

<Preface to Narcissistic Leaders

By Michael Maccoby>

<Running heads: Preface—recto; Preface—verso>

<FMH>Preface

<FMTXT>In a time of historic changes in the way we live and work, the opportunities before us, and the threats we face, visionary business leaders have spearheaded these changes with their ideas, revolutionary technology, and organizational innovations. But visionary leaders in both business and government have also been destructive pied pipers, ruining investors who believed in their shady businesses and leaving a legacy of hatred in people left behind in the wake of history. This book is about understanding both the good and the bad visionary leaders—the type of personality that Sigmund Freud, who identified himself as one, termed *narcissistic*.

As the business world changes, so do popular styles of leadership. When this book was first published in 2003, the stock of narcissistic business leaders had plummeted owing to the dot-com crash and Enron- and Tyco-type scams. Formerly admired narcissistic leaders were unmasked as failures, frauds, and fabricators. Even successful narcissists were frowned on as too greedy and self-promoting. While throughout the 1990s, bigger-than-life narcissists decorated the covers of *Fortune*, *BusinessWeek*, and even *Time* and *Newsweek*, in 2003 we saw a shattered marble bust of Jack Welch on the cover of *The Economist*.

For a while, the new twenty-first century ideal became the determined, methodical but “self-effacing, quiet, reserved, even shy” obsessive business leaders celebrated by Jim Collins in *Good to Great*.ⁱ Even narcissistic bosses began to spout the self-deprecating talk we invariably hear on TV from the winners of golf tournaments. (“It’s a tough course, but I had a few lucky breaks, etc.”) But of course there’s a big difference between talking and acting humble. On May 20, 2006, at an Economist Leadership Forum on Narcissistic Leaders, in Rome, Fausto Bertinotti, president of the Chamber of Deputies, made the astute point that while only narcissists can be visionary leaders, they’d be wise to learn to act humble.

Then, in 2006, *Fortune* did an about-face. Steve Jobs, a prototypic productive narcissist, was named “the model CEO for the twenty-first century”.ⁱⁱ Why turn the spotlight from the modest but driven obsessives heralded a few years before? Was *Fortune* just reflecting the fact that Jobs had hit it big with the iPod—or was there a dawning awareness that to sustain business success, you need bold innovators, productive narcissists? Of course, the problem with narcissists is that while some—like Jobs, Bill Gates, Larry Ellison, Howard Schultz, and Oprah Winfrey—keep on innovating and producing what people want to buy, some—like Steve Case or Jean-Marie Messier—flare out, and others—like Bernie Ebbers, Kim Woo Chong, and Dennis Kozlowski—turn out to be crooked.

To understand differences among narcissists and even predict which visionaries will succeed and which are likely to fail, this book dissects narcissistic personalities and contrasts narcissists with the other psychoanalytic personalities: the careful obsessives, caring erotics, and adaptive marketing types. I’ve changed the original title of this book from *The Productive Narcissist, the Promise and Peril of Visionary Leadership* to focus

on the themes that have most interested readers. (This new title is also close to the one used in the Spanish translation, *El Lider Narcisista*.) The English translation of the Japanese title is *Why Nasty Guys Advance in Their Careers*. But unlike the Japanese, who consider all self-promoting narcissists as nasty, I take a more differentiated view and recognize the positive contributions of some narcissistic leaders.

Are narcissistic leaders really better than the obsessives? Not necessarily. Are we just seeing changes in business leadership fashion? Yes, to some extent. But in the thirty-five years I've studied business leaders I've seen that different personality types fit better in certain roles, and the importance of these roles continually changes. The fashions aren't arbitrary. It's a matter of *context*, not that one type is better or worse than another. Sometimes mature businesses led by obsessives outperform the innovative businesses led by narcissists and sometimes it's the reverse. The obsessive business leaders are great at cutting costs, throwing nonperformers off the corporate bus, and putting in place the right processes for productivity in manufacturing, marketing, and retail companies. But their innovations are generally improvements on existing products, like Gillette's next new razor blade. Obsessives want to win the game they're in, even break records, like Tiger Woods chasing Jack Nicklaus's record number of wins in golf majors. But productive narcissists want to create new games, changing the way we live and work. While Henry Ford, the narcissist, was realizing his vision of making a car most Americans could afford, Collins's exemplary obsessives might have been making better and cheaper buggy whips for horse-drawn carriages or breeding faster horses.

Some of the most effective managers intuitively know they have to fit personality to the role. Jack Welch writes that he picked a head for a commodity product business who was "in his element with people who sweated the nitty-gritty details like he did, talking about ways to squeeze efficiencies out of every process." This is a productive obsessive. For the head of an innovative, risky business, he picked someone who "hated the nuts and bolts of management . . . But he sure did have the guts and vision to place the big bets." This is a productive narcissist.ⁱⁱⁱ

Using the personality questionnaire you'll find at the end of chapter 1, my colleagues and I have tested the theories presented in this book. I've used the questionnaire with hundreds of managers in workshops on leadership and discussed the results with them. For example, production managers at Volvo-Mack trucks are productive obsessives, as are managers in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; most of the business media managers at VNU have marketing personalities. Matt Downs and Michael Anderson, students at Stanford Business School, gave the questionnaire to thirty-six executives of Bay Area businesses. As the theory predicted, nine of ten high-tech entrepreneurs with the guts and vision to place the big bets were narcissists, while six of seven manufacturers who squeezed the efficiencies out of every process were obsessives. Executives in sales or professional services fell almost evenly in the marketing, narcissistic, and erotic buckets.

I've found the same patterns in business executives I've taught at Oxford's Said School of Business and the Brookings Institution's programs for federal managers. Effective executives usually have personalities that fit their role. Furthermore, some CEOs I've coached have used the questionnaire with their own teams and with candidates for executive jobs. They find the personality profile useful, not only for improving

chances for hiring someone who fits the role but also for enlivening a recruiting interview.

In contrast to my approach, some management writers contend that personality doesn't matter, that leaders can tailor their style to fit the situation they're faced with. Obviously this is true to some degree. Depending on the situation, practically any leader can be commanding or consultative. Any leader can learn when to be close and when to increase distance from the troops. But as Heraclitus wrote twenty-five hundred years ago, character is man's fate. There are limits to behavioral plasticity, and in time of stress, personality prevails. A CEO put it neatly when I asked his view of situational leadership: "Most of my interactions are taking place in chaos. I can't stop and think about what my style should be with different people. My style is my personality." Naturally, some personalities are more flexible and others are more rigid. Of all the personality types, the marketing type is the most elastic; these people can seem so chameleonlike that we might believe they have no personality.^{iv} But this quality of adaptability is exactly what defines the marketing personality.

By emphasizing context, I'm not eliminating the idea that some leadership styles are better than others. But my leadership hierarchies are different from the one Collins presents. He puts the selfless obsessives at the top of his hierarchy and even the best of the self-promoting narcissists a step below them. While I look for the personality that fits the role and don't place any type above another, I do recognize that all types have positive and negative potentials that can be described in terms of two hierarchies viewed within, not between, personality types. These are levels of productiveness (chapter 3) and levels of moral reasoning.

These two hierarchies are different and don't always correlate with each other. I use the contrast of productive versus unproductive to describe healthier versus less developed or even disturbed personalities. A productive person is active and enthusiastic—someone who bounces back from failure and perseveres to achieve a reasoned purpose. In contrast, unproductive people are less free and therefore reactive rather than active, without a clear purpose and driven by addictive needs that make them fearful and dependent.^v

Of course, higher levels of moral reasoning don't guarantee that actions will always have the intended benefit, but clearly we want leaders who seek to achieve a common good, not just to feather their own nests. Although morally developed people are almost always productive, there are active, enthusiastic productive people who cut corners or worse and don't score highly on the scale of moral reasoning. In other words, being productive doesn't necessarily mean being good.

In other words, when productive narcissists are morally good, they can be very, very good and when they are bad, they can be horrid. This is because unlike the obsessives, they don't respect the existing cultural norms and want to impose their own vision and values, which can be morally good or bad. As Freud described the narcissistic personality, its defining quality is a lack of a strong programmed conscience or what he termed the super-ego. For whatever reason, as children, narcissists did not internalize the ethical commands of a parent, and therefore they are free either to design their own conscience or to leave the space blank. Narcissists want to change the world to fit their view of how things should be, and they have little or no sense of guilt to constrain them

from radical, risky ventures that can be creative or destructive at either a high or low level of moral reasoning.

In support of Freud's theory, many well-known male narcissistic leaders had weak or absent fathers who were not admired models—the basis for internalizing strong norms, especially for boys. According to Lyndon B. Johnson's brother Sam, "the most important thing for Lyndon was not to be like his daddy" who was a bankrupt rancher.^{vi} Ronald Reagan's father was an alcoholic shoe salesman and Bill Clinton's father died before he was born. But all three, like a number of productive narcissists, had strong mothers who gave them unconditional love and a sense of invulnerability. An excellent film portrayal of a narcissist is *Citizen Kane*, written, produced, and directed by Orson Welles (himself a creative narcissist who also played the lead role) and based on the life of William Randolph Hearst. Charles Kane's father is a weak failure, and his strong mother sends him off as a child to be raised as the heir to a fortune. He starts his career as a visionary crusading newspaper publisher, but ends up disgraced and isolated, done in by his grandiosity and unwillingness to heed the advice of his best friend.

Since narcissists don't grow up with a programmed conscience; forming their views of right and wrong or finding a purpose in life requires an internal dialogue that can take time. Some narcissists, Hamlet-like, never fully decide. Some we now honor as great leaders—Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Mohandas Gandhi, and Winston Churchill—didn't start out with a clear, inspiring purpose for the common good. Lincoln was an ambitious country lawyer who only matured into the visionary of the Gettysburg Address after sleeplessly struggling with the meaning of the Civil War, finally coming to the view that it was not just to preserve the Union, but to realize the promise of the Declaration of Independence—that all Americans shared the unalienable right to liberty. Roosevelt was a rich and charming politician who transcended his crippling polio, affirmed the power of the individual spirit, and gave hope to a nation mired in economic and psychic depression. Gandhi wanted to be a respected barrister but, humiliated by British racists, defied them with principled civil disobedience that shamed the British public and eventually inspired an oppressed people to become a great nation. And Churchill, viewed as lacking judgment in his early public life, then rejected by his party and country as he warned against Hitler, became the invincible leader resisting Nazi forces and inspiring Britain to persevere when it was at its lowest ebb.

These leaders forged their own unique views of what needed to be done to make their world a better place. Unlike other personality types who try to please parents, peers, or the public, they fought to be true to their own developing conception of the right. This is not to say that they were particularly caring. Like most narcissistic leaders, they could be arrogant and bullying, running roughshod over naysayers. And they did not obsess over decisions resulting in the deaths of thousands, when they believed this was the price for achieving the common good.

Narcissists need followers or else they become isolated, and both good and bad narcissistic leaders have been effective recruiters. The difference is that the bad ones invariably make their change-the-world visions into excuses to grab unlimited power at the expense of any common good. Immoral monsters like Napoleon, Hitler, Stalin, and Mao began their leadership careers spouting idealistic visions and ended up devastating their own countries and revealing that their ultimate priority was at the bottom of the scale of moral reasoning, unlimited personal power.

To be sure, the good narcissistic leaders were at times kept in check by the countervailing forces of democratic societies. Roosevelt failed to pack the Supreme Court and Churchill was voted out of power after the war was over. But unlike the tyrants who crushed democratic institutions, the good narcissists believed in and defended democratic institutions.

<FMA>Narcissists Versus Psychopaths

<FMTXT>Since the publication of this book, I've been asked whether there is any difference between narcissists and psychopaths. The answer is that some narcissists are similar to psychopaths or, put another way, psychopaths can be considered an extreme and malignant version of the narcissistic personality.

Both psychopaths and narcissists can be extremely seductive when they need something from people. Both can be glib, charming, manipulative, deceitful, and ruthless. Both use people, squeeze them like oranges, and throw them away once they've drunk the juice.

The difference then is that psychopaths, unlike some productive narcissists, always operate at the lowest level of moral reasoning with no concern for the common good, much less remorse or guilt for self-serving actions that harm other people. Psychopaths can be brilliant, but they build no lasting relationships. Narcissists sometimes do.

Furthermore, whatever their faults, and there were some big ones, narcissistic leaders like Andrew Carnegie, John D. Rockefeller, Henry Ford, and Bill Gates not only created great companies employing thousands, with products that millions have found useful, but they also gave huge sums to fund programs for human betterment. Unlike psychopaths such as Al Dunlop ("Chainsaw Al" of Sunbeam) and others who trash companies and sneak away with the loot or the shady book-cookers like Japanese Internet mogul Takafumi Horei, these philanthropic narcissists linked their own success to the success of the companies they built. Also, to sustain successful companies, they had to be trusted by employees, customers, and suppliers. They had to honor commitments and set a good example or else in each case the company's spirit would have been eroded by cynicism, with employees just looking out for themselves. That's what happens when psychopaths are in charge. But it also happens when productive narcissists become so puffed up and isolated that they lose their judgment and sense of reality.

<FMA>Who Succeeds and Who Fails

<FMTXT>Some narcissistic leaders who light up the sky like summer fireworks also quickly flare out while others sustain their initial success. The difference has to do with the character and intelligence, personality and brains, of the narcissistic leader.

Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton are examples of narcissists whose character flaws did them in. Both lacked strong internal checks to their self-defeating impulses: Nixon's dirty political tricks and Clinton's combination of uncontrolled lust and lying about it.

As I write this, Italy's Silvio Berlusconi has narrowly lost the national election. For years he has teetered on the edge of disaster, dodging accusations of bribery and corruption while claiming he is "the Jesus Christ of politics," tormented by his enemies and sacrificing himself for all Italians.^{vii} Other narcissists like Napoleon and Henry Ford have failed to control their grandiosity and ended up not only harming themselves but also the people who followed them.

The difference between narcissistic business leaders who have sustained success and those who haven't also has to do with the quality of their thinking, their kind of intelligence. Clearly, anyone who gets to the top of a major business would score well on a traditional IQ test. But that would only indicate one kind of intelligence, essentially a combination of good memory and analysis. During the past twenty years, psychologists have demonstrated that while traditional IQ is correlated with doing well in school, it doesn't predict success in business.^{viii} This means you can have a high IQ and do poorly at business. Other kinds of intelligence—street smarts, imagination, emotional intelligence, systems thinking—can be even more important to business success.

When I compared those narcissistic business leaders who sustained success with those who did not, I found the eventual failures—including William Durant, founder of General Motors, Jean-Marie Messier of Vivendi, Carly Fiorina of HP, and others—all built their empires by buying companies, often accumulating heavy debt, rather than growing their company.^{ix} The successful ones who bought many companies, like Jack Welch, showed exceptional ability in integrating the acquisitions into a strong corporate culture. That's because these successful leaders shared a kind of intelligence that was missing in those who flamed out. I call it *strategic intelligence*. It applies elements of analytic intelligence, street smarts, and creative intelligence in five interrelated qualities: foresight, systems thinking, visioning, motivating, and partnering. (See chapter 4.)

A group of consultants who read this book were stimulated enough to contact me about learning more about strategic intelligence (SI).^x They joined me to interview more than thirty top executives on their level of SI and its importance to them in developing and implementing strategy.

These executives all agreed that SI was essential for top leadership effectiveness. Typically, Lydia Thomas, CEO of Mitretek, pointed out that foresight—scanning for future trends, developing alternative scenarios, sensing opportunities and threats—was an essential CEO responsibility. As for the other elements of SI, she agreed, “You can't be successful without them.”

Not surprisingly, how leaders use their brains is connected to their personality type. Narcissists, more than the other types, are natural visionaries and tend to think holistically about what they want to create, while obsessives are more likely to make lists of what they plan to do. However, for many of the executives we interviewed, systems thinking is the most difficult SI element. Their knee-jerk approach to a problem is to attack and analyze, to break it into clearly manageable pieces that are more likely to be stacked than integrated. Furthermore, they've learned in business school to construct bureaucracies by splitting work roles into hierarchically ordered chunks. And that's a big reason why organizations end up with silos that block people from collaborating and learning from each other.

The kind of systems thinking most lacking in Western managers combines social, technical, and economic factors. A disastrous example of this weakness has been the inability of American auto companies and, for that matter, researchers and business school professors to understand the Toyota “humanware” system even when it's been explained to them.^{xi} Toyota organizes work to cut costs, incentivize innovation at all levels, and encourage continuous development of employees as well as continuous improvement of production. It is well known that when Toyota took over management of a poorly performing GM plant in Fremont, California, productivity jumped and union

grievances disappeared. GM sent a string of managers to learn how Toyota did it, but even those who learned were unable to re-create anything similar back at their home factories. That's because it wasn't a matter of changing this or that practice, such as just-in-time delivery of parts, but of redesigning a whole socio-technical-business system, which at Toyota keeps evolving.

When I visited Japanese auto companies, I found a greater understanding and application of systems thinking than in the United States or Europe. Why is this so? I'm not sure of the answer, but my hunch is that Asian philosophy and cultural traditions play a role. Chinese philosophy is holistic, relating opposites like *yin*, the female principle, and *yang*, the male principle. The Japanese *daimyo* tradition of feudal knighthood combined the way of *bu* (the arts of swordsman, archery, horsemanship) with the way of *bun* (the arts of calligraphy, poetry composition, painting). In the West, these arts were separated; warriors and artists had totally different career paths.

In the exhibition of Daimyo Culture presented at the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C., it was suggested that modern Japanese industrialists were influenced by this tradition, that they combined a warlike business strategy with a sense of elegant design.^{xii} Whatever the reason, education in Japan, Taiwan, China, and Korea appears a factor in developing systems thinking.

However, there have also been notable systems thinkers in the West. Furthermore, SI doesn't have to depend on a single leader. The qualities of SI can be shared in a group as was the case with the framers of the U.S. Constitution. They envisioned a great nation that needed the strength that could be gained only by partnering among the thirteen original states. They foresaw new states joining the union and prepared for their entry. And they recognized that to motivate Americans to support this new government, the Constitution had to protect individual liberty. That's what the revolution was all about, and Americans feared a new, overweening national government. Although it took the first ten amendments—the Bill of Rights—to fully establish this principle of civil rights; the Civil War, the fourteenth amendment, and the civil rights legislation of the 1950s and 1960s to expand these rights to African-Americans; and the nineteenth amendment to grant women's suffrage, the framers had been thinking systemically about the constitution as they prepared for the convention that drafted it. James Madison, in particular in the *Federalist* Number 10, emphasizes that a system of checks and balances—what eventually became the executive, legislative, and judicial branches—would be necessary to protect individual liberty. Without this system, democracy could lead to oppression of individuals and minorities by majority factions.

Can systems thinking and the other elements of SI be taught? Yes, but only if managers are willing first to unlearn the bureaucratic logic they've been practicing.

<FMA>How About Emotional Intelligence (EI)?

<FMTXT>A number of readers believe that this book shows that successful leaders are tough guys without emotional intelligence.^{xiii} That overstates what I've written.

While it's true that many successful narcissistic leaders lack EI, the issue is complex. Keep in mind that elements of EI like empathy are talents, not values. Being sensitive to others feelings doesn't mean you care about them. Bill Clinton used empathy to charm and seduce, while Abraham Lincoln used empathy to manage a cabinet of big egos.^{xiv} Does a narcissistic leader's lack of emotional sensitivity indicate an inability or

does it result from a decision to tune out diverting emotions? Some narcissists tell me they are protecting themselves from doubts and bad feelings by ignoring emotions. However, in so doing, they are losing the ability to better understand themselves and others. EI doesn't necessarily keep a leader from making tough decisions that hurt some people. Decisive leaders can be hard-hearted, have a well-protected heart, or, like Lincoln, have a brave heart, but they don't have flabby or bleeding hearts.

<FMA>The Future for Narcissistic Leaders

<FMTXT>As long as we remain in a period of continual technological and social change, productive narcissists will inevitably emerge to grasp opportunities with new visions that pull in followers who hope for riches or to be part of something great.

A prime example: Craig Venter, who first mapped the human genome, may have failed at Celera, but after a three-year yacht trip around the world, he now promises to cure our addiction to oil by creating a designer microbe with “genes culled from the ocean to turn crops such as switch grass and cornstalks into ethanol.” So he told the *Washington Post's* Michael S. Rosenwald, adding, “We are on a crusade as much as it is an economic goal. This is one of those crusades that only works if it becomes profitable.”^{xv} You won't hear anything like that from the humble level 5s.

While the past few years have seen a pendulum swing back and forth from narcissistic to obsessive leaders, business researchers are now reporting that large companies need to be what Charles O'Reilly and Michael L. Tushman call *ambidextrous organizations*, combining mature operations with risky innovation.^{xvi} But where will they find the entrepreneurial productive narcissists who drive innovation? And how can narcissists survive in large, bureaucratic companies?

Bala Chakravarthy and Peter Lorange of IMD International, who have studied successful ambidextrous companies like Medtronic and Nestlé, find that young entrepreneurial visionaries survive only when sponsored by a courageous senior executive who puts his own credibility on the line.^{xvii} As noted in chapter 4, this kind of mentor kept Jack Welch at GE when he was a division manager. Without such a mentor, Welch would have either left or been shelved as too rebellious and abrasive for promotion.

There are other solutions for ambidextrous companies. Smart marketing types can buy a company to get the innovators. That's what Bob Iger of Disney did when he bought Pixar, getting John Lasseter as Chief Creative Officer and Steve Jobs as a board member.

All personality types with SI will find a way to partner with talent that complements their strengths. HP shareholders should hope that Mark Hurd, a productive obsessive who has succeeded in paring away the fat at HP, recruits innovative narcissists. By cost cutting and aggressively moving product, he has dramatically improved profitability, but all that can't create great new products that grow the company.

<FMA>Questioning Popular Theories

<FMTXT>As you read this book, you'll find that I question, explicitly or implicitly, four popular fashions in management theorizing: situational leadership, level-5 self-effacing leadership, emotional intelligence, and focusing solely on people's strengths.^{xviii}

These theories aren't all wrong, but I believe they are incomplete and can limit your ability to understand people and make wise decisions about them. The appeal of these theories is that they're optimistic and idealistic. It would make life easier if we

could always change our style of leadership to fit the situation, but we can't. It would be inspiring if all the best leaders were humble and self-effacing, but they aren't. Employees would be happier if all the most successful leaders demonstrated emotional intelligence, but they don't. And it would make life more pleasant if we didn't have to pay attention to people's weaknesses, but we do. And the reason is that by viewing the whole person, not just strengths, we expand our knowledge and become better able to develop strengths in ourselves and others. We also are better equipped to avoid getting hurt by toxic leaders.^{xix}

It's good to accentuate the positive, particularly if it helps to eliminate the negative. Notably, a number of narcissistic leaders have thanked me for emphasizing the positive potentials of their personalities, and a few have sought my help in building on those strengths because when they do that, the negatives seem to lose their bite. In other words, when you coach narcissists who do want to improve themselves, the best strategy is to focus on growth, not their faults.

To conclude, I'm proposing that management theories need to take account of personality and context. Different personality types shine in different settings. Their approach to leadership may be right for one context but not another. But little attention has been paid by business theorists to understanding personality, and what little there is has focused on behavioral traits. After the publication of this book, Gerhard Gschwandter and I published an article in *SellingPower* describing how the different personality types typically deal with customers.^{xx} In that piece, we introduced the concept of *Personality IQ*, the ability to understand personality, to see how people relate to others, and to perceive their strengths and weaknesses. This book can help you to improve your Personality IQ, but knowledge of types is only one part of the equation. It doesn't tell you the level of a person's productiveness and moral reasoning or emotional attitudes such as enthusiasm, envy, anger, fear, sadness, optimism, and so on. That requires a combination of intellect and emotional awareness or what I'd rather call a heart that listens—the ability to experience and recognize emotional attitudes.

In my next book, forthcoming from Harvard Business School Press, I'll write more about the role of personality in both leaders and followers in the changing context of our time.

<FMA>Appreciation

<FMTXT>This edition would not have been published without the support of enthusiastic readers. In particular, I appreciate the efforts of Jeff Kehoe, who championed the book at the Harvard Business School Press. He made the case for publication with testimony from Charles O'Reilly, Charles Handy, and Dr. Donald L. Nathanson, all of whom have made significant contributions to understanding people and organizations in their own writings. Thanks to Julia Ely, who edited this preface, and to Maria Stroffolino, who has patiently typed the many drafts.

Washington, D.C.
April 2006

<COMP: Please add to Notes section in backmatter>

- i. Jim Collins, *Good to Great: Why Some Companies Make the Leap . . . and Others Don't* (New York: HarperBusiness, 2001).
- ii. <<AU: author, article title?>>Fred Vogelstein, "Mastering the Art of Disruption", *Fortune*, February 6, 2006, <<AU: page?>> 23.

- iii. Jack Welch and Suzy Welch, *Winning* (New York: Harper Business, 2005), 181–184.
- iv. An example is Malcolm Gladwell’s statement, “I don’t believe in character. I believe in the effect of the immediate impact of environment and situation on people’s behavior.” <<AU: Title of article>>”The Gladwell Effect,” by Rachel Donadio, *New York Times Book Review*, February 5, 2006, <<AU: page?>>.
- v. See my discussion of the difference between developmental and addictive needs in Michael Maccoby, *Why Work?: Motivating the New Workforce*, 2nd ed. (Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press, 1995), chapter 2.
- vi. “Lessons in Power: Lyndon Johnson Revealed: A Conversation with Historian Robert A. Caro,” *Harvard Business Review*, April 2006, 47–52.
- vii. <<AU: title of article>>, “As Italy Votes, Golden Career of Berlusconi Is at Crossroads,” *Wall Street Journal*, March 30, 2006.
- viii. See, especially, Robert J. Sternberg, *Beyond IQ: A Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- ix. Before Fiorina was fired, I asked an HP manager what she thought of her. She wrote, “The people who work for her see her as an idea person who doesn’t follow through or have deep knowledge. In psychological terms, she might be a productive narcissist. She has all the imperial accoutrements—limos, planes, etc. I get no sense that she is either an obsessive or erotic type—maybe also marketing.”
- x. The consultants were Richard Greene, Richard Margolies, Edith Onderick-Harvey, Mark Paulson, Mark Paulson Jr., and Gary Wolford. This concept has provoked interest from both academics and consultants. I was invited to give a keynote address to the Strategic Management Society at its 2004 international meeting in San Juan, Puerto Rico.
- xi. For warnings to managers, see Haruo Shimada and John Paul MacDuffie, “Industrial Relations and ‘Humanware,’” working paper 1855-88, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, , December 1986; See also, Michael Maccoby, “Is There a Best Way to Build a Car?” *Harvard Business Review*, November-December 1997, 161–171.
- xii. Shimizu Yoshiaki, “Japan, the Shaping of the Daimyo Culture 1185–1868,” exhibition catalogue Washington, D.C., National Gallery of Art, 1988.
- xiii. An enthusiastic reader from Buffalo, NY, summarized a number of positive comments about this book after giving it five stars in Amazon’s customer reviews: “Wow! Now this is a book about what leadership really is! Real leaders are narcissists . . . Successful leaders are not warm and fuzzy types; they succeed because they can make tough decisions on difficult matters, often times ignoring or not listening to others . . . This book flies in the face of Daniel Goleman and others who have jumped on the emotional intelligence bandwagon (claiming that the stuff of leadership is empathy and emotional intelligence),” Amazon.com, January 2, 2005.
- xiv. Doris Kearns Goodwin writes that Lincoln “possessed extraordinary empathy—the gift or curse of putting himself in the place of another, to experience what they were feeling, to understand their motives and desires.” See *Team of Rivals, the Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006), 104. Lincoln also possessed an element of emotional intelligence that I haven’t seen mentioned

in books on the subject. That’s a sense of humor, the emotional equivalent of a sense of reality.

- xv. Michael S. Rosenwald, <<AU: name of article?>>”J. Craig Venter’s Next Little Thing. Tackling the World’s Energy Problem”, *Washington Post*, February 22, 2006.
- xvi. Charles O’Reilly and Michael L. Tushman, “The Ambidextrous Organization,” *Harvard Business Review*, April 2004, <<AU: page?>>.
- xvii. Bala Chakkravarthy and Peter Lorange, <<AU: title of paper?>>”Leading for Growth: Managing Dilemmas”, (paper presented at Strategic Society annual meeting, San Juan, Puerto Rico, November 3, 2004).
- xviii. The best presentation of this theory is Marcus Buckingham and Donald O. Clifton, *Now, Discover Your Strengths* (New York: The Free Press, 2001). Right before he died, Donald Clifton sent me a note praising this book for pointing out the strengths of productive narcissists.
- xix. Jean Lipman-Blumen, *The Allure of Toxic Leaders: Why We Follow Destructive Bosses and Corrupt Politicians and How We Can Survive Them* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004); Barbara Kellerman, *Bad Leadership: What It Is, How It Happens, Why It Matters (Leadership for the Common Good)* (Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 2004).
- xx. Michael Maccoby and Gerhard Gschwandtner, “Productive Sales Leaders,” *Selling Power* 25, no. 1 (2005): 58–65.