by followers’ preferences when, in a democracy—and ancient Athens purportedly was “the cradle of democracy”—leaders are elected to implement what citizens want done?

Bob Dylan: “Come senators, congressmen, please heed the call // Don’t stand in the doorway. Don’t block up the hall // For s/he that gets hurt will be s/he who has stalled // There’s a battle outside and it’s ragin’ // It’ll soon shake your windows and rattle your walls // For the times they are a-changin’.”

Has there been much change since Dylan sang that in the 1960s? How can you tell when it is better to “block” and to “stall” than to rush forward or embrace change? When there are competing “calls”—for stability, for change—how can our leaders tell which “call” to heed?

Albert Camus: “What’s true of all the evils in this world is true of plague itself. It helps [people] to rise above themselves.”

What could he mean by “to rise above themselves”? If evils have the effect that Camus says, are evils good?
Aurelius Augustine: “Justice having been removed, what are kingdoms but gangs of criminals on a large scale? What are criminal gangs but petty kingdoms? A gang is a group of persons under the command of a leader, bound by an agreement or covenant that governs the association in which plunder is divided according to a constitution of sorts. . . . For the answer given by a captured pirate to Alexander the Great was amusing but true. When great Alexander asked why the pirate terrorized seafarers, the latter boldly replied, suggesting that his purpose and Alexander’s were identical. When I do what I do with a small vessel, he noted, I am called a pirate. Because you do the same with a mighty navy, you are called an emperor.”

Does the anecdote prove Augustine’s point about government and larceny? If you were Alexander how would you answer the pirate’s equation?

Martha Nussbaum: “Nations all over the world will soon be producing generations of useful, docile, technically trained machines rather than complete citizens who can think for themselves, criticize tradition, and understand the significance of another person’s sufferings and achievements.”

Nussbaum thinks that the humanities could and should serve as an antidote. Do you share Nussbaum’s distress? If docile citizens are useful and well-trained, should we object that somehow they are docile and therefore incomplete citizens? Is it fair to compare them with machines? How important is it for leaders to criticize tradition?

Susan Sontag: “The photographer’s intentions do not determine the meaning of a photograph, which will have its own career, blown by the whims and loyalties of the diverse communities that have use for it.”

Nonsense? Aren’t the loyalties and disloyalties—as well as the whims—of communities determined by the images that artists/photographers give them? Isn’t the person behind the camera in control? Don’t the persons, factions, and media-moguls, who pay the freight, frame what viewers see? And doesn’t what we see shape how we think about wars, leaders, candidates, poverty, nobility?

In this section of LDST 101, we’re going to raise these questions as well as others that you’ll find in the schedule portion of the syllabus in bold print. You’ll want to take special note of these bold questions, because they are good candidates for exam questions. But we ask them not because the answers lay at the foundation of leadership studies; the asking does. The conversations generated by our asking ought to draw our various likes and dislikes into the open, problematize some ideas we may take for granted, and prompt intriguing encounters with problems, with problem-solvers, and with a gaggle of issues we might otherwise have left unexplored.

We’ll start by glancing at a few issues raised by two leading theorists, who suggest that factions could well be a problem for leaders and for leadership studies--James Madison and Niccolo Machiavelli--and then we proceed to watch one of the twentieth-century’s best known fictional politicians, Willie Stark, deal with factions and crises. From fiction, we’ll return to “fact” and study several more contemporary leaders, Obama, Al Sharpton, and Richard Nixon. So much for the start of our journey together. It takes us to and through republican Rome, early modern England, two world wars, war correspondents, photo journalism, and studies of charisma, celebrity, and economic theory before letting us close among those colleagues groping for ways to achieve both diversity and excellence in education.
In addition to your attendance and attention during class, I ask you to reserve one evening, Wednesday, March 26, 7PM for Janet Jarman’s presentation on photography, immigration, and change at the Jepson Alumni Center.

BUT . . .

before you agree that all this might be a good way to spend parts of your semester and strap yourselves into this course, attend to the next section on . . .

Requirements and Grades

Lively, informed encounters with our questions, obviously, require your lively and informed participation in class discussions. “Require” means I expect it. I deduct points from the final grades of the participants who don’t meet that expectation—who are often absent and/or unfamiliar with assignments. 100 points are available. You’ll complete two mid-term exams, Feb. 13th (25 points) and April 1st (35 points) as well as a final exam (40 points).

Students who miss a midterm due to illness (please obtain a physician’s note) or to deaths in the family, and students who miss a midterm to represent the university on the road may make up the exam during the week of finals.

(Taboo during class-time: late arrivals, early departures, mid-class breaks, laptops, multi-tasking.)

You’ll be responsible for readings on electronic reserve (marked ER in the schedule that follows) as well as for reading all or substantial parts of the books available for purchase at the student book store.

Robert Penn Warren, ALL THE KING’S MEN
Susan Sontag, REGARDING THE PAIN OF OTHERS         Kevin Mattson, JUST PLAIN DICK
William Chafe, CIVILITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS         William Shakespeare, CORIOLANUS (also on line)
Thomas More, UTOPIA (also on line)         Albert Camus, THE PLAGUE

Niccolo Machiavelli, THE PRINCE (also on line)

SO-- what do we do, and when do we do it?

1/14 Welcome and Introduction

1/16 Read James Madison, Federalist #10 (ER). What, if anything, distinguished factions from political parties? Why does Madison think factions are unavoidable? How would he control the wicked effects factions might have on leaders’ abilities to govern?

1/21 Read Machiavelli’s PRINCE, chapters 1-17. Machiavelli has been dubbed the first political scientist; do you think that characterization fits? Why? Why not? If you were to write an essay on Machiavelli and trust, how would you begin? How would you conclude?
1/23 Finish Machiavelli’s PRINCE. If you were to select a single chapter of THE PRINCE to assign to you class, which one would you select? Why? Select four figures from Machiavelli’s many that you’d want to use to answer most questions about his recommendations for leaders? Pick one quote from those that introduce this course on the syllabus and tell me how and why you’d use it to begin your lecture on leadership and Machiavelli. How would you reply to those who cite Machiavelli to prove that leaders must sometimes set aside the norms, customs, and values of society—conventions and ethics, perhaps—“to heal the state”? Machiavelli elsewhere criticizes the nobles—aristocracies—for generating factions and tearing apart republics; is there evidence that he was similarly inclined to criticize the nobility in THE PRINCE?

1/28 Read ALL THE KING’S MEN, chapters 1-2. “Judge Irwin has come out for Callahan.” That said, Governor Willie Stark sprints to the judge’s home in Burden’s Landing, and the confrontation between them tells us a lot about the judge and of the sly belligerent Willie. Penn Warren stages it splendidly. Give me your impressions of the two, and tell me how the author helps you form and formulate them. Then, apply Willie’s truism: “It’s dirt that makes the grass grow,” to the study of leadership. You meet Willie before he became governor when you get to the second chapter, where he appears politically ineffective because there was “too much talk about principles and not enough about promises,” so says jack Burden, the narrator. Keep an eye on Burden’s role in the novel, but for now, ponder the importance of principles and promises in contemporary leadership. Are we wary of principles and suckers for promises—in business and politics?

1/30 Read ALL THE KING’S MEN, chapter 3. Humpty Dumpty had a great fall, they say, and all the king’s men couldn’t put him together. Would that apply to Willy? To Hugh Miller? To Sadie or Jack Burden?

2/4 Read ALL THE KING’S MEN, chapters 6 and 8 along with the first chapter of Mattson’s JUST PLAIN DICK. If you were writing this syllabus, what questions in bold print would you put with this assignment?

2/6 Read Mattson’s JUST PLAIN DICK, pp. 111-160; listen to Nixon’s “Checkers” speech on youtube. Evaluate “the ways to pay for campaigning” for positions of political leadership that are (and are not) mentioned in Nixon’s speech. You’ll know by now that Willy Stark bears a striking resemblance to an immensely popular politician in Louisiana, Huey Long. Might he be compared favorably / unfavorably with Richard Nixon, whom Mattson calls a “little Machiavellian”? Don’t all leaders have to be a little Machiavellian?

2/11 Read ALL THE KING’S MEN, chapter 9, Mattson’s JUST PLAIN DICK, chapter 5 and the conclusion, and the speeches of Barak Obama and Al Sharpton at the 2004 Democratic convention (ER); then go to youtube and listen to those speeches.

2/13 FIRST M I D T E R M E X A M
Read UTOPIA, book 1. How does Hythloday justify his decision not to enter government service? Is he skeptical, cynical, or neither about leadership? What is More’s--the character’s--alternative to Hythloday’s position? Why do you think Thomas More--the author--gave most of UTOPIA’s first book to Hythloday and kept so little for his own character in the “dialogue”?

Read UTOPIA, book 2. Would you want to live in this utopia? Should we refashion society to minimize inequities, relieve hardship, and extinguish evils that plague this world when, according to Camus, evil--say greed, graft, envy, war and plague--prompt individuals to “rise above themselves”?

Read CORIOLANUS, acts 1, 2, and 3 and watch the film, CORIOLANUS, which the MRC will try to stream or place on UR-TV----time, to be announced. Does Shakespeare’s play and Fiennes’s version, especially the confrontations between Coriolanus and the tribunes help you decide whether—or to what extent—George Bernard Shaw got it right when he concluded that “democracy reads well but doesn’t work well”?

Read my “What we can learn about leadership from CORIOLANUS” (ER). Your assignment is a lecture i delivered last year on several campuses, including the USMA at West Point. The bottom line ought to be familiar to you by now; take that and the route used to get there apart. Find flaws--an assortment of characterizations or inferences with which you’d disagree. If you’d subscribe to this assignment’s take on the play--and on leadership--tell me why.

Read Woodrow Wilson’s Commemorative address on education at Princeton, delivered in 1896 (ER, pp. 1-14) and my address “Rumsfeld in Prague,” delivered at Davidson College in 2003 (ER, pp. 442-45). Davidson is not unlike Richmond. Does the curriculum ad UR serve the same purposes that I’ve ascribed to the curriculum at Davidson? Is that sort of planning for a general education desirable or are students better off getting to their areas of special interest--business, finance, pre-med--sooner rather than later in college? If pre professional education is a threat to the humanities today, much the same could be said of the sciences in Wilson’s day, “declin[ing] to reckon with spirit or with the stuffs of the mind.” Would you agree with Wilson’s defense of the humanities? With mine? Or with the short essay by David Brooks in your syllabus? When Wilson showed a draft of his speech to his wife, she advised that it ended poorly, so he added a last paragraph. Is it effective? By ending the address with a question, has Wilson left you hanging or thinking? If thinking, about what?

Read Wilson’s two other speeches (ER), his address in Philadelphia on the meaning of liberty and his acceptance speech at the Democratic convention, 1916. Lecturing at the USMA, Wilson said that he disapproved of “blustering nationalism.” Maybe so, but do today’s assignments suggest he was less than conscientious when occasions called for bluster? Reflect on the respective places of “bluster” and humility in leadership studies.

B R E A K
3/18  Read Camus, THE PLAGUE, parts 1-4. **Rieux may be the closest we come to a leader in Camus’s novel, yet Rambert--who is generally quite perceptive--tells him that he (Rieux) uses “the language of reason, not of the heart” and that he “live[s] in a world of abstractions.”** Is Rambert correct? What do you prize in leaders grappling with crises: reason, heart (or compassion), abstractions (principles)? As for Rambert, he is trapped by the plague far from home. A few interpreters think that he rather than Rieux is Camus’s “messenger;” if so, what might the message be?

3/20  Finish Camus’s PLAGUE. **Reread the Bynum and Camus quotes at the front of your syllabus.** How might they apply to the novel? Keep in mind that Camus was fond of inferences that historian Thucydides drew from the plague that afflicted the Greeks in 431 BCE--specifically, that misfortunes and crises remind humans that, despite their illusions of control, they must learn to cope with being controlled. How well or badly do several of the novel’s characters--Rieux, Rambert, Cottard, Tarrou, and Paneloux--cope? What lesson would you draw from the novel’s last lines?

3/25  Read Sontag’s REGARDING THE PAIN OF OTHERS, Huntington’s THE HISPANIC CHALLENGE (ER), and inspect the photographic essay, MARISOL’S AMERICAN DREAM, [www.jarman.co](http://www.jarman.co) -- **Be ready to assess Jarman’s photographs, using what you’ve learned from Sontag and Huntington.**

3/26  **7pm--Jepson Alumni Center: Jarman presentation**

3/27  Discussion of Jarman’s discussion of photography’s role in documenting or “framing” critical issues and leading social change.

4/1  **second MIDTERM EXAM**

4/3  Read the selections from Max Weber-Charisma (ER). **What, if anything distinguishes charisma from celebrity and popularity?**

4/8  Read Rojek-Celebrity (ER). **Rojek seems preoccupied with a phenomenon he calls “collective effervescence”; what is it? Does it assist people to--in Camus’s terms--“rise above themselves”?** By now, the term “collective” in this class could signal the submergence of individuality? Could Rojek have described a process in which charismatic leadership builds social capital by creating “celebrity culture[s]” in which followers have more to lose than to gain? What’s lost? What’s gained? Why does religion figure so prominently in Rojek’s study?

4/10  Katie Lofton is speaking today at 4:30PM on charisma and culture. You’re to attend unless other curricular responsibilities require your presence elsewhere. **Payback: no class this morning.**
4/15  Read Angus Burgin’s “Moral Capital” and the conclusion attached to it (ER). What does it mean to be “a leading advocate for laissez faire” from the last half of the 20th century into the 21st. William Buckley believes “the struggle between individualism and collectivism” is all but interminable, but a case could be made (and has been in your assignment) that the recent economic collapse tipped the balance decisively in favor of collectivism. Do you see it that way? Respond to Angus Burgin’s final question: “to what extent do we wish to make ours a market-centered world?”

4/17  Read Justice Thomas’s opinion in the 2007 Seattle School District case about racial balancing, remedial measures to prevent re-segregation, and the “color-blind constitution” of the United States, http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/05-908.ZC.html. And read Michael Klarman’s opinion about “How Brown Changed Race Relations: The Backlash Thesis,” http://www.jstor.org/stable/2080994. A case could be made that education is critical in remedying what Martha Nussbaum (see the quotes provided at the front of the syllabus) sees as a terrible problem. Does Thomas’s opinion or the one delivered by the court in Brown vs Board of Education (see Klarman) make education part of that problem or part of its solution?

4/22  Read William Chafe’s, CIVILITIES AND CIVIL RIGHTS, pp. 3-118 and 172-202. How do the civic leaders you’ve met in William Chafe’s study of Greensboro, North Carolina stack up with or against those to whom Klarman introduced you? Given what CIVILITIES reports, should Chafe have changed the title of his book to CIVILITIES OR CIVIL RIGHTS?

4/24  Read Edmundson-Liberal Education (ER).

The final examination for LDST 101, section 2 has been scheduled by the university for Tuesday, April 29th -- 2PM.
Jepson School of Leadership Studies

Common Syllabus Insert

Awarding of Credit

To be successful in this course, a student should expect to devote 10-14 hours each week, including class time and time spent on course-related activities. 
http://registrar.richmond.edu/services/policies/academic-credit.html

Disability Accommodations

Students with a Disability Accommodation Notice should contact their instructors as early in the semester as possible to discuss arrangements for completing course assignments and exams. 
http://studentdevelopment.richmond.edu/disability-services/policies.html

Honor System

The Jepson School supports the provisions of the Honor System. The shortened version of the honor pledge is: “I pledge that I have neither received nor given unauthorized assistance during the completion of this work.” 
http://studentdevelopment.richmond.edu/honor/

Religious Observance

Students should notify their instructors within the first two weeks of classes if they will need accommodations for religious observance. 
http://registrar.richmond.edu/planning/religiousobs.html